

Title	Vid and Na r tanie in the Slavonic Grammatical Terminology
Author(s)	山口, 巖
Citation	ことばの構造とことばの論理 : 山口巖教授停年記念論文集 (1998): 398-402
Issue Date	1998-07
URL	<a href="http://hdl.handle.net/2433/65811">http://hdl.handle.net/2433/65811</a>
Right	
Type	Departmental Bulletin Paper
Textversion	publisher

VID AND NAČRBTANIE  
IN THE SLAVONIC GRAMMATICAL TERMINOLOGY<sup>1</sup>

Needless to say, the category of aspect is of great importance, especially in the verbal systems of the Slavonic languages. This term is obviously a “calque” of an Old Slavonic word *vid*, which in turn corresponds to the Greek εἶδος in the works of the Alexandrian grammarians.

This word is said to have appeared first in an Old Church Slavonic translation of a grammatical tractatus “On the Eight Parts of Speech”, the oldest manuscript of which is a Serbian reduction of the 14th century. Although this tractatus was formerly believed to have been written by St. John of Damascus (Ioan Damaskin) in the 8th century, a doubt was subsequently cast upon its authorship, and now it is commonly referred to as “Pseudo-Damascene”.

However, as far as we learn from the definition of *vid*, or εἶδος as well, in the above mentioned Greek and Old Church Slavonic works, it should be understood that originally it was a term concerning word derivation in general and had nothing to do with grammar. It is quite understandable, therefore, that the term is applied not only to the derivation of verbs, but also to that of nouns.

For example, in Pseudo-Damascene the category of *vid* of nouns is defined as follows:

ВНДЬ ЖЕ НМЕНЬЪ ДѢЛНТЬ СЕ ВЪ СІА· ВЪ ПРЪВОБЫТНО И ДѢНСТВЪНО И  
ПОВѢСТНО И РОДОДАТНО. ПРЪВОБЫТНО ЮСТЬ СЕ· ВСАКЪ УЛОВѢКЪ, НЕ БО  
ОТЬ ННОГО ПРІЮТЬ СЕ. ДѢНСТВЪНОЕ ЖЕ СЕ, ЯКО ОТЬ ДѢНСТВА ПРОЗЫ-  
БДЕТЬ СЕ, ЯКО СЕ· КОВАУЪ, ДРѢВОДѢЛЮ. ОТЬ РОДА ЖЕ ЯКО СЕ· МАНІАКЪ,  
ШОУМЕ. ОТЬ ПОВѢСТИ ЖЕ, ЯКО СЕ· ОБѢШЕННКЪ. ОБѢСЕНІН БО ПОДАСТЬ  
ВСЕМОУ РОДОУ ОБѢШЕНІА НМЕ<sup>2</sup>.

“*Vid* of nouns is divided into the following types: primary, deverbative, assertive and qualitative. The primary form is as **ВСѢКЪ УЛОВѢКЪ** (“every man”), because it is not derived from another noun. Those which are named through derivation from an action are like **КОВАУЪ** (“smith”) — from **КОВАТИ** (“to forge”), **ДРѢВОДѢЛЮ**

<sup>1</sup> *Japanese Slavic and East European Studies*, Vol. 5, 1984, pp. 99–104.

<sup>2</sup> V. Jagić, *Codex Slovenicus Rerum Grammaticarum*, Berlin 1896, pp. 42–43

(“carpenter”) — from ДРЪВО (“wood”) + ДЪЛАТИ (“to make”), and those which are derived from *rod* “species” like МАННІАКЪ (“maniac”), ШОУМЕ (“drunkard”?). Those which are derived from ПОВѢСТЬ (“naration”) are, like ОБѢШЕННКЪ (“those who are possessed by an evel spirit”) — from ОБѢШНТИ СѦ (“to be possessed by an evil spirit”), because he who is possessed by an evil spirit gives the name of being possessed by an evil spirit to all of his members”.

What is meant here by *rod* and by *повѣсть* is not quite clear. Prof. V. Jagić writes in this connection as follows:

В нашей статьѣ в науке о глаголе действительно придержано такое же деление в “пръвообразное” и “преводное”, но в рассуждении о имени славянскому компилятору попал в руки какой-то особый греческий текст, различный от обыкновенных грамматических теорій. Деление имени по нашей статьѣ на “пръвобытно”, “действно”, “повѣстно” и “рододатно” не обнаруживает никаких отголосков Дионисиевой классификации. Если сказать, что первое название “пръвобытно” передает греческое πρωτότυπον, что могло бы быть, судя по смыслу, то мы опять получим новый пример такой несообразности, что в той же статьѣ греческое слово πρωτότυπον раз переведено через “пръвообразно”, потом же через “пръвобытно”. Второе название “действно” могло бы представлять перевод греческаго ἐνεργητικόν, потому что существительным, соответствующим славянским примерам “ковач”, “древоделя”, в грехеском изложении граммтики, у Дионисия и комментаторов его, присваивается ἐνέργεια, ср. слова Дионисия Фракийскаго (Uhlig I. с. 46): ἐνέργεια μὲν ὡς χριτῆς ὁ κρίνων. Третье название “повѣстно” мы встречаем в разборе глагола, как одно из “изложений” (ἔγκλισις) его. Там оно, как увидим ниже, передает греческое ἀποφαντικόν, но в делении имени это греческое название мне не встречалось. Наконец четвертое название “рододатно”, хотя и ему подходящаго в греческой классификации имени нет, напоминает собою то объяснение, которым комментатор Стефан снабдил греческий термин φερόνυμον: τὸ τιθέν ἐκ γενετῆς (J. Bekker II. 868). (V. Jagić, *op. cit.*, p. 62).

Dionysius of Thrace, one of the most eminent figures among the Alexandrian grammarians, explains εἶδος of nouns in his work *hē technē grammatikē* as follows:

Εἶδη δὲ δύο, πρωτότυπον καὶ παράγωγον. πρωτότυπον μὲν αὖν ἐστὶ τὸ κατὰ τὴν πρώτην θέσιν λεγθέν, οἷον Γῆ. παράγωγον δὲ τὸ ἀφ’ ἐτέου τὴν γένεσιν ἐσχηχός, οἷον Γαιήϊος (η 324).

Εἶδη δὲ παραγώγον ἐστὶν ἑπτὰ πατρωνυμικόν, κτητικόν, συγκριτικόν, ὑπερθετικόν, ὑποκοριστικόν, παρωνυμιον, ῥηματικόν.

(1) Πατρωνυμικόν μὲν ὄν ἐστι τὸ κυρίως ἀπὸ πατρὸς ἐσχηματισμένον καταχρηστικῶς δὲ καὶ τὸ ἀπὸ προγόνων, οἷον Πηλείδης, Αἰακίδης ὁ Ἀχιλλεύς. — Τύποι δὲ τῶν πατρωνυμικῶν ἀρσενικῶν μὲν τρεῖς, ὁ εἰς  $\delta\eta\varsigma$ , ὁ εἰς  $\omega\bar{\nu}$ , ὁ εἰς  $\alpha\delta\iota\omicron\varsigma$ , οἷον Ἀτρείδης, Ἀτρείων, καὶ ὁ τῶν Αἰολέων ἴδιος τύπος Ὑρράδιος· Ὑρρα γὰρ παῖς ὁ Πιπταχός, θηλυκῶν δὲ οἱ ἴσοι τρεῖς, ὁ εἰς  $\iota\varsigma$ , οἷον Πριαμῖς, καὶ ὁ εἰς  $\alpha\varsigma$ , οἷον Πελιάς, καὶ ὁ εἰς  $\nu\eta$ , οἷον Ἀδρηστήνη (E 412). — Ἀπὸ δὲ μητέρων αὐὸ σχηματίζει πατρωνυμικόν εἶδος ὁ Ὀμηρος, ἀλλ' οἱ νεώτεροι.

(2) Κτητικόν δὲ ἐστὶ τὸ ὑπὸ τὴν κτήσιν πεπτωκός, ἐμπεριελημμένου τοῦ κτήτορος, οἷον † Νηληϊοὶ ἵπποι (A 597), Ἐκτόρεος χιτών (B 416), Πλατωνικὸν βιβλίον.

(3) Συγκριτικόν δὲ ἐστὶ τὸ τὴν σύγκρισιν ἔχον ἑνὸς πρὸς ἓνα ὁμοιογενῆ, ὡς Ἀχιλλεὺς ἀνδρειότερος Αἴαντος, ἢ ἑνὸς πρὸς πολλοὺς ἑτερογενεῖς, ὡς Ἀχιλλεὺς ἀνδρειότερος τῶν Τρώων. Τῶν δὲ συγκριτικῶν τύποι εἰσὶ τρεῖς, ὁ εἰς  $\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\varsigma$ , οἷον ὀξύτερος βραδύτερος, καὶ ὁ εἰς  $\omega\bar{\nu}$  † καθάρως, οἷον βελτίων, καλλιῶν, καὶ ὁ εἰς  $\omega\bar{\nu}$ , οἷον κρείσσων ἥσσων.

(4) Ὑπερθετικόν δὲ ἐστὶ τὸ, κατ' ἐπίτασιν ἑνὸς πρὸς πολλοὺς παραλαμβανόμενον ἐν συγκρίσει. Τύποι δὲ αὐτοῦ εἰσὶ δύο, ὁ εἰς  $\tau\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$ , οἷον ὀξύτατος βραδύτατος, καὶ ὁ εἰς  $\tau\omicron\varsigma$ , οἷον ἄριστος μέγιστος.

(5) Ὑποκοριστικόν δὲ ἐστὶ τὸ μείωσιν τοῦ πρωτοτύπου ἀσυγκρίτως δηλοῦν οἷον ἀνθρωπίσχος λίθαξ μειρακύλλιον.

(6) Παρωνυμιον δὲ ἐστὶ τὸ παρ' ὄνομα ποιηθέν, οἷον Θεῶν † Τρύφων.

(7) Ῥηματικόν δὲ ἐστὶ τὸ ἀπο ῥήματος παρηγμένον, οἷον Φιλήμων Νοήμων.

Thus, according to Dionysius, there are eight kinds of *eidos* including primary forms: *prōtōtypon*, *patrōnymikón*, *ktētikón*, *sygkritikón*, *hyperthetikón*, *hypokoristikón*, *parōnymón* and *rēmatikón*. Among these, *prōtōtypon*, or primary form (cf.  $\text{BCAK}^{\text{b}} \text{YAOB}^{\text{b}} \text{EK}^{\text{b}}$ ), and *rēmatikón*, or deverbative form (cf.  $\text{KOBAY}^{\text{b}}$ ), are already mentioned in the above cited text of Pseudo-Damascene. From the remaining six, *patrōnymikón* (patronymic), *sygkritikón* (comparative derivation), *hyperthetikón* (superlative derivation), *parōnymon* and *hypokoristikón* (hypocoristic) can be excluded as having no correspondence in the above cited text. If this conjecture be true, it would become highly probable that the remaining two, namely *ktētikón* and *parōnymón*, correspond to those which derived from *pod* and to those from *nošpctb*. To judge from the above passage, a derivation like  $\text{OB}^{\text{b}} \text{ŠENHK}^{\text{b}}$  is called *nošpctb* because it “gives a name of being possessed by an evil spirit to all of his members”. That is, it is called

*novnct̃* because it stands as a “predicate” of the group of men, who are possessed by an evil spirit. From this point of view, the term *novnct̃* seems to be applied, though not very appropriately, to denote *ktētikón*, which means “that which fell into one’s possession”. On the other hand, however, *pod* can be interpreted as denoting a genus like θεῶν (“belonging to god), θεός”, which is the example cited by Dionysius of the word *parōnymón*, though his definition of it is quite different (the word *parōnymón* means “denominative”).

On the other hand, the explanation concerning *vid* or εἶδος of verbs is relatively brief in Pseudo-Damascene as well as in Dionysius:

ВНДЬ ЖЕ МНОГОБРАЗНѢ ГЛАГОЛЕТЬ СЕ, ВЪ ЛЮБОМОУДРІИ Н РѢУЕТО-  
УБСТВѢ Н НМЕНЕХЪ. УТО ЖЕ ЈЕСТЬ ВНДЬ ВЪ РѢУЕХЪ, КВННМЪ. ВНДЬ ГЛАГОЛ-  
ЈЕТЬ СЕ РѢУИ ДѢЛНМѢИ НА ДВОЈЕ, ВЪ ПРѢВООБРАЗНОЕ Н ПРѢВОДНОЕ, КАКО СЕ:  
ПРѢВООБРАЗНОЕ ПРІНМОУ, ХОКЮ: ПРѢВОДНОЕ ЖЕ: ВЪСХОКЮ, ВЪСПРІНМОУ:  
ΩΤΗ ΠΡΙΕΤΙΑ ΕΩ ВЪСПΡΙΕΤΙΕ ΠΡΟΥΔΑ ΤΑΚΟΒΑΔ. (V. Jagić, *op. cit.*, p. 45)

Εἶδη δὲ δύο, πρωτότυπον καὶ παράγωγον· πρωτότυπον μὲν οἶον ἄρδω, παράγωγον δὲ οἶον ἄρδεύω.

However, we cannot but point out that there is a very important difference in the conception of the two terms: as is evident from the examples cited above, *ΠΡΕΒΟΔНОЕ*, or the derived form, is, in the former, derived from its primary form, or *ΠΡΕВООБРАЗНОЕ*, by adding the prefix: *ХОКЮ* (i.e. *хочу*) — *ВЪСХОКЮ* i.e. *всхочу* “to want”). *ПРІНМОУ* — *ВЪСПРІНМОУ* (“to receive”), while in the latter *parágōgon*, or the derived form, is derived from *prōtótýpon*, or the primary form, by adding a suffix and not by means of prefix: e.g. ἄρδεύω from ἄρδω (“to water”) by the addition of the suffix \*-eu- (cf. Slavonic verbal suffix -e/ov-). Just the same can be said in relation to the nominal derivation: *parágōgon* γαῆριος (“born from the Earth”) is derived from its *protōtýpon* γῆ (“the Earth”) by means of the suffix \*-ē-iyō-.

This difference may seem at first glance to be of quite a trivial nature. But, in view of the procedure by which aspectual pairs are formed in the Slavonic languages, it should never be ignored: as is well known, in the Slavonic languages verbs of perfective *vid* are mostly derived from their imperfective counterpart by means of prefixation and not by suffixation. As for suffixation, it is usually made use of when “secondary” imperfectives are formed from prefixed perfective verbs. Therefore, if the term is applied exclusively to denote procedure of suffixation, it would be not

appropriate for denoting the procedure of aspectual formation.

On the other hand, derivation by means of suffixation is treated in the work of the Alexandrian grammarian under the rubric of *schēma*:

Σχήματα δὲ ὀνομάτων ἐστί τρία· ἀπλοῦν, σύνθετον, παρασύνθετον· ἀπλοῦν μὲν οἶον Μέμνων, σύνθετον δὲ οἶον Ἄγαμέμνων, παρασύνθετον δὲ οἶον Ἄγαμεμνονίδης † Φιλιππίδης. — Τῶν δὲ συνθέτων διαφοραὶ εἰσι τέσσαρες. ἃ μὲν γὰρ αὐτῶν † εἰσιν ἐκ δύο τελείων, ὡς Χειρίσοφος, ἃ δὲ ἐκ δύο ἀπολείποντων, ὡς Σοφοκλῆς, ἃ δὲ ἐξ ἀπολείποντος καὶ τελείου, ὡς Φιλόδημος, ἃ δὲ ἐκ τελείου καὶ ἀπολείποντος, ὡς Περικλῆς.

According to him, there are three kinds of *schēma*: *haploūn*, *sýn্থeton* and *parasýn্থeton*. *haploūn*, or simple form, is a word like Μέμνων, *sýn্থeton*, or a synthesized form, like Ἀγαμεμνονίδης, “son of Agamemnon”, etc. Therefore, words like ВЪСΧΟΚЮ, ВЪСПРΗНМОУ should have been treated as examples of *sýn্থeton*.

Thus it seems to be certain that the author of Pseudo-Damascene took *schēma* for *eĩdos*. This mistake leads him to a confusion in his treatment of *ναχρητανιε*, which corresponds to the *schēma* of Dionysius of Thrace. It is found to be difficult, indeed, to make any clear distinction between *vid* and *ναχρητανιε* on the basis of his explanation: according to him, “*ναχρητανιε* is a meaning of verbs if it is simple, synthesized or ‘persynthesized’ as is seen in a simple form ΔΔΜБ (“to give”), synthesized form ВЪΖΔΔΜБ (“to give over, surrender”), and ‘persynthesized’ ВЪΖΔΔΜБ ΕΜΟΥ (“to give over to him”).

Accordingly, as mentioned above, in view of the fact that prefixation is the most typical of the procedures by which perfective verbs are formed from their imperfective counterparts, and that suffixation is used mainly to derive “secondary” imperfectives from the prefixed perfective, it is rather *ναχρητανιε*, or *schēma*, that seems to be more appropriate to denote this procedure of forming aspectual pairs.

Thus it is concluded that the term *vid* was introduced into our grammatical terminology, so to speak, by a happy mistake of the author of Pseudo-Damascene. It subsequently came to denote mainly the functioning of the derivational procedure of aspectual pairs of Slavonic verbs.