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Kyoto University
VID AND NACRTANIE
IN THE SLAVONIC GRAMMATICAL TERMINOLOGY

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 εἰδός 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 εἰδός 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:

Видъ же имени дѣлить се въ сиа: въ пръвобытно и дѣствинно и повѣстиво и рододативо. Пръвобытнѣ есть се всѣхъ уловѣкъ, не бо оаихъ нѣго приять се. Дѣствивное же се, мѣо оаихъ дѣствия произвесть се, мѣо се ковать, древодѣламъ. Оаихъ родъ же мѣо се: манѣакъ, шоумъ. Оаихъ повѣстивъ же, мѣо се: убѣщенкъ. Убѣщеннѣ бо подать всѣмому роду убѣшення нмѣ.

"Vid of nouns is divided into the following types: primary, deverbative, assertive and qualitative. The primary form is as всѣхъ уловѣкъ (“every man”), because it is not derived from another noun. Those which are named through derivation from an action are like ковать (“smith”) — from коватъ (“to forge”), древодѣламъ".
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(“carpenter”) — from Δράβω (“wood”) + ΔιάλατΗ (“to make”), and those which are derived from род “species” like Маниакъ (“maniac”), Стоуме (“drunkard?”). Those which are derived from пове́сты (“naration”) are, like ОБЩЕНИКЪ (“those who are possessed by an evil spirit”) — from ОБЩЕНИЯ СА (“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 род and by пове́сты is not quite clear. Prof. V. Jagić writes in this connection as follows:

В нашей статье в науке о глаголе действительно придерживалось такое же деление в “пръвообразное” и “преводное”, но в рассуждении о имени славянскому компилатору попал в руки какой-то особый греческий текст, различный от обыкновенных грамматических теорий. Деление имени по нашей статье на “пръвообразно”, “действительно”, “пове́стыно” и “рододатно” не обнаруживает никаких отголосков Дионисиевой классификации. Если сказать, что первое название “пръвообразно” передает греческое ἔστότοπον, что могло бы быть, судя по смыслу, то мы опять получим новый пример такой несообразности, что в той же статье греческое слово ἔστότοπον раз переведено через “пръвообразно”, потом же через “пръвообразно”. Второе название “действительно” могло бы представлять перевод греческого ἐνέργειά, потому что существительным, соответствующим славянским примерам “ко- вач”, “древодел”, в греческом изложении грамматики, у Дионисия и комментаторов его, присваивается ἐνέργεια, ср. слова Дионисия Фракийского (Uhlig l. c. 46): ἐνέργεια μὲν ώς κρατήρος κρήνον. Третье название “пове́стыно” мы встречаем в разборе глагола, как одно из “изложений” (ἐγγράφως) его. Там оно, как увидим ниже, передает греческое выражение ἀποφαντικόν, но в делеении имени это греческое название мне не встречалось. Наконец четвертое название “рододатно”, хотя и ему подходящего в греческой классификации имени нет, напоминает собой то объяснение, которым комментатор Стефан снабдил греческий термин феро́ môn: τὸ τιθέν ἐκ γενέτης (J. Bekker II. 868). (V. Jagić, op. cit., p. 62).

Dionysius of Thrace, one of the most eminent figures among the Alexandrian grammarians, explains е́дос of nouns in his work ἡ teχνή γραμματική as follows:

Εἶδη δὲ δύο, πρωτότυπον καὶ παράγωνον. πρωτότυπον μὲν οὖν ἐστὶ τὸ κατὰ τὴν πρώτην θέσιν λεγόν, οἷον Γῆ, παράγωγον δὲ τὸ ἀρ’ ἐτέο ϑὴν γένεσιν ἐσχηκός, οἷον Γαυθίως (η 324).
Thus, according to Dionysius, there are eight kinds of eidos including primary forms: prototypon, patrōnymikōn, ktētikōn, sygkritikōn, hyperthetikōn, hypokoristikōn, parōnymōn and rēmatikōn. Among these, prototypon, or primary form (cf. ἐκάκιον ὀλοθέκκα), and rēmatikōn, or deverbal form (cf. κοβαύλα), are already mentioned in the above cited text of Pseudo-Damascene. From the remaining six, patrōnymikōn (patronymic), sygkritikōn (comparative derivation), hyperthetikōn (superlative derivation), parōnymōn and hypokoristikōn (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 ktētikōn and parōnymōn, correspond to those which derived from pod and to those from noemēm. To judge from the above passage, a derivation like ὀξεῖωσθηκά is called noemēm because it “gives a name of being possessed by an evil spirit to all of his members”. That is, it is called
because it stands as a “predicate” of the group of men, who are posessed by an evil spirit. From this point of view, the term *nepvičt* seems to be applied, though not very appropriately, to denote *ktētikón*, which means “that which fell into one’s posession”. On the other hand, however, *pod* can be interpreted as denoting a genus like *θέων* (“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 *εἴδος* of verbs is relatively brief in Pseudo-Damascene as well as in Dionysius:

ΒΙΔΑ ΖΕ МНОГООБРАЗНΕ ГЛАГОЛЕТЬ СЕ, Β ΛЮБОМΟΥΔΡΗΝ Η ΡΕΥЄТΟ-
УСТВΕ Ν ΗΜΕΝΕΧ, ΥΤΟ ΖΕ ΕСТЬ ΒΙΔΑ ΒΙ ΡΕЎЄΧ, ΜВНМЬ. ΒΙДА ГЛАГО-
ЛЕТ Є СЕ ΡΕУН ΑΔΛΗΜЄН ΝΑ ΔΒΟЄ, ΒΙ ПΡΟБОБРАЗΝЄ Η ΠΡѢΒΟДЊЄ, ΜЌЄ СЄ:
ПРѢБОБРАЗЊЄ ΠΡѢЋΜΟΥ. ΧΟЌЈ: ΠΡѢБОДЊЄ ΖЄ: ΒѢϹΧΟЌЈ, ΒѢϹΠѢЋМΟΥ:
ΩΤЋ ΠѢѢΤΙΑ ΒѲ ВѢϹѢΡѢѢΤΙЄ ΠΡѢѢѢΑ ΤΑΚѢѢΑΑ. (V. Jagić, op. cit., p. 45)

Στα δυο, πρωτότυπον καὶ παράγωγον τυπότυπον μὲν οἶνον ἄρδω, παράγωγον
δὲ οἶνον ἄρδεω.

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, *πѢѢѢΟϹЃۃ* or the derived form, is, in the former, derived from its primary form, or *ПѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѢѪ-

This difference may seem at first glance to be of quite a trivial nature. But, in view of the procedure by which such 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 ὄνομάτων ἐστὶ τρία: ἀπλοῦν, σύνθετον, παρασύνθετον ἀπλοῦν μὲν οἷον Μέμιων, σύνθετον δὲ οἷον Ἀγαμέμνων, παρασύνθετον δὲ οἷον Ἀγαμεμνονύθης ἢ Φιλτύπλης. — Τῶν δὲ συνθέτων διαφορά εἰσι τέσσαρες. ἀ μὲν γὰρ αὐτῶν ἢ ἐσιν ἐκ δύο τελείων, ὡς Χειρόσοφος, ἢ δὲ ἐκ δύο ἀπολείποντων, ὡς Σοφοκλῆς, ἢ δὲ ἐξ ἀπολείποντος καὶ τελείου, ὡς Φιλόδημος, ἢ δὲ ἐκ τελείου καὶ ἀπολείποντος, ὡς Περικλῆς.

According to him, there are three kinds of *schēma*: haploûn, synþethon and parasynþethon. haploûn, or simple form, is a word like Μέμιων, synþethon, or a synthesized form, like Ἀγαμεμνονύθης, “son of Agamemnon”, etc. Therefore, words like ΒςΧΞΚΧ, ΒςΧΠΡΗΜΟΥ should have been treated as examples of synþethon.

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