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VID AND NACRBTNIE
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 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:

"Vid of nouns is divided into the following types: primary, deverbative, assertive and qualitative. The primary form is as вскѣ уловѣкъ ("every man"), because it is not derived from another noun. Those which are named through derivation from an action are like ковавъ ("smith") — from ковать ("to forge"), дрѣвоздѣлам...

2 V. Jagić, Codex Slovenicus Rerum Grammaticarum, Berlin 1896, pp. 42–43
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What is meant here by *rod* and by *повеств* is not quite clear. Prof. V. Jagić writes in this connection as follows:


Dionysius of Thrace, one of the most eminent figures among the Alexandrian grammarians, explains τίδος of nouns in his work ἡ ἑκατηγορία grammaticē as follows:

Εἶδη δὲ δύο, πρωτότυπον καὶ παράγωγον. πρωτότυπον μὲν οὖν ἐστὶ τὸ κατὰ τὴν πρῶτην θέσιν λεγόντων, οἷον Γῆ, παράγωγον δὲ τὸ ἀφ᾽ ἐτέου τὴν γένεσιν ἑσχηκός, οἷον Γαυήδως (η 324).
Thus, according to Dionysius, there are eight kinds of eidos including primary forms: prototyon, patroynimikon, ktetikon, sygkritikon, hyperthetikon, hypokoristikôn, paroymôn and rematikon. Among these, prototyon, or primary form (cf. ΕΕΔΚΩΥΛΟΒΕΚΓ), and rematikon, or deverbative form (cf. ΚΟΒΑΥΛ), are already mentioned in the above cited text of Pseudo-Damascene. From the remaining six, patroynimikon (patronymic), sygkritikon (comparative derivation), hyperthetikon (superlative derivation), paroymon and hypokoristikôn (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 ktetikon and paroymôn, correspond to those which derived from pod and to those from noemai. To judge from the above passage, a derivation like ΟΕΘΤΕΝΙΚ is called noemai because it "gives a name of being possessed by an evil spirit to all of his members". That is, it is called
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Vid and Načrtanie 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 *noencmb* 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 θεϊν (“belonging to god), θεός”, which is the example cited by Dionysius of the word *parōnymon*, though his definition of it is quite different (the word *parōnymon* means “denominative”).

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

> ΒΝΑΔ ΗΣ ΜΗΝΟΝΟΒΡΑΞΗΓ ΓΛΑΓΟΛΕΤΤΕ ΣΕ, ΒΒ ΛΟΦΟΜΟΥΔΡΙΝ Η ΡΕΥΕΤΟ-

> ΥΣΤΒΗ Η ΗΝΕΘΕΥ, ΥΤΟ ΗΕ ΕΣΤΕ ΒΝΑΔ ΒΒ ΡΕΥΕΥΧ, ΗΒΗΜΗ, ΒΝΑΔ ΓΛΑΓΟ-

> ΛΕΤΕ ΣΕ ΡΕΥΝ ΔΑΛΗΜΕΝ ΝΑ ΔΒΟΕ, ΒΒ ΠΡΕΒΟΕΦΑΖΗΟΕ Η ΠΡΕΒΟΦΑΓΟΕ, ΗΜΟ ΣΕ:

*prēvobrazhnoe prinimo, xokio: prēvobando je: vycxokio, vycpinimo: otht punctia bw vycsprietie pseuvad takovaa.* (V. Jagić, op. cit., p. 45)

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, *prēvobando*, or the derived form, is, in the former, derived from its primary form, or *prēvobrazhnoe*, by adding the prefix: ΧΟΚΙΟ (i.e. xouy) — vycxokio i.e. vycxeuxy “to want”). ΠΡΙΝΜΟΥ — VYCSPΡΙΝΜΟΥ (“to receive”), while in the latter *paragōgon*, or the derived form, is derived from *prōtōtypon*, or the primary form, by adding a suffix and not by means of prefix: e.g. άρδευω from άρδω ("to water") by the addition of the suffix *-euv* (cf. Slavonic verbal suffix -e/ov-). Just the same can be said in relation to the nominal derivation: *paragōgon gaithioc* (“born from the Earth”) is derived from its *prōtōtypon* γη ("the Earth") by means of the suffix *-e-ivo-.*

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 ὄνοματων ἐστὶ τρία: ἄπλοῦν, σύνθετον, παρασύνθετον ἄπλοῦν μὲν ὀνὸν Μέμιον, σύνθετον δὲ ὀνὸν Ἀγαμέμνων, παρασύνθετον δὲ ὀνὸν Ἀγαμέμνονόντης † Φιλίππιδης. — Τῶν δὲ συνθέτων διαφοραί εἰσι τέσσαρες. α μὲν γὰρ αὐτῶν † εἰσιν ἐκ δύο τελείων, ὡς Χειρίσσος, καὶ δὲ ἐκ δύο ἀπολείποντων, ὡς Σωφοκλῆς, καὶ δὲ ἐς ἀπολείποντος καὶ τελείου, ὡς Φιλόδημος, καὶ δὲ ἐκ τελείου καὶ ἀπολείποντος, ὡς Περικλῆς.

According to him, there are three kinds of *schēma*: *haploûn*, *sýntheton* and *parasýntheton*. *Haploûn*, or simple form, is a word like Μέμιον, *sýntheton*, or a synthesized form, like Ἀγαμέμνονόντης, “son of Agamemnon”, etc. Therefore, words like ΒλήσκΧΣΚΧ, Βλήσπρόνημοι should have been treated as examples of *sýntheton*.

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