

Kostić, Svetislav

Indic vdā-/dad, vdhā-/dadh- and slavic vdā-/dad, vdē-/ded-

Sborník prací Filozofické fakulty brněnské univerzity. A, Řada jazykovědná. 2007, vol. 56, iss. A55, pp. [53]-64

ISBN 978-80-210-4335-0

ISSN 0231-7567

Stable URL (handle): <https://hdl.handle.net/11222.digilib/100968>

Access Date: 28. 11. 2024

Version: 20220831

Terms of use: Digital Library of the Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University provides access to digitized documents strictly for personal use, unless otherwise specified.

SVETISLAV KOSTIĆ

INDIC $\sqrt{DĀ-/DAD-}$, $\sqrt{DHĀ-/DADH-}$
AND SLAVIC $\sqrt{DĀ-/DAD-}$, $\sqrt{DĚ-/DED-}$

0. Among the IE verbs there is a class of verbs that form the Present Tense stem by means of reduplication. This means is significant mainly in ancient languages, such as Sanskrit, Latin and Greek. It also takes part in forming the Perfect Tense stem, as well as intensive and desiderative stems, which are typical for Sanskrit. Many of the IE languages, including Slavic, do not use this morpho-phonological means. Nevertheless, there are two verbs *dā-/dad-* to give and *dē-/ded-* to put, which seem to be a kind of remnants or rudiments of the process of reduplication, which probably was very productive in the PIE period. We suppose the reduplication to be one of the very important means of the verb-stem formation. Its lack in modern Slavic languages is compensated by other morphologic means. The two reduplicative stems also serve as a source and motivation for a 'quasi reduplication' in some Slavic dialects.

1.0. In Sanskrit some words or their inflected forms are repeated for the sake of *emphasis* of the basic meaning. Their resulting formations have adverbial meanings of wider distribution of action in time and space. E.g., repetition of Skt. nouns (e.g. *aharaha* 'day by day' < *ahar* 'day'; *dine dine* 'day by day' < *dine-loc.* 'day', *pade pade* 'step by step, lit. at every step', < *pade-loc.* 'step' etc.) has to stress the meaning of these words. Since these nouns denote temporal and spatial units, their repeated inflected forms serve as adverbial phrases of the distributive function.

Reduplication is a very productive morpho-semantic process in ancient IE languages, not only in Sanskrit, but also in Greek and Latin. It appears as grammatical means to coin some verbal forms expressing temporal and aspectual features.

1.1. The reduplication is considered as a main means of the perfective action and especially of the Perfect Tense formation in ancient Indo-European languages such as Sanskrit, Avestan, Greek and Latin.

As for the phonological processes of this kind of reduplication, they are also common in these old languages and include complex changes of vowels and con-

sonants of the root initial syllable, so that the copied syllable is simpler and it is prefixed or left placed to the (original) root syllable. Thus the reduplication appears as a regressive morpho-phonological process.

The root vowel is weakened, and in the newly formed syllable it is *-e-* in Greek, *-a-* in Sanskrit, and in Latin it is copied root vowel. In some cases it seems to be a kind of augment, which is *e-* in Greek and *a-* in Sanskrit, strengthened by the initial root consonant. The following scheme shows some syllable-structure-changes as a means of the Perfect stem formation:

- | | | |
|-----|--|---|
| | Skt. | Gk. |
| (1) | CV > C ₁ aCV ₁
<i>bhū</i> > <i>bábhū-</i> | CVC > C ₁ eCV ₁ C
<i>lip-</i> > <i>lé-loip-</i> |
| (2) | CVC > C ₁ aCV ₁ C
<i>khād-</i> > <i>cákhād-</i> | CCVC > C ₁ eCCV ₁ C
<i>treph-</i> > <i>té-troph-</i> |

In Latin the original vowel *-e-* is preserved only in several verbs (e.g.: *dō* ‘to give’ > Perf. *dedī*, *stō-* ‘to stay’ > Perf. *steī*), but mostly it is replaced by the vowel of the concrete-root syllable, i.e.: *-i-/-u-/-o-*: *discō* ‘to learn’ > Perf. *didicī*, *currō* ‘to run’ > Perf. *cucurrī*, *pungō* ‘to sting’ > Perf. *pupugī*, *mordeō* ‘to bite’ > Perf. *momordī* (for parallel instances in Skt. see tab. 6.).

If a verb root begins with a vowel, this vowel and its reduplicated/copied form, prefixed to the previous one, blend to make a long vowel, e.g. in Gk. *orth-* ‘to straighten up’ > *o* + *orth-* > Perf. stem *ōrth-*; *opl-* ‘to arm’ > *o* + *opl-* > Perf. stem *ōpl-*; or in Skt.: *an-* ‘to breath’ > *a* + *an-* > Perf. stem *ān-*; *ah-* ‘to say’ > *a* + *ah-* > Perf. stem *āh-*; *uc-* ‘to take pleasure in’ > *u* + *uc-* > Perf. stem *ūc-* etc.

As for the reduplicated consonant, there are restrictions concerning aspirated consonants (3) in Greek, which change into non-aspirated. In Sanskrit the restriction concerns, besides aspirated consonants, also velars (4), which become palatals:

- | | |
|------|---|
| Skt. | Gk. |
| (3) | <i>p/ph</i> > <i>p</i> , <i>t/th</i> > <i>t</i> , <i>k/kh/c/ch</i> > <i>c</i> <i>p/ph</i> > <i>p</i> , <i>t/th</i> > <i>t</i> , <i>k/kh</i> > <i>k</i> :
<i>b/bh</i> > <i>b</i> , <i>d/dh</i> > <i>d</i> , <i>g/gh/j/jh</i> > <i>j</i> : 1.sg. <i>phainomai</i> > <i>péphēna</i> ,
<i>bhū-</i> > <i>ba-bhū-</i> <i>thērāō</i> > <i>téthērka</i> , <i>khéō</i> > <i>kékhuka</i> . |
| (4) | <i>k/kh/c/ch</i> > <i>c</i> ; <i>g/gh/j/jh</i> > <i>j</i>
<i>kr-</i> > <i>cakṛ-</i> , <i>khid</i> > <i>cikhid-</i> |

According to the above-mentioned restrictions, the representative consonants among occlusives are only unaspirated i.e. [*p*], [*t*], [*k*], [*b*], [*d*], [*g*] in Gk., and unaspirated and non-velar consonants: [*c*], [*j*], [*t̪*], [*d̪*], [*t*], [*d*], [*p*], [*b*] in Skt.

The cluster of the root consonants in Sanskrit may consist even of two, three or more consonants, but the reduplicative consonant is always only one, i.e. the typical or representative consonant for the respective cluster (Šefčík: 26–7): *kṣṇu-* ‘to whet, sharpen’ > Perf. *cukṣṇāva*.

The reduplicated syllable is as a rule short, as it is evident from (1) and (2), but in the Vedic Sanskrit in some 30 verbs it is long, e.g. *kan-* ‘to agree’ > Perf. stem *cākan-*, *nam-* ‘to bow to’ > Perf. stem *nānam-*, *van-* ‘to love, to wish’ > Perf. stem *vāvan-*, *vas-* ‘to dwell, to stay’ > Perf. stem *vāvas-* etc.

The reduplication of the vocalic [r] and [l] is often made with [a/ā], and the reduplication of [a/ā], [i/ī], [u/ū] with [a/ā], [i/ī], [u/ū]:

- (5) *kr-* > *cakr-*, *grdh-* > *jāgrdh-*, *klp-* > *cāklp-*.
 (6) *budh-* > *bubudh-*, *bhī-* > *bibhī-*.

This scheme has not to show the whole reduplicative process, where the original root vowel takes different forms for the weak, middle and strong forms, which depend on the paradigmatic place in conjugation (person, number). Our aim is to show the shape of reduplicated or prefixed syllable, which has grammatical function of perfectivization, i.e. of the Perfect Tense formation.

1.2. No reduplication as a regular grammatical means of the Perfect Tense is found in Slavic, since the Classical languages’ type of Perfect Tense does not occur in Slavic, but instead of it the Periphrastic Perfect has been developed. Actually, the so-called Aorist Tense in Slavic presents a fusion of the Perfect and Aorist tenses of the PIE. A parallel situation is in Latin, where the Perfect Tense plays the role of the both tenses. In Slavic there are the Aorist forms of the verbs *dā-/dad-* ‘to give’ and *dē-/ded-* ‘to put’, which correspond to the Sanskrit respective roots *dā-/dad-* ‘to give’ and *dhā-/dadh-* ‘to put’. In this treatise, from now further, we are focusing the two verbs in Slavic, Indic and Greek. It is rather difficult to track down the Aorist Tense forms in all Slavic vernaculars, since they are preserved only in some modern languages, mostly in Serbian, Bulgarian and Sorbian. The Slavic Aorist does not distinguish between strong and weak forms. They are formed from the primordial stems *dad-* and *ded-*, e.g. Srb. Aorist of *dad-* ‘to give’: sg. *dadox*, *dade*, *dade*; pl. *dadosmo*, *dadoste*, *dadoše*, and *ded-* ‘to put’: *dedox*, *dede*, *dede*; pl. *dedosmo*, *dedoste*, *dedoše*. Actually, this paradigm has an alternative Aorist paradigm of the non-reduplicative stem, which is more typical for the old stage of Slavic (Weingart: 382) and it is similar to the Greek and Sanskrit Root Aorist, except the augment, which is missing in Slavic.

(7)

	sg.			du.			pl.		
	Skt.	Gk.	OCS	Skt.	Gk.	OCS	Skt.	Gk.	OCS
1	<i>a-dā-m</i>	<i>é-dō-ka</i>	<i>dā-xъ</i>	<i>a-dā-va</i>	–	<i>dā-xově</i>	<i>a-dā-ma</i>	<i>é-do-men</i> (<i>edōkamen</i>),	<i>dā-xomъ</i>
2	<i>a-dā-s</i>	<i>é-dō-kas</i>	<i>dā</i> (<i>dastъ</i>)	<i>a-dā-tam</i>	<i>é-do-ton</i>	<i>dā-sta</i>	<i>a-dā-ta</i>	<i>é-do-te</i> (<i>edōkate</i>)	<i>dā-ste</i>
3	<i>a-dā-t</i>	<i>é-dō-ke(n)</i>	<i>dā</i> (<i>dastъ</i>)	<i>a-dā-tām</i>	<i>e-dó-tēn</i>	<i>dā-ste</i>	<i>a-d-us</i>	<i>é-do-san</i> (<i>édōkan</i>).	<i>dā-šę</i>

Similarly the Skt. verb *dhā-*, Gk. *thē-*, Slav. *dē-* form the Root Aorist: Skt. *adhām*, *adhās*, *adhāt* etc., Gk. *ethēka*, *éthēkas*, *ethēke(n)*; pl. *éthēmen* (*ethēkamen*), *éthēte* (*ethēkate*), *éthēsan* (*éthēkan*) and Slav. *děxъ*, *dě*, *dě*, etc.

In Sanskrit, besides the Root Aorist, other Aorist forms occur too, e.g. *a*-Aorist (*ādat*) and reduplicative Aorist (*adīdadat*) too.

Although in Sanskrit no aspectual difference among past tenses is apparent, some linguists consider it to be evident in the oldest stage of OIA, i.e. in Vedic (Elizarenkova: 286–287). Some IE languages, e.g. Greek and Slavic, clearly distinguish the tenses according to the verbal aspect as perfective and imperfective tenses. The Aorist, besides the perfective action, can also denote an action performed in a moment, or punctual action. Elizarenkova says that in Vedic the Aorist “states an action in the past, which gives a subjective impression of punctuality, independently of the objective course of action” (Elizarenkova: 286). We consider that the formation of the range of different tenses is based not only on the temporal realization, but also on aspectual manners of action. Actually this has to be the feature of the verb stem (i.e. the Aoristic Verb Stem). Some verb-stems are unmarked for any kind of special manners of action, other are marked for phasal (initial and final phase of action), punctual, frequent, and continuous manners. Possibly the primordial difference existed between perfective and imperfective aspects. In most IE languages this feature disappeared, but it is still alive in Slavic, where there are parallel verb lexemes: *imperfective* vs. *perfective*, the second being marked counterpart of the previous one, or in some instances it is formed of suppletive roots.

As for the Perfect Tense reduplication of the two discussed verbs, its evidence is in Sanskrit, as well as in Greek, and less in Latin¹. The morphologic means for the perfective aspect is reduplication of the root syllable:

(8)

<i>dā-</i>	sg.			du.		pl.		
	Skt.	Gk.	Lat.	Skt.	Gk.	Skt.	Gk.	Lat.
1	<i>dadāu</i>	<i>dédōka</i>	<i>dedī</i>	<i>dadīva</i>	-	<i>dadimá</i>	<i>dedōkamen</i>	<i>dedimus</i>
2	<i>dadātha</i>	<i>dédōkes</i>	<i>dedistī</i>	<i>dadāthus</i>	<i>dédōton</i>	<i>dadá</i>	<i>dedōkate</i>	<i>dedistis</i>
3	<i>dadāu</i>	<i>dédōke(n)</i>	<i>dedīt</i>	<i>dadātus</i>	<i>dédōtēn</i>	<i>dadús</i>	<i>dedōkasin</i>	<i>dedērunt</i>

(9)

<i>dhā-</i>	sg.		du.		pl.	
	Skt.	Gk.	Skt.	Gk.	Skt.	Gk.
1	<i>dadhāu</i>	<i>téthēka</i>	<i>dadhīva</i>	-	<i>dadhimá</i>	<i>tethēkamen</i>
2	<i>dadhātha</i>	<i>téthēkes</i>	<i>dadhāthus</i>	<i>téthēton</i>	<i>dadhá</i>	<i>tethēkate</i>
3	<i>dadhāu</i>	<i>téthēke(n)</i>	<i>dadhātus</i>	<i>tédhetēn</i>	<i>dadhús</i>	<i>tethēkasin</i>

2.0. The reduplication process also functions as a means of creating some Present Tense stems, especially in Greek and Sanskrit. The two discussed verbs are reduplicative ‘by nature’, both in Sanskrit and Greek, and belong to a special class,

i.e. to the reduplicative class of verbs. In Slavic too, they are reduplicative by origin, although all forms, except 3. pl., are contracted², i.e. the reduplicated/copied consonant has been elided.

(10)

dad-	sg.			du.			pl.		
	Skt.	Gk.	OCS	Skt.	Gk.	OCS	Skt.	Gk.	OCS
1	<i>dadāmi</i>	<i>didōmi</i> Lat. <i>reddō</i>	<i>dam̥</i> < * <i>dadm̥</i>	<i>dadvas</i>	–	<i>davě</i> < * <i>dadvě</i>	<i>dadmas</i>	<i>didomen</i>	<i>dam̥</i> < * <i>dadm̥</i>
2	<i>dadāsi</i>	<i>didōs</i>	* <i>dasi</i> < <i>dasi</i>	<i>datthas</i>	<i>didoton</i>	<i>dasta</i> < * <i>dadta</i>	<i>dattha</i>	<i>didote</i>	<i>daste</i> < * <i>dadte</i>
3	<i>dadāti</i>	<i>didōsi(n)</i>	<i>dast̥</i> < * <i>dast̥</i>	<i>dattas</i>	<i>didoton</i>	<i>daste</i> < * <i>dadte</i>	<i>dadati</i>	<i>didōsi(n)</i>	<i>dadet̥</i> < * <i>dadent̥</i> / * <i>dadont̥</i>

Although this reduplicative verb occurs only in a few modern Slavic languages, in Russ. it is limited only to several forms (*dadit*, *dadút* ‘they give’), in older times some forms were common in all vernaculars, e.g. OCz. 3. pl. *dadie* (Lamprecht 1987: 101), OCz. 16th century *dadí* (Lamprecht 1986: 232), participle forms: *dada*, *dadúic* (Lamprecht 1986: 232), in Polish 3. pl. *dadzą* (Brückner: 84) etc.

The verb **dhe-/dedh-* has parallel tense forms to those of **dō-/dad-* in Skt. and Gk., but they are less frequent. In Lat. and OCS. Lat. forms of the corresponding verb *faciō*, Inf. *facere* ‘to do’, Perf. *fēcī* are not reduplicative. The OCS has reduplicative forms of the verb *de-žd-* (see tab. 11), but no of them is preserved in modern Slavic languages.

(11)

*dhē-	sg.			du.			pl.		
	Skt.	Gk.	OCS	Skt.	Gk.	OCS	Skt.	Gk.	OCS
1	<i>dadhāmi</i>	<i>títhēmi</i>	<i>dežd̥o</i> < * <i>ded-j̥o</i>	<i>dadhvas</i>	–	<i>dežd̥evě</i>	<i>dadhmas</i>	<i>títhemen</i>	<i>dežd̥em̥</i>
2	<i>dadhāsi</i>	<i>títhēs</i>	<i>dežd̥eši</i>	<i>dhat-</i> <i>thas</i>	<i>títheton</i>	<i>dežd̥eta</i>	<i>dhattha</i>	<i>títhete</i>	<i>dežd̥ete</i>
3	<i>dadhāti</i>	<i>títhēsi(n)</i>	<i>dežd̥et̥</i>	<i>dhattas</i>	<i>títheton</i>	<i>dežd̥ete</i>	<i>dadhati</i>	<i>títhēsi(n)</i>	<i>dežd̥ot̥</i>

The so-called Slavic reduplication seems to be formally different from the respective reduplication process in Skt. and Gk. If in all types of reduplication in Skt., Gk. and Lat., including Perfect, Aorist, Present tense reduplications, as well as intensive, frequentative and desiderative derived verb reduplications, the repeated syllable (r) precedes the root (R), then it is evident that in these languages the regressive morpho-syntagmatic process of partial repetition is implemented. The verb root proper also undergoes certain changes – in Skt. it appears, according to the grammatical persons, as strong in sg. or weak in du. and pl. (see tab. 10). In Slavic the reduplication seems to be an inverse, i.e. a progressive reduplication process, where, instead of the syllable, only the root consonant *-d-* is repeated.

(12)

	Process	R	r+R	R	r+R
Skt.	r-R	<i>dā-></i>	<i>da-dā-mi</i>	<i>dhā-></i>	<i>da-dhā-mi</i>
Gk.		<i>dō-></i>	<i>dí-dō-mi</i>	<i>thē-></i>	<i>tí-thē-mi</i>
		R	R + r	R	R+r
Slav.	R-r	<i>dā-></i>	<i>*da-d-mь > dāmь</i>	<i>dē-></i>	<i>*de-d- (de-ž-d-ǫ)</i>
			3. pl. <i>dadęťь</i>		3. pl. <i>dežđǫťь</i> .

We can also view the so-called Slavic reduplication not as process proper, but rather as phenomenon of the two fossilized verb stems, functionally specialized for punctual or time pointed actions. Moreover the dental *-d-* in most person forms is elided due to the contact with labials *-m* and *-v*, and dissimilated in contact with other dental occlusive (*-t*).

3.0. In Slavic the stems *dad-* and *ded-* are reduplicative by origin and primordially denoted Aoristic or perfective aspect, as well as punctual or time-pointed action (see 1.2.). The reduplication did not evolved as a systematic morphologic means aspect and manner in Slavic, but some other morphologic means took place here, esp. prefixes and suppletive perfective stems. One of the means is the nasal affix [-*n/nu-*] that denotes an initiating action. This affix forms the so called *verba inchoativa/inchoativa* in Slavic and it is akin and historically connected to the respective affix in Greek, that forms the so called *nu-*verbs, and probably to the verbs of Sanskrit *Sunvādi* class (e.g. *su-*, *sunu-/suno-*). In some modern Slavic languages, mainly in Srb. and Bg. the two means, e.g. the reduplicative stems *dad-*, *ded-* and affix *-nu* are blended. Thus we have two parallel forms of Aorist in colloquial Serbian:

(13)

	1. sg.	2. sg.	3. sg.	1. pl.	2. pl.	3. pl.
<i>dad-</i>	<i>dadox/dadnux</i>	<i>dade/dadnu</i>	<i>dade/dadnu</i>	<i>dadosmo/dadnusmo</i>	<i>dadoste/dadnuste</i>	<i>dadoše dadnuše</i>
<i>ded-</i>	<i>dedox/de(d)nux</i>	<i>dede/de(d)nu</i>	<i>dede/de(d)nu</i>	<i>dedosmo/de(d)nusmo</i>	<i>dedoste/de(d)nuste</i>	<i>dedoše/de(d)muše</i>

The forms of *ded-* often appear in Srb. dialectal forms as contracted, i.e. with elided reduplicative [*d*] in Aorist: sg. *denux*, *denu*, *denu*; pl. *denusmo*, *denuste*, *denuše*.

The two Aoristic stems in Srb. and Bg. are very productive in forming perfective moods: Time-pointed Subjunctive and Imperative:

(14)

<i>dad-</i>	1. sg.	2. sg.	3. sg.	1. pl.	2. pl.	3. pl.
Subj.: <i>da let, ako if +</i>	<i>-dadnem</i>	<i>dadneš</i>	<i>dadne</i>	<i>dadnemo</i>	<i>dadnete</i>	<i>dadnu</i>
Imper.		<i>dadni</i>		<i>dadnimo</i>	<i>dadnite</i>	

(15)

ded-	1. sg.	2. sg.	3.sg.	1.pl.	2.pl.	3.pl.
Subj.: <i>da let, ako if</i> +	<i>de(d)nem</i>	<i>da(d)neš</i>	<i>de(d)ne</i>	<i>de(d)nemo</i>	<i>de(d)nete</i>	<i>de(d)nu</i>
Imper.		<i>deni</i> < * <i>dedni</i>		<i>denimo</i> < * <i>dednimo</i>	<i>denite</i> < * <i>dednite</i>	

The contracted forms, i.e. forms with elided [d] are as follows: *da/neka* (let), *ako* (if) + *dam, daš, da, damo, date, dadu*. The elided [d] from *ded-* is simply substituted by [n].

3.1. Reduplication in Slavic has to emphasize a punctual/perfective action. The Aorist Tense forms are here in place of the Perfect Tense, as the old IE reduplicative Perfect Tense did not evolve in the respective Slavic Perfect tense.

Mixing of the rudimentary reduplicative forms with other morphological means of time-pointed or punctual action, i.e. with [-*nu-*] forms) in Slavic, reminds us of the Greek merger of reduplicative Present forms with inchoative -*sk-* forms, see. Gk. *gignoskō* ‘to know, to perceive’ < *gignōmi* + *gnōskō* (Giannakis 1992: 166–167) and Lat. *discō* ‘to teach’ < *di-dō-scō*.

Both -*nu-* and -*sk-* markers are common for Skt., Gk. Lat., Slav. and Lith. as well. The Skt. stem-forming morphs: -*nu-*, -*nā*, -*cch* are parallel to the respective -*nu*, and -*sk-* markers in Gk., which are characterized as manner of action, i.e. Aktionsart means (Hirt: 529), as well as to the respective Slavic -*nu-* marker of inchoative verbs. In Slavic there are several fossilized verbs in -*sk- too*, i.e. in -*šč-*. For more examples see the following table³.

(16)

	-neu- ~ -nu- /-nā- ~ -nī- vs. unmarked		-sk- vs. unmarked	
Skt.	<i>stṛ-</i> 5, <i>stṛṇoti</i> , 9 <i>stṛṇāti</i> <i>kr-</i> 5, <i>krṇoti</i> <i>su-</i> 5, <i>sunoti</i>	<i>stṛ-</i> 1. <i>starati</i> <i>kr-</i> 8, <i>karoti</i> <i>su-</i> 1, <i>savati</i> , 2 <i>sauti</i>	<i>yam-</i> 1, <i>yacchati</i> <i>iṣ-</i> 6, <i>icchati</i> <i>gam-</i> 1, <i>gacchati</i>	<i>yam-</i> 1, <i>yamati</i> <i>gam-</i> 1, <i>gamati</i>
Gk.	<i>stórnumi</i> , <i>strōnumi</i>		<i>báskō</i>	<i>báinō</i>
Lat.	<i>sternō</i>		<i>strāvī</i> , 1. sg. Perf.	<i>crescō</i>
Slav.	Cz. <i>lehnout, sednout</i> , Cz. <i>tnout</i> , OCS <i>тъноу</i> , 1. sg.	Cz. <i>ležet, sedět</i> , Cz. <i>tít</i> , OCS <i>тѣти</i>	<i>iskati</i> Russ. <i>iskatʹ</i> > <i>iščet</i> , 3.sg.	
Balt./ Lith.	<i>einu</i> , 1.sg		<i>eiti</i> , Inf.	Lith. <i>ieškoti</i> , Let. <i>iēškāt</i>

These are very significant perfective aspect, punctual and phasal manner of action marked verbs.

For marking the imperfective aspect and iterative/frequentative manner of action, Slavic languages have other morphological means, i.e. affix [-*ja-*]⁴ or [-*va-*] or alternation of the two morphs, e.g. in OCS (Weingart: 430), *dájati*: Present: *daju, daješi, dajetʹ*, pl. *dajemʹ, dajete, dajutʹ*, du. *dajevě, dajeta, dajete*. The verb *děti/dějeti* has the following iterative forms: *dějō, děješi, dějetʹ*, and so forth. The Habitual Present forms in Czech include consistently the -*va* suffix: *dávám, dáváš, dává, dáváme, dáváte, dávají*. In Srb. and Russ. only the Infini-

tive is in *-va*: *davatb*, other forms are in *-ja*. E.g. Russ. *daju*, *dajěš*, *dajět*, *dajëm*, *dajëte*, *dajut*, and Srb.: *dajem*, *daješ*, *daje*, *dajemo*, *dajete*, *daju*.

The Imperfect Tense in Old Slavic is in *-ja-* (sg. *dajaxb*, *dajaaše*, *dajaaše*, du. *dajaaxově*, *dajaašeta*, *dajaašete*, pl. *dajaaxomb*, *dajaašete*, *dajaaxo*).

In OCS there are also reduplicative Imperfect Tense forms consisting of the reduplicative stem blended with the frequentative affix *-ja* and the Aorist Tense endings: *dadejaaxb* ‘I was giving, I used to give’ *dadejaaše* ‘you were giving, you used to give’ *dadejaaše* ‘he was giving, he used to give’ etc. (Weingart: 382). This fact suggests that the Imperfect Tense can denote an iterative/frequentative action, whereas the Aorist Tense the time-pointed or punctual action (see Dostál: 97). This is the essential difference between the two tenses and simultaneously explains their mutual relation: multiplication or iteration of the single punctual action (Aorist) makes the function of the Imperfective Tense.

The regular means of the Imperfect Tense formation is the aspect-neutral stem (*dā-*, *dē-*) expanded by the frequentative or multiple action affix *-ja/-va*, e.g. in OCS: impf. sg. *dajaaxb*, *dajaaše*, *dajaaše*, du. *dajaaxivě*, *daajašeta*, *dajaašete*, pl. *dajaaxomb*, *dajaašete*, *dajaaxo* (Weingart: 430); in Srb.: *davax*, *davaše*, *davaše*, *davasmō*, *davaste*, *davaxu*. Thus the reason of existence of two types of the Imperative Tense in OCS is clear: one type, consisting of the reduplicative Aoristic forms, is the Frequentative Imperfect, whereas the second one is the Imperfect Tense proper.

3.2. The need for such a morphologic means as it was the reduplication, is evident e.g. in Srb., where the reduplicative syllable, or rather only consonant *d-* from the verb *dad-*, expands its applicability and appears with other verbs too. E.g. the verbs: *znati* ‘to know’, *imati* ‘to have’, *valjati* ‘to be valid’ etc. affiliate this ‘borrowed’ marker *-d*, both for Present and Aorist stems. Thus the new forms have arisen – for Present: *znadem*, *imadem*, *valjadem*, Imperfect: *znadijax* *i* *imadijax*, and Aorist: *znadox*, *imadox*, *valjadox* etc. Also modal verbs have the similar forms: *morati* ‘must’, *imati* ‘to be able to’, *smeti* ‘may’, *hteti* ‘to want’ in the Present Subjunctive: *da/ako moradem*, *da/ako smedem*, *da/ako umadem* and in the Aorist Tense too: *moradox*, *smedox*, *xtedox*, *imadox* etc. (Stevanović: 194). This ‘quasi reduplication’ also permits variant forms with the nasal-extension to denote time-pointed actions, but only in the Subjunctive: *da/ako htednem*, *da/ako smednem*, *da/ako umadnem*, *da/ako znadnem*’ etc.

4. The comparison of different forms of Skt. and IE verbs *dad-*, *dadh-* and Slavic *dad-*, *ded-* verbs, leads us to conclusion that they probably are the only evidence of aspect-marked reduplicative verbs common to both languages. The aspect-neutral and non-reduplicated roots are: *dā-*, *dhā* in Skt. and *dā-*, *dē-* in Slavic.

Due to the divergent way of language development of PIE, the reduplication continued to function in Skt., as well as in Gk. and Lat. In Slavic however, there are only its remnants, i.e. the originally reduplicated two Aoristic stems which continue to serve as suppletive stems to denote time-pointed or perfective action.

This semantic feature is also evident in the Present and Imperfect Tenses, where it serves to denote the multiple pointed actions.

Otherwise, there is only a little formal difference between Aorist and Imperfect Tenses in Slavic. The first is formed mainly from perfective, and the second from imperfective verbs. Nevertheless the reduplicative verbs *dad- ded-*, denoting time-pointed and perfective action, by means of the frequentative affix *ja-/va-* makes the frequentative Imperfect.

In Sanskrit the Imperfect is formed from the Present Tense stem, whereas the Aorist from Aoristic one. Although there is no apparent aspectual contrast between the two tenses, searching more profoundly into the history of OIA reveals that the Vedic Aorist had a perfective function.

As for the verbs *dad-* and *dadh-/ded-*, we can also presume their primordial meaning of the perfective and punctual or time-pointed actions. Probably the whole class of reduplicative verbs had this function. Although the aspect distinction in Sanskrit has no evidence, except, probably, in its oldest stage or in Vedic, there are verb classes, which form the Present Tense stem by different morphological means. Some of the means resemble the respective means in Slavic and Greek. Thus the Skt. stem-forming morphs: *-nu*, *-nā*, *-cch* have their counterparts in Gk. verbs in *-nu*, *-sk-*, which are characterized as phasal verbs, as well as in Slavic *-nu* or inchoative verbs (Cz. *počnu*, *lehnu* etc.) and several fossilized verbs in *-sk-*, i.e. in *-šč* (*išču*) etc.

- 1 There are cases of Lat. Perfect forms that are formed even from the reduplicative present stem, e.g. *gignō*, *gignere* [IE. *gen-i*, Skt. *jan-*] to beget, to procreate, but in Perfect they lose reduplication: *genuī* 'I have begotten'.
- 2 Some linguists say that PSlav. *damъ*, *dasi*, *dastъ*, *damъ*, *date*, *dadęť* originate from **dō-* etc. (but not from **dō-d-mi*) and the only reduplicative form is 3. pl. (Machek: 111). Others consider all forms to be of the reduplicative and contracted origin (Xaburgaev: 261, 264). The contraction was performed due to elision of *-d-* before labials (*damъ* < *dadmъ*) and dissimilation of dental occlusive. i.e. by replacing the first placed occlusive by sibilants (*dadtъ* > *dastъ*).
- 3 Meanings of the cited verbs are as follows: Skt. *str-*, Gk. *stor-*, Lat. *ster-* 'to spread', Skt. *kṛ-* 'to do', Lat. *cre-* 'to create', Skt. *su-* 'to press out', Skt. *yam-* 'to raise, to hold', Skt. *iṣ-*, *icch-*, Slav. *isk-*, Lith. *iešk-* 'to wish, to desire', Skt. *gam-* 'to go', Gk. *bainō* 'to go', Lith. *ienu* 'to go', Slav. *leg-/leh-/lež-* 'to lie, be lying', Slav. *sed-* 'to sit', Slav. *tnoq* 'to snuff out'.
- 4 For the transcription of Slavic sound [y] we use here the symbol [j].

ABBREVIATIONS

- Bg. – Bulgarian
 C – Consonant
 C₁ – reduplicative consonant
 Cz. – Czech
 du. – dual
 Gk. – Greek
 IE. – Indo-European
 Imper. – Imperative Mood
 Inf. – Infinitive

Lat. – Latin
 Let. – Latvian
 Lith. – Lithuanian
 loc. – Locative case
 OCS – Old Church Slavic
 OCz. – Old Czech
 OIA – Old Indo-Aryan
 Perf. – Perfect Tense
 PIE. – Proto Indo-European
 pl. – plural
 PSlav. – Protoslavic
 R – Verb Root
 r – Reduplicated syllable or sound
 Russ. – Russian
 sg. – Singular
 Skt. – Sanskrit
 Srb. – Serbian
 Subj. – Subjunctive Mood
 V – Vowel
 V₁ – reduplicative vowel

REFERENCE BOOKS AND ARTICLES

- ARUMAA, P. (1985): *Urslavische Grammatik. Einführung in das Vergleichende Studium der Slavischen Sprachen, III Band, Formenlehre*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.
- BRÜCKNER, A. (1957): *Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego*. Warszawa: Wiedza powszechna
- BUCK, C. D. (1942): *Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press
- ČERNYX, P. J. (1954): *Istoričeskaja grammatika russkogo jazyka*. Moskva: Gosudarstvennoe učebno-pedagogičeskoe izdatel'stvo
- ČERNYX, P. J. (1994): *Istoričesko-etimologičeskij slovar' russkogo jazyka I, II*. Moskva: Russkij jazyk
- DELBRÜCK, B. (1874): *Das altindische Verbum aus den Hymnen des Rigveda*. Halle: Verlag der Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses
- DOSTÁL, A. (1954): *Studie o vidovém systému v staroslověnině*. Praha: SPN
- ELIZARENKOVA, T. J. (1982): *Grammatika vedijskogo jazyka*. Moskva: Nauka
- ERHART, A. – VEČERKA, R. (1981): *Úvod do etymologie*. Praha: SPN
- ERHART, A. (1982): *Indoevropské jazyky. Srovnávací fonologie a morfologie*. Praha: Academia
- GIANNAKIS, G. (1992): *Reduplication as a morphological marker in the Indo-European Languages*. Word 43.2: 161–196.
- GIANNAKIS, G. (1997): *Studies in the Syntax and Semantics of the Reduplicated Presents in Homeric Greek and Indo-European*. Innsbruck: Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft
- HIRT, H. (1912): *Handbuch der Griechischen Laut- und Formenlehre*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.
- JANDA, R. D. & JOSEF, B. D. (1986): One Rule or Many? Sanskrit Reduplication as Fragmented Affixation, In: *Proceedings of the Second Eastern States Conference on Linguistics*, 103–119.
- JANDA, R. D. & JOSEF, B. D. (1991): Meta-templates & the Underlying (Dis)-Unity of Sanskrit Reduplication, In: *Proceedings of the Eight Eastern States. Conference on Linguistics*, 160–173.
- KABELKA, J. (1975). *Latvių kalba*, Vilnius: Mintis
- LAMPRECHT, A. (1987): *Praslovanština*, Brno: Univerzita J. E. Purkyně

- LAMPRECHT, A. – ŠLOSAR, D. – BAUER, J. (1986): *Historická mluvnice češtiny*, Praha: SPN
- MACHEK, V. (1971): *Etymologický slovník jazyka českého*. Praha: Academia
- NEVINS, A. (rev. 2002) Raimy, E.: The Phonology and Morphology of Reduplication, In: *Language*, Vol. 78, Num. 4, pp. 770–773.
- NIEPOKOJ, M. (1999): *The Development of Verbal Reduplication in Indo-European*. Washington: Institute for the Study of Man – Journal of Indo-European Studies Monograph No. 24
- OTRĘBSKI, J. (1956), *Gramatyka języka litewskiego. Tom III – Nauka o formach*. Warszawa: Państwowe wydawnictwo naukowe
- POLJANEC, F. (1931): *Istorija srpskohrvatskog književnog jezika*, Beograd: Narodna prosveta
- SAVČENKO, A. N. (1974): *Sravnitel'naja grammatika indo-evropejskix jazykov*, Moskva: Vysšaja škola
- STEVANOVIĆ, M. (1957): *Gramatika srpskohrvatskog jezika*. Beograd: Nolit
- ŠEFCÍK, O. (2000): Příznakovost konsonantů ve staroindických trsech a jejich reflexe ve středoevropských jazycích. In: SPFFBU A, 19–30.
- SZEMERÉNYI, O. (1990/1970), *Einführung in die Vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft
- TISCHLER, J. (1976): *Zur Reduplikation im Indogermanischen*. Innsbruck: Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft
- FASMER, M. (= Vasmer, M.) (1986): *Ětimologičeskij slovar' russkogo jazyka*. Moskva: Progres
- WEINGART, M. (1937): *Rukověť jazyka staroslověnského*, Praha: Didaktický kruh klubu moderních filologů
- WHITNEY, W. D. (2000): *Sanskrit Grammar*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidas
- XABURGAEV, G. A. (1974): *Staroslavjanskij jazyk*. Moskva: Prosvěšćenie

INDOEVROPSKÉ $\sqrt{D\bar{A}}/DAD-$, $\sqrt{DH\bar{A}}/DADH-$ A SLOVANSKÉ $\sqrt{D\bar{A}}/DAD-$, $\sqrt{D\bar{E}}/DED-$

Reduplikace jako gramatický prostředek tvorby slovesného kmene perfektního nachází své uplatnění v nejstarším období vývoje indoevropských jazyků a je přítomna v hlavních klasických ie. jazycích. Pravidla reduplikace jsou velmi podobná např. v sanskrtu a v řečtině. Kromě perfekta se tento morfo-fonologický prostředek vyskytuje zčásti v aoristu a v odvozených slovesech intenzivních, deziderativních a perfektních sloves, jakož i v jedné třídě sloves v přítomnosti (sanskrtská 3. neboli reduplikovaná třída).

Ve slovanštině reduplikace jako gramatický prostředek není produktivní, ale vyskytuje se v převážně aoristních tvarech dvou sloves: $\sqrt{d\bar{a}}$ 'dátí' a $\sqrt{d\bar{e}}$ 'děti/dítí', pro něž je reduplikovaná, i přítomná podoba, příznačná ve všech starých ie. jazycích.

Ačkoliv reduplikované kmeny *dad-* a *ded-* lze považovat ve slovanských jazycích za ustrnulé pozůstatky starých ie. sloves, nelze usuzovat o úplném zániku perfektivizační funkce reduplikace ve slovanštině. Argumentem pro toto tvrzení mohou sloužit příklady z některých živých jazyků (bulharština, srbsština jižní a srbsština lužická), kde reduplikativní perfektivní kmen přítomnosti obou sloves odpovídá tvarům v řečtině a v sanskrtu.

Z funkčního hlediska právě ve slovanštině, vedle řečtiny, aorist má funkci aspektu a způsobu konání děje (počínavost, jednorázovost, ukončenost děje). Tato funkce v sanskrtu zanikla, ačkoliv ji védský sanskrť měl.

Reduplikované tvary sloves *dad-* a *ded-* ve slovanštině, především staré, se používají i jako prostředek vyjádření násobenosti, tj. frekventativnosti děje, např. v stsl. imperfektu: *dadejaaxv*, *dadejaaše*, atd.

Reduplikaci jako morfonologický prostředek perfektivizace mohou postrádat moderní slovanské jazyky, které si zachovaly aorist. O této potřebě svědčí např. nově vzniklé aoristní a jiné perfektové tvary některých sloves na základě kontaminace s převzatým reduplikativním příznakem z tvarů slovesa *dad-*, tj. s příznakem *-d*, v srbsštině. Např. *moradox*, *imadox*, *smedox*, *xtedox* atd. podle vzoru *dadox*.

Pro aoristní a perfektivní tvary sloves *dad-* a *ded-* je příznačné také jejich (fakultativní) rozšíření pomocí formantu počínavosti *-n* (*da dade* > *da dadne*), který však často vytlačuje a nahrazuje reduplikativní *-d*, např. u slovesa *ded-* v srbské *dedem* > *dednem* > *denem*).

Svetislav Kostić
Indologický seminář
FF University Karlovy
Celetná 20
Praha 1