



National Library of Canada

Cataloguing Branch
Canadian Theses Division

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

Direction du catalogage
Division des thèses canadiennes

NOTICE



The quality of this microfiche is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us a poor photocopy.

Previously copyrighted materials (journal articles, published tests, etc.) are not filmed.

Reproduction in full or in part of this film is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30. Please read the authorization forms which accompany this thesis.

**THIS DISSERTATION
HAS BEEN MICROFILMED
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED**

AVIS

La qualité de cette microfiche dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de mauvaise qualité.

Les documents qui font déjà l'objet d'un droit d'auteur (articles de revue, examens publiés, etc.) ne sont pas microfilmés.

La reproduction, même partielle, de ce microfilm est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30. Veuillez prendre connaissance des formules d'autorisation qui accompagnent cette thèse.

**LA THÈSE A ÉTÉ
MICROFILMÉE TELLE QUE
NOUS L'AVONS REÇUE**

THE ROLE OF THE AORIST AND IMPERFECT TENSES IN THE
DEVELOPMENT OF ASPECT: A STUDY OF THE PRETERITE
FORMS OF THE POVEST' VREMENNYKH LET

by Heather R. Bissonette

Thesis presented to the School of
Graduate Studies of the University
of Ottawa in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in Slavic Studies

Ottawa, Canada, 1977



Heather R. Bissonette, Ottawa, Canada, 1978.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This thesis was prepared under the supervision of Professor Constantine Bida, Ph.D., and Professor Zbigniew Folejewski, Ph.D., Chairman, of the Department of Slavic Studies and Modern Languages of the University of Ottawa.

Research for the thesis was facilitated by a Canada Council Doctoral Fellowship travel grant, and by association with the University of Illinois Summer Research Laboratory on Russia and Eastern Europe.

CURRICULUM STUDIORUM

Heather R. Bissonette was born in Brantford, Ontario, November 18, 1942. She received a B.A. (1966) in General Arts and an M.A. (1970) in Russian Literature and Linguistics from the University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario. The title of her M.A. thesis is The Poetic Quality of the Hagiography of the Kievan Pechersky Monastery: An Interpretation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	page
INTRODUCTION.	iv
I.- THE DISCUSSION.	1
1. Argument	1
2. The Determinate:Indeterminate Category	2
3. The Application of Aspect as a Binary System	10
4. Methodology	17
II.- THE ANALYSIS.	19
1. Tense Polarization	19
2. The Determinate Imperfect	26
3. The Indeterminate Aorist	51
4. Cognitive Verbs	57
5. The Verbs of Motion	64
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	77
BIBLIOGRAPHY.	82
Appendix NOTE ON APPENDICES	93
1. VERB GROUPS DISPLAYING TENSE POLARIZATION	94
2. VERB GROUPS CONTAINING THE DETERMINATE IMPERFECT FORM.	98
3. VERB GROUPS CONTAINING THE INDETERMINATE AORIST FORM	106
4. VERB GROUPS CONTAINING A COMMON INDETERMINATE: DETERMINATE STEM.	108
5. VERBS OF MOTION AND <i>БЪИТИ</i> AND <i>ДАТИ : ДАРАТИ</i> GROUPS.	110
6. ABSTRACT.	113

INTRODUCTION

Most of the literature dealing with the historical development of verbal aspect agrees that aspect did exist in the Old Church Slavonic and Old East Slavic texts, in at least some stage of completion. However, based on the study of imperfect and aorist verb forms occurring in the Povest' Vremennykh Let, I have come to the conclusion that aspect as such was not yet evident. My position is basically that the values, which in the literature are called aspectual, are in fact combinations of the determinate-indeterminate category and tense, and that aspect is a later binary structure encompassing both of these categories.

This position is advantageous according to the law of parsimony in that it simplifies many more complex theories, and does not, on the other hand, appear to be contradicted by data introduced by other text analyses. An analysis of the Povest' shows that a binary opposition, called determinate-indeterminate, does structure the verbal system, and that tense usage is strictly defined by this opposition. This category, which encompasses the verbs of motion, was a factor in the development of verbal aspect. Since aspect combines the values of this category and tense, aspect cannot be seen in this text as an independent or perfectly realized grammatical category, structuring the entire verbal system. The advantage of this approach, therefore, lies in the fact

that as a descriptive tool it posits only two elements: the determinate:indeterminate category and tense; and that it offers as a corollary an explanation of the development of verbal aspect.

The problem of the development of verbal aspect has been a very complicated one. Literature on the subject deals with the interplay of four basic categories: the perfective and imperfective aspects, the aorist and imperfect tenses, the determinate:indeterminate category of the verbs of motion, and an earlier I.E. determinate:indeterminate category.

I have accepted from the literature that the original category was the determinate:indeterminate category, which was common to all I.E. languages, Slavic and non-Slavic. The modern determinate:indeterminate category of the verbs of motion is seen as a remnant of this original opposition.

The present study contradicts literature which assesses the stages of aspect development according to the correspondence or lack of correspondence between tense and aspect.

This study demonstrates a correspondence between the determinate:indeterminate category and tense, but instead of imposing a binary grammatical structure over the system which existed, it will suggest that it was the very synthesis of these elements through normalization and simplification which should be seen as aspectualization.

This approach, which shifts the entire process of aspectualization into a later period, offers a solution to some of the problems which result from prematurely forcing the aspect system to come to terms with these other categories.

CHAPTER I

THE DISCUSSION

1. Argument

This study is based on the assumption that verbal aspect as such did not exist in the language reflected in the Povest' Vremennykh Let. Instead, the system was structured by the older indeterminate:determinate category and tense and, further, aspectual value is a combination of the values of the indeterminate:determinate category plus the imperfect and aorist tenses. Aspect, therefore, is not a binary grammatical category structuring the entire verbal system of the Povest'.

The thesis is based on the fact of polarization of tense use relative to the determinate and indeterminate stems in the Povest'. The discussion will demonstrate that (excluding the verbs of motion) the indeterminate stem was used with the imperfect tense, and the determinate stem was used with the aorist tense; and exceptions (the determinate imperfect and indeterminate aorist forms) are special uses, and therefore predictable.

I would suggest that the polarized combinations of indeterminate plus imperfect and determinate plus aorist constitute redundancies and that, therefore, during the process of simplification to a binary grammatical structure

(aspect), the tense endings normalized with the -1 ending. This does not mean that the morphological value of the imperfect and aorist tenses was lost, or that the morphological value of "perfect" was borrowed. On the contrary, both the aorist and imperfect tense values were retained. Therefore, aspectual value appears in the verbs of the Povest' only as combinations of tense and stem values, e.g., the combination of determinate stem plus aorist tense corresponds to the perfective aspect; and the combination of indeterminate stem plus imperfect tense corresponds to the imperfective aspect.

The verbs of motion, however, did not demonstrate a polarized use of tense, i.e., the unprefixd verbs of motion occur in both tenses. Thus, during the process of aspectualization, the determinate and indeterminate stems did not combine with the aorist and imperfect tenses to become perfective and imperfective, and the verbs of motion preserved the old determinate:indeterminate category.

2. The Determinate:Indeterminate Category

Many scholars have agreed that the perfective:imperfective distinction developed from an original I.E. determinate:indeterminate category. N. Van Wijk (1929) agrees with A. Meillet (1922) that the determinate:indeterminate opposition characterized not only the verbs of motion,

but encompassed the entire system. According to Van Wijk, at the time of the formation of the new preterites, it still occupied its dominant place in the verbal system. C. G. Regnell (1944) also describes the formation of aspect as the historical continuation of the I.E. determinate:indeterminate category, and includes verbs other than the verbs of motion in this category.

According to V. V. Borodich (1951, 1954) also, the determinate:indeterminate (opredelenny:neopredelenny) was the initial opposition in all I.E. languages, and was characteristic of the Slavic verbs in general. However, unlike Van Wijk, who defines determinate action as simple action leading directly to an end, and indeterminate action as action composed of many acts, or as extended or repeated, Borodich suggests that the original determinate:indeterminate relation, which existed in all I.E. languages, was one of action versus state. In Slavic verbs, this opposition was realized in two subtypes: the opposition of factitive vs. state (e.g., *сдѣлати* vs. *сдѣлѣти*), which was not productive; and the opposition of transition to a state vs. state (e.g., *сидѣти* vs. *сидѣлѣти*). The latter developed into the determinate:indeterminate category, which was the basic opposition in Slavic verbs until the development of aspect. Determinacy is characterized as concrete action; and indeterminacy as a statal action, capability for action or collectivity.

Although Yu. S. Maslov (1958, 1959) calls the pre-aspect opposition terminative:aterminative (predel'nyy : nepredel'nyy), he also (as Borodich) traces it to earlier Aktionsarten of state and change of state, which in the pre-Slavic period formed the opposition terminative:aterminative:neutral.

Ye. V. Cheshko (1951), in her work on the verbs of motion in the Codex Zographensis, demonstrated that the indeterminate and determinate verbs of motion do not have the same meaning as in modern Russian. *НОСУТЯ*, for example, describes the very act of carrying; it refers more closely to the physical means of carrying out an action. Thus the action as abstraction is emphasized, rather than spatial diversity (as in modern indeterminate verbs). The indeterminate stems expressed action per se, isolated from environmental conditions, while the determinate stem expressed concrete action, i.e., action in a definite moment of time, directed to the achievement of a goal or result. Cheshko suggests that the opposition abstract:concrete was common to all verbal stems, not only the verbs of motion, until the development of aspect.

Herbert Galton (1976), from the initial definition of succession as the invariant function of time, has formulated the essential features of process in time as change vs. nonchange. This opposition is reflected in the perfective

and imperfective aspects, such that the perfective aspect is the morphological means for presenting temporal succession, while the imperfective aspect presents immutability, a state lasting unchanged while other events change. Completion and duration are not features of aspect, but only of the events themselves. Perfectivity denotes only a link in succession (the temporal chain), while imperfectivity means that a state persists despite the flux of time, and is viewed in isolation from it.

Although Galton is defining essential features of aspect, the opposition of change vs. nonchange corresponds to the notion of state vs. transition to state employed by Borodich when referring to the determinate:indeterminate category, and Maslov when referring to the terminative:aterminative category, and to Cheshko's definitions of the verbs of motion in Old Church Slavonic. The verbal forms of the Povest' have been described in this present study in terms of the traditional determinate:indeterminate category, which I have defined as reference to events vs. reference to action per se. This also corresponds to Galton's definitions of perfectivity and imperfectivity as points in succession vs. immutability.

According to Tine H. Amse-de Jong (1974, pp. 33, 26), linguists who refer to "aspect" when speaking of non-Slavic languages are actually referring to the opposition telic:atelic, which exists in all I.E. languages, including Slavic

and non-Slavic. A telic event is one limited by natural limits (termini). It implies a contrast period lying on either side of the event period, i.e., on the time line beyond the termini. An atelic event is an event of unlimited duration. This opposition is also characteristic of the verbs of motion, e.g., the determinate verb *ИЕЧУ* is telic, since it covers the distance A - B in one direction; the contrast periods are "be in A" and "be in B." *НОЧУ* is atelic, referring to carrying without direction, or in (or from) more than one direction.

In other words, if we subtract the notion of duration (which, according to Galton (1976, p. 11) is not an essential feature of aspect or the basic time opposition) from Amse-de Jong's definition of action, the telic:atelic opposition corresponds to definitions of the basic opposition already discussed (i.e., those of Borodich, Maslov, Cheshko, and Galton), and is similar in meaning to event (i.e., event bounded by contrast periods) and action per se (i.e., event without reference to a contrast period), which is the definition of determinate:indeterminate action used in the present study.

Scholars who oppose the concept that the aspect system developed from the determinate:indeterminate opposition, which was a general category encompassing also the verbs of motion, point to the fact that the aspect opposition does

not correspond to the determinate:indeterminate category of the verbs of motion. According to Antonin Dostal (1963), for example, the fact that both *нелѣту* and *нелѣту* are imperfective in modern Russian demonstrates the lack of correspondence between the determinate:indeterminate category of the verbs of motion and aspect.

Rudolf Růžička (1962) discusses the problems of I. Němec and Regnell, who found it necessary to place *нелѣту* in a group of semantically unmarked verbs in order to explain its later imperfective value, and objects that the very verbs which are the clearest representatives of determinacy must thereby be called unmarked. Ruzicka also points out that it was the fact that determinate verbs did not become perfective that led Maslov to define a terminative:aterminative opposition (realized predominantly through the prefix), in order to distinguish it from the verbs of motion. A related argument presented by Růžička, demonstrating that the aspect system was not inherited from an I.E. opposition, centers on the fact that, although the Greek aorist $\eta\upsilon\lambda\epsilon\gamma\kappa\alpha$ and the determinate verb *нелѣту* are genetically identical and semantically similar, in this case, since *нелѣту* is imperfective, the verbs are not aspectually equivalent.

An explanation for the lack of correspondence between determinate and perfective values is that the stems of the determinate verbs of motion, as evidenced by the forms found in the Povest', entertained a liberated use of the imperfect

and aorist tenses, and therefore, during the process of normalization did not retain the value of the aorist tense, and remained a remnant of the old system. (It is suggested also by Van Wijk (1929, p. 244) and others that the determinate and indeterminate verbs of motion preserved a trait which was at one time characteristic of the Slavic verb in general.) When the determinate verb of motion did occur in the aorist tense, however, it possessed a value equal to perfectivity. This explains how the determinate verb of motion was equivalent to the other determinate verbs, and yet did not like them become perfective. Further, in response to the problem presented by Růžička concerning the comparison of the Greek aorist and the Slavic determinate verb of motion, it should be said that although *HCCTY* is not imperfective, it is determinate, and it was the determinate: indeterminate category which was inherited from the I.E. system.

It has been suggested that the unprefixd determinate verb of motion in the aorist tense has perfective value (Cheshko, 1951, p. 304; Regnell, 1944, p. 88; Růžička, 1957, p. 16; and others). This corroborates the view that the perfective aspect is a combination of the values of the determinate stem plus the aorist tense, and means that *uac* and *noyac* are aspectual equivalents.

According to D. G. Huntley (1967), on the other hand, neither *UTY* nor *XOAYTY* expresses the attainment of

the limit of action, and therefore both are imperfective. Huntley gives the example: *ἰ βῆσταβῆ ἰδε κῆ ο(τῆ)υῖο* *своему. εἰτε же βῆου δαλεγε σῆυτῆο ουζῆρδῆ ἰ ο(τῆ)υῖο εῖο* (Ass. *ποιδε*) (Luke 15, 20, Mar. Sav.). He disagrees with Van Wijk, who does not find a difference between *ιδε* and the Assemanianus variation *ποιδε*, and Huntley suggests that the form *ιδε* indicates that the action has not yet achieved its goal and is, therefore, imperfective. I would suggest, however, that it is the aorist tense, referring to the action as discrete, which imposes the limit, and that since both *ιδε* and *ποιδε* are determinate verbs in the aorist, they have equivalent aspectual value. Moreover, in order to assess whether or not the action of the verb has reached its limits, it is necessary to define the semantic value of *ιτι*.

Jose Johannet (1957), in fact, found that *ιδε*, as well as referring to a voyage or expedition, can refer to the pure and simple act of going, without reference to duration or accompanying circumstances. He found that the difference between *ιδε* and *ιζυιδε* is not aspectual, but the difference of a simple verb versus a prefixed verb. He concluded that this use of *ιτι* is a remnant of pre-aspectual usage.

3. The Application of Aspect as a Binary System

I have suggested that aspect as such, i.e., a binary grammatical structure encompassing the entire verbal system, did not exist in the Povest', although combinations such as determinate-plus-aorist (a discrete act in past time), indeterminate-plus-imperfect (action per se as process), correspond to modern aspectual values. On the contrary, the system was characterized by the interplay of two separate categories, i.e., the determinate:indeterminate category and tense. The determinate imperfect form, which expressed repeated discrete action, and the indeterminate aorist form, which expressed action per se with a specific time period, did not represent arbitrary use of tense, but were characterized by specific functions of the imperfect and aorist tenses, and did not contradict the law of indeterminate-plus-imperfect and determinate-plus-aorist. During the process of simplification (aspectualization) of the verbal system, these hybrids fell together with the determinate or indeterminate forms.

Although the evidence of the Povest' is not a sufficient basis for the formulation of a theory concerning the actual process of aspectualization, the many later variations of the determinate imperfect as indeterminate imperfect, such as *вспомогательные*, the Academy and Radziwill

variation of the original *бѣиѣшаще* on page 214 of the text (see Galton, 1976, p. 181); the modern perfective value of the determinate aorist verb of motion (*иде* became *пошел*); and the modern perfective value of the indeterminate aorist (*стога* became *постоял*) constitute a partial indication at least, that during the process of aspectualization the stem was conditioned by the regressive action of the tense, i.e., the determinate stem of *бѣиѣшаще* became indeterminate, and the stems of *иде* and *стога*, by means of the prefix *по-*, clearly indicate conservation of the value of the aorist tense.

The main point, however, and the one which is essential to the thesis, is that aspect is a combination of these values, i.e., both stem and tense, and therefore one cannot impose aspectual value entirely on one or the other; and secondly, that aspect as a universal binary grammatical system was not yet evident.

Some scholars see aspectualization as the subordination of tense and stem to aspect. According to Antonin Dostal (1963), for example, aspect existed as a remarkably well developed system in the Old Church Slavonic, encompassing 98 percent of the verbs. He found that the imperfect tense was used with imperfective aspect 99 percent of the time, but that the aorist is used with both perfective and imperfective verbs.

T. P. Lomtev (1948) also imposed a binary structure on the verbal system. Because forms such as *ympanuc* and *pacnpobaxy* (the imperfect tense with perfective stem) would be incompatible, he concluded that the verb is not yet perfective, and that therefore the prefix does not perfectivize. This means that the aspect value (i.e., process vs. completed action) was carried by the imperfect and aorist tense until the prefix began to perfectivize, and then the aspect value was carried by the stem. At this point, contradictions in the tense and stem led to the loss of incompatible tense endings. Lomtev assesses the stage of development as the extent to which the arbitrary use of tense is lost, e.g., he found that in the chronicles, the process whereby the aorist tense is lost from the imperfective verb is evident, but the process whereby the imperfect tense is lost from the perfective verb has gone even further.

As Dostal, Lomtev assesses aspect as the degree to which tense and stem are subordinated to an imposed binary structure. But, in fact, in the Povest', apart from the verbs of motion, there is no evidence of a liberated use of tense.

Borodich (1951, 1954), as Lomtev, explained the process of aspectualization in terms of the collision and confusion of stem and tense ending and the shifting of aspectual meaning between stem and ending. According to

Borodich, the primary meaning of the aorist and imperfect tense was not perfectivity and imperfectivity, but determinacy and indeterminacy (concrete vs. collective action). Originally, the imperfect was formed only from the indeterminate verb and the aorist from the determinate. Later, the imperfect tense was used with all stems and developed the meaning of duration (imperfectivity), while the aorist of prefixed stems developed the meaning of completion (perfectivity) which spread to all forms of the aorist and could also be used with any stem. According to Borodich, the process of development of the indeterminate verb from the determinate (the secondary prefixed form) was unusually productive in the development of aspect. The collision of determinacy plus indeterminacy (expressed by the imperfect tense) confused the determinate meaning and created a new concept: a single concrete action was presented as a state or process, which was opposed to the old imperfect meaning of repeated or habitual action.

According to Borodich (1954, p. 62), the Old Church Slavonic Gospels reflect the beginning of the tendency toward a liberated use of tense, while in the later Old Church Slavonic manuscripts any combination of tense and stem is possible. I have not found evidence of a liberated use of tense in the Povest' except in the verbs of motion. The aorist (except for a few cases of the special use of

orist with an indeterminate verb accompanied by a specific time period) always refers to a discrete event in the past, i.e., occurs with a determinate stem, and completion is not an essential meaning of the aorist tense. The secondary prefixed verb is always indeterminate, referring to the content of action, and always occurs in the imperfect tense, which describes action as process. The determinate imperfect verb form, whether of prefixed or simple verbs, refers to event as repeated discrete action. The individual forms which Borodich presents as new developments (i.e., verbs of state in the aorist tense, or verbs of action in the imperfect) appear similar to those of the Povest', but most of these forms are discussed in this study as special uses, as verbs of motion or as verbs of cognition. I would agree with Van Wijk and others, therefore, that the prefixed form, as well as the form extended by an "a"-theme suffix, were manifestations of the determinate:indeterminate category.

Wulf Budich (1969) and Amse-de Jong (1974) have defined aspect as an abstract grammatical category, applied this definition to the Old East Slavic and Old Church Slavonic language, and concluded that, in fact, aspect only does exist in the old texts according to the same definitions, i.e., as pairs which are distinguished only by the morphology of aspect (prefixed pairs distinguished by the suffix or pairs distinguished by the empty prefix).

According to Budich's (1969, p. 199) definitions, the category of perfective aspect includes verbs which are complexive and verbs which have displexive partners, while imperfective verbs are displexive verbs and verbs with complexive partners. A complexive verb is defined as durative action which is limited (by an empty prefix); a displexive verb is one which is extended (by lengthening or suffix). In other words, the stem is defined as either durative or nondurative, and aspect is indicated by the presence of pairs formed either by means of the empty prefix or by means of the secondary imperfective. In the Novgorod Chronicle (Synodal Copy), according to Budich, aspect pairs are attested generally with the secondary prefixed form, and only a few were formed by means of the prefix (e.g., *померети* and *пожьдати*).

Amse-de Jong (1974, p. 34) also recognized aspect as pairs which were formally distinguished by the "a" suffix. She defined perfective as action which is telic (the action is confined to its natural limits); exclusive, i.e., the Full Event Period (FEP) is equal to the Narrated Period (NP) (NP is the part of the time line indicated by the verb form); and with Orientation Period (OP) lying outside the NP. Imperfective action is telic; non-exclusive, i.e., the FEP is not equal to the NP (or the FEP = NP, but is not equal to the Marked Period, which forms a larger

background against which repeated action occurs); and the OP is inside the NP.

Action, therefore, must be telic to participate in aspect, although (as discussed above) the telic:atelic relationship corresponds to the determinate:indeterminate category which, according to the present study, is a component of aspect. Simplex verbs which occur in the Old Church Slavonic texts are thus non-aspectual according to Amse-de Jong. *МОЛУТИ* and *ПОМОЛУТИ* do not constitute an aspect pair. And as long as **ПОМОЛЛЮТИ*, the non-exclusive member, is missing, the most one can say is that the *ПО* - of *ПОМОЛУТИ* presents a condition for a possible aspect opposition, i.e., it is a telic event.

Both Budich and Amse-de Jong have imposed an external structure on the old language, and have concluded that aspect encompasses only those verbs which correspond to that structure. It should be pointed out that, according to both Budich and Amse-de Jong, duration is a component of aspect: Budich recognizes verbs as durative or nondurative, while Amse-de Jong describes action as events on a time line. This approach is contrary to the view of Galton, who suggests that duration is a feature of event, but not an essential feature of aspect.

Another inherent problem in the application of a modern structure to the old language is reflected in the

work by Růžička (1957) on the aspect system of the Povest'. He tests for the existence of aspect by comparing the forms with a modern translation. However, this approach does not take into account possible changes in the meaning of a verb during the process of aspectualization. For example, it is possible that verbs such as *ТБОПУТУ* and *МОАУТУ*, which occur in the text with determinate value, but commonly occur in the imperfect to express repeated action, have shifted from determinate to indeterminate function with the loss of the tense ending. In other words, all forms should be analyzed in terms of the total system in which they occur.

4. Methodology

In order to demonstrate that the polarized use of tense exists in the text, I have analyzed all of those verb groups which contain both the aorist and imperfect tense. A verb group consists of all simple, prefixed and suffixed forms of the stem.

Polarization, which is indicated by the fact that a single stem cannot be used with both the imperfect and aorist tense ending, implies a binary structure which is defined in terms of the determinate:indeterminate category discussed above, i.e., as event versus action per se.

Stems which occur with both the aorist and imperfect tense are treated as exceptions to the evident pattern.

of determinate-plus-aorist and indeterminate-plus-imperfect, and are analyzed in terms of their specific functions.

The text used is the Laurentian Copy of the Povest' Vremennykh Let (excluding the "Instruction" of Prince Vladimir Monomach) in the Polnoye Sobraniye Russkikh Letopisey edition, and page numbers refer to this edition. The numbers of occurrences of a specific form (simple, prefixed, or suffixed in the aorist or imperfect tense) are given in brackets.

Translations of excerpts from the text are usually taken from the Samuel Hazzard Cross translation, and translations which are significantly divergent from Cross's interpretation have been commented on.

The appendices represent a complete list of all verb groups which occur in the text in both the imperfect and aorist tense. They give the number of occurrences of all simple, prefixed and suffixed forms of each group in the aorist or imperfect tense.

The London School of Slavonic Studies system of transliteration was used in the bibliography.

CHAPTER II

THE ANALYSIS

1. Tense Polarization

The following verb groups are taken from Appendix 1. Members of the 51 groups in this section have mutually exclusive use of tense; both the aorist and imperfect tense are not used with the same stem. The indeterminate stem, which describes action per se, always occurs in the imperfect tense, while the determinate stem, which refers to action as event, always occurs in the aorist. The values of indeterminate-plus-imperfect:determinate-plus-aorist correspond to the values of modern imperfective:perfective.

БОЛАШЕ (1): *РАЗБОЛѢСА* (7)

130 *ПОСЛА ПРОТИВУ ИМѢ БОРИСА САМЪ БО БОЛАШЕ ВЕЛМИ*

he sent Boris out against them, for he himself was very ill.

39 [и] *ОУКЛЮНИУ В НОГУ И С ТѢ РАЗБОЛѢ И УМРЕ*

and (the serpent) bit him in the foot, so that he sickened and died

The determinate verb *РАЗБОЛѢСА* occurs seven times, always in the aorist. It expresses the discrete occurrence of an event in past time. The indeterminate imperfect verb *БОЛАШЕ* occurs once. It expresses the action as content, in this case, the state of being ill.

Взгарахуса; из- (3): Взгорѣша(сА); из-; съ-;
по-; раз- (6)

59 и тако взгарахуса голубѣнници шво клѣти
шво вехѣ шво ли шоринѣи и не бѣ двора
иде же не горяще и не бѣ лѣзѣ гасити.
вси бо двори взгорѣшася

thus the dove-cotes, the coops, the porches and
the haymows caught on fire. There was not a
house which was not burning, and it was impossible
to extinguish the flames because all of the houses
had caught on fire

All six aorists are formed from the primary prefixed
stem, while the three imperfects are formed from the second-
ary prefixed stem. In the example given, *взгарахуса*₂
(indeterminate imperfect) describes the action itself as a
process, while *взгорѣшася* (determinate aorist) refers
to the burning of all the houses as a fact which made the
extinguishing of the fires impossible..

сѣдираху (1): шора; раз- (3)

154 тако и неще дѣшущимъ конемъ сѣдираху

хзѣи с нихъ толкъ бо бѣ морѣ в конѣ

they tore the skins off while the horses were
still breathing, so violent was the plague
from which the animals suffered

103 ЦРКВНАТА ЗАПОНА РАЗДРАСА НАДВОЕ:

МРЪТВИИ ВСТЪЩА МНОЗ

the veil of the temple was rent in twain, and
many of the dead arose

The indeterminate (*съдиражу*) is often used in the description of dramatic events, where the emphasis is on the content of the action. *раздраса* (determinate aorist) refers to the action as an historic event. Determinate verbs often express action in sequence, and here it is followed by the determinate aorist *встѣша*.

дѣвляху (1): *оудѣвѣса*; по - (3)

9 ТѢИ СЛЪШАЩЕ ДѢВЛЯХУ

those listening to him marvelled

129 КЪША КНАЗИ ПЕЧЕНЪЗЪСТІИ И ПОДѢВИШАСА

the Pecheneg princes took (the porridge) and
were amazed

The determinate aorist form *подѣвишаса* expresses the discrete occurrence of an event in past time. *дѣвляху* (indeterminate imperfect) focuses on the content of the verb. Notice that *подѣвишаса* follows the determinate aorist verb *къша*, while *дѣвляху*, which does not express action in sequence, is preceded by a present participle.

подобашеть (3): сподобиса (4)

223 подобашеть на̄ [преданъимъ быти] в руки
языку странну

we deserved to be delivered into the hands of
an alien people

207 но въчнѣ жизни и покою сподобѣса

but he was found worthy of eternal life and
peace

The determinate aorist form сподобиса describes
the occurrence of an event, while the indeterminate imper-
fect form подобашеть describes the state of being unworthy.

шдалаху (1): шдолѣ (12)

69 и бѣ^ѣ сѣча велика и шдалаху Болгаре
и рече^ѣ Сѣславъ во емѣ своимъ и къ
вечеру шдолѣ Сѣславѣ

there was great carnage and the Bulgarians
were winning. And Svyatoslav said to his men
. . . . Towards evening Svyatoslav gained the
upper hand

All twelve aorists occur with the determinate verb.
The single imperfect is formed from the indeterminate second-
ary prefixed verb. The use of both forms in the above
excerpt indicates a switch from "winning" as a situation to
"winning" as a fait accompli.

звѣху(сѣ) (5); прозѣиваху; при-; съ- (3); прозвѣща(сѣ);

со-; во-; при-; пре- (46)

28 аще и Поланс звѣхѣсѣ но словенская
рѣ бѣ

they were called Polyanians, but their language
was Slavic

165 звѣзда восиа на западѣ испущающа
луча южа прозѣиваху блистаницю

a star arose in the west, which emitted rays,
and which men called a brilliant star

159 а ѿ того прозвѣсѣ Печерскѣи монастырѣ

and because of this they called it the Pechersky
Monastery

: There is complete polarization of tense usage among
the 54 nonprefixed, prefixed and secondary prefixed vari-
ations of *звати*. Both *звѣхѣсѣ* and *прозѣиваху* are
indeterminate and focus attention on the action per se,
which is expressed in the imperfect tense as continued
action. In contrast, *прозвѣсѣ* (determinate aorist) refers
to an event occurring in discrete past time.

кусаше (1): вкуси; ис-; оу- (5)

194/195 за .в. лѣта лежа си ни хлѣба не
вкусу ни воды и помалу оградавѣсѣ
кусаше хлѣба

he lay for two years, tasting neither bread nor
water gradually he became aware of the
bread and ate it

The only occurrence of the imperfect tense is the nonprefixed indeterminate form (*кѹсаше*), which emphasizes the content of the verb itself, the action of tasting.

проливашѣ (1): *лъгаша* (1); *налъгаша* -;
въз -; *из* -; *про* - (7)

279 То чему ты не казаше снвѣ своихъ и
 роду своего не преступати рѣчи но
проливашѣ кровь хѣганьску

why did you not admonish your sons and your
 kinsmen not to violate their oaths by the
 shedding of Christian blood?

129 и почерпаша въдромѣ и лъгаша в латки
 they drew up some (brew) in a pail, and poured
 it into pots

129 люде же налъгаша корчагу цѣжа
 so they poured out a bowl of brew

лъгаша and *налъгаша* occur only in the aorist; both are determinate, expressing action as a discrete event.¹ According to Ruzicka (1957), *прольяти* occurs in the Povest' as a perfective aorist. *проливашѣ*, on the contrary, emphasizes (the evil of) the action itself.

¹ A verb which occurs only in the aorist tense, and refers to action as a discrete event, is considered to be determinate.

ЛЮБАШЕ (6): ВЪЗЛЮБИ (9)

78 И ѿчь его не любаше

his father did not love him

10 приде къ Дунаевѣ [и] възлюбѣ мѣсто
и сруби градокъ малъ

he arrived at the Danube. The place pleased
him and he built a small town

любаше, found only in the imperfect, describes
an emotional state; while възлюбѣ, found only in the
aorist, refers to the "coming to love" as an event.

мучаху (2): примучи (2)

12 си же добръ боеваху на словѣнѣ и

примучиша Дулѣбѣи и насилѣе

творяху женамъ таку мучаху Дулѣбѣи

these Avars made war on the Slavs, and harassed
the Dulebians did violence to the Dulebian
women Thus they harassed the Dulebians

Here again (as with любаше : възлюбѣ), the
nonprefixed verb in the imperfect complements the prefixed
occurring in the aorist. примучиша (determinate aorist)
is a statement of fact, in contrast with the indeterminate
мучаху (and thus they harassed them), which is a state-
ment about the mode of harassment, and thus about the
content of the action.

радовашеся (6): ωбродовашася; по - (2)

83 Бѡху бѡ тогда члвци невѣголови и
погани дѣлавоу радовашеся сему

for at this time the Russes were ignorant pagans.
The devil rejoiced thereat

59 Деревляне же ради бывше видоша. въ
градъ и повѣдоша людемъ и ωбродовѣшася
людемъ в градѣ

the Derevlians re-entered their city with glad-
ness and reported to the inhabitants, and the
people in the city rejoiced

The nonprefixed indeterminate imperfect form ex-
presses an emotional state. The prefixed determinate
aorist refers to an event resulting from a previous event.

2. The Determinate Imperfect

The 47 verb groups in this section (Appendix 2) con-
tain determinate imperfect forms. These are exceptions to
the rule of polarization in that a common determinate stem
is used in both the imperfect and aorist tense. The deter-
minate verb occurs normally in the aorist, referring to a
discrete event in past time. In all cases where it occurs
in the imperfect, it refers to repeated discrete action.
Often the determinate imperfect describes a recurring
sequence of events, or an event which habitually precedes

another event or action. Therefore, the determinate imperfect is a particular use of the determinate verb.

The examples presented include the more difficult cases, e.g., where the occurrences of the determinate imperfect exceed the occurrences of the determinate aorist, or where the determinate:indeterminate category does not correspond to the modern perfective:imperfective category.

ИЗБАВАШЕСТЬ (1) vs. ИЗБАВИ (3)

97 ЕГДА СЯ НАЧАХУ КАТАТИ И ПОМИЛОВАШЕСТЬ

И ЕГДА ИЗБАВАШЕСТЬ ИХЪ ПАКИ

ДУКЛАНАХУТЬСА НА БѢСОСЛУЖЕНЦЕ

when they repented, he had mercy upon them.
When he had freed them, they returned
nevertheless to the worship of devils

163 ТАКО БѢ ИЗБАВИ ХЪ ТАНЪ Ѡ ПОГАНЪ ВЪ ИХЪ

thus God delivered the Christians from the
infidels

ИЗБАВАШЕСТЬ is determinate imperfect, occurring in the aorist with the same determinate stem. In the example given above, where it is found in company with other determinate imperfect verbs (НАЧАХУ and ПОМИЛОВАШЕСТЬ), it refers to repeated discrete actions preceding the action of the indeterminate form ДУКЛАНАХУТЬСА. The determinate aorist ИЗБАВИ refers to a single discrete action in the past.

велаше (1) vs. велаща (1)

- 12 аще повхати будаше шьвину не дааше
 въпрачи коня ни вола но велаше въпрачи
 ꙗ. ли ꙗ. ли ꙗ. ли жєны в тєлѣу

whenever an Avar made a journey, he did not cause either a horse or a steer to be harnessed, but gave command instead that three or four or five women should be yoked to his cart

- 46 привєдоша рускиа слѣи и велаща ꙗти
 и писати обѡихъ рѣчи на харитѣѡ

they brought forward the Russian envoys and ordered them to speak, and ordered that the speech of both sides be written down on parchment

As бѣти (above), вєлѣти occurs only twice in the text, once in the imperfect and once in the aorist tense.

велаща clearly refers to an event, and is therefore determinate. велаше describes repeated discrete actions, as a determinate imperfect, and occurs with other determinate forms: будааше and дадааше.

повелѣша occurs 68 times, only in the aorist.

вержаше (2) vs. верже (1)

- 190 взимая из лона лѣтокъ вержаше на
 кого либо аще ли вержаше на
 другого

taking a flower from his bosom he would throw it at someone if he threw it at someone else

177 и верже с нбсе на зсмаго

and he threw it from heaven to earth

The imperfect tense *вержаше* refers to habitual action, while the aorist *верже* is clearly a determinate aorist form.

The form *вержаше* is an irregular determinate imperfect, as it should have been formed from the determinate stem *верг-*. (See *взвраташется* below.) The soft ending probably distinguished it from an indeterminate verb (imperfect *вергаше*).

взвраташется (2) vs. *взвратиса* ; раз- (7)

190 *аще пригнаше кому чвѣтокъ.... изидаше*
ис чркви и не взвраташется в
чркви до ѿпѣтъга

if the flower attached itself to anyone
he left the church and did not return until
the end of the service

125 и взвращашется на Оустеньѣ стѣига
бѣа

he returned to Kiev on the feast of the Assump-
tion of the Holy Mother of God

The determinate imperfect verb form *взвраташется* occurs on p. 190 together with other determinate imperfect forms: *пригнаше* and *изидаше*, all of which express repeated discrete action.

It is interesting to compare *ВЪЗВРАЩАШСЯ*, the imperfect of the determinate stem, with the indeterminate imperfect *ВЪЗВРАЩАШСЯ* (p. 125). Here, the imperfect tense is the normal ending for the indeterminate verb, and does not indicate repeated action.

ПОВЪДАХУ ; ПРОТО- (5) vs. *ПОВЪДА* ; *ОУ-* ; *УСИТО-* ;

ЗАПО- ; *СПО-* ; *ПРОТО-* (46)

90 *ДѢЛАЕМУ ЖЕ КОБЧЕРУ ЗА Р. ЛБ^ѣ И ПОВЪДАШЕ*

НОИ РАКО БЪИТИ ПОТОПУ И ПОСМЪХАХУСА ЕМУ

the ark was one hundred years building, and Noah foretold that there would be a flood, and they mocked him

There are five cases of the prefixed verb in the imperfect tense, compared with 46 occurrences of the aorist. All of the imperfect verbs can express repeated action. Such forms as the example on p. 90 might be considered ambiguous, if one were to ignore the other data of the present study. However, based on the fact that, logically speaking, Noah must have spoken about the flood several times during the hundred years required for the construction of the ark, and based on the presence of the determinate imperfect *ПОСМЪХАХУСА*, it is considered that this example also is determinate.

ПОГНАШЕ (1) vs. ИЗГНАША ; ПО -; ПРО -; ВЪ -;
ВЪЛ -; ВЪЗ - (27)

271 И БОНАКЪ ПОГНАШЕ СЪКА ВЪТЪЛЪ А
АЛТУНОПА ВЪЗВРАТАШЕТА ВПАТЪ И НЕ
ДОПУСТАХУ ОУГРЪ ШПАТЪ

Bonyak, who wheeled and attacked them from the rear. Altunopa then faced about, and they did not allow the Hungarians to give ground, (but thus killed a great number as they drove them back and forth)

This occurrence of ПОГНАШЕ is the only determinate imperfect among 28 prefixed verbs. It occurs here with other determinate imperfect forms (ВЪЗВРАТАШЕТА and ДОПУСТАХУ), and refers to repeated discrete action.

СОЖЪЖАХУ. (1) vs. ПОЖИГОША ; ЗА -; ВО - (20)

14 АЩЕ КТО УМРАШЕ ВЪЗЛОЖАХУТЪ И НА
КЛАДУ МРТВЦА СОЖЪЖАХУ

if someone died they laid the corpse on a pyre and burned it

The short vowel and soft stem distinguish the determinate imperfect СОЖЪЖАХУ from the indeterminate imperfect (ПОЖИГАХУ)... Together with the other determinate imperfect forms УМРАШЕ and ВЪЗЛОЖАХУТЪ, it refers to a usual sequence of events.

- ЗНАМЕНАШЕ (1) vs. ЗНАМЕНАСЯ (2)

197 и ЗНАМЕНАШЕ лице свое крѣ^тнѣимъ
образѣ^п и тако ищезнаху

he would make the sign of the cross and they
would disappear

197 и ЗНАМЕНА крѣ^тмь и ищезнуша

he made the sign of the cross and they
disappeared

These excerpts, both occurring in the text on
page 197, nicely contrast the difference between ЗНАМЕНАШЕ
... ищезнаху and ЗНАМЕНА ... ищезнуша.

ЛЪСТАХУСА (1)

76 и пакы язъики своимъ ЛЪСТАХУСА
суди имъ бѣ

and it is further written, "Their tongues
have spoken falsely. Judge them, God

This is the only example of the imperfect or aorist unprefixated form. It refers to events rather than to the action itself, and is therefore considered to be a determinate imperfect form.

ПОМАЗАШЕ (1) vs. ПОМАЗАШАСА (1)

189 И АБЕ СТВОРАШЕ МОЛИТВУ И МАСЛОМЪ

ПОМАЗАШЕ И ПРИМАХУ ИЦВЛЕНЬЕ

as soon as he prayed and anointed (the sick),
they would be cured

236 И ТУ СТВОРИШАСА ВРАТА МЪДАНА И

ПОМАЗАШАСА СУНКЛИТО^М

gates of brass were erected there, and they
were covered with indestructible metal

The determinate imperfect forms (СТВОРАШЕ and ПОМАЗАШЕ) in the first example are distinguished in meaning from the determinate aorist forms (СТВОРИШАСА and ПОМАЗАШАСА) only by their reference to habitual action.

МОЛАШЕСА (10) vs. МОЛИСА (2)

275 И ПРИВЕДЕ К КИЕВУ И МОЛИ Ш НС^М

МЕТРОПОЛИТЪ И ИГУМЕНИ И ОУМОЛИША

СЪТОПОЛКА .

and he brought him to Kiev. The metropolitan
and priors interceded on his behalf and per-
suaded Svyatopalk

- 264 *Всеволожана же и метрополитъ*
придоша к Володимеру и молиста
ему
 the widow of Vsevolod and the metropolitan
 came to Vladimir and made known to him their
 plea
- 156 *приходѣ с Берестоваго ѿпѣваше часѣи*
и молашсѣ ту бѹ втайнѣ
 coming here from Berestovo, he chanted the
 hours and offered his prayers to God in
 secret
- 207 *и молаше бѣ всегда глѣ ги бѣ мои*
 he used to pray to God exclaiming "O Lord
 my God
- 278 *Русскиѣ же князи и вои вси молахугѣ*
бѣ и ѿбѣтѣи вѣдараху бѹ
 the princes of Rus' and all the soldiery
 offered their prayers to God and made their
 vows to God

The aorist forms on pp. 275 and 264, meaning "asked, beseeched," refer to discrete events, and therefore appear as determinate. The imperfect tense form, however, appears much more frequently, and has the meaning "prayed." According to Borodich (1954), *молити* in the imperfect tense refers to a religious state, whereas the aorist refers to a concrete request. Although the imperfect in this text generally refers to repeated action (as on p. 156, where it occurs with the determinate imperfect *ѿпѣваше*, and on p. 207), the example on p. 278 is ambiguous. It is also

not clear in some cases whether the reference is to events or to content of action. It is possible that *МОЛЪЩСА*, when it meant "to pray," was originally conceptualized as a series of discrete acts of seeking God, and thus has the form of determinate imperfect, referring not to a state of prayer but to a repetition of acts.

премѣнаше (2) vs. *премѣниса*; *премѣса* (2)

180 и сѧ̄ премѣнашется шво, старѣ шво молодѣ
ово ли ꙗко много премѣнаше во много
шбѣра̄.

and he changed his own aspect, appearing sometimes old, sometimes young, and sometimes he even changed one man to the semblance of another

164 прѣ̄ сѧ̄ же вренемѣ и сѧ̄нце
премѣниса и не бѣ̄ свѣтло

before this time the sun also suffered alteration, and was not bright

The two incidences of *премѣнашется* obviously express repeated determinate action, in contrast to the discrete action expressed by *премѣниса*.

начаху (1) vs. почаша ; нача (163)

151 и черноризьци почаша множитиса
и монастырехе починаху бѣти

the number of monks increased and new monas-
teries came into being

97 егда са начаху каати и помиловашеть и

when they repented, he would have mercy on
them

The determinate verb начати / почати
occurs normally in the aorist (163 times), and only once
in the imperfect. On page 97, начаху refers to
repeated discrete action antecedent to the action of
помиловашеть (also determinate imperfect). The
~~determinate aorist~~ on page 151 refers to the increase
as fact, while the indeterminate imperfect refers to a
situation.

просаху (1) vs. просиша (1)

157 приходяще к нему просаху оу него
бл҃гнѣна

those who approached him sought his blessing

19 крѣтитиса просиша

they asked to be baptised

просаху is determinate imperfect, expressing habitual action, in contrast with the aorist form просиша, which refers to a discrete event.²

рече (1) vs. рече (454)

190 аще к нему что рече ли добро
ли зло сбудашетсѧ старче
слово

if he made any prophecy, whether good or evil,
the ancient's word was fulfilled

² въпраша ; оу - (3): въпрашати is a determinate verb, which in the text means "enquire," in contrast with the determinate verb просити, which means "ask for, demand." It was probably formed from прашати, an indeterminate verb expressing a state of mind, i.e., to enquire. The example below (p. 102) demonstrates the determinate quality of the verb. All of the occurrences of the aorist in the text refer to a discrete act.

102 призвавъ книжники и старци людовска
и въпраша ѿ кде х҃ѣ ражае^{тсѧ}

having called together the scribes and elders
of the people, he enquired of them where Christ
should be born

рещи occurs consistently in the text as a determinate aorist form (454 times). The only exception is the determinate imperfect found on p. 190 (above): *речаше* expresses repeated discrete action, and is followed in the apodosis by the determinate imperfect verb *сбудашется*.

посвѣташе (1) vs. *просвѣти* ; ш - (2)

148 и бѣ сѣча силна како посвѣташе

мологна блещ^ашется шружъс

the combat was terrible. As the lightning flashed, the weapons gleamed

The determinate imperfect form *посвѣташе* (p. 148) expresses action antecedent to the action of the indeterminate imperfect verb *блещ^ашется*. The repeated flashes of lightning make visible the gleaming of weapons, which is descriptively referred to in terms of the content of the action.

послушаху (3) vs. *послуша* ; пре - (29)

85 Володимеръ же слушаше ихъ бѣ

бо самъ любя жени и блуженьска

многое послушаше, сладко

Vladimir listened to them, for he himself was fond of women, and liked to hear about great debauchery

The meanings of *слушаше* (indeterminate imperfect) and *послушаше* (determinate imperfect) in this

example are quite different. *слушаше* refers to the content of listening in this specific situation, whereas *послушаше* refers to Vladimir's usual practice of listening, i.e., a series of events.

растреляху (1) vs. *растрѣлаша* (1)

30 *шбѣхъ посекаху другиа же мучаху
и нѣга же растреляху а другыи
в море вметаху*

some they beheaded, some they tortured, some they shot, and still others they threw into the sea

268 *и растрѣлаша стрѣлами Василковичи*

and they shot the sons of Vasil'ko

растреляху (p. 30) is a determinate imperfect form, referring to repeated discrete events.

судаше (1); осудаше (1) vs. *соудихомъ* (1)

33 *многажды право соудихомъ*

we have often deemed it proper

97 *по сихъ же судаше Илии жрече*

next Eli the priest was judge

264 *аще кого видаше ли шюмна . . . не осудаше*

if he saw anyone uproarious . . . he did not condemn him

соудити has clear determinate meaning on p. 33 (*соудити оупѣ*). Ruzicka (1957) also ascribes to this occurrence modern perfective meaning. If the verb *соудити* is determinate, *судаше* on p. 97 should be read as referring to a series of acts of judging performed by the Priest Eli, i.e., he acted as judge. *осудаше* on page 264 is clearly determinate imperfect, as is the form *вудаше*.

засѣпаше; при - (2) vs. посѣпаша; раз-;
съ - (4)

56 и повелѣ засѣпати га живѣи и посѣпаша га

and she ordered them to bury them alive. And they buried them

185 [и] вшеде в пещеру и затвораше двери

почерѣ и засѣпаше перстью

entering the crypt, and closing the door, he would cover himself with dust

109 воини же присѣпаху боис

the soldiers kept rebuilding the earthwork

посѣпаша (p. 56), which refers to a discrete event, is an example of the determinate aorist form.

засѣпаше (p. 185) refers to repeated acts, and is found in a series of other determinate imperfects, e.g.,

затвораше: The imperfect of p. 109 is not as clear, and has the Cross translation "the soldiers kept on building"

(while the inhabitants stole the heaped-up earth). However,

in view of the evidence of the other forms, it could be interpreted that the soldiers were repeatedly rebuilding the earthwork.

сѣдаху (14); присѣдаху (2); сѣде (56);
ссѣде; в -; ѡ -; вѣи - (6)

29 полями же прозвани быши. зане в

поля сѣдаху

they were known as Polyanians because they lived in the fields

31 по тѣмъ бо городѣмъ сѣдаху великии

кнѣзи

in these cities lived great princes

192 како утрудашется сѣдаше на сѣдалѣ

свое^{мъ} единому же нему сѣдашию

when he tired he sat on his stool. Once when he was sitting

These verbs are listed in Appendix 1, but are presented here because of the ambiguous nature of the form

сѣдаше on p. 192. It seems to describe indeterminate action following the action of the determinate imperfect

verb утрудашется (when he became tired, he would sit on

his stool); but could be interpreted as the imperfect tense

of the determinate verb сѣсти (when he become tired, he

would sit down on his stool). Cross translates both

утрудашется and сѣдаше as determinate but not as

repeated action: "When he was wearied, he sat down upon his stool." The other 13 occurrences of *сѣдаше* (as on pp. 29 and 31) are indeterminate. They are static verbs expressing the content of the action. Borodich (1954) found no exceptions to the use of the imperfect tense with *сѣдѣти* and the aorist with *сѣсти*.

13 а Оуличи Тиверци сѣдаху бо до Днѣстру
присѣдаху къ Дунаеву

but the Ulichians and the Tivercians lived by the Dniester, and extended as far as the Danube

189 посѣ же приде Ѡвдоси с брѣего и
присѣдаху оу него

later Theodosius came with the brethren, and they sat beside him

Both occurrences of *присѣдаху* (pp. 13 and 189)

appear to be indeterminate imperfect forms. If so, ~~the~~ latter example should be read as "sat with him," rather than "sat down beside the sick man" (Cross translation).

творяху (23) vs. *творихъ* (3); and *створаше* ;

за - (2) vs. *створиша* ; за - (114)

58 когда творихъ трѣизну мужеву своему

when I held a funeral feast for my husband

92 фара же твори кумирѣ навѣикъ оу шца своего

Авраамъ же прише[дъ] въ Вумь возрѣ на нѣбо

... и рѣ^ѣ воистину то естъ бѣ

Terah built idols, having learned the art from his father. But Abraham (son of Terah), when he

came to reason, looked up to heaven ... and said "In truth, that is God

266 азъ бо лахо много зла твори и хотѣлъ
 ꙗко [смы] створити и мстити русьскѣи земли
 for I have done the Poles much harm, and would
 gladly have done more to avenge the land of Rus'

Although творити occurs only three times in the aorist tense, compared to 23 times in the imperfect, it has the value of a determinate verb. All cases of the aorist (pp. 58, 92, and 266) refer to past events rather than to the action itself. According to Borodich (1954), творити occurs twice in the aorist in the codex Zographensis; and Ruzicka (1957) ascribes modern perfective value to some incidences of творити (including the example from p. 266).

12 и насилье твориаху жєнамъ Дулѣнскимъ
 аще поѣхати будаше шѣрину не дааше
 вѣпрачи коня ни вола но вєлаше вѣпрачи
 ꙗко ли .д. ли .с. ли жєнь в телѣгу
 they did violence to the Dulebian women. If an
 Avar wanted to make a journey, he did not cause
 either a horse or a steer to be harnessed, but
 instead commanded that three or four or five
 women should be yoked to his cart

14 аще кто оумраше твориаху трѣизно надъ нимъ
 и по сємь твориаху кладу велику и възложашутъ
 и на кладу мртвца сожѣжаху и посємь
 собравше кости вложашу в судну малу и
 поставашу на столпѣ на путє еже творятъ
 ватици и нѣинѣ си же твориаху обѣчана кривичи

When someone died, a feast was held over the corpse, and then a great pyre was constructed on which the deceased was laid and burned. After the bones were collected, they were placed in a small urn and set upon a post by the roadside, even as the Vyatchians do to this day. Such customs were observed by the Krivichians.

140 *Варази баху мнози оу Ярославѣ и
насилъе творяху Новгородцѣ и женамъ
ихъ*

Yaroslav had many Varangians under his command, and they did violence to the inhabitants of Novgorod and their wives

82 *и иде Киеву и твораше потребу
кумирѣмъ с людьми своими*

and he went to Kiev, and together with his people sacrificed to the idols

All cases of the imperfect tense describe repeated action. On p. 12 *творяху* refers to repeated discrete acts and occurs with other determinate imperfect forms: *будаше*, *дадаше* and *велаше*. In the excerpt from p. 14 *творяху* occurs three times and, together with the other determinate imperfect verbs in the passage (*оумраше*, *взложашутъ*, *сожъжашу*; *вложашу* and *поставашу*), refers to an habitual sequence of events. The determinate imperfect value of the forms on pp. 140 and 82 is not as obvious from the contexts. However, the action may easily be interpreted as repeated, and it is logically more probable that the action in both cases was, in fact, repeated.

185 и тако изидаше из мoнaстeрa... шeдe в
печеру и зaтвoрaшe дeрeчa пeчeрѣ
then he would leave the monastery ... enter
a crypt and close the door

The two imperfect prefixed forms are clearly deter-
minate. For example, зaтвoрaшe on p. 185 occurs with
the determinate imperfect изидаше and refers to an
habitual event.

тpудaшeтcя. (1) vs. тpуд^ѣ. (3)

See the discussion for сбдаше, which occurs
with the determinate imperfect тpудaшeтcя on p. 192
of the text.

oутѣшaxу. (3) vs. oутѣш^и. (3)

188 аще котори братъ въ егеро прегрѣшенъе
впаде oутѣшaxу
if any brother feel into some sinful way they
consoled him

oутѣшaxу is an ambiguous form, as it could be
formed from either the indeterminate or indeterminate stem.
In the text, however, it always occurs with other determinate
imperfect forms, and refers to recurring past events.

гАДАХУ (5) vs. гАСТА (3)

89 снѣстѣ и вдастѣ мужго своему и

гаста и ѿверзостася ѡчи има

she ate of it and gave it to her husband. They ate and their eyes were opened

119 гАДАХУ скверну всяку . . . и смертвецю

не погребѣху но гАДАХУ

they ate all manner of unclean things . . . and did not bury their dead, but ate them

гАДАХУ is a determinate imperfect form, and in all cases refers to repeated action. (The indeterminate imperfect гАДАХУ does not occur in the text.)

вЪЗМАШЕ (1) vs. прита ; по- ; вз- ; на- ; пере- ;

под- ; за- ; порѣ- ; пре- ; сн- ; вспри- ; от- ;

из- ; нла (123)

194 и положаху пред ни и не вЪЗМАШЕ

его но ли, вложити в руцѣ ему

they would place bread near him, but he would not take it unless they placed it in his hands

The determinate imperfect form вЪЗМАШЕ is the only imperfect among 124 prefixed determinate verbs found in the text. It refers to repeated action following the action of the determinate imperfect verb положаху, and conditional on the action of the determinate verb вложити.

изимахуть; вн-; при-; ш- (13) vs. изъима ;
по-; вѣи-; пере-; при- (9)

237 шлег же по прияти града шзъима Ростовци
и Бѣлошзерци и Суздалицѣ

after the capture of the city, Oleg arrested the
men of Rostov, Beloozero and Suzdal'

204 Всеволодъ же сѣде Кѣневѣ . . . персеима
власть Русьскую всю

Vsevolod reigned in Kiev ... he assumed
sovereignty over all Rus'

188/ аще братъ етеръ вѣидаше из монастыря
189 . . . и приимаху брата в монастырь
if some brother left the monastery ... they would
take the brother (back) into the monastery

63 Шльга часто глашеть . . . шнѣ же не
внимаше того

Olga would often say (to him) ... but he did not
heed her

Various prefixed forms of the indeterminate verb
имати occur in the aorist nine times (e.g., изъима and
персеима on pp. 237 and 204), and have determinate value,
referring to discrete events in the past.

The imperfect form, occurring 13 times, expresses
repeated action, and functions as determinate imperfect.
приимаху, on p. 188/9, occurs in a parallel construction
with the determinate imperfect verb вѣидаше. On p. 63
внимаше refers to Syvatoslav's behavior on many occasions.

221 Половци же начаши налѣгати и
штѣмаху воду

The Polovcians began to press them hard and
 cut off their water supply

штѣмаху on p. 221 is not as clearly a deter-
 minate imperfect form. To be consistent, it must refer to
 repeated holding back of water, although there are no other
 indications from the context that this was the case.

3. The Indeterminate Aorist

This section includes all of the 10 verb groups
 listed in Appendix 3. Although the indeterminate verb, ex-
 pressing the content of action, normally occurs in the
 imperfect tense, which denotes process, these groups contain
 indeterminate aorist exceptions, i.e., the indeterminate
 verb occurs in the aorist tense. In all cases of the
 indeterminate aorist, the action is limited by a specific
 time reference, usually explicit, and for this reason appears
 in the aorist tense. The verb preserves its indeterminate
 imperfect value: action per se as process.

Бреже (1) vs. Брежаше (2)

63 и оучашеть и мѣти крѣтити сѧ и не бѣжаше
 (Брежаше) того ни [во] оуши причмѣти

his mother urged him to be baptised, but he
 would not heed her suggestion

194 нача ходити и не брежаше в цркви
 ходити

he began to walk. He would not go faithfully
 to church

194 и не преже (бреже) за недѣлю гаси
 he did not eat for a week

брежаше appears to be indeterminate and occurs twice in the imperfect tense. On pp. 63 and 194 (the first example) it describes a heedless state of mind. In the second example from p. 194, the verb occurs in the aorist tense, but is defined by an explicit time reference (за недѣлю). The action of the verb is indeterminate, but it occurs in the aorist because the action of the verb is limited by a specific time period.

влачиша (1)

75 и влачиша трупе из гробли ѿ утра
 и до полудне

they dragged bodies from the moat from morning
 til noon

Although the imperfect tense does not occur in the text, влачити is considered to be indeterminate. It appears so on p. 75, where it refers to the content of the action. Here it expresses indeterminate action defined by the time phrase ѿ утра и до полудне.

ЖДАША (1)

79 и ЖДАША за мѣсяцъ и не дасть имъ

they waited for a month, and he gave them
nothing

ЖДАТИ also occurs only once, and that occurrence is in the aorist tense. The verb is indeterminate, drawing focus on the waiting itself, but occurs in the aorist because the time period of the action is explicitly stated.

ЖИВЕ (1) vs. ЖИВАШЕ (12)

121 посемь же Володимеръ ЖИВАШЕ въ
законѣ христіанствѣ

after these events Vladimir lived in the
Christian faith

162 ЖИВЕ же всѣхъ лѣтъ .о. и .ѣ.

he lived altogether seventy-six years

ЖИТИ is an indeterminate verb, which normally occurs in the imperfect tense (as on p. 121). The single occurrence of the aorist tense is accompanied by a reference to a specific time period. In the Old Church Slavonic texts studied by Borodich (1954) there are no occurrences of the aorist tense of ЖИТИ.

КНЯЖИ (3) vs. КНЯЖАШЕ (2)

10 но се Кий КНЯЖАШЕ в родѣ своемъ

but Kiy was chief of his kin

18 а гярополкъ кнажи лѣтѣ .и.

Yaropolk ruled eight years

кнажити occurs three times in the aorist tense and only twice in the imperfect. The verb is indeterminate, however, and refers to the content of the action. All three occurrences of the aorist tense describe action which is explicitly limited by a time period (as on p. 18).

лежа (3) vs. лежаще (2)

179 кудесникѣ же лежаще шѣлъ

the magician lay in a trance

194 бѣ бо раслабленѣ тѣломѣ ... но лежаще
на единой сторонѣ ... [се же бѣ дивно
чюно како за .ѡ. лѣта лежа си ... но
нѣмѣ и глуу лежа за .ѡ. лѣтѣ]

for he was so weakened in body ... he lay always upon one side ... it is wondrous and strange that he lay thus for two years ... [but lay deaf and mute for two years]

145 шѣ же в немощи лежа [и] въсхопи въса
гѣше

he lay in a trance, and recovering cried out

лежати is an indeterminate verb describing a state of being, and occurs twice in the imperfect tense (as on p. 179).

The aorist tense occurs twice on p. 194, and in both cases is defined by a specific time period. Although

the indeterminate aorist *лежа* on p. 145 is not limited by an explicit time reference, the duration of the action is limited by the following past participle *въсклонивъся* (having recovered). *лежа* occurs once in the gospels studied by Borodich (1959). In that example also, the end of the time period is only implied by the text.

СТОЯ (3) vs. *стояше* (21) : *станаше* (2) vs. *ста* (40)

141 *и стоя мѣѣ .Г.*

they stood for three months

214 *въ мечтѣ нѣи бѣваше в ноци тутѣнѣ*

станаше по улицѣ

at night there would be heard a clatter in the streets

219 *и пристояху совѣту сему смѣислени*

мужи гѣнѣ и прочи

Yan and other prudent men supported this opinion.

This verb group provides a good example of tense polarization: the indeterminate imperfect (including prefixed forms) occurs 22 times, while the determinate aorist forms (including prefixed forms) numbers 63. The five exceptions, which include both determinate imperfect and indeterminate aorist forms, are regular. The action of the determinate aorist form (e.g., *стоя* on p. 141) is always limited by a time period, and both occurrences of the determinate

imperfect (e.g., *станаше* on p. 214) refer to repeated events. *пристораху* (p. 219) is presented as an example of the prefixed indeterminate verb, similar to *присѣдаху*, which is discussed above.

ТОПИША (1)

95 *нако ꙗко мѣць топиша дѣти жидаовьски*

because they drowned the children of the Jews
for 10 months

The aorist *топиша*, on p. 95, is indeterminate, and appears to refer to the action itself. The time period of the action is explicitly stated.

The two following verbs, *обладати* and *плакатица*, are indeterminate verbs occurring in the aorist, but without an explicitly stated time period for the action.

ѡблада (1) vs. *ѡбладаше* (3)

102 *не бѣ оу нихъ црѣно архирѣи ѡбладаху*

ими до црѣно иноплеменикъ иже

ѡблада *ими в сего иже властвѣ*

they had no tsar, but the high priests ruled
over them until the time of the foreigner Herod,
who ruled over them. In his reign

20 *и тѣми всѣми ѡбладаше рурикъ*

Rurik ruled them.all

ѡбладати occurs three times in the imperfect tense, and refers to the action as content (e.g., pp. 102 and 20).

The form *ωβλαδα* on p. 102 also is indeterminate, but must refer to the period of Herod's reign (*βλαστη*), and for that reason be expressed by the aorist tense.

πλακασα (13) vs. *πλακαхуса* (4)

188 *и се кему гл҃цго плакахуса брата
гл҃це шче молиса за нзи к бѹ*

and when he was speaking these words the brothers wept saying, "Father, pray to God for us

57 *ωλγα . . . приде кѣ гробу его [и]*

плакаса по мужи своемѣ

Olga . . . came to her husband's grave and mourned for him

плакахусѣ, meaning "wept," is indeterminate and always occurs in the imperfect tense (e.g., on p. 188). *плакаса*, however, which occurs 13 times meaning "mourned," always occurs in the aorist (e.g., on p. 57). The explanation for the indeterminate aorist form must be that the verb *плакати* is indeterminate, but is idiomatically used in the aorist when it means mourned, and implies the period of mourning.

4. Cognitive Verbs

The six verb groups in this section (listed in Appendix 4) are the only ones of the 109 groups studied (excluding the verbs of motion) which contain stems which

do not formally distinguish between indeterminate and determinate, i.e., the unprefixes stem functions as both a determinate and indeterminate stem. The use of tense, however, is consistent with the use described in other sections, in that the verb occurring in the imperfect tense has indeterminate value (describes a state or process); while the verb occurring in the aorist has determinate value (refers to an event).

ВИДАШЕ (4) and *ВИДѢ* (33)

8 и приде въ словѣни... и ВИДѢ

ту люди сущага

he reached the Slavs ... and saw the people dwelling there

190 и аще кого ВИДАШЕ в помышленъи

шбличаше и втайнѣ

if he beheld any brother lost in reflection, he reproved him in secret

264 аще кого ВИДАШЕ лишомна ли в

кое^м зазорѣ не осудаше

if he saw anyone uproarious or committing some excess, he did not condemn him

88 и бѣ Адамъ в раи. ВИДАШЕ бѣ

и славаше

Adam was in paradise. He saw God and praised him

111 в се время разболѣ Володимеръ шчими

и не видаше ничтоже

at this time Vladimir fell ill and was unable
to see

видаѣти can be either indeterminate or determinate.

It occurs most frequently in the aorist, where the action is expressed as an objective fact in the manner of a determinate verb, e.g., on p. 8. It also functions as an indeterminate verb, referring to the sense of sight or ability to see, and in this case appears in the imperfect tense, as on pp. 88 and 111. The other two occurrences of the imperfect tense (pp. 190 and 264) are not indeterminate. They are regular determinate imperfect forms, containing the determinate value of видаѣти as it appears in the aorist sense, and refer to repeated discrete events in the past.

глаголю (26) and глаголю (7)

118 а дьраволъ стена глаголю оубви мнѣ

but the Devil, moaning, said, "Woe is me

196 многожды бо бѣси пакости дѣлаху

мѣму и глаголю нашѣ кеси

many times the demons harassed him, and said,
"You belong to us

132 послала к борису глаголю како с тобою

любовѣ имѣти

he sent a message to Boris, saying that he
desired to live at peace with him

Глаголати, as *вѣдѣти* above, serves as both an indeterminate and determinate verb. It occurs most frequently in the imperfect tense, as on pp. 118, 196, and 132, where it functions as an indeterminate verb and refers to the content of the action. The imperfect is the regular tense for the indeterminate verb, and does not in itself refer to repeated action. Thus it need not be translated as "commonly said," as is done in the Cross translations of pp. 215 and 271 (not presented here). In the same way, *послала ... глше* (p. 132) need not be translated "He sent messages" (plural).

256 и глша к собѣ рекуще по что губи^ѣ
Русьскую землю

they spoke to each other saying, "Why do we
destroy the land of Rus'

136 *кдѣ* сутѣ словеса твоя *наже* гла
къ мнѣ

where are the words you spoke to me

260 *аще ли* неправо гла *двдз*

if David spoke untruthfully

193 *приде* Антонию по *шбѣчано* ко
шконцо и гла *гѣ* *блгви* *шче*
Исакие и не *бзѣ* *швѣта*

Antonius came to the window according to his habit and said, "May the Lord bless you, Father Isaac." But there was no reply

185 вшедь в пещеру и затвораше двери
печеръ и засыпаше перстыю и
не гаше никомуже

he entered a crypt, closed the door behind him,
and covered himself with dust. He spoke to no
one

In all 7 occurrences of the aorist tense, the verb is determinate, and refers to the objective act of speaking, rather than to the action of communicating. It may be translated as "spoke," as opposed to "said." On p. 256 the determinate form гаша requires a second verbal form, (*рекуще*) to express the actual communication. A similar construction appears on p. 106: гаша *сказаше* (they spoke about the beginning of the world). On pp. 136 and 260 we are concerned with speech as an objective fact. The excerpt from p. 193 is not as clear, but I think that the determinate aorist form must mean that Antonius spoke, whereas Isaac did not reply.

Since the verb is sometimes determinate, гаше may function as a determinate imperfect form, as on p. 185. Here it occurs with other determinate imperfects: *затвораше* and *засыпаше*, and refers to repeated objective events. This is the only occurrence of the determinate imperfect in the text; all other verbs in the imperfect tense appear to be indeterminate.

можаше (5) and моглоша (4)

145 не можаше сѣдѣти [на кони]

he was unable to ride

66 Печенѣзи оустремишася на нь . . . и не

моглоша ему ничтоже створити

the Pechenegs hurried in pursuit . . . but did not succeed in doing any harm

This verb also functions as an indeterminate imperfect and a determinate aorist verb. In the imperfect tense it describes a capability; and in the aorist, it refers to an objective event.

мнѣхуть (3) and мнѣша (1)

66 бѣ бо оумѣга Печенѣжьскѣи и

мнѣхуть и своего

for he knew the Pecheneg language, and they thought that he was one of them

66 и людѣе въ градѣ кликнуша Печенѣзи

же мнѣша князя пришедша

the people in the city raised a shout, so that the Pechenegs thought that the Prince himself had arrived

мнѣхуть functions as an indeterminate verb, describing a cognitive state, while мнѣша appears to be determinate, referring to a discrete event.

смаху (4) and смѣ (2)

141 прише Ярославъ и стаща противу ш поль
днѣпра и не смаху ни си шнѣхъ ни
шнѣ си хъ начати и стогаша мѣѣ . Г .

Yaroslav arrived and the brothers stood over against each other on both banks of the Dnieper, but neither party dared attack. And they remained there for three months

35 ѿдасть тоє еже смѣ створити

he shall return what he has dared to appropriate

смаху and смѣ are similar to мнѣху and мнѣша in form, meaning and function.

хоташе (13) and хотѣ (5)

219 Володимеръ хоташе мира стополкъ
же хоташе рати

Vladimir favored peace, but Svyatopolk wanted war

263 стополкъ же хотѣ побѣгнѣти: и с
Киева [и] не даша ему кзганѣ

Svyatopolk wanted to flee from Kiev, but the Kievans would not let him

The indeterminate imperfect form occurs most frequently and means "desired, wanted," as on p. 219. However, хотѣти occurs in the aorist five times, always with determinate meaning, and can be translated by "was about to." The determinate form is probably functionally related to хотѣти as future auxiliary.

5. The Verbs of Motion

The indeterminate and determinate verbs of motion display a liberated use of tense: the indeterminate verb (prefixed and nonprefixed) occurs in the aorist tense to express discrete action; and the determinate nonprefixed verb occurs in the imperfect tense to express extended determinate action (as well as iterated action). On the other hand, tense polarization is evident in the use of the determinate nonprefixed verb, which occurs most frequently in the aorist; and in the use of the determinate prefixed verb, which occurs almost exclusively in the aorist, except to express iteration.

The verb groups *быти* and *дати : дарати* are included in this section because they display patterns of tense usage similar to those of the verbs of motion.

202 пакы же брата его прогнаста и и
ходи по чужей земли блуда и сбдацго
 ему пакы на столѣ своемъ

the brothers expelled him, and he went wandering through foreign lands. Later, when he was again restored to his throne

156 и ходи по монастыремъ и не възлюби

he went about the monasteries and liked none of them

54 а хѣтаную Русь водиша ротѣ в
 * цркви стго Ильи

and the Christian Russes took oath in the
 Church of St. Elias

207 баше съ князь тихъ . . . десятину
дана стѣи бѣи ѿ своего имѣнѣа
 по вса лѣта

this blessed prince was calm . . . he gave a
 tithe of all his possessions yearly to the
 Blessed Virgin

282 и въ .2. чѣ дне бродишѣа чресъ Сулу
 и кликнуша на ни

at the sixth hour of the day, they crossed the
 Sula and shouted at them

The indeterminate nonprefixed verb occurs regularly
 in the aorist as well as the imperfect tense. The forms
 presented here are indeterminate and refer to the content
 of the action: e.g., *ходи* (pp. 202 and 156) refers to
 wandering or walking as such; and the indeterminate form
бродишѣа (p. 282) refers to the action of crossing,
 rather than to the event. The aorist tense imposes a limit
 on the action, but does not occur with a specific reference
 to the time period of the action, as it does with non-
 motion verbs. This use of the indeterminate verb in the
 aorist tense is contrary to the law of polarization, and does
 not occur outside the verbs of motion.

THE ANALYSIS

- 29 Игоревѣ же възрастѣшно и хожаше
по шлѣзѣ и слышаша (слышаше)
ЕГ

when Igor grew up he followed after Oleg and obeyed his instructions

- 105 Дѣхъ Бжии ношашеса верху водѣи
the Holy Ghost hovered over the waters

- 64 Хода возѣ по собѣ не возаше ни
котла ни масть вара

upon his expeditions he carried with him neither wagons nor kettles, and boiled no meat

- 196 Да друзии раны дему дараху
so that the others dealt him blows

The indeterminate unprefixes verb occurs here in the imperfect tense. хожаше (p. 29) and ношашеса (p. 105) appear to be regular indeterminate imperfect verbs, referring to the process of action per se. On the other hand, because the indeterminate may be expressed as completed action in the aorist tense, it may be that the imperfect tense refers to repeated action in such forms as возаше on p. 64 or дараху on p. 196. However, no variation of these indeterminate imperfect forms is attested in the text, and it is thus difficult to impose an interpretation on these particular forms.

127 и бѣ глаго велико в городѣ . . .

и оудолжиса штого в городѣ и

бѣ глаго велико

there was a great famine in the city ... The
seige was prolonged, and the famine was severe

54 се бо бѣ сборнага цркви мнози бо

бѣша Варязи храни

this was in fact a parish church, since many
of the Varangians were Christian

39 како бѣ и цртво Доментианово нѣкии

волхво мене Аполонитанико знаемо

беаше шествова и твора встоу в

градѣ и в селе бесовьская чюдеса

during the reign of Domition there was a certain
soothsayer named Apollonius of Tyana. He
attained celebrity journeying about performing
infernal miracles throughout the cities and
towns

The indeterminate of бѣти occurs normally in the
aorist tense (148 times) and only three times in the imper-
fect. The excerpt from p. 127 demonstrates the difference
between the determinate and indeterminate aorist form. The
determinate form бѣ introduces the fact of the famine;
while the indeterminate form бѣ is a static verb, used
in reference to the quality of the famine. бѣ and бѣша
(p. 54) also refer to the content of being rather than to the
existence of being. беаше (p. 39) is one of the three
occurrences of the indeterminate imperfect. It describes
indeterminate action as process.

231 и придоѡта къ Зарубу [и ту] перѡбродистасѡ
и не шчютиша ихъ Половци

they arrived at Zarub and crossed the river
without being detected by the Polovcians

231 Сѡполокъ же и Володимеръ вбредоста
в Трубсжь к Половцемъ

Svyatopolk and Vladimir crossed the Trubezh
to engage the Polovcians

206 и вси Кияне великъ плачь створиша
надъ нимъ со пѡмѡи и пѡнми прѡводиша
и до стѡ^ѡ Дмитрѡга

all the people of Kiev raised great lamenta-
tions for him, and brought him with chants and
hymns to St. Demetrius

106 и рѡ^ѡ имъ се приходиша ко мнѡ^ѡ
Болгаре . . . посемъ жѡ приходиша
Нѡмци . . . по сихъ придоша жидове се же
послѡже придоша Грѡци

he said to them, "Behold, the Bulgars came to
me . . . After that the Germans came . . . After
them arrived the Jews and finally the Greeks.

The indeterminate prefixed verb may appear in the
aorist tense. The two examples from p. 231 demonstrate the
difference between the indeterminate and determinate stems.
In the first example *перѡбродистасѡ* refers to the
content of the action, i.e., they crossed without being
seen, while in the second example, *вбредоста* refers
strictly to the event. Both are expressed in the aorist,
which contradicts the law of polarization.

приводиша (p. 206) and *прихоиша* (p. 106)

also provide examples of the indeterminate prefixed verb in the aorist tense. The stylistic effect of a shift from indeterminate to determinate verbs on p. 106 is a shift in emphasis from the coming itself to further arrivals as events.

104 и се рекъ възношашеся на нѣбо

having thus spoken, he ascended into heaven

175 и привожаху к нимъ сестры своя

и матре и жены своя

and they brought to them their sisters, mothers and wives

190 се же старецъ послѣ исхожаше изъ

церкви идущю же ему единому

сѣде шпочивати подъ биломъ

the starets came out of the church later by himself, and sat down to rest under the bell

197 шногда же пакы в ноци прихожаху

к нему

sometimes, however, (the demons) came to him again by night

The indeterminate prefixed verb may also occur in the imperfect tense. *възношашеся* (p. 104), *привожаху* (p. 175) and *исхожаше* (p. 190) are regular imperfect tense forms. Although *прихожаху* (p. 197) refers to

repeated action, this is not an essential meaning of the form: the verbal action is neither completed nor repeated.

192 БѢ же гадѣ него проскура ѿдина и
та же чересѣ днѣ воды в мѣру пѣнаше
приносашеть же ему Великѣи Антонию
и подаваше ему шконцемѣ

his sustenance was one wafer, and that only once a day, and he drank but moderately of water. The great Antonius carried it to him, and passed it to him through a window

216 ѿзлиха же любаше черноризци [и]
подаваше требованѣе имѣ

he was extremely fond of monks and ministered to their needs.

157 и приходяху к нему приносяще же
нему еже на потребу бѣ

people came to him, bringing whatever he needed

An interesting phenomenon, concomitant with the possibility of the indeterminate aorist form, i.e., the capability of expressing indeterminate action as completed, is the indeterminate imperfect form which functions in a manner similar to the determinate imperfect, and describes repeated discrete action. приносашеть and подаваше on p. 192 refer to a repeated sequence of actions. The form приносашеть may be contrasted with the soft stem възновашеся (p. 104: above); and подаваше may be contrasted with

подараше on p. 216. приходяху (p. 157) occurs frequently and describes repeated completed action.

13 брачнѣи шбѣчати имаху не хожеше
зате по невѣсту но приводяху вечерю
а завтра приносаху по нем что
владуче

they had their wedding customs, whereby the groom's brother did not fetch the bride, but she was brought to the bridegroom in the evening, and in the morning they brought her dowry

130 и оурокомъ дающе кыеву двѣ
тысячѣ гривнѣ ѿ года до года
а тысячу новгородѣ гривень
раздаваху

(Yaropolk) paid two thousand grivny a year as tribute to Kiev, and another thousand to his garrison in Novgorod

On p. 13 the hard stem приводяху occurs with regular indeterminate, imperfect forms хожеше and приносаху. An explanation for the form приводяху (as opposed to the form привожаху) is that it describes habitual action which precedes the action of приносаху, and therefore refers to repeated completed action.

The imperfect раздаваху (p. 130) occurs twice in the text, always with a hard stem to express repeated action. This corresponds with the general usage of the indeterminate verb раздавати, which occurs seven times in the aorist (раздала). (раздалаху does not occur.)

75 слышав же се Володимеръ в Новѣгородѣ
 како Ярополкъ оуби Шлѣга оубога вса
бѣжа за море

when Vladimir in Novgorod heard that Yaropolk
 had killed Oleg, he was afraid and fled abroad

225 люди раздѣлиша и ведоша в бежѣ
 к сродоболѣ

they separated the people and led them into
 tents to their relatives

Although 90% of the determinate nonprefixed verbs
 do occur in the aorist tense, as *бѣжа* (p. 75) and
ведоша (p. 225), the examples below demonstrate that the
 determinate nonprefixed verb does reflect a tendency to
 liberate tense from the determinate-plus-aorist law operat-
 ing among the non-motion verbs.

220 Сѣтополкъ же и Володимеръ и Ростиславъ
 исполчивше дружину поидоша и идаше
 на деснѣи сторонѣ Сѣтополкъ

after marshalling their troops, Svyatopolk,
 Vladimir and Rostislav moved forward.
 Svyatopolk marched on the right wing

145 и несахуть и на носилѣхъ прчнесоша
 и къ бестою бѣгающе с нимъ . . . и
бѣжаху с нимъ шнѣ же в немоци лежа

they carried him on a litter and brought him
 to Brest, fleeing with him . . . and they fled
 with him, while he lay in a faint

284 и Моисеи великѣи не возможе видѣти ангѣлаго
 естества водашеть бо га въ днѣ столпѣ
 облаченъ а в ноци столпѣ огненъ
 то се не столпѣ водаше ихъ но ангѣлъ
идаше прѣ ними в ноци и въ днѣ

even the great Moses could not view the angelic
 being, for a pillar of cloud led them by day and
 a pillar of fire by night. This was not a pillar
 leading them, but an angel was going before them
 by night and day

This usage is peculiar to the verbs of motion, i.e.,
 the determinate imperfect (nonprefixed) form expresses
 extended determinate action, as demonstrated by идаше
 on p. 220, and несахуть and бѣжахуть on p. 145. On
 p. 284 the extended determinate action (идаше) refers
 to the angel going before, as an event, in contrast to the
 indeterminate action (водаше), which refers to the
 manner in which they were led (the content of the action).

282 такъ бо шбѣчаша имѣаше стополкъ
 коли идаше на воину

for it was Svyatopolk's custom that whenever
 he went to war

The determinate imperfect (nonprefixed) may also
 express repeated discrete action, as does идаше (p. 282).
 Among the non-motion verbs, this is the only function of the
 determinate imperfect form.

8 *идеже послѣже бѣ Киевѣ*

where later Kiev was

The verb *бѣти* with determinate meaning is most frequently found in the aorist tense (127 times, compared with 45 in the imperfect tense). *бѣ* on p. 8 and p. 127 (above) refers to being as a fact of existence.

9 [и] *баше школо града съсъ и борѣ великѣ
и бяху ловаща звѣрь бяху мужи мудри
и смислени [и] нарицахуса полане*

around the town lay a wood and a great pine forest. There were hunters and wise and prudent men. And they were called Polyanians

201 *Олег же и Борисъ [не] баста*

but Oleg and Boris were not there

24 *и вѣдаша шльговѣ по шльагу такоже
[и] Козаромѣ даху*

they gave Oleg a shilling apiece, as they had paid the Khazars

баше, the determinate imperfect form of *бѣти*,⁴ expresses extended determinate action. Occurrences on

⁴ According to C. H. van Schoonveld (1959, Chap. III), *баше* is the Old Russian equivalent of the Old Church Slavonic imperfective imperfect *бѣаше*. Citing from the *Povest'* (983) *баше варягъ единъ и бѣ дворѣ его, идеже...* (there was one Varangian, and his manor was where), he describes the difference between *баше* and *бѣ* in terms of the imperfect and aorist tense; i.e., the imperfect denotes a fact of importance for the whole story, while the aorist denotes a simple fact. I would suggest that the verb *баше* is determinate and (as the determinate verb *бѣ*) refers to a fact of existence, here extended in the imperfect tense (as the determinate imperfect *идаше*); whereas *бѣ* is indeterminate, and refers to a mode of existence.

pp. 9 and 201 refer to extended events. *даху* (p. 24), the imperfect tense of the determinate verb *дати*, also refers to an extended fact. This usage is identical with the function of the determinate imperfect peculiar to the verbs of motion.

185 *ТАКО ИЗИДАШЕ ИЗ МОНАСТЫРА... И
ЗАТВОРАШЕ ДВЕРИ ПЕЧЕРЪ И ЗАСЫПАШЕ
ПЕРСТЬЮ... АЩЕ ЛИ БУДАШЕ НУЖНОЕ ШРУДЕ
ТО ШКОНЧЕШЬ МАЛѢ БСѢДОВАШЕ*

thus he would leave the monastery ... and shut the door of his cave and cover himself with dust ... if he needed anything he would converse through a small window

127 [и] *ПРИДОША И СТАША ШКОЛО БѢЛАГОРОДА
И НЕ ДАДАХУ ВѢЛСТИ ИЗ ГОРОДА*

they came and took up positions around Belgorod, and allowed no sally from the city

12 *АЩЕ ПОѢХАТИ БУДАШЕ ШБѢРИНУ НЕ
ДАДАШЕ ВѢПРАЧИ КОНА НО ВЕЛАШЕ ВѢПРАЧИ
Т. ЛИ Д. ЛИ С. ЛИ ЖЕНЬ В ТСАБГУ*

if they wanted to ride they did not have a horse harnessed, but instead gave directions for three, four or five women to be harnessed to a cart

бѣти and *дати* also occur with the regular determinate imperfect of repeated discrete action. However, these two verbs possess a separate stem for this function, i.e., the hard stems *буд* - and *дад* -. *БУДАШЕ*, on p. 185, refers to repeated events, and occurs with other regular determinate imperfect verb forms: *ИЗИДАШЕ*,

затвораше and засыпаше. The use of дадашу on p. 127 corresponds to repeated attempts to sally from the city. будаше and дадаше both occur on p. 12 together with the determinate imperfect велаше, and obviously refer to repeated discrete action.

189 аще кто коли принесаше дѣтицу болель
кацѣмъ либо недугѣ одержи^м

whenever anyone brought a child suffering from some kind of disease (to the monastery)

190 аще кому что рече ли добро ли
зло сбудашется старче слово

whenever he said anything to anybody, whether good or bad, the word of the elder was fulfilled

95 люде ѿ землѣ Египетски и всдаше
го гдѣ путемъ по пустыни къ
Чермному морю и предидаше предъ
ними ночью столпъ огненъ

he departed out of the land of Egypt. And the Lord led them over the road through the desert to the Red Sea, preceding them by night as a fiery pillar

The determinate prefixed verbs most closely conform to the law of polarization. They occur most frequently in the aorist tense (examples were given above in excerpts from pp. 220, 106, and 231), and occur in the imperfect only to express repeated discrete action. принесаше (p. 189) and сбудашется (p. 190) both refer to discrete events.

предъидаше (p. 95), however, is an exception, and could refer to extended determinate action (in analogy with *идаше*). It occurs here with *ведаше*, a nonprefixed determinate imperfect expressing extended determinate action.

The Old Church Slavonic verbs of motion did not manifest liberation of tense relative to the determinate: indeterminate opposition to the same degree as we find in the Povest'. Ye. V. Chesňko (1951), in her study of the Codex Zographensis, found a complete absence of the indeterminate aorist (such as *ходиша* and *нианосиша*) and the prefixed determinate imperfect (such as *принесаху*), i.e., forms which occur in the Old East Slavic chronicles, etc. According to V. V. Borodich (1954, p. 87) also, the aorist of indeterminate stems and the imperfect of prefixed determinate stems is not met in the earliest Old Church Slavonic texts.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Tense polarization is an essential feature of the verbal system represented by the forms of the Povest' Vremennykh Let'. Fifty-one groups display complete polarization, i.e., the aorist tense always occurs with the determinate stem, and the imperfect tense always occurs with the indeterminate stem. The determinate imperfect and indeterminate aorist exceptions (found in 47 and 10 verb groups, respectively) are special uses occurring in verb groups which otherwise display polarization.

The determinate imperfect form always expresses a repeated discrete event, thereby retaining both the values of determinate (event) and aorist (discrete). The indeterminate aorist form is always accompanied by a specific time period, generally explicit. Thus it retains the values of indeterminate (action per se) as well as imperfect (process). These special uses of the imperfect and aorist tenses are therefore precisely defined by the stem, and do not reflect an arbitrary use of tense.

In the group which has been named cognitive, i.e., the indeterminate value implies a consciousness of a cognitive act or process itself, a common unprefixes stem is used with both the imperfect and aorist tenses, although the prefixed forms conform to the pattern of polarization. As these stems number only six of a total of 109 non-motion

verb groups (some groups have members in more than one section), they do not significantly undermine the main thesis. Moreover, these verbs maintain the determinate:indeterminate distinction, in that the stem used with the imperfect tense always refers to the content of the action, while the stem used with the aorist refers to an event.

The verbs of motion, on the other hand, do not display tense polarization relative to the determinate:indeterminate opposition, i.e., the imperfect and aorist tenses occur with both the determinate and indeterminate stems. The indeterminate verb *НОСИТИ* occurs in the aorist to express the act of carrying performed as a discrete act in the past (*НОСИ*); the determinate verb *НЕСТИ* occurs in the imperfect to express an extended event (*НЕСАШЕ*).

ДАТИ : *ДАТАТИ* and *БИТИ* verb groups are included in this section because they display the same patterns of tense usage.

An interesting phenomenon reflected in the verbs of motion is that if an indeterminate verb can occur in the aorist tense as discrete action, it can also appear in the imperfect as repeated action. These two functions are distinguished in the prefixed indeterminate form by means of hard and soft endings of the stem, i.e., *ПРИНОСАХУ* expresses repeated action, whereas *ПРИНОШАХУ* does not.

The $\Delta\alpha\tau\eta$: $\Delta\alpha\tau\eta\tau\eta$ and $\beta\epsilon\tau\eta$ groups distinguish these functions in the simple determinate as well, by means of stem variations: $\Delta\alpha\Delta\alpha\omega\epsilon$ and $\beta\gamma\Delta\alpha\omega\epsilon$ refer to repeated action, while $\Delta\alpha\chi\gamma$ and $\beta\alpha\omega\epsilon$ refer to extended action.

As I discuss below, the liberation of tense usage among the verbs of motion is a point in favor of the argument concerning the role of polarization in the development of aspect, not a problem.

The phenomenon of the determinate:indeterminate opposition (reflected in tense polarization) leads to a theory of the development of aspect. The predictability of tense usage implies a redundancy, and according to the linguistic principle of simplification, we can expect a normalization of tense endings--which did occur with the $-\lambda$ ending of the perfect tense. It must be emphasized that normalization does not mean morphological borrowing, or even morphological change. (A possible reason for the use of the $-\lambda$ ending is that among the past tenses it was only in the perfect tense that both the indeterminate and determinate stem occurred.) The values of the imperfect and aorist tenses were retained by the $-\lambda$ ending, and were a part of the later aspect system.

It has been observed that the verbs of motion did not (except in the prefixed determinate forms) reflect

polarization. An explanation, therefore, for the emergence of the category of determinate:indeterminate which exists in the modern verbs of motion is that the liberation of tense in the Old East Slavic verbs of motion occurred before the normalization of tense endings, and therefore the universal -1 ending of the past tense did not retain the value of a specific tense, i.e., the stem did not combine with predictable aorist or imperfect tense value. It is the absence of this formation which allowed the determinate:indeterminate category of the verbs of motion to remain in the language as a remnant of the old system (modified, of course, during the process of aspectualization).

If we consider the modern aspect system as the result of combinations of determinate-plus-aorist and indeterminate-plus-imperfect values, some of the anomalies of the modern aspect structure can be explained. For example, iterativity (the combination of determinate stem and imperfect tense) had to accommodate the new structure by sacrificing the determinate stem and joining the indeterminate imperfect verb group. It is possibly for this reason that repeated action requires a special definition within the structure of aspect.

Another well known anomaly is the use of the verb type *писал*, as in *кто писал этот роман?* where an imperfective verb expresses completed action. This may be

explained by keeping in mind that the aorist and imperfect tense endings were normalized with the -A ending, which did not indicate the value of the perfect tense. However, it is possible that the form *пучаа* in the context mentioned is a remnant of the perfect tense of the indeterminate verb, and means "Who has performed the action of writing the novel?"

These examples demonstrate the efficacy of the present theory, which not only provides a more parsimonious model for the description of the Old East Slavic verbal system, but also serves as the basis for a description of aspect formation which clarifies some of the anomalies of the modern system.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Primary Source

Polnoye sobraniye russkikh letopisey. T. 1, Lavrent'yevskaya letopis', Adad. nauk SSSR, 1962.

2. Secondary Sources

Aitzemüller, Rudolf. Slav. iměti und das idg. Perfekt. Die Sprache, Band VII, Heft 2, 1962, 250-262.

Aitzemüller, Rudolf. "Über Präfixe bei nicht-durativen Verben vom Typus mrěti. Zeitschrift für slavische Philologie, Band XXX, Heft 2, Heidelberg, 1962, 310-334.

Aitzemüller, Rudolf. Aksl. vědě und die slavischen Zustandsverba. Slawistische studien zum V Internationalen Slawistenkongress in Sofie 1963, 209-214.

Aksakov, K. C. Sochineniya filologicheskaya. Chast' I - O russkikh glagolakh. Moscow, 1855.

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

Bakmutova, Ye. A. Razvitiye vidovoy sootnositel'nosti v rusском yazyke. Kazan', 1962.

Van den Berk, C. A. Die Problematik des Verbs: Aspekt und Zeit im Slavischen. Slavische Studien zum VII Internationalen Slavistenkongress im Warschau. München, 1973, 9-28.

Birnbaum, H. Zum analytischen Ausdruck der Zukunft im Altkirchenslavischen. Zeitschrift für slavische Philologie, B. XXV, Heidelberg, 1956, 1-7.

Bondarko, A. V. K voprosu o sostoyanii vidovoy differentsiatsii glagola v drevnerusskom yazyke. Istoricheskaya grammatika i leksikologiya russkogo yazyka. Moscow, 1962, 76-84.

Bondarko, A. V. Vid i vremya russkogo glagola. Moscow, 1971.

Borodich, V. V. K voprosu o znachenii aorista i imperfekta v staroslavjanskome yazyke. Slavyanskaya filologiya, Moscow, 1951, 24-37.

- Borodich, V. V. K voprosu o vidovykh otnosheniyakh staroslav'yanskogo glagola. Uchenyye zapiski instituta slavyanovedeniya, T. IX, 1954, Moscow, 50-138.
- Borodich, V. V. Materialy o dovidovykh glagol'nykh korrelyatsiyakh v staroslav'yanskom yazyke (Kauzativ-glagol vyzvannogo sostoyaniya). Slavyanskaya filologiya, vyp. 9, Moscow, 1973, 102-125.
- Budich, Wulf. Zur neueren Literatur über das altrussische Verbalsystem. Anzeiger für slavische Philologie, 1966, 156-180.
- Budich, Wulf. Aspekt und verbale Zeitlichkeit in der I. Novgoroder Chronik. Graz, 1969.
- Bunina, I. K. Sistema vremen staroslav'yanskogo glagola. Moscow, 1959.
- Bunina, I. K. Istoriya glagol'nykh vremen v bolgarskom yazyke. Moscow, 1970.
- Cheshko, Ye. V. K istorii slavyanskikh glagol'nykh vidov. Uch. zap. in-ta slavyanovedeniya, T. III, Moscow, 1951, 328-344.
- Cross, Samuel Hazzard, & Sherbowitz, O. P. The Russian Primary Chronicle-Laurentian Text. Cambridge, Mass., 1953.
- Debrunner, A. Koschmieder, Erwin. Zeitbezug und Sprache. Indogermanische Forschungen, 1930, 89-95.
- Demidenko, L. P. Morfologicheskiye sposoby vyrazheniya nachala glagol'nogo deystviya v drevnerusskom yazyke. U.Z. Leningr. Gosud. ped. in-ta. T. 258, 1965, 7-30.
- Demidenko, L. P., & Naumovich, A. N. Sovremennyy russkiy yazyk - glagol. Minsk, 1972.
- Dem'yanov, V. G. Osnova imperfekta v drevnerusskom knizhnom yazyke XII veka. Istochnikovedeniya i istoriya russkogo yazyka, izd. "Nauka", Moscow, 1964, 142-149.
- Dem'yanov, V. G. Slovoobrazovatel'nyye ryady glagol'nykh osnov v drevnerusskom knizhnom yazyke starshego perioda. Izvestiya Ak. Nauk SSSR, Seriya lit. i yazyka, T. XXV, vyp. 1, 1966, 230-235.

- Dombrowszky, Jozsef. Contribution à l'étude de la genèse des aspects verbaux slaves. Publicationes instituti Philologiae Slavicae Universitatis Debreceniensis, Debrecen, 1961, 3-25.
- Dostal, Antonin. Chapt. VIII from Studie o vidovem systemu v staroslovenstine. Prague, 1954. (In Voprosy glagol'nogo vida: sbornik, ed. Yu. Maslov, 1962, 287-307.
- Dostal, Antonin. K izucheniyu kategoriy glagola v staroslav-yanskoy yazyke. Issledovaniya po sintaksisu staroslav-yanskogo yazyka. Prague, 1963, 101-120.
- Drakhosh, J. K voprosu sposobov glagol'nogo deystviya. (Aktionsarten) v russkom yazyke. Slavica, IX, 1969, 71-82.
- Eterley, Ye. N. Funktsii prostykh form proshedshego vremeni glagola "byti" v drevnerusskom yazyke. Izvestiya Ak. Nauk SSSR, Seriya lit. i yazyka, T. XXVIII, 1969, 155-160.
- Ferrell, James. The Meaning of the Perfective Aspect in Russian. Word, Vol. 7, New York, 1951, 104-135.
- Fomenko, Yu. V. K istoricheskoy problematike russkogo prichastiya i deeprichastiya. Uchenyye zapiski Moskov. Gosud. ped. in-ta im. Lenina, T. 132, vyp. 8, 1958, 299-309.
- Forsyth, James. The Nature and Development of the Russian Verb. The Slavonic and East European Review, Vol. L, No. 121, October 1972, 493-506.
- Gal'perina, D. S. Prichastiya na -em v pamyatnikakh rysskoy pis'mennosti XI-XVII vv. Uchenyye zapiski Lening. Gosud. ped. in-ta im. Gertsena, T. 202, 1959, 41-60.
- Galton, Herbert. Aorist und Aspekt im Slavischen. Wiesbaden, 1962.
- Galton, Herbert. The Main Functions of the Slavic Verbal Aspect. Skopje, 1976.
- Garde, Paul. Verbes indéterminés et verbes itératifs dans les langues slaves. Slavia, Ročník XXXIV, Sešit 2, Prague, 1965, 177-189.

- Grubor, Dzhuro. Translated excerpt from Vidovyve znacheniya, 1953. (In Voprosy glagol'nogo vida; ed. Yu. Maslov, 1962, 68-76).
- Havranek, B. Aspect et temps du verbe en vieux slave, 1939. (Translated in Voprosy glagol'nogo vida; ed. Yu. Maslov, 1962, 175-183).
- Havranek, B. Objektive und subjektive Aktionsart. Indogermanische Forschungen, Band 45, 1927, 207-228.
- Hermann, Eduard. Aspekt und Zeitrichtung. Indogermanische Forschungen, Band 54, 1936, 262-264.
- Hermelin, Ellen. Über den Gebrauch der Präsenspartizipien von Perfektiven Verben im Altkirchenslavischen. Upsala, 1935.
- Holt, Jens. Etudes d'aspect. Copenhagen, 1943.
- Huntley, D. G. L'aspect de ITI en vieux slave. Revue des Etudes Slaves, V. 46, 1967, 15-21.
- Il'inskiy, G. A. Iz istorii staroslavjanskogo aorista. Izvestiya otdeleniya yazyka i slovesnosti Imper. Akad. nauk, T. V, 1900, 191-203.
- Il'inskiy, G. A. Praslavyanskaya grammatika. Nezhin, 1916.
- Isačenko, A. R. Ružička, Der Verbalaspekt in der altrussischen Nestorchronik. Zeitschrift für Slawistik, Band IV, Heft 2, 1959, 290-295.
- Jakobson, Roman. Zur Struktur des russischen Verbuns. Selected Writings, II. Word and Language. The Hague-Paris, 1971.
- Janke, Gottfried. Der Ausdruck des Passivs im Altrussischen. Berlin, 1960.
- Johannet, Jose. De l'aoriste imperfectif dans la Chronique Laurentine. Revue des Etudes Slaves, V. 34, Paris, 1957, 81-87.
- Kalinin, I. A. Kategoriya vida v russkikh glagolakh. Trudy gor'kovskogo gosud. ped. in-ta, vyp. VIII, 1940, 165-211.

- Karcevski, S. Remarques sur la psychologie des aspects en russe. Mélanges de linguistique offerts à Charles Bally. Genève, 1939, 231-248.
- Karskiy, Ye. Iz sintakticheskikh nablyudenii nad yazykom Lav. let. Sbornik statey v chest' akademika A. I. Sobolevskogo. Red. V. N. Perets, Lenigrad, 1928, 39-42.
- Kastien, H. Das slav. Imperfect und seine indg. Verwandten. Zeitschrift für slavische Philologie, Band XXV, Heidelberg, 1956, 67-112.
- Kølln, Herman. Die Entstehung des slavischen Verbalaspekts. Scando-Slavica, T. IV, 1958, 308-313.
- Kølln, Herman. Zum Aorist im Altrussischen. Scando-Slavica, T. V, 1959, 64-77.
- Kopechnyy, F. Résumé of "K problematike slavyanskogo prichastiya na -1." Slavyanskaya filologiya, IV Mezhdunarodnyy s"ezd slavistov, Moscow, 1958, 161-163.
- Koschmieder, Erwin. Durchkreuzungen von Aspekt-Tempussystem in Präsens. Zeitschrift für Slavische Philologie, Band VII, 1930, 341-358.
- Koschmieder, Erwin. Zu den Grundfragen der Aspekttheorie. Zeitschrift für Indogermanistik und allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft, V. 53, Berlin-Leipzig, 1935, 280-300.
- Koschmieder, Erwin. Aspekt und Zeit. Slawistische Studien zum V Internationalen Slawisten Kongress in Sofia 1963, 1-22.
- Koschmieder, Erwin. Zeitbezug und Sprache. Darmstadt, 1971.
- Koschmieder-Schmid, Kathe. Vergleichende griechisch-slavische Aspektstudien. Munchen, 1967.
- Koshelev, A. K. K voprosu o sozdanii tipov pervonachal'noy parnosti po vidu v drevnerusskom yazyke. Vestnik M.G.U. Ist. filol. seriya, No. 2, 1958, 3-39.
- Kudryavskiy, D. K statistike glagol'nykh form v Lav. letopisi. Izvestiya otdeleniya russkago yazyka i slovesnosti. Akad. Nauk, 1910, 48-54.

- Kudryavskiy, D. K istorii russkikh deeprichastiy. Uch. zap. Imperat. yur'yevskago. univers., No. 10, Yur'yev, 1916.
- Kuznetsov, P. S. K voprosu o genezise vido-vremennykh otnosheniy drevnerusskogo yazyka. Trudy in-ta yazykoznaneya AN SSSR, T. II, 1953, 220-253.
- Kuznetsov, P. S. Ocherki istoricheskoy morfologii russkogo yazyka. Moscow, 1959.
- Kurkina, L. V. Tipy slovoobrasovatel'nykh otnosheniy osnov na -i v sisteme drevnerusskogo glagola. Filologicheskiye nauki, 1(29), Moscow, 1965, 159-167.
- Kuryłowicz, J. La genèse d'aspects verbaux slaves. Prace Filologiczne, T. XIV, Warsaw, 1929, 644-657.
- Kuryłowicz, J. Réflexions sur l'imparfait et les aspects en vieux slave. International Journal of Slavic Linguistics and Poetics, I/II, 'S-Gravenhage, 1959, 1-8.
- Leipkhin, N. P. Ob upotreblenii proshedshikh vremen drevnerusskogo glagola v zavisimosti ot konteksta. U-Z. Perm. U., T. 22, vyp. I, 1965, 21-28.
- Lomov, A. M. Neskol'ko zamechaniy o metodike analiza vidovoy semantiki russkogo glagola. Materialy po russko-slavyanskomu yazykoznaneyu, Voronezh, 1972, 93-98.
- Lomtev, T. P. K kharakteristike vidovoy differentsiatsii preterial'nykh form glagola v drevnerusskom yazyke. Uch. zap. -Trudy kafedry russkogo yazyka. Kg. 2, vyp. 137, Moscow, 1948, 70-88.
- Lomtev, T. P. Ob upotreblenii glagola otnositel'no kategorii vremeni v drevnerusskom yazyke. Uch. zap. - russkiy yazyk, vyp. 150, Moscow, 1952, 219-253.
- Maslov, Yu. S. Imperfekt glagolov sovershennogo vida v slavyanskikh yazykakh. Voprosy slavyanskogo yazykoznaneya, vyp. 1, Moscow, 1954, 68-138.
- Maslov, Yu. S. Rol' tak nazyvayemoy perfektivatsii i imperfektivatsii v protsesse vzniknoveniya slavyanskogo glagol'nogo vida. Moscow, 1958.

- Maslov, Yu. S. Zur Entstehungsgeschichte des slavischen Verbalaspektes. Zeitschrift für Slawistik, B. IV, H. 4, 1959, 560-568.
- Maslov, Yu. S. Voprosy glagol'nogo vida v sovremennom zarubezhnom yazykoznanii. Voprosy glagol'nogo vida: Sbornik, ed. Yu. Maslov, Moscow, 1962, 7-32
- Mazon, Andre. L'aspect des verbes slaves: principes et problèmes. IV^e Congrès International de Slavistes. Moscow, 1958.
- Meillet, A. Des innovations du verbe slave. Revue des Etudes Slaves, V. 2, Paris, 1922, 38-46,
- Nekrasov, N. P. Zametki o yazyke Povesti vremennykh let po Lav. letopisi. Izvestiya otdeleniya yazyka i slovesnosti imperatorskoy Akad. Nauk, T. II, 1897, 104-174.
- Němec, Igor. -Résumé of "Genese slovanského systému videvého." 1958. (In Voprosy glagol'nogo vida; Ed. Yu. Maslov, 1962), 265-275.
- Netteberg, Kristine. On the Disappearance of Uncompounded Preterite Forms in Russian," Scando - Slavica, T. I, Copenhagen, 1954, 44-53.
- Nicholson, John Greer. Russian Verbal Aspect and 'Aktionsart', Slavic and East-European Studies, 1967, 50-54.
- Otto, M. V. K voprosu o formakh perfekta v drevnerusskom yazyke. Nauk. zap. Zaporiz'k. ped. in-tu, T. 4, 1957, 214-225.
- Ozolina, K. N. Infinitiv kak sredstvo vyrazheniya budushchego otnositel'nogo v drevnerusskom yazyke. Trudy kaf. russkogo yazyka vuzov Vostochnoy Sibiri i Dal'nego Vostoka, vyp. I, 1960, 90-112.
- Panzer, Baldur. "Begriff "Aktualität" und "Nichtaktualität" der Aspekt- und Tempustheorie des Slavischen. Aus der Geisteswelt der Slaven. Dankesgabe an Erwin Koschmieder, München, 1967, 68-81
- Peciar, Štefan. Aspekt und Aktionsart. Studia Linguistica Slavica Baltica, V. 8, Lund, 1966, 209-221.
- Petrus', Z. F. O grammaticheskom znachenii i smyslovykh. funtsiyakh imperfekta v I Novgorodskoy letopisi po Sinodal'nomu spisku. Uch. zap. Kirovsk. ped. in-ta, vyp. II, 1957, 143-154.

- Plaskacz, Bohdan. L'aspect et le temps dans le langage, d'Afanasij Nikitin. Etudes Slaves et Est-Européennes, 1973, 128-135.
- Polak, Vaclav. L'origine de l'aspect verbal en slave. Orbis, T. XIX, No. 1, Louvain, 1970, 187-201.
- Potebnýa, A. A. Iz zapisok po russkoy grammatike. IV. Glagol, mestoimeniye, chislitel'noye, predlog. Moscow, 1941.
- Regnell, Carl Göran. Über den Ursprung des slavischen Verbalaspektes. Lund, 1944.
- Royzenon, L. N. O mnogoprstavochnykh glagolakh drevnerusskogo yazyka (predvaritel'noye soobshcheniye). Trudy Samark. u., nov. seriya No. 139, 1964, 33-34.
- Rozanova, T. S. Ocfunktsiyakh glagolov nastoyashchego vremeni v predlozhenii po pamyatnikam russkoy pis'mennosti XI-XVI vv. Uchenyye zapiski Velikoluzhskogo ped. in-ta, T. 3, 1958, 386-401.
- Rozanova, T. S. Ocfunktsiyakh glagolov budushchego vremeni v predlozhenii po pamyatnikam russkoy pis'mennosti XI-XVI vv. Uchenyye zapiski Velikoluzhskogo ped. in-ta, T. 4, vyp. 3, 1959, 53-64.
- Rudnev, A. G. O proiskhozhdenii deeprichastiya. Casopis pro slovanské jazyki, Literaturu a Dějiny SSSR. Naklad. Československé Akad. Ved, 1956, 19-63.
- Růžička, Rudolf. Der Verbalaspekt in der altrussischen Nestorchronik. Berlin, 1957.
- Růžička, Rudolf. C. H. van Schooneveld, A Semantic Analysis of the Old Russian Finite Preterite System. Zeitschrift für Slawistik, Band VII, Heft 2, 1962, 287-297.
- Růžička, Rudolf. Zur Genesis des slavischen Verbalaspekts. International Journal of Slavic Linguistics and Poetics, Vol. V, 1962, 16-27.
- Růžička, Rudolf. Das syntaktische System der altslavischen Partizipien und sein Verhältnis zum Griechischen. Berlin, 1963.

- Sadnik, Linda. Das slavische Imperfekt (Ein Beitrag zur Erforschung des urslavischen Verbalsystems). Die Welt der Slaven, Band V, Berlin, 1960, 19-30.
- Sadnik, Linda. Der Ersatz von Aorist und Imperfekt durch die L-Periphrase, namentlich im Russischen. Anzeiger für slavische Philologie, Band I, Wiesbaden, 1966, 16-30.
- Samilov, Michael. C. H. van Schooneveld, A Semantic Analysis of the Old Russian Finite Preterite System. International Journal of Slavic Linguistics and Poetics, Vol. IV, 1961, 147-148.
- Sannikov, V. Z. Poryadok razmeshcheniya chastey slozhnopodchinennogo predlozheniya v drevnerusskom yazyke (na materiale pamyatnikov XI-XIV vv). Istoricheskaya grammatika i leksikologiya russkogo yazyka, Akad. Nauk, Moscow, 1962, 96-113.
- Schelesnik, Herbert. Aspekt und Aktionsart der Iterativa im Altkirchenslavischen. Die Sprache, Band II, Heft 4, 1952, 215-221.
- Schelesnik, Herbert. Entstehung und Entwicklung des slavischen Aspektsystems. Die Welt der Slaven, Jahrgang IV, Wiesbaden, 1959, 390-409.
- Schelesnik, Herbert. Wulf Budich, Aspekt und verbale Zeitlichkeit in der 1. Novgoroder Chronik. Anzeiger für slavische Philologie, Band IV, Wiesbaden, 1970, 115-119.
- Schooneveld, C. H. van. A Semantic Analysis of the Old Russian Finite Preterite System. 'S-Gravenhage, 1959.
- Seidel, Eugen. Zu den Funktionen des Verbalaspekts. Etudes dédiées au Quatrième Congrès de Linguistes. Prague, 1936, 111-129.
- Semina, G. Ya. K voprosu ob upotreblenii glagol'nykh form proshed. vremeni v Povesti. Uch. zap. L. G. U., No. 277 seriya filol. nauk., vyp. 55, 1959, 42-59.
- Shafranov, S. O vidakh russkikh glagolov v sintaksicheskom otnoshenii. Moscow, 1852.
- Sobolevskiy, A. I. Drevna-kievskiy govor. St. Petersburg, 1905.

- Sørensen, Hans Christian. Aspect et temps en slave. Aarhus, 1949.
- Sokolova, M. A. K istorii russkogo yazyka y XI veke. Izvestiya po russkomu yazyku i slovesnosti, T. III, AN SSSR, 1929, 75-135.
- Stender-Peterson, Adolf. Hans Christian Sørensen, Aspekt et temps en slave. In a Review of Scandinavian Contributions to Slavonic and Baltic Philology, Literature and History. Scando-Slavica, Tomus II, 1956, 149-151.
- Stender-Peterson, Adolf, & Knud Jordal. Das Griechisch-Byzantinische Erbe im Russischen. Travaux du Cercle Linguistique de Copenhague, Vol. XI, 1957, 163-218.
- Stola, R. Zur Frage der Entwicklung des "deeprichastiye" im Altrussischen. Slavyanskaya filologiya, I, IV Mezhdunarodnyy s"ezd slavistov, 1958, 189-193.
- Timofeyev, K. A. K voprosu o proiskhozhdenii infinitivnykh predlozheniy v russkom yazyke. Filologicheskiye nauky, 1(29), Moscow, 1965, 105-113.
- Toporov, V. N. K voprosu ob evolyutsii slavyanskogo i baltiyskogo glagola. Voprosy slavyanskogo yazykoznanija, vyp. 5, Moscow, 1961, 35-70.
- Trost, Klaus. Perfekt und Konditional im Altkirchenslavischen. Wiesbaden, 1972.
- Vaillant, André. L'aspect verbal du slave commun; sa morphologisation. Revue des Etudes Slaves, Vol. 19, Paris, 1939, 289-314.
- Vinogradov, V. V. Russkiy yazyk. Moscow, 1972.
- Volkov, A. G. Klassy glagolov drevnerusskogo yazyka. Vestnik M.G.U. Inst. filol., No. 12, seriya 1958, 41-53.
- Wijk, N. van. Die sogenannten Verba iterativa und die Bezeichnung der wiederholten Handlung im Altkirchenslavischen. Indogermanische Forschungen, Band V, 1927, 93-104.
- Wijk, N. van. Sur l'origine des aspects du verbe slave. Revue des Etudes Slaves, Vol. 6, 1929, 237-252.

Yakovleva, A. P. K voprosu o razvitii form budushchego vremeni nesovershennogo vida v 'russkom yazyke. Uchenyye zapiski Michurinsk. ped. in-ta, vyp. 5, 1958, 3-24.

Yefimov, A. I. K istorii form proshedshego vremeni russkogo glagola. Uch. zap. Permsk. ped. in-ta, vyp. 2, 1937, 83-137.

Zaritskiy, N. S. O zalogovom znachenii stradatel'nykh prichastiy v drevnerusskom yazyke. Naukovi zapysy Kyivs'koho Derzhavnoho Universytetu, T. 18, vyp. 2, 1959, 115-134.

NOTE ON APPENDICES

The appendices list all verbs used in the study, and give the number of occurrences of aorist and imperfect tense forms. Only verb groups which have members attested in the text in both tenses were used.

Appendix 1 contains verbs which display complete tense polarization, i.e., the imperfect tense occurs only with the indeterminate verb, while the aorist tense occurs only with the determinate. Appendices 2 and 3 contain determinate imperfect and indeterminate aorist forms (underlined). These occurrences reflect special uses of the imperfect and aorist tenses. Appendix 4 lists six verb groups which express both indeterminate and determinate meaning with the same unprefixes stem. Appendix 5 contains the verbs of motion. These verbs reflect a liberation in the use of tense--a tendency away from polarization.

APPENDIX 1 .

VERB GROUPS DISPLAYING TENSE POLARIZATION

APPENDIX 1

VERB GROUPS DISPLAYING TENSE POLARIZATION

Indeterminate

Болаше (1)

Съвазѣваху (1)

Гнѣвашеса (1)

Възгаряхуса; из- (3)

погрѣбаху (1)

съдираху (1)

двѣжаше (1)

дѣвлаху (1)

подобашеть (3)

шдалаху (1)

дѣтаху (1)

зваху (сѧ) (5)

прозѣваху; при-; съ- (3)

Determinate

разболѣса (7)

сѣзаша (1)

прогнѣваша; раз- (8)

възгорѣша (сѧ); из-; съ-;

по-; раз- (6)

погребоша (13)

шдра; раз- (3)

въздвѣже (3)

оудивиса; по- (3)

сподобиса (4)

шдолѣ (12)

сдѣта; на- (сѧ) (5)

прозваша (сѧ); со-; во-;

при-; пре- (46)

искаше (3)	доискахомъ; сн- (4)
приискаваху (1)	
прекладаше; вс- (3)	покладоша (1)
кланяху (3)	поклонися (9)
оукланяхуться (1)	
копахомъ (1)	ископа; про-, ѿ- (12)
куповаше (1)	совокупи (8)
кусаше (1)	вкуси; ис-, оу- (5)
проливаше (1)	льгаша (1)
	нальгаша; про-, въз-, из- (7)
любаше (6)	възлюбихи (9)
мучаху (2)	примучи (2)
шмѣваше (1)	шмѣся (1)
шмѣлаше (1)	помѣслиша; оу-, с-, про-
примѣшляше; до-, оу-,	по- (11)
по- (4)	
вметаху (2)	шмѣтасте (1)
шбрѣтаху (1)	шбрѣтоша; с-, устрѣте (13)

падаху (2)	паде (9)
впадаше (1)	нападе; по-; ѿ-; ис-; с-;
	в- (10)
пасаше (1)	спси (1)
пихаху (1)	спехнуша (2)
плеваше (1)	блгону (1)
плаваше (1)	приплуша (2)
пленоваху (2)	поалѣни (5)
полозаху (1)	поползеса (1)
радовашеса (6)	шбредовашеса; по- (2)
подражаху (1)	поразихь; прсшб- (4)
сгаше (2)	вѡсига (4)
шквернаху (1)	шкверниша (3)
славаше (3)	прослави (3)
прославлаху (1)	
наслѣдоваста (1)	наслѣдиша (2)
прислѣваше (2)	прислѣ; оу- (6)

приступаше (2)	ступиша ^ѣ (3)
	ѡступища; въ-; прѣ-; съ- за-; рас-; при-; въ-; под-; па-; по- (50)
сѣдѣху (4)	сѣде (56)
присѣдѣху (2)	ссѣде; в-; ѡ-; въ- (6)
тоняху (1)	потопе; оу-; ис- (7)
тужаше (1)	вѣстужиши (1)
растинѣху (1)	роста (1)
оумаше (2)	разумѣ (6)
оучашеть (2)	наоучи; по- (СА) (4)
хвалаше (2)	похвали (3)
хулаше (1)	похули (1)
чташе (3)	почти (4)
цадѣаше (1)	поцадѣ (1)
прогавляше (4)	нависа (15)

APPENDIX 2

VERB GROUPS CONTAINING THE DETERMINATE IMPERFECT FORM

APPENDIX 2

VERB GROUPS CONTAINING THE DETERMINATE IMPERFECT FORM

IndeterminateDeterminate

оубиваху; въ-; из- (7)

избави (3)

избаваште (1)

бисл (1)

бьгахутса (1)

изби; оу-; раз-; из-; с- (52)

велѣши (1)

велаше (1)

повелѣ (68)

верже (1)

вержаше (2)

приверже; ѡ-; с-; в-; из-;

испро-; по- (10)

възвращаетса (1)

вороти(са); врати(са) (2)

възвратиса; раз- (34)

възвраташте (2)

вдѣлиши (1)¹

всivolokoши; с- (2)

облечеса; со- (8)

привлечяхутѣ (1)

¹ See Appendix 3.

	воевоша (10)
	<u>воеваху</u> (3)
	повоеваста(2)
вѣдаше (5)	повѣда; оу-; испо-; запо-; спо-; пропо- (46)
	<u>повѣдаху; пропо-</u> (5)
ѡвещеваху (1)	свѣщаща; ѡб-(ср) (18)
	<u>сѡвѣщашеса</u> (1)
	гнаша (3)
	изгнаша; по-; про-; вз-; взг-; взз- (27)
	<u>погнаше</u> (1)
	раздѣлиша (14)
	<u>раздѣлаху</u> (1)
жагаху (1)	пожгоша; за -; во- (20)
пожиггаху (2)	<u>сожжгаху</u> (1)
	знаменаса (2)
	<u>знаменаше</u> (1)
позоровахомс (1)	зрѣ (1)
	оузрѣ; за-; во-; про-; по- (12)
	<u>оузраше</u> (1)

	изчезнуща (2)
	<u>изчезнаху</u> (1)
казаше (1)	показаша; с-; предпо- (14)
показываше (3)	<u>наказаху</u> (2)
	взложи; за-; по-; пре- (20)
	<u>взложиху; в-; по-</u> (3)
прелцаше (1)	<u>лъстяхуся</u> (1)
	прельсти (5)
	налѣзоша; в-; из-; назе-;
	взи- (21)
	<u>взлѣзаше</u> (1)
	помазашася (1)
	<u>помазаше</u> (1)
оумираху (2)	помроша; оу- (29)
	<u>оумраше</u> (1)
	помилова (2)
	<u>помиловашеть</u> (1)
	молися (2)
	<u>моляшася</u> (10)
	оумолиста; по- (4)

ПОМНАШЕ (1)²

ПРАМЪНИСА; ПРЕМЪСА (2)

ПРЕМЪНАШЕ (2)

НАЧЪНАХУТЬ; НАЧИНАХУ (2) С ПОЧАША; НА- (163)

НАЧАХУ (1)

ПРОСИША (1)

ПРОСАХУ (1)

ИСПРОСИША; С-; В- (3)

СПРАТА (2)

СПРАТАШЕ (1)

ПОУСТИ (15)

Ѡ ПОУСТИ; ИС-; ПО-; ВЪИ-; РАС- (16)

ДОПУСТАХУ; ПРИ- (2)

ПЪТАХУ (2)

ИСПИ; ОУ- (2)

НАПАГАШЕ (1)

ПОДЪПЪТАХУТСА (1)

НАРИЦАХУСА;

РЕЧЕ (454)

ПРОРЪЦАХУ (4)

РЕЧАШЕ (1)

НАРЕКОША̄; ПРРКША (26)

ПРОСВѢТИ; Ѡ- (2)

ПОСВѢТАШЕ (1)

посекаху (1)	<u>САЦАХУСА</u> (1)
	исбче; по-; рас-; взи- (15)
слаше (1)	посла; при-; со- (129)
посылаше; в- (3)	<u>ПОСЛАШЕ</u> (1)
слушаше (2)	послуша; пре- (29)
	<u>ПОСЛУШАХУ</u> (3)
	оупе (2)
	<u>ОУПАШЕ</u> (1)
стогаше (21)	ста (40)
стог ³ (3)	<u>СТАНАШЕ</u> (2)
пристогоху (1)	шста (СА); вг-; оу-; на-; при- (23)
ставлаше (1)	постави; ш-; оу-; сь-; при-; пре- (СА) (89)
	<u>ПОСТАВАХУ</u> (1)
стрелуху (1)	стрѣли (1)
	растрѣлаша (1)
	<u>РАСТРЕЛАХУ</u> (1)
	соудихомъ (1)
	<u>СУДАШЕ</u> (1)
	<u>ОСУДАШЕ</u> (1)

посъипаша; раз-; съ- (4)

засъипаше; при- (2)

творихъ (3)

творяху (23)

створиша; за- (114)

свораше; за- (2)

трудѣ (3)

трудашетса (1)

оутѣши (3)

оутѣшаху (3)

гаста (3)

гастаху (5)

снѣсть; по- (3)

гаста (20)

прита; по-; вз-; на-; пере-;

подъ-; за-; поре-; пре-; сн-;

вспри-; шт-; из-; ꙗпа (123)

взъмаше (1)

изъима; по-; въи-; пере-;

при- (9)

изимахуть; въи-; при-;

ѡ- (13)

имаше (6)

APPENDIX 3

VERB GROUPS CONTAINING THE INDETERMINATE AORIST FORM

APPENDIX 3

VERB GROUPS CONTAINING THE INDETERMINATE AORIST FORM

<u>Indeterminate</u>	<u>Determinate</u>
брежаше (2)	
<u>преже</u> (бреже) (1)	
<u>блациша</u> (1) ⁴	
шблацише (3)	блациша (1)
<u>шблада</u> (1)	
<u>ждаша</u> (1)	дожда (1)
шжидаше (1)	
живаху (12)	поживе; ш- (3)
<u>живе</u> (1)	
кнажаше (2)	
<u>кнажи</u> (3)	
лежаше (2)	везлеже; за (3)
<u>лежа</u> (3)	
плакахуса (4)	
<u>плакаша</u> (13)	
<u>стога</u> (3) ⁵	
<u>топиша</u> (1)	потопи (2)

⁴ See Appendix 2 for other forms: ⁵ Ibid.

APPENDIX 4

VERB GROUPS CONTAINING A COMMON INDETERMINATE:
INDETERMINATE STEM

APPENDIX 4

VERB GROUPS CONTAINING A COMMON INDETERMINATE:
...DETERMINATE STEM

<u>Common Stem</u>	<u>Indeterminate</u>	<u>Determinate</u>
видаше (4)		увидѣхомъ;
видѣ (33)		вза- (4)
глаголаху (26)		проглагола (2)
глаголаша (7)		
можахше (5)	изнемогаху;	възмогоста;
могоша (6)	-могаху (3)	изне- (3)
мнаше (3)		поману; оу- (5)
мнѣ (1)		помнаше (1) ⁶
смаху (4)		
смѣ (2)		
хоташе (13)		
хотѣ (5)		всехотѣ (8)

⁶ See Appendix 2.

6

APPENDIX 5

VERBS OF MOTION AND *βιτη* AND *δατη* : *δατατη*
GROUPS

APPENDIX 5

VERBS OF MOTION AND *БЪТИ* AND *ДАТИ*: *ДАТАТИ* GROUPSIndeterminate

Бродяху (1)
 Бродихъся (1)
 Персбродихъся (1)

Водаше (1)
 Водиша (1)
 Привожаху (3)
 Приводиша; за- (2)
 Приводаху (1)
 Возаше (1)

Determinate

побредe; в- (4)

Бѣжа (23)
 Бѣжаху (1)
 Бѣже (2)
 оубѣжа; про-; при-; в- (4)
 оубѣгоша; ѝ-; по-; про-;
 в-; вѣ-; при- (47)

Ведоша (6)
 Водаше (1)
 Приведоша; вѣ-; на-; из-;
 с-; вѣ- (40)
 Везоша (3)
 съвезоша; при-; по-; пере-;
 при- (11)

хожаше (3)	идс (102)
ходи (6)	идаше (13)
схожахуса; иѣ; при- (4)	разидоша; сн-; по-; при-;
приходи; на- (7)	наѣ; из-; вн-; вѣи-; ѿ-;
приходаху (3)	шб-; вѣ-; пре-; про-;
	подѣ- (429)
	предѣидаше; из-; вѣи- (5)
ношаху (3)	несоша (8)
приношаху; вѣз- (2)	несахуть (1)
приносашеть; из- (2)	принесоша; по-; в-; при-;
	вѣз-; про-; пре-; на-;
	пере- (19)
	принесаху. (2)
бѣаше; беаше (3)	бѣи (172)
бѣ (148)	баше (42)
бѣваше (6)	будаше (3)
прѣбѣваше (2)	сбѣиса; прѣт; из-; за- (19)
	сбудашеться (1)
дагаше (4)	даша (25)
дана (2)	даху (1)
подагаше; вѣз- (2)	дадаше (2)
раздана (7)	вдаша; пре-; по-; вѣз-
раздаваху; по- (3)	ѿ- (59)

APPENDIX 6

ABSTRACT

APPENDIX 6

ABSTRACT

The thesis analyzes the verb forms of the Povest' Vremennykh Let in terms of the determinate-indeterminate opposition (defined as event vs. action per se) and the aorist and imperfect tense. It examines all verb groups (including simple, prefixed, and suffixed variations) which occur in the text in both the imperfect and aorist tense forms. Verb groups are presented in five sections: (1) those in which the aorist and imperfect tense forms are completely polarized relative to the determinate and indeterminate stem, i.e., the aorist tense only occurs with the determinate stem and the imperfect tense only occurs with the indeterminate stem; (2) those containing the determinate imperfect form (a special use); (3) those containing the indeterminate aorist (a special use); (4) those containing a common unprefixed stem for both the aorist and imperfect forms (cognitive verb groups); and (5) the verbs of motion.

The study demonstrates that in 103 of 109 verb groups (excluding the verbs of motion) the occurrence of the aorist and imperfect tense forms reflect the determinate-indeterminate opposition. The verbs of motion, however, entertain a liberation of tense use relative to the stem, i.e., the aorist and imperfect tense forms may occur with any stem.

An argument is presented that tense polarization implies predictability of tense use, which led to simplification of the system, whereby the tense endings normalized with the / - ending of the perfect tense. The verbs of motion, on the contrary, in which the use of tense is not structured by polarization, retain the determinate: indeterminate category as a remnant of the old system. Aspect, therefore, is a later combination of the determinate: indeterminate category and aorist and imperfect tense values, and does not structure the verb forms of the Povest.