

SLAVISTICA

No. 29

P. KOVALIV

**PARTICIPIAL ADJECTIVES IN THE
SLAVIC LANGUAGES**



Winnipeg

1957

Published by the Ukrainian Free Academy of Sciences

SLAVISTICA

ПРАЦІ ІНСТИТУТУ СЛОВ'ЯНОЗНАВСТВА
УКРАЇНСЬКОЇ ВІЛЬНОЇ АКАДЕМІЇ НАУК

За редакцією Яр. Рудницького

Ч. 29

П. КОВАЛІВ

**ПРИКМЕТНИКИ З ДІЄПРИКМЕТНИКІВ
У СЛОВ'ЯНСЬКИХ МОВАХ**

Вінніпег

1957

Накладом Української Вільної Академії Наук

SLAVISTICA

PROCEEDINGS OF THE INSTITUTE OF SLAVISTICS OF THE
UKRAINIAN FREE ACADEMY OF SCIENCES

Editor-in-Chief — J. B. Rudnyc'kyj

No. 29

P. KOVALIV

**PARTICIPIAL ADJECTIVES IN THE
SLAVIC LANGUAGES**

Winnipeg

1957

Published by the Ukrainian Free Academy of Sciences

This Issue Of
SLAVISTICA

Is Dedicated To

PROFESSOR OLAF BROCH

University of Oslo, Norway

On Occasion

Of His 90th Anniversary in 1957.

—The Editor.

Printed by

National Publishers Limited, Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada

In Slavistic literature we encounter an almost invariable statement to the effect that participles in the living language are in a stage of decline, and that some are artificially created in the book language¹⁾. Concerning participles of the active present tense in particular, in practically all Slavic languages one can notice either their complete decline, or their transformation, in certain syntactical functions, into gerundives, or adjectives²⁾.

Forms of participles of the active present tense have, since a long time, been created on bases of verbs in the present tense with the aid of the noun suffix **-nt**. Verbs with a thematic o/e (I and II cl.) ended in **-ont**, those with a thematic jo/je (III cl.) in **-jont**, with a thematic i (IV cl.) in **-int**. E.g.: **vedont-**, **dvignont-**, **znajont-**, **chvalint-**³⁾.

Originally, participles belonged to nouns, with a stem in the consonant. By the way, a trace of this old noun variety (strictly, nominal) of participles has survived in the form of the nominative plural masc. gender ending in **-e**: **vedąte** (old-Slav. **vedušte**), as well as: **kamene**. In the old Bulgarian, like in other Slavic languages, there was in the masc. and neutr. nominative singular a form ending in **-y**: **vedy** (***vedonts**)⁴⁾. In old Eastern Slavic literature there was a form ending in **-a**: **veda**, **nesa**, **moha**. It has survived as such to this day in the Czech language: **veda**, **nesa**; also in the Uk-

1) O. Ogonowski. Studien auf dem Gebiete der rutheinischen Sprache. Lemberg, 1880, pp. 146-147; B. L. Beaulieux. Grammaire de la langue bulgare. Paris, 1933, p. 190; A. Mazon. Grammaire de la langue tcheque, 1931, p. 230; A. Leskien. Grammatik der serbo-kroatischen Sprache. Heidelberg, 1914, p. 522, ff. 558; W. Taszycki. Imiesłowcy czynne terażniejszy i przeszły w języku polskim. Kraków, 1926 (Rozprawy wydz. Fil. Pol. Akad. Um. XI; 5); Jurij Šerech. Participium universale im Slavischen. Slavistica, No. 16, 1953, p. 5; L. Bulaxovskij. Istoričeskij kommentarij russk. liter. jazyka. 1950, p. 206.

2) A. Potebnja. Iz zapisok po ruskoj grammatike. I-II. Xar'kov, 1888, p. 182; F. Travníček. Historická mluvnické československá. V Praze, 1935, p. 343.

3) H. Ilinskij. Praslavjanskaja grammatika, Nežin, 1916, pp. 87-90, 318; M. Hrunskij ta P. Kovaliv. Istorija form ukrajins'koji movy. Xar'kiv, 1931, pp. 304-305.

4) A. Leskien. Grammatik der altbulgarischen (Altkirchenslavischen) Sprache. Heidelberg, 1919, p. 205.

rainian language, in the word "moha" ("jako moha švydše"). The Bulgarian dialects went through a similar stage⁵). The form was also known to the old Polish language. Comp.: old-Bulg. *nesy*, old-Czech *bera*, old-Pol. *czeka*, old-East Slav. *moha* ⁶).

The subsequent process of development of participles of the active present tense in Slavic languages, as a distinct morphological category, the process of the development of their structural peculiarities was closely related to their syntactic functions. The syntactic functions of participles of the active present tense determined not only their form, but their meaning as well. And because syntactic functions of words in the process of the historical development of Slavic languages changed, like the syntactic structure of these languages itself, forms and meanings of participles as parts of sentences, changed correspondingly⁷). This is vividly illustrated by the history of Slavic languages.

A new grammatical category came into being against this background, the category of indeclinable participles, or the so-called gerundives. Gerundives originated from short participles during a certain historical period⁸). Already A. Potebnja emphasized the fact that "all Slavic gerundives permit a nominal form of participle. A pronominal participle, says he, never becomes a gerundive; it either ceases to be used altogether, or remains a participle, or changes into an adjective"⁹).

The same kind of statement regarding the origin of gerundives is made at present by L. Bulaxovsky: "Dejepričastije vo vsex

5) See A. M. Seliščev. *Staroslavijanskij jazyk*. II. Moscow, 1952, pp. 185-7.

6) N. van Wijk. *Zur Entwicklung der partizip. Nominativendung -onts in den slav. Sprachen*. Zeitschrift f. sl. Phil. Bd. I, 279.

7) See P. Kovoliv. *Do pytanja no vyznačennja i rozvytok hramatyčnyx katehorij*. Ukrajn. zasiv. 1943, No. 4.

8) M. Kolosov (*Očerok po istoriji zvukov i form russkogo jazyka s XI po XVI v.*, Warsaw, 1876, p. 99) placed the beginnings of the transformation of active participles into gerundives at the 13th c. A. Potebnja (*Iz zapisok*, 182) wrote on this occasion: "Kažetsja nesomnennym, čto v konce XIV st. pričastija dejstvit. zaloga apozitivnyje byli uže tolko v knižnom jazyke, i dejepričastije, kak vpolnje opredelivšajasja čast' reči, uže suščestvovalo, xotja i otličalos' koje-čem ot nynesšnego." Comp. M. Hruns'kyj and P. Kovaliv. *Istorija form ukrajnjskoj movy*. Xarkiv, 1931, p. 307. Also L. P. Jakubins'kij. *Istorija drevnerusskogo jazyka*. Moscow, 1953. p. 253.

9) A. Potebnja. *Iz zapisok*, I-II, 181.

slavjanskix jazykax, kak i v drugix indojevropijskix jazykax, — kategorija novaja, razvivšajasja odnositel'no pozdno v osoboj žizni etix jazykov. Po svojemu proisxoždeniju dejepričastija sploš vosxodjat k pričastijam” 10).

What kind of syntactic function did the short participles have to perform in order to be able, thanks to such function, to change their categorical meaning, and turn from participles into gerundives?

In all such instances the participles were in an appositive function. Only in this function they appropriated a meaning of conditional words, gerundives. In this function the participle, uniting itself with the subject, gravitated at the same time to the predicate, and as a result the unity was disjoined, and the participle transformed into an adverbial word 11). E. g.: *povele Olha mov stvoriti, rbkušče sice Lavr. L. 24.* 12). *Ne pověduči nikomuže šedše ubijte brata mojeho Borisa Lavr. L. 13*). *Comp. old-Polish: A jakoż się drzewiej Pan nad nami radował, dobrze wam czynię, a was płodzę: takeż się weselić będzie, zatracę was. BZ 151a 13-16. Deut. XXIX, 63; Przerzeczoną winą pieśnadszęcia będzie pomszczon nieddżący ciężej alibo gwałtem odbijający alibo wypuszczący wziętą ciężę . . . (Świętost. II, 26. Arch. K. Pr. III, 236. 14).*

Interesting data on the old-Czech language are contained in E. V. Nemčenko's dissertation “Iz istoriji kratkix pričastij dejstvitelnogo zaloga v češskom jazyke.” He maintains that in the formation of the category of gerundives in the Czech language, as indicated by monuments of the 13th and 14th c., a decisive role was played by “the usage of short participles in the predicate function.” The predicative usage of short participles came about, according to him, by their rendition also of the meaning of the conditions surrounding the main action which is given by a verb. It determined

10) L. Bulaxovskij, *Istoričeskij kommentarij*, 340. See in detail: D. N. Kudrjavskij. *K istorii russkix deepričastij*. Jur'ev, 1916.

11) “One may say, — wrote Žytec'kij, — that even at their coming into existence the forms *-jačy, -učy* had the meaning of so-called gerundives: in old-rus'ky monuments we have not encountered these forms as declinable” (*Narys literat. istoriji ukrajin. movy v XVII st. Lviv, 1941, p. 93*).

12) A. Potebnja. *Iz zapisok, I-II, 183*.

13) E. Koschmieder. *Nauka o aspektach czasownika polskiego w zarysie. Proba syntezy. Rozprawy i materiały Wydziału i Towarzystwa przyjaciół nauk w Wilnie. 1934, vol. V. zeszyt 2, p. 169*.

14) A. Potebnja. *Iz zapisok, I-II, 269, 274*.

on its part, so to say, their transition into the category of adverbial predicative words, i. e. gerundives. Nemčenko connects the process of forming gerundives with the gradual change in the function of short participles. At that, the means of creating gerundives in the literary Czech language and the living vernacular differ from each other. In the literary language which, during the period of the formation of gerundives, reflected the process of mingling their form according to gender and number, in the further course a tendency prevailed of differentiating gerundives according to gender and number. In the folk dialects (as well as in old-Pol., old-Eastern Slav. and other Slavic languages during the early period of their development) the forming of gerundives was connected with a non-differentiation of short participles according to gender and number, and a subsequent introduction of gerundive forms only according to the category of aspect and time.¹⁵⁾

Nemčenko emphasizes the syntactic role of short participles which provided an opportunity to "better understand the reason for their transition into gerundives." He stresses that "short participles were used in them (in monuments of Czech literature—P. K.) in the function of predicative and adverbial words. The usage of short active participles in the attributive function during this period (13-14 c.) was improper. In the attributive role pronominal forms of active participles came into being"¹⁶⁾. We shall discuss participles of the active present tense in their attributive function later, here we shall only indicate that Nemčenko's statement is worthy of notice, and that the results of his studies of monuments of the Czech language only confirm the thought expressed earlier on the significance of the syntactic function in the development of participles.

On the other hand, we can state after A. Potebnja that both in the Russian, as well as in other Slavic languages at an early period of their existence, the usage of participles was much more widespread, and a participle could possess such a degree of independence and predicativeness which, in modern languages "is pos-

15) *Voprosy slavjanskogo jazykoznanija*. Ak. Nauk SSSR. Institut slavjanovedenija. *Kratkije soobščeniija*. Moscow, 1952. No. 7, p. 66.

16) *ibid.* p. 61.

sible only in the personal verb, and partially in the infinitive" 17). Old monuments are replete with numerous examples of predicative usage of short participles with the verb *buty*. E.g. in old-Eastern Slavic monuments: *I jest' cerki ta stojašči v Korsuně hradě Lavr. L. 47; . . . i čajušče jesmy Božija blahodati Ip. L. 135/44; budeši stenja i trjasasja do života svojego Lavr. L. 38. 18)*. In old-Czech: *duch svatý od otce a od syna ne učiněn, ani stvořen, ale jest pocházeje Tom. ze Štírného. XIV et.; a postýři byli v té krajině ponocujice Bibl. bratská (XVI). In old-Polish: Obloženie dawności jim obrzezono niemoże być, alizby polieciech byli omiaszkajaci (cy?). 1449. Ks. Ustaw. 51. In old-Serb: budi uprvae vsěmь srbďsemь na Boha, 1222-8, Mikl. Monum. Serb. 9; ašče kto lĭbo budetĭ pŕetvarae, anatema emu budi ibid. 19)*

In modern Slavic languages these participle-predicative constructions have obviously not survived. Having a tendency, in this function, to transform into verbs (*az jesm tvorjaj čudesa*), they later transformed into them (*ja tvorju čudesa*). These participles of the active present tense which were in an appositive function transformed in virtually all Slavic languages into gerundives with a function of a subsidiary predicate, and with a shade adverbial meaning. In other words, they signify, according to the apt expression of L. Bulaxovskýj, "a chronological relation to the first" 20).

But here also, a certain role was played by the sentence structure. Especially in the Russian literary language, short participles changed into gerundives only in such instances, where the

17) A. Potebnja, op. cit. I-II, p. 534.

18) *ibid.* p. 129. The frequent use of participle-predicative constructions in old East. Slav. language monuments gave some authors the idea (Čornyj. Grečesk. sintaksis, §146, 8) to consider them imitations of the Greek language by reason of their similarity to Greek phrases, with which Potebnja disagreed (op. cit. 133-34) on the basis that they were widely known also in other old Slavic languages: Czech, Pol., Serb., etc.

19) *ibid.* p. 133.

20) L. Bulaxov'skyj. *Poxodžennja ta rozvytok movy. Xarkiv, 1925, p. 78.* In the Russian language, since a long time, the greater predicative force of gerundives brought about a tendency to use them as *sui generis* equivalents of hypotaxis sentences with a possible independent subject, a tendency also known to the vernacular. E. g.: *I tolko videli molodca sjadajuči, i ne videli jego projeđuči.*" See L. Bulaxovskij. *Istorič. komentarij, 340-41. Comp. in the old-Croat: I vijaše žena vlaščega muža padući mrtva od glada (Korizmenjak fratra Ruberta. 1508, 46). E. Koschmieder, op. cit. 170.*

sentence structure was such that the same subject possessed both the main predicate (verb) and the subsidiary predicate (participle). E. g.: "On čitajet knigu, sidja na divane", or: "Vziav karandaš, on načal pisat." But where the sentence was so built structurally that second predicate (participle) gravitated not to the subject, but to the object, and formed along with it, as if a separate sentence, in such instances the short participle quite naturally, preserved its categorical meaning, only in a pronominal adjective form²¹). This explains why the contemporary Russian language is so consequential in preserving active participles in an appositive function. E. g.: "Ja vižu studenta, šitajuščego knigu." In other Slavic languages, particularly in the Ukrainian, in these instances a construction with a dependent clause was introduced. E. g.: "Ja baču studenta, ščo čytaje knyhu."

II

Participles in the attributive function formally acceded to simple adjectives with pronominal form. In this function the participles likewise lost their original verbal meaning: functioning in a new function of attribute they categorically became similar to adjectives. In such instances the participles in large measure lost their verbality and acquired an immutable meaning, peculiar to adjectives in general, a meaning of action taking place (*xorujuča ludyna, virujučyj narod*).²²)

In this function participles, as a category of grammar, have hardly survived in Slavic languages, and particularly in their vernaculars. Only in literary languages (in some more, in some less) has this form survived in some degree, as a form of artificial construction following old book tradition²³).

Among Slavic languages this form is best preserved in the Russian language which, as has been indicated, remained under a

21) A. Potebnja. *Iz zapisok*. I-II. p. 182.

22) See P. Kovaliv. *Ukrajins'ki aktyvni dijeprykmetnyky*. *Naši Dni*. Lviv, 1943, p. 12.

23) Obviously, in later formed literary Slavic languages which are now closer to the vernacular, as e. g. the Slovak, and partly the Serb, Byelorussian and Ukrainian, participles have survived less often. Comp. Jurij Šereh. *Participium universale im slavischen*. *Slavistica*, No. 16, Winnipeg, 1953, p. 6.

string influence of the old book language. In the language of old Eastern Slavic literature, which had not yet felt a strong influence of the Church Slavic, the use of participles of the active present tense did not occur in the attributive function at all. Of course, the frequency of the use of such participles in simple or pronominal form depended upon the genre of this or the other work.

The latest studies of S. Obnorskij²⁴⁾ of the language of such famous literary monuments as: "Rus'ka Pravda", "Tvory Volodymyra Monomaxa", "Molinnja Danyjila Zatočnyka", and "Slovo o polku Ihorevim" bring to light a complete picture of the use of participles.

In its genre relation, "Rus'ka Pravda" is outstanding by its complete absence of Church Slavic influences; the same can be also said of "Slovo o polku Ihorevim". Separate works of Volodymyr Monomax bear unequal testimony to Church Slavic influence on language: this influence is noticeable in "Povčennja", very insignificant in Monomax's letter to Oleh, and almost completely absent in his autobiography²⁵⁾.

S. Obnorškyj has the following to say on the use of participles in "Rus'ka Pravda": "Pričastnye formy so storony svojego obrazovanija ne vyzyvajut zamečanj. V otnošenii samogo upotreblenija pričastij dejstvitelnogo zaloga sledujet podčerknut', čto oni neizvestny v sklonjaemyx formax, poetomu postojanny v otpravnoj forme imenitel'nogo padeža, buduči svjazany s glagolom-skazujemyx. Sr. "ašče ne boudet' kto lbstja to . . .", "da ašče boudet' obidja ne dal'..."²⁶⁾. So much on participles in "Rus'ka Pravda." It seems that participles in an attributive function are not used there at all.

In "Slovo o polku Ihorevim" undeclinable forms of participles are also used almost exclusively. This provides the basis on which S. Obnorškyj considers these forms a rule of the old Eastern Slavic language. Finding that this monument "uses widely . . . participles of the active", Obnorškyj notes at the same time that "active participles are not used in declinable form, they, being connected with

24) Očerki po istoriji ruskogo literaturnogo jazyka staršego perioda. Akad. Nauk SSSR. Moscow-Leningrad, 1946.

25) S. Obnorskij, Očerki, p. 7.

26) ibid. p. 21.

the subject, have a semi-adverbial meaning". E. g.: "o daleče zajde sokolъ ptyeъ bѣja kъ morju", "malo li ti bjašetъ horъ podъ ob-laky vѣjati lelѣjuči korabli na sině morě" 27).

In "Tvory Volodymyra Monomaxa" S. Obnorŝkyj finds "širo-koje ispolzovanije pričastij", but these "pričastija upotreblajutsja preimuščestvenno v kratkoj forme." Regarding examples with a pronominal form, they occur "počti isključitel'no na vyderžki iz cerkovnyx istočnikov," and "pričastija v nečlennoj forme počti postojanno služad v roli predikativnogo narečija, naxodjas' v so-glasovaniji s verba finitum osnovnogo predloženiya 28).

In "Molinnja Danyjila Zatočnyka" participles are also "used very widely". At that, simple forms undoubtedly predominate. S. Obnorŝkyj writes: "Pričastija dejstvitel'nogo zaloga nastojaščego i prošedšego vremeni upotreblajutsja preimuščestvenno v smysle deepričastij, a krome togo, v nemnogix primerax v funkciji predi-kata". E. g.: "byx mysliju parja aki oreľ po vozduxu" 29).

The monuments cited span a period of close to two centuries, from the 11th to the end of the 12th. Quoted facts indicate that during this period participles of the active present tense (the past tense included, as a matter of course) lost the original categorical meaning almost completely, and were used mostly in the meaning of gerundives.

1. The contemporary Russian vernacular has not preserved par-ticiples of the active present tense either, substituting for them the use of dependent clauses and gerundives 30). The Russian literary

27) Obnorskiy, op. cit. pp. 161-162.

28) *ibid.* pp. 51-52.

29) *ibid.* pp. 103-104.

30) M. Kolosov (Obzor zvukovyx i formalnyx osobennostej narodnogo russkogo jazyka. Warsaw, 1878, p. 258), wrote: "V sovremennom russkom pričastija djestvit. zaloga počti ne upotrebitelny. Dejepričastije (drevneje pričastije) nastojašč. vremeni destv. zaloga na -a isčežlo. Dejepričastije togo že vremeni i zaloga na -ja slyšitsja redko, upotreblajas' pri tom inogda v značeniji prošedšego vremeni: polonja jeje, za muz' vydali Tl. K. VII. pr. 195. napoja konja, stal dumu dumati, *ibid.* V, 126. Upotrebitelnej dla nastojašč. vremeni okončanie uči: pered batjuškoj stojuči, pered batjuškoj plakuči Vd. H. Sb. II, 158." Comp. also Karcevski: "La langue parlée ne se sert guère des participes, excepté le participe passé passif dans les phrases actives, le plus souvent impersonnelles du type: Skazano—sdelano." Serge Karcevski. *Système du verbe russe.* 1927, Prague, 161.

This has been found in the latest dialectological studies: "Mestoimennyx pričastij, dejstvitel'nyx i stradatel'nyx, v sisteme govora net." V. G.

language, however, under the subsequent influence of the Church Slavic, developed for general use, pronominal participles in the attributive function, and even in the Church Slavic, ending in -ščij, -ščaja, -ščeje. 31).

There is no doubt that these participles in the Russian language are artificial. Even Šaxmatov wrote: "Pričastija nastojaščego vremeni voobščee predstavljajutsja splos' cerkovnoslavjanskimi obrazovanijami, sr. formu jix okončanij -aščij, -uščij" 32).

L. Bulaxovskij writes: "Upotrebljajemyje v russkom literaturnom jazyke sklonjajemyje pričastija, t. e. otglagol'nyje prilagatelnyje, karakterizujuščijesja specialnymi sintaksičeskimi otnošenijami, jedva li ne splos' predstavljajut zaimstvovanija iz cerkovnoslavjanskogo jazyka" 33).

In his time, even Lomonosov stressed in his grammar (§§ 435, 437, 439, 442) the unproductivity of Russian participles. As examples of "quite improper Russian participles, which are unknown to Slavs", he offers such as: "hovorjaščij, čavkajuščij, brjaknuvšij, nyrnuvšij" and characterizes them as "quite unacceptable" 34). Of course, participles were completely strange to A. Puškin when he noted: "Pričastija voobščee i množestvo slov neobxodimyx obyknovenno izbegajutsja v razgovore. My ne govoric: kareta, skačuščaja po mostu, sluga, metuščij komnatu; my govoric: kotoryj skačet, kotoryj metet i pr." 35).

But with all that, this grammatical category imported by the Russian literary language from the outside, not only survived as a sui generis syntactical way of abbreviating dependent clauses 36), but developed further against the background of Russian literature, introducing into the Russian literary language a series of at-

Orlova. O govore sela Permas Nikol'skogo rajona, Vologodskoj oblasti. Materjaly i issledovanija po russkoj dialektologiji. Tom I, 1949, p. 70. Another scholar writes: "Pričastij dejstvitelnyx v govore net, jesli ne sčitat' neskol'kix zaimstvovannyx slov na -šaj — knižnogo proisxoždenija . . . (zavedšaj, nastajašaj)." R. Avanesov. Očerki dialektologiji rjazanskoj meščery. Materialy i issledovanija po russk. dialektologiji. Tom. I, 1949, p. 199.

31) See: Iz trudov A. A. Šaxmatova po ruskomu jazyku. Moscow, 1952, pv. 83-84.

32) *ibid.* p. 264.

33) L. Bulaxovskij. Istorič. komment., 1950, p. 206.

34) L. Bulaxovskij. Op. c. p. 210.

35) See "Atenej", kn. I-II, 1924, pp. 6-7.

36) L. Bulaxovskij, Op. cit. v. 210.

tributive-semantic shades, and coming into closer relations with adjectives not only formally, in simple declinable form, but also semantically with certain qualitative shades.

V. Vinogradov distinguishes participles as a category, wherein "glagolnost' oboznačajetsja kak okačestvlennoje dejstvije, pripisannoje predmetu i opredelajuščeje jego napodobije imeni prilagatel'nogo." He says further: "Jestestvjenno, čto v strukture pričastija soxranjajutsja osnovnyje leksikomorfologičeskie priznaki glagolnosti, t. e. vid i zalog. A tak kak formy pričastij dvojstvenny, i eta dvojstvennost' morfologičeski opredelajetsja ne tol'ko suffiksami i vidovymi različijami, no i otličijami osnov nastojaščego vremeni ot osnov prošedšego vremeni (sr. **peku-ščij** i **pek-šij**; **pišuščij** i **pisav-šij**), to v strukturje pričastij vystupajut i vremennyje ottenki." And further: "Itak, so storony glagola vxodjat v grammatičeskoje strojenje pričastij formy vida, zaloga i vremeni. So storoni že imen prilagatelnyx prisojedinjajutsja sjuda formy soglasovanija v rode, čisle i padeže, vyražajemyje affiksami -yj, -ij, -aja, -jaja, -oje, -jeje i soprjažennoj s nimi sistemoj sklonenija. Tak kategorija kačestva.— continues Vinogradov, — stakivajetsja s kategorijej dejstvija processa. Ix bor'ba i vzaimodestvije privodjat k raznym grammatičeskim tipam pričastnyx obrazovanij" ³⁷).

It can be stated in general that in the Russian literary language, in a majority of cases, participles in an attributive function preserve a double categorical meaning, depending on the sentence structure and the character of the attributive word: once they are used as participles with a preponderance of the verbal element, and then again as adjectives, with a loss of the verbal element. This dualism of the categorical meaning manifests itself equally in participles of transitive and intransitive verbs. In the examples cited below, participles which, under different structural conditions preserve their original categorical meaning as participles, have here lost this original categorical meaning, and acquired a meaning of an adjective. Such participles no longer indicate the time of action, only a sign of process ³⁸), as an immutable sign. E. g.: **zvučaščij** (zvučaščeje tjelo Uš. I, 1087) ³⁹), **p'juščij** (čelovek p'juščij ni na čto

37) V. V. Vinogradov. *Sovremennyj russkij jazyk*. II, 1938. p. 248.
38) Vinogradov, *Op. cit.* pp. 251-52.

ne goden Pušk. Uš. III, 1037), **padajuščij** (Padajuščaja bašnja v gorode Pizje Uš. III, 15), **prihodjaščij** (Posle obxoda palat načalas' prijemka prihodjaščix bolnyx Čexov Uš. III, 875) and others.

The participle loses its verbality most frequently for the reason that it is used in the transitional meaning as an immutable sign thing which contains that processual sign as an immutable sign which is the result of a process that can be acted out by the acting person, or a live being in general. E. g.: **blestjaščij** (Blestjaščaja rječ) ⁴⁰⁾, **vjažuščij** (Vjažuščeje veščestvo Uš. I, 530), **krasjaščij** (Krasjaščije veščestva Uš. I, 1503), **lajuščij** (Iz vnutrennostej jego, slovno iz pustogo prostranstva . . . , vyletel gromkij lajuščij golos S. Ščedr. Uš. II, 30), **mysljaščij** (Govoril Nikolaj Petrovič, imeja vid zadumčivj i myljaščij M. Gork. Uš. II, 289), **napravljajuščij** (Napravljajuščaja sila R.-Ukr. Sl. 273-274 ⁴¹⁾), **nedremljuščij** (Nedremljuščeje oko materinskoj ljubvi Uš. II, 503-4), **obodrvajuščij** (Obodrvajuščij vzgljad Uš. II, 680), **ottalkivajuščij** (Ottalkivajuščaja vnešnost' Uš. II, 997), **ošelomlajuščij** (Ošelomlajuščeje vpečatlenije Uš. II, 1037), **perexodjaščij** (Perexodjaščeje znamja Uš. III, 220), **plačuščij** (Dušeňka! — skazal on plačuščim golosom Čex. Uš. III, 291), **podavljajuščij** (Podavljajuščeje bol'sinstvo golosov Uš. III, 358), **razdirajuščij** (Razdirajuščije sceny Uš. III, 1150), **razlagajuščij** (Razlagajuščeje vlijanije Uš. III, 1158), **rešajuščij** (Rešajuščaja pobeđa Uš. III, 1354), **rukovodjaščij** (Rukovodjaščije ukazanija Uš. III, 1402), **svistjaščij** (Svistjaščij zvuk Uš. IV, 94), **streljajuščij** (Streljajuščaja bol' R.-Ukr. Sl. 684), **striguščij** (Striguščij lišaj R.-Ukr. Sl. 682), **tancujuščij** (Tancujuščaja poxodka Uš. IV, 652), **tekuščij** (Tekuščij remont Uš. IV, 668), **toržestvujuščij** (Toržestvujuščij vzgljad Uš. IV, 750), **užasajuščij** (Užasajuščeje zrelišče Uš. IV, 905), **umoljajuščij** (Umoljajuščij vid Uš. IV, 946), **uničtožajuščij** (Uničtožajuščij ogon' artilleriji Uš. IV, 953), **čarujuščij** (U njego čarujuščaja ulybka Uš. IV, 1236).

The participles which acquired a meaning of adjectives are, by

39) Abbreviation: Prof. D. N. Ušakov. *Tolkovyj slovar' russkogo jazyka*, 1935, I; 1938, II; 1939, III; 1940, IV.

40) *Sovremennij russkij jazyk. Morfologija*. Izd. Mosk. Univ. 1952, p. 168.

41) Abbreviation: *Russko-Ukrain. Slovar'*. A. N. Ukr. SSR. 1948.

42) See V. Vinogradov. *Russkij jazyk*. 1947, p. 214.

this meaning of theirs, close to adjectives of verbal derivation with suffixes -atel'nyj, -itel'nyj: spasatel'nyj (spasajuščij), vozmutitel'nyj bditel'nyj, nabludatel'nyj, živitel'nyj, odobritel'nyj, zaključitel'nyj, prokladitel'nyj, prezritel'nyj, ubeditel'nyj, golovokružitel'nyj, and others ⁴²).

In a different sentence structure the very same participles might keep their original categorical meaning, i. e. with a larger element of verbality. Comp.: "Vjažuščij snopy čelovjek" and "Vjažuščeje veščestvo." But the Russian literary language knows instances where participles are used mostly in a sentence structure with a preponderance of adjectivity. E. g: nezaxodjaščij (solnce) (R.-Ukr. Sl. 294), nep'juščij (U nas xorošaja nep'juščaja sem'ja Nehr. Uš. II, 542), neržavjejuščij (Neržavejuščaja stal' Uš. II, 547), potrjasajuščij (R.-Ukr. Sl. 486), odurmanivajuščij (ibid. 343), opjanjajuščij (ibid. 355), otrezvljajuščij (ibid. 376), and others. In all these instances the participle loses its original meaning entirely, and acquires the meaning of an adjective.

The adjective nature of participles appears in the forced tendency of the book language to create complex participial forms with the basis of a noun or other category in the first part. E. g.: blizležaščij (Blizležaščije strany Uš. I, 154), boleutoljajuščij (Boleutoljajuščije sredstva) ⁴³, vseveduščij, vsevedjaščij (Uš. I, 399), dušerazdirajuščij (Dušerazdirajuščij krik) ⁴⁴, živorodjaščij (Vse mlekopitajuščije -živorodjaščije Uš. I, 866), životvorjaščij ⁴⁵, zvukoza-pisyvajuščij (R.-Ukr. Sl. 134), ognedyšaščij (Ognedyšaščaja gora Uš. II, 748), pal'cexodjaščije (R.-Ukr. Sl. 388), pervoprisutstvujuščij R.-Ukr. Sl. 365), svobodomyljaščij (Uš. IV, 98) ⁴⁶).

Regarding refletiva participial forms ending in -sja, V. Vinogradov says of them the following: "Ix rezkoje morfoložičeskoje ot-

43) V. Vinogradov. Sovrem. russkij jazyk. II, 1938, v. 252.

44) ibid.

45) It is indicated in Ušakov's dictionary that this is a "pričast. dejstv. nast. vrem. ot životvorit'." In reality this is an adjective which can compete semantically with "životvornyj" given alongside by Ušakov: "žadno glotat' životvorjaščij vozdux, razlityj v usčel'jax" (Lerm.) and "Derevenskij vozdux životvorno (adverb) vezdejsťvov: na bol'nogo." Uš. I, 866.

46) This is an adjective created not from the verb "svobodomyslit'," because there is no such verb, only from "svoboda" and "myslit'." This con-taminatively created lexeme acquired the appropriate meaning of a person, who thinks freely, i. e. the equivalent of "volnodumnyj."

ličije ot prilagatjelnjyx (t. je. konečnoje -sja), ix zalogovyje značeni-ja služat prepjatstvijem ix okačestvleniju. Liš' polnaja grammatičeskaja izoljacija takogo pričastija ot drugix form togo že glagola, vključeni-je jego v krug čisto kačestvennyx značenij možet povleč' za soboju nejtralizaciju jego glagolnyx svojstv" 47).

In reality in a sentence structure, such purported verbal forms change completely into the category of adjectives. E. g.: *iskrjaščijsja* (R.-Ukr. Sl. 174), *losnjaščijsja* (ibid. 229), *neb'juščijsja* (Neb'juščajasja posuda Uš. II, 480), *penjaščijsja* (R.-Ukr. Sl. 394), *peremežajuščijsja* (Molnija . . . vzdragivajuščim, pjeremježajuščimsja svetom osvetila Isanku Veres. Uš. III, 156), *preryvajuščijsja* (Preryvajuščimsja golosom on rasskazal mne svežuju novost' Uš. III, 749), *trudjaščijsja* (Trudjaščejesja naselenije Uš. IV, 815).

In the Russian language, participles of the active present tense in short form, have not survived precisely because of their attributive function⁴⁸). In this function they have structurally come near pronominal adjectives in the later pronoun form. Nevertheless, we find instances of the use of short form participles in the predicative function. These instances become more frequent in styles of artistic language. E. g.: *štyk jego ostr i predosteregajušč* (A. Tolstoj), *Jevgraf Žmakin, učitel' tancev, byl neizmjenno vesjel i letajušč* (Leonov, Barsuki), and others⁴⁹).

2. In the Ukrainian literary language, participles of the active present tense in pronominal form, are quite frequently used in monuments of the 14th c., as well as in writs of the 14th and 15th c. E. g.: "My Aleksandrъ, abo Vitovtъ, znamenyto čynymъ tymъ našymъ lystomъ nynišnim i potomъ budučimъ" "zakazujučiji vynu namъ majutъ zaplatyty." P. Žytečkyj says that "these forms do not find support in the folk language, only in monuments of the South-rus'kyj (Ukrainian—P.K.) literature which reflect the folk language composition, they are a common occurrence⁵⁰). This is found to be the case with Ukrainian writs of the 14th and 15th c. according to

47) V. Vinogradov. *Russkij jazyk*. 1947, p. 273.

48) See L. P. Jakubinskij. *Istorija drevnerusskogo jazyka*. Moscow, 1953, p. 253.

49) V. Vinogradov. *Sovrem. Russkij jazyk*. 1938, p. 249.

50) P. Žyteč'kyj, *Narysy literaturnoji istoriji ukrajins'koji movy v XVII st. Lviv*, 1941, p. 93.

V. Dem'jančuk: zemlja ležačaja, o bělku ležačiju, buduščiji (plur.), *oumějučyx, buduščimъ* (budučymъ), *promynučymy, tekučymy, stojačymy* etc. 51). Also in the 16th and 17th c.: burmistrom na totъ čas *budučim* i napotom kotoryje budut. Akt. II,92 52); majučij Hal. M. 161, movjačoho Hal. Kaz. III, majučomu Sl. o bezd., movjačij Pam. Berynda, 163, *budučij* ibid. 169, činjačij ibid. 182, and others 53). Later in the works of some writers of Galicia, especially of the poets comprising the "Rus'ka Trijeja" group in the first part of the 19th c., according to studies of Prof. W. Lew, participles of the active present tense are used "in temporal and relative dependent clauses in place of the conjunctive and verbum finitum", e. g.: *ščob raduvav sja sijučyj vkupi iz žnuščymy* Š. I, 79; *zadlja besidy ženy posvidčajuščoj* S. I, 78; *v tyx ležala množin' bolijuščyx, nedužnyx i slipyx* . . . S. I, 79; *sered zvizd merkotjučyx mrije* V. Ph. 142 (Wasył Lew. *Mova poetiv Rus'koji Trijei*. Zap. Nauk. Tovarystva im. Ševčenko, t. CLXI. Zb. Filolohičnoji Sekciji, t. 24. New York—Paryž, 1953, p. 82).

In the contemporary Ukrainian language participles of the active present tense have not survived either in the attributive, nor in the predicative function 54). In the literary language there is a tendency to use them sometimes, but only in the attributive function, and without dependent words 55). In the Ukrainian literary language they are not used in the appositive function at all: in their place descriptive-verbal forms are used. 56)

In the attributive function, participles without dependent words

51) Vasył Dem'jančuk. Morfolohija ukrajin'sk'yx hramot XIV i peršoji polovyny XV viku. Zap. Ist.—Fil. Viddilu UAN, 1928, kn. XVI, pp. 107-108.

52) F. Miklosich. Vergl. Synt. p. 819.

53) Z. M. Veselov'ska, Mova "Leksykonu" Pamvy Beryndy. Zap. Ist.—Fil. Viddilu UAN, 1927, kn. XIII-XIV, p. 329. See prof. P. Buzuk in "Visnyk Odes'koji Komisiji Krajeznavstva" for the year 1925.

54) P. Žytec'kyj (O perevode jevangelijo na malorusskij jazyk, 24) noted: "Čto kasajetsja do pričastij dejstvitel'nogo zaloga, to oni soveršenno otsutstvujut v narodnom jazyke."

55) See P. Kovaliv. Ukrajin'ski aktyvni dijeprymetnyky. Naši Dni. Lviv, 1943, No. 12.

56) O. Ohonovskij wrote long ago: "Die Participium werden im Ruthenischen überhaupt nicht häufig gebraucht. Statt des Part. praesent. act. und praet. act. I, wird gern ein Relativsatz eingeleitet mit ŠČO oder KOTRYJ angewendet" (Studien, p. 146).

lose their verbal meaning, and by their categorical meaning become almost assimilated with adjectives. E. g.: Treba nam pracjuvaty v tyx blahoslovennyx zemljax, de nad **mysljačoju** holovoju ne stojit' iz dovbneju bezholovoj cenzor P. Kul. VI, 583⁵⁷); Ostanni slova Zaxara . . . pryhlušyly v ušax **sluxajučoju** hromady šum vodopadu I. Franko; **kryčašoju** superečnistju S. Jefremov; **otočujučyj** svit R.-Ukr. Sl. 349, and others.

It can be stated in general that in the contemporary Ukrainian literary language pronominal participles are of a sporadic nature; they are used in restricted instances, and under circumstances indicated above. In other instances they are transmitted by descriptive verbal forms. E. g.: "Ja baču **sydjačoho** na stil'ci čolovika." This construction is inappropriate to the Ukrainian language. The proper way is: "Ja baču čolovika, ščo sydyt' na stil'ci."

3. In the Byelorussian language participles of the active present tense changed into gerundives, acquiring the immutable form ending in **-uči, -ači**: **sędzjuči** Šejn. M. I, 14 Borys., **rydajuči** Rom. I-II, 36 Hom. and others, 58). Even in old monuments, according to E. Karskij, similarly "preobladajuščeju formoj javlajetsja na **-či** (uči, ači, jači = ašti bez udarenija), no rjadom s neju vstrečajutsja i **če** dlja vsech rodov" 59).

E. Karskij also notes the fact that these participles "inogda sklonjajutsja, primajaja okončaniye imen prilagatjel'nyx polnyx". We have found a few such examples in Nosovič's dictionary: **nastupujučij** (V nastupujučij dzen' 320), **trivajičij** (Trivajučij remen' 639, trivajučaja verovka ibid.) 60). But, as we can see, even in these few examples the participle has already lost its original categorical meaning and appears in the meaning of an adjective.

4. In the Polish language, according to T. Florinskij, participles of the active present tense have survived in one immutable form ending in **ąc**, which is used in the meaning of gerundives: **idąc, znając, bojąc**, and others. Regarding declinable participles in pronominal form, they are, as stated by Florinskij, "at the present time

57) O. Kurylo. Uvahy do sučasnoji ukrajin. liter. movy. Kiev, 1920, p. 13.

58) E. Karskij. Obzor zvukov i form belorussk. reči. Moscow, 1885. Also: K istoriji zvukov i form belorussk. reči. RFV. 1893, XXX, p. 76.

59) E. Karskij, Op. cit.

60) N. Nosovic. Slovar' belorusskago narečija. St. Peterburg, 1870.

rare; e. g.: *bijący, -a, -e*; they occur more frequently in the old language" 61).

Jan Łoś writes the following: "Deklinacja dzisiejszego imiesłowu odmiennego pozostała niezmienną od najdawniejszego okresu języka piśmiennego, jak to stwierdzają przykłady zebrane z najstarszych zabytków: z Kazań świętokrzyskich: *sło (wa) sy(na) bo (że)go wabiącego, leżący sa, mo(wi) siedzącym, leżącym*; z Psalterza florjańskiego: *człowiek niesłyszący, woda ciekąca, od strzały latającej, ludu przybliżającemu się, czynisz sługi twe ogniem zającącym, . . . nie chciej usiłowan być we złoczyńcyach*. 62).

But even in the old-Polish language participles of the active present tense in the attributive function began to lose their original categorical meaning, and acquired a meaning of adjectives. E. g.: *Modlący Fl. Ps. 89, 15; Czasu radzącego (radnego, czasu rady) BZ Num. 16, 2; Wątpiącemu czasowi XV w. Rozpr. XXII, 29*. 63).

In the contemporary Polish literary language participles of the active present tense in the attributive function almost invariably lose their original categorical meaning, and appear in the meaning of adjectives. E. g.: *wróbek należy do ptaków skaczących* nie

61) T. Florinskij. *Lekcji po slawjanskomu jazykoznaniju*. Kiev. 1897, No. II, p. 479. W. Taszycki gives the following general characteristic of the development of Polish participles: "Od starej wielobarwności formalnej i funkcyjnej doszło do stanu dzisiejszego: 1) do imiesłowu terażniejszego na *-ąc*, tworzącego się tylko od słów niedokonanych i mającego funkcję przysłówkową; 2) imiesłowu przeszłego I. na *-szy*, tworzącego się tylko od słów dokonanych i mającego funkcję przysłówkową, i 3) imiesłowu terażniejszego odmiennego na *-ący, -ąca, -ące* o funkcji jedynie przydawkowej, niezdolnego już wyrażać stosunków w czasie." Witold Taszycki. *Imiesłowowy czynny, terażniejszy i przeszły w języku polskim*, Polska Akademia Umiejętności. Wydział Filologiczny. *Rozprawy*, tom. LXI, No. 5, p. 59). E. Koschmieder finds, in the old Polish language, very frequent cases of the creation of participles of the act. pres. tense from perfective verbs: "Das Part. praes. wurde im Altpolnischen noch häufig vom perfectiven verbum gebildet. Es hatte dan meist praeteritale, zuweilen aber auch futurische und seltener noch rein praesentische Bedeutung." (Erwin Koschmieder. *Der Einfluss des Aspekts auf den Formenbestand des polnischen Verbums*. *Archiv f. sl. Philol.* Bd. 41, 1927).

62) Jan Łoś. *Krótką gramatyka historyczna języka polskiego*. Lwów, 1927, p. 157.

63) Jan Łoś. *Syntaktyczne użycie form gramatycznych*. *Język polski*. II, 1915, p. 171.

64) Dr. Tadeusz Lehr-Spławiński. *Nowy słownik języka polskiego*. I, 355.

chodzących⁶⁴), wdole kupka domków z **jarzącymi** światłami w oknach⁶⁵).

If participles of the active present tense do occur in the Polish literary language in the attributive function here and there, in the folk language they disappear altogether. W. Taszycki writes: "Generally speaking, our participles are, in folk dialects, in a stage of decline. All Northern Poland, with the exception of Kaszuby, does not have them in living form at all."⁶⁶) Polish dialects in East Prussia also lost participles of the active present tense⁶⁷). In this respect the most conservative region is Malopolska, "although even here the people use our participles very rarely, substituting dependent clauses for them"⁶⁸).

5. In the Czech language, according to a statement of A. Mazon, participles of the active present tense, "ne sont plus que des formes purement livresques, étrangères à la langue parlée"⁶⁹). This means that in the written language participles of the active present tense are still distinguished by gender and number (-a, -ouc, -ouce, -e, -íc, -íce) but in the vernacular they are not distinguished by gender and number and are used in the meaning of gerundives⁷⁰). F. Travniček writes that "v ludové vluvě dnešní participia nt-ová jsou typ neživý, ustrnulý v adverbia, jak se to někdy pozoruje i ve

65) *ibid.*, I, 1281.

66) Witold Taszycki. *Imiesłowy czynne, terażniejszy i przeszły w języku polskim.* p. 60.

67) K. Nitsch. *Dialekty polskie Prus Wschodnich*, MPKJ. III, 1903, pp. 457-458: "Imiesłowy na -ąc, -ący, -szy nie istnieją." S. Kulbakin (*Morfologija sważenskogo govora. Izv. ORJAS, 1904, IX, 130*) also states that 'part. praes. obyčno ne upotrebljajetsja v narodnoj rječi v Sważendze. Mnene prixodilos' etix form otmečat.'" S. Nikel. *Die polnische Mundart des oberschlesischen Industriebezirks.* Berlin, 1908, p. 39: "Das Participium praes. ist als Verbalform ausser Gebrauch. Wenn es noch gebildet wird, so hat es, wie auch das Participium praes. pass., adjectivische Bedeutung, z. B. gorąci (heiss), spąci (schlāfrig), svecąci (glānzend). Folgende Reste existieren noch von dem alten Participium praes. act. — merkwürdig in der Femininform — stojąci (stehend), leżąci (liegend), klenąci (kniend), xożąci (hin und her gehend), idąci (gehend), sejąci (sitzend)."

68) W. Taszycki. *Op. cit.* p. 62. Researchers of particular dialects also find the usage of participles of the active present tense in the meaning of adjectives. E. g. I. Ostrembs'kyj. *Serbovicko-dzvonovickij govor.* RFV. 1913, LXIX, 420. J. Loś. *Gwara opoczyńska.* Rozpr. XI, 1836, p. 174.

69) André Mazon. *Grammaire de la langue tchéque.* Paris, 1952, p. 265.

70) T. Florinskij. *Lekciji, II, p. 164.*

spis. češ., kde se naše participia drží v platnosti přechodníkové, např.: takřka, nehledíc, počínajíc". 71)

6. Similarly in the Slovak language forms in -úc or -iac have survived in the meaning of gerundives: *nesúc, nesiac*. From participles in -úc, -iac, gerundives in -ci have been formed in accordance with the adjective form: *nesúci, chvalaci*. 72).

7. In the Kashubian language participles of the active present tense have survived in the meaning of gerundives in -ące and adjectives in -aćö, -ące: *plocące, plocáci*. 73).

8. In the Serbo-Wend language: in the Upper-Wend participle forms in -cy are always declineable; contrariwise in the Lower-Wend they are not declined and are used in the meaning of gerundives: *duša bužo chvalecy a žekujucy spiwaš* 74).

9. In the Bulgarian language participles of the active present tense have gone out of use almost completely, both in the literary and folk language 75). Only some distinct participle forms are the exception, such as: *suštij, sušt, sušta, sušto; nastojaštij, -a, -e; buduštij, budušt, -a, -e; slědujuštij* 76). In addition, Prof. S. B. Bernstejn in his article "Kratkij grammatičeskij očerk bolgarskogo jazyka" 77), indicates some borrowings from the Russian language, e. g.: *pišešč, učešč, organizirašč* 78). But he finds an absence of such participles in the vernacular. "Redko pol'zujutsja imi xorošije stilisty. Čašče vsego oni upotrebljajutsja v naučnom jazyke, ispytavšem sil'noje rusškoje vlijanije". 79)

71) F. Travníček. Historická mluvnice československa. V Praze, 1935, p. 385.

72) T. Florinskij, op. cit. II, p. 308.

73) *ibid.* p. 578.

74) *ibid.* p. 655.

75) R. Brandt, in his "Kratkaja fonetika i morfologija bolgarskogo jazyka" (Uč. zapiski imper. Moskov. un-ta. Otd. ist.-fil. Vyp. XXX. p. 22) says that the participle even "v vide napričastnika vstrečajetsja liš v oblastnoj reč." See S. Mladenov. Geschichte der bulg. Sprache, p. 264.

76) T. Florinskij. Lekcii. I, pp. 128-29. See L. Beaulieux et S. Mladenov. Grammaire de la langue bulgare, Paris, 1950, p. 195.

77) Bolgarsko-russkij slovar. Moscow, 1947, pp. 491-92.

78) In the opinion of S. Bernstein this causes some variations in the written forms of the participle: to wit, in some cases they are transcribed with the peculiarities of Russian phonetics, in others borrowed forms reflect the rules of Bulgarian phonetics. Thus, e. g. along with -ešč, we find -ašč, -jašč, -ušč, -jušč: *rabotešč* (but also: *rabotjašč*), *pišešč* (but also: *pisašč*), *cvetušč, upravljajušč*. *Ibid.*

79) *ibid.*

10. In the Serbo-Croatian language former participles of the active present tense have survived only in the meaning of gerundives in -ći: plétući, viděći, nosěći⁸⁰). T. Florinškyj indicates only three forms: vruč, mohuč, držeć, which, in his opinion, are to be considered participles, but he is nevertheless compelled to admit that "po značeniju i upotrebleniju oni nastojašćije prilagatel'nyje i kak takovyje izmenjajutsja po rodam, čislam i padežam"⁸¹). A. Meillet and A. Vaillant state without any qualification that "il n'y a pas des participes actifs" in the Serbo-Croatian language.⁸²).

Even these isolated examples of the use of participles of the active present tense which are encountered in monuments from before the 16th c., as was noted even by Daničić (Ist. obl. s. 365), are not specifically Serbo-Croatian: they are of Church-Slavic origin and have nothing in common with the folk language. In the Dalmatian monuments of the 16th c. declineable forms of participles are encountered mainly in Latin constructions. E. g.: travu noseću sjeme⁸³). F. Francev maintains that all Serbo-Croatian participles still existed in the 16th c., and of those the active of the past tense had disappeared entirely, and of the present tense have been preserved in separate remnants.⁸⁴)

It is to be understood that they are all phenomena of the literary language of the period, but in the vernacular they did not exist in the 16th c. any more. It is very doubtful whether, as Francev maintains, they existed in the Kajkavian dialect "in the not too distant past" in the same meaning as they appear in Serbo-Croatian monuments, and for the most part under the influence of Church-Slavic sentence structure. E. g.: na Synuchega brata Perg. 67; imaiuchemu Vram. Post. II, 45a; i disechega z mertuih I. 99b.⁸⁵).

11. In the Slovenian language participles of the active present

80) R. Brandt. *Kratkaja fonetika i morfologija serbskogo jazyka*. Učene zap. imper. Moskov. un-ta. Otdel. ist.-fil. Moscow, 1896, XXIII, 32.

81) T. Florinškyj. *Lekciji*. I, p. 317.

82) A. Meillet et A. Vaillant. *Grammaire de la langue serbo-croate*. Paris, 1924, p. 191.

83) A. Leskien. *Grammatik der serbo-kroatischen Sprache*. Heidelb. 1914, pp. 553-554.

84) F. Francev. *Beiträge zur historischen serbo-kroatischen Dialektologie*. Arch. f. sl. Ph., 1911. Bd. XXIII, pp. 353-355.

85) *ibid.*

tense have disappeared entirely⁸⁶). Obviously such examples as: *goreča svēča, noseča grvida, skeleča rana, stoječa, tekoča voda* etc. ⁸⁷), also *begeč* "fugax", *bleskeč* "splendens"⁸⁸), can hardly be tied with participles even genetically (see next Chapter).

III.

Adjectives constitute an entirely separate group genetically, in spite of the same participial formant: *-učyj, jučyj, ačyj, jačyj* (also rarely: *uščyj, juščyj, aščyj, jaščyj*): *revučyj, koljučyj, ležačyj, zahrebuščyj*, and others. A methodologically erroneous idea has been dominant in science so far, according to which these adjectives have their origin in participles: allegedly through their loss of indication of time they acquired the meaning of common adjectives. But thus far, nobody has indicated the criteria of such formations, being satisfied merely with the formal characteristics of using the above mentioned participial formants in the creation of such adjectives.

Thus, even Ohonovs'kyj wrote: "Einige Participia, welche die Form der zusammengesetzten Deklination annehmen, wie *tjamuščyj, mohučyj, trudjaščyj*, treffen als Adjectiva auf, und geben somit den Begriff einer Handlung auf."⁸⁹) E. Karskij wrote: "Otgolosok cerkovnoslavjanskogo jazyka predstavljajut pričastija-prilagatelnye na -ščij: *spljuščij, voči zavidjuščija, ruki zagrebuščija* Zap. I, 274"⁹⁰). A Šaxmatov also wrote that "pričastija nastojaščego i prošedšego vremeni v funkciji atributivnoj čast'ju iščezli sovsem iz upotreblenija, a čast'ju prevratilis' v prilagatel'nyje: sr. takije pričastija, kak *horjačij, sidjačij, letučij, paxučij, žhučij, tjahučij, polzučij, koljučij*"⁹¹). As we see, Šaxmatov calls these adjectives participles⁹²). V. Simovyč also wrote in his grammar: "We also have adjectives in *-jačyj, -učyj, (-uščyj)* which formerly constituted a separate form of the verb (participles), but after a feeling for this form had been lost,

86) T. Florinskij, *Lekciji*, I, p. 473.

87) F. Miklosiċ. *Vergl. slav. Syntax*. 821.

88) W. Vondrak. *Vergl. slav. Grammatik*. 1906, I, p. 493.

89) O. Ogonowski. *Studien auf dem Gebiete der rutherinischen Sprache*, 1880, pp. 146-147.

90) E. Karskij. *Obzor zvukov i form bjelorusskoj reči*. Moscow, 1885, p. 146.

91) *Iz trudov A. A. Šaxmatova po rusckomu jazyku*. Moscow, 1952, p. 86.

they remained adjectives: *harjačyj*, *nezrjačyj*, *tjamačyj* (and *tjamaščyj*), *pekučyj*, *slipučyj*, *nevmyruščyj*, *nevsypuščyj*...⁹³). Thus Simovyč also treats these adjectives as remnants of former participles. Prof. I. Ohienko also considers the forms “*tjamaščyj*, *nevsypuščyj*” to be “the last of” participles.⁹⁴) Likewise Prof. P. Buzuk writes that adjectives in *-čyj* “come from corresponding participles of the present tense” and cites examples: *pekučyj*, *revučyj*, *terpljačyj*.⁹⁵)

This explanation of the genesis of these adjectives became traditional in science: it even penetrated into school grammars⁹⁶). Later a similar explanation was given by: M. Hrunskýj and P. Kovaliv⁹⁷), O. Synjavskýj⁹⁸), L. Bulaxovskýj⁹⁹), Ju. Šerech¹⁰⁰), and others. In the modern university course of the Russian language we read: “*отпричастными по своему происхождению являюtsja прилагательные с основой и суффиксами -uč, -juč, -ač, -jač, исторически восходящими к древне-русским суффиксам действительных причастий настоящего времени . . . : gorjučij, dremučij, žgučij . . .*”¹⁰¹). The

92) Similarly also Miklošić (Verg. Synt. 822) erroneously included such forms as: *horjučyj*, *kypučyj*, *vyduščyj*, *ležačyj*, and others, in participles.

93) V. Simovyč. *Praktyčna hramatyka ukrajins'koji movy*. Rastadt, 1918, p. 147.

94) Prof. I. Ohienko. *Narysy z istoriji ukrajn. movy*. Warsaw, 1927, p. 83. See also: Ilarion (Dr. Ivan Ohienko). *Ukrajins'ka literaturna mova*. 1951, § 227. Also W. Taszycki, *op. cit.* p. 34.

95) Prof. P. Buzuk. *Narysy z istoriji ukrajn. movy*. Kiev, 1927, pp. 84-85. I. Verxratškyj (Howir batjukiv. *Zb. F. Sekc. NTŠ. XV*, 1912, p. 40) also understood the meaning of such adjectives to be that of participles, and he wrote that participles of the active present tense “are used rarely, and sometimes they have the meaning of an adjective: *koljuščyj* (“*koljušča korova*”), *stojaščyj* (“*stojašča voda*”), *sxodjaščyj* (“*sxodjašča voda*”), *vyduščyj* (“*vydušča jama*”), *huljaščyj* (“*rodu huljaščoho*”), *robotjuščyj*.”

96) See Prof. V. Katran. *Hramatyka ukrajn. movy*. Mainheim, 1946, p. 135. O. Panejko. *Hramatyka ukrajn. movy*. Augsburg, 1950, p. 143.

97) M. Hrunskyj i P. Kovaliv. *Istorija form ukrajn. movy*, X. 1931, page 308.

98) O. Synjavskyj. *Normy ukrajn. liter. movy*. Xarkiv, 1932, 2d ed. Lviv, 1941, p. 95.

99) L. Bulaxovskij. *Istoričeskij kommentarij k rcsskomu literat. jazyku*. Kiev, 1950, p. 207.

100) Jurij Šerech. *Participium universale im slav. Slavist. No. 16*, p. 8.

101) *Sovremennij russkij jazyk. Morfologija*. Izd. Mosk. Univ. 1952, p. 169. Yet in another place: “*Ети прилагательные (жгучий, лежачий) по происхождению являюtsja причастиями*” (p. 358).

latest academic grammar of the Russian language¹⁰²), also considers these adjectives "participial by their origin."

All such explanations cannot be accepted by scholarship today, being explanations based on methodologically erroneous foundations. These adjectives cannot structurally be placed in one order with participles as such, nor with participles which, in certain syntactical functions lose the meaning of participles and acquire the meaning of adjectives. The latter (e.g.: *sluxajuča hromada, mysljača holova*) undoubtedly belong to participles. But such adjectives as: *havkuča sobaka, ciljušča voda*, etc. do not, and never did belong to participles at all, because structurally they have an entirely different meaning, and an entirely different genesis.

O. Kurylo was probably the first to call these adjectives adjectives of verbal origin. In her "Uvahy do sučasnoji ukrajins'koji movy" (Cracow-Lviv, 1942) she even gave a special title: "Prykmetnyky dijeslivnoho pochodžennja na -čyj." (p. 13)¹⁰³. Nevertheless O. Kurylo is inclined to believe that these adjectives belonged to one group with participles in the past, as we can surmise from the first paragraphs of her explanation: "In the vernacular former participles in -čyj, entered into the category of adjectives both by their meaning and functions" (p. 13).

Hence it is clear that O. Kurylo confused here adjectives of verbal origin with adjectives which genetically belong to the order of participles. This is particularly clear from the following statement: "The examples cited (*kusjučyj, plodjučyj, robotjaščyj, robuščyj*, and others) indicate that adjectives of verbal origin have completely lost the shade of time. Only in one instance has the time element been preserved: *pryjšov vin do sp'jačoho boha Šuch. Z.*" (p. 18). In this case the element of time has been retained precisely because the adjective "sp'jačoho" structurally belongs to the group of participles (comp.: *mysljača holova*). But O. Kurylo classifies it in the order of the adjectives of verbal origin of the same type as "kusjučyj." It can be stated in general that O. Kurylo has given this

102) Grammatika russkogo jazyka. Akad. Nauk SSSR. Moscow, 1953. vol. I, § 496.

103) Vinogradov V. (Russkij jazyk, 1947, pp. 319, 242) also later called such forms as: *huljaščij, zavaljaščij, robotjaščij* "otglagol'nye." He clearly distinguishes accented suffixes -ušč, -jušč, from participial suffixes.

chapter a methodologically erroneous construction: she states that adjectives of verbal origin in *-čyj* (i. e. of the same type as "hav-kučyj") "have lost their shade of time completely" (p. 18), whereas in reality they structurally belong to adjectives of verbal origin which, according to the nature of their formation never had any shade of time, only a constant sign.

Therefore, we must clearly distinguish adjectives which are derived from participles through the loss of their verbal element. The former belong to a group of adjectives of verbal creation, i. e. to the same group as other adjectives of verbal origin (comp.: *balakučyj* and *balaklyvyj*). These adjectives, although they originate from verbs, do not possess such constructive features in a sentence as verbs and participles, i. e. they cannot have alongside such dependent words, as can verbs or participles. A clear illustration of such cases is given by O. Synjavskýj (Normy, 95-96). He states: "The verb "okuvaty" can have such additions: **dobre, kruhom** ("okuvaty dobre", "okuvaty kruhom"), as well as the simplest combinations "dobre okovanyj", "okovanyj kruhom" (with a participle), "probyty naskriz," "probyty spysom", and "probytyj naskriz," "probytyj spysom" etc. But we do not observe the same on examples of **koloty** and **koljučyj, tjamyty** and **tjamuščyj**, etc.: simple combinations are in order, e. g. "koloty holkoju," but "koljučyj holkoju" is quite impossible, similarly "tjamytyme ce do novyx vynykiv" and "tjamuščyj ce do novyx vynykiv" etc. These, and other similar verbal outgrowths can now only be simple adjectives, hence in appropriate combinations "koljučyj drit," koljuče slovo," "tjamušča ljudyna" etc."

Structurally these adjectives are of an entirely different type, and they cannot, under any circumstances, be genetically tied with participles, which is what researchers have been doing. Genetically they are tied with participles only by suffixes *-uč, -juč, -ač, -jač (-ušč, -jušč, -ašč, -jašč)* which come from the original formant of the participle of the active present tense *-nt*, and in this structural order, together with the verbal stem, they form an entirely different sematic group from the structural order of truly participial formations. This semantic group, as a group of structurally different adjectives, assumes a supporting meaning.

This has been noted by R. Smal-Stoc'kyj in his work "Značennja ukrajins'kyx prykmetykiv" (Warsaw, 1926). Relating these adjectives verbal origin with the participial formant -nt, he nevertheless does not mention anywhere that these adjectives are of participial origin. All the more surprising, since according to him this formant of the participles of the active present tense has a broader function, embracing not only verbal roots (**pekty-pekučij**) but also adjective stems (**dobryj—dobrjačyj**), endowing the latter with the very supporting meaning, an increase of attribute.¹⁰⁴).

Thus, a separate group of adjectives was created as a separate semantic group, although at the basis of their creation lie stems of two different types: the participial and the adjective. These two different stem types are so closely tied by a common supporting meaning that they are hard to distinguish at first glance (comp. **skrypučyj** from: "skrypity", and "skupučyj" from: "skupyj").

Even the principle of the creation of adjectives of verbal origin is entirely different. Whereas participles of the active present tense in their creation are tied with the form of the third person plural active voice (**sydjat' — sydjačyj, vykonujut' — vykonujučyj**), adjectives of verbal origin with the same suffix do not necessarily tie with the third person plural; they have a different basis. Comp.: **pečut' — pekučyj, letjat' — letjučyj, terpljat' — nesterpučyj**¹⁰⁵). In other words, there is a violation of the principle of conjugation, a principle clearly observed in the creation of participles¹⁰⁶). What

104) Ju. Šerech (Narys ukrajins'koji literaturnoji movy, 235) evaluates the appropriate suffixes as having a "meaning of a creator of action" with "a shade of constant attribute." Prof. S. K. Bulič (Litografirovannye lekciji po morfoloziji russkogo jazyka. Kurs 1903-4 g. pp. 70) assumed that forms in -aščyj, -jaščyj" could get a supporting meaning easily from the addition of a magnifying suffix, like e. g. -išča, -šče: ručišča, domišče.

105) See O. Synjavskij. Normy ukrajins'koji literaturnoji movy, p. 96.

106) V. Vinogradov (Russkij jazyk, 1947) even gives some normative indications: "Vybory togo ili drugogo suffixa (-uč ili -jač) zavisit, prežde vsego, ot togo, na kakoj soglasnyj okančivajetsja kornevoj element proizvodjaščego glagola. Jesli on okančivajetsja na gubnoj ili zadnejazyčnyj, to k nemu prisojedinjajetsja tol'ko suffixs -uč (gremučij, šipučij, sypučij, paxučij, žgučij, tolkučij). V drugih položenijsx upotreblenijsx suffixov -uč i -jač opredelajetsja takim pravilom. Suffixs -jač, (-ač) sočetajetsja liš s kornevymi elementami (okančivajuščimisja na gubnoj i ne na zadnejazyčnyj) tex glagolov, kotorye obrazujut formy 3-go lica množ. čisla na -jat (t. j. prinadležat ko vtoromu sprjaženiju), napr.: ležaičij, bro-

is more, they are sometimes created from such verbal stems, from which simple participles were never created and are not created; and if created, then with different suffixes. E. g. ' kusjučyj sobaka (the participle of the actives present tense should be: kusajučyj sobaka), spivuča divčyna (participle: spivajuča divčyna), robotjaščyj (participle cannot be created), robočyj (participle: robljačyj) etc. 107).

But what mostly demands our attention, is the meaning of adjectives of verbal origin with the formant *-nt*. We have said above that this is a separate, structurally entirely different semantic group with a supporting meaning. In his time R. Smal-Stoc'kyj analyzed this problem in the work quoted, and we shall now recall some of it.

R. Smal-Stoc'kyj explains the meaning of these adjectives by the cause of their origin. First of all, the derivation of these adjectives was caused by a strong intensity of action, performed by a person or thing: havkučyj sobaka (having the attribute of barking a lot, spivuča divčyna (has the attribute of singing well not just singing), tekuča voda (has the attribute of flowing without interruption), rostjuče derevo (has the attribute of growing well) and others 108). But in the opinion of R. Smal-Stoc'kyj the main cause of a development of this supporting meaning is "the characteristic meaning of a whole series of verbs from which adjectives are created, and noun consociations of such newly created adjectives." R. Smal-Stoc'kyj borrowed the term "consociation" from Sperber 109) with the following meaning: from a whole mass of words the given word chooses a certain group with a certain meaning and content of feeling, with which it has a constant relation. Through this relation one word influences another. E. g.: revučyj hrim, pe-

djačij, sidjačij, xodjačij, stojačij i t. p. Vo vsech ostalnyx slučajax primenjaetsja suffixs *-uč* (*-juč*) Napr.: padučij, polzučij, vonjučij, prostorečnoje pristavučij i t. d.)". (p. 219).

107) The university course of the Russian language (op. cit. p. 169) indicates that some of these adjectives, which have "jarko vyražennoje kačestvennoje značenije" can create short and combined forms of degrees of comparison: "boleje paxučij, samyj mogučij" etc.

108) op. cit. pp. 69-70.

109) Dr. Hans Sperber. Einführung in die Bedeutungslehre. Leipzig, 1923, p. 50.

kuče sonce, koljuče ternja, paxučyj sad, boljuča rana, ščipuča horilka, etc. Here every word acts on the emotions of man, on his soul, ear, nose, taste, skin¹¹⁰). Finally, an important role is also played by the accent on suffixes -uč, -juč, -ač, -jač, (-ušč, -jušč, -ašč, -jašč¹¹¹). The accent assumes a functional meaning: the accent not only favors stressing the meaning of invariably accentuated suffixes (**robúcyj, balakúcyj**) but in addition, it also changes the meaning of the word¹¹²). E. g.: **báčučyj** (participle) and **bačúčyj** (adjective), **májučyj** (participle) and **majúčyj** (adjective) etc.¹¹³).

Furthermore, in combination with the adjective stem the suffixes of Old Slavonic origin -ušč, -jušč, -ašč, -jašč give the newly created adjectives the meaning of the highest degree (superlative): **biljušča soročka, bahatjušča baba, pohanjušča divka, zljuščyj sobaka, važnjušča persona**, etc. At that, R. Smal-Stockyj does not believe that Old Slavic forms with -šč had any significant role in this process¹¹⁴). All the more so, since such creations very frequently have Eastern Slavic suffixes -uč, -juč, -ač, -jač: **hladkuča korova, tverdjučyj kulak, tovtjuča svynja, skupučyj did, dobrjačyj čolovik, ščyrjača ljudyna, sytjuča viveja**¹¹⁵). One way or another, even these creations of an adjective derivation acquire that supporting meaning or, according to R. Smal-Stoc'kyj, "a meaning of coarse pejorative superlatives"¹¹⁶).

Thus the basic characteristic of adjectives of verbal origin with the formant -nt is the preservation of the semantic meaning of that verb from which the adjectives is derived, acquiring a meaning of an invariable feature of a subject of action, and losing its reference to time entirely. Accentuated suffixes, in addition to their purely word-creating role (they, together with the verbal root are precisely

110) R. Smal-Stoc'kyj, op. cit. p. 71.

111) See Ju. Šerech, Narys, p. 235.

112) See Ja. Rudnyc'kyj. Ukrajins'kyj naholos jak funkcijna problema. Praha, 1944. Also: P. Kovaliv. Do problemy ukrajins'koho naholosu.. Ukr. Dijsništ', Praha, 1944, No. 16.

113) This is also noted by V. Vinogradov (Russkij jazyk, 1947, p. 242): "Ot etix udarjajemyx suffixosov -ušč, -jušč, -jašč, konečno, neobxodimo otličat' suffixy pričastij i razvixsjsja iz nix kačestvennyx prilagatelnyx."

114) R. Smal-Stoc'kyj, op. cit. pp. 71-72.

115) *ibid.* p. 69.

116) R. Smal-Stoc'kyj, op. cit. p. 22.

responsible for that invariable feature in the new basis), favor an even greater intensiveness of that feature. This intensiveness appears in greater or lesser degree, depending on the nature of the verb from which the adjectiv is created. But to us the matter of main concern and of principle is not a greater or lesser intensiveness of the feature, but the very fact of the creation of this structurally separate group of adjectives which came about according to an entirely different principle than the creation of participles, and of those adjectives which developed from participles. The latter are especially abundant in the Russian language, as indicated by fairly numerous examples cited above.

Adjectives of verbal origin exist in greater or lesser degree almost in all Slavic languages, and they are best known in the Ukrainian language.

1. This group of adjectives is quite numerous in the Ukrainian language, particularly with accentuated suffixes **-uč**, **-juč**, (**-ušč**, **-jušč**): **balakučyj** (Tam taka pryjazua ta balakuča žinka Kob. p. Hr. I, 66, 117), **bačuščyj** (Daj. Bože, ščob dytyna bula bačušča, vydjušča i pam'jatjušča Myl. 27. Hr. I, 76), **biučyj** (Tut vodecja biučaja — troxy pokupajsja Hr. I, 129), **blyskučyj** (Oči ponoči blyščat' blyskuči MV. Hr. I, 147) and **blyščačyj** (Sju nič u sni bačyv ja na nebi xrest zolotyj niby to blyščačyj Kam. p. Hr. I, 117), **boljučyj** (Jaku velyku i boljuču nošu u serci ranu K. Psal. 210. Hr. I, 127. — Boljušči zuby H. Barv. *ibid.*), **brjazkučyj** (Hr. I, 145), **valjuščyj** (Vin p'janyj, až valjuščyj Zmijiv. p. Hr. I, 167) and **valjaščyj** (H. Barv. 439 *ibid.*), **vbyruščyj** (H. Sab. 40) ¹¹⁷), **vezučyj** (Kobyła xoč i špakuvata, ta prote vezuča Niz. p. Hr. I, 172), **vydjučyj** and **vydjuščyj** (Koly meni slipomu kurka, to tobi vydjuščomu i dvi Nom. c. 984. Hr. I, 200), **havkučyj** (Ce v nas havkučyj sobaka. Ščenia havkuče K. Dz. 49. Hr. I, 305) and **havkuščyj** (Otary sterežut' brovky kudlati, havkušči, zljušči KMB. II, 119. *ibid.*), **hnučyj** (Mužyča pravda jest' koljuča, a pans'ka na vsi boky hnuča Kotl. En. VI, 53. Hr. I, 337. — I stanom hnučym, i krasoju preneporočna molodoju stariji oči veselju Ševč. 425. *ibid.*), **hovorjučyj** (Molodyj

117) Abbreviation: B. Hrinčenko. Slovar ukrajins'koji movy. Berlin, 1924. Photoprint ed. of 1909, Kiev ed.

118) Abbreviation: H. Sabaldyr. Praktyčnyj rosijs'ko-ukrajins'kyj slovnyk, 1926 roku.

hovorjučyj Radjuk Lev. Pov. 154. Hr. I, 338), **homonjučyj** (Homonjučyj čolovik Xark. p. Hr. I, 349), **horjučyj** (Jasen — horjuče derevo Miussk. okr. Hr. I, 359)¹¹⁹), **hrymučyj** (Oj ni, ne tatory, — xrystyjans'ka syła, mov xmaramy hrymučymy, tabor obložyla K. Dosv. 7. Hr. I, 370, Vik naš bombamy hrymučyj Man. Bajk. 16 = Ivan Manylo. Bajkar. 1953), **hudjučyj** (Hudjučyj ljutyj zimnyj viter Lev. I, 35. Hr. I, 378), **dymuščyj** (Dymušča pič)¹²⁰), **žyvljuščyj** (Tilky de ne de zostajet'sja pam'jat' žyvljušča MV. III, 41. Hr. I, 524), **žyvučyj** (-ščyj) (Nevhamovani, žyvuči dity Izrajilja i v vodi ne tonut', i v ohni ne horjat' Lev. I, 92. Hr. I, 524.—Use tin' mynušča, odna rič žyvušča; svit z Bohom Nom. No. 3930. Hr. I, 525)¹²¹), **zavyduščyj** and **zavydjuščyj** (Zavydušči oči Hr. I, 552), **zahrebuščyj** (Oči zavydjušči, ruky zahrebušči Prysl. Hr. I, 566), **zapaljuščyj** (H. Sab. 121), **kvitnjučyj**, **kvitučyj**, **kvitjučyj** and **kvituščyj** (vesna pryjšla teplaja, svižaja, kvitušča Hr. I, 769. — Kvitjuča luka Myr. XVR. 65. ibid. — Šumily vyšen'ky kvituči Man. Bajk. 9), **koljučyj** (Burjan koljučyj ta budjak . . . v jaru čornije Ševč. — Mužyča pravda jest' koljuča, a pans'ka na vsi boky hnuča Kotl. En. Hr. I, 809, — Ja zla, a ty koljučyj Man. Bajk. 73), **kotjučyj** (Kotjučyj viter nyzavsja pomiž derevom bezlystym MV. II, 113, Hr. I, 829-830), **krađučyj** (Rody, Bože, na trudjaščoho i na krađučoho Nom. No. 10134. Hr. I, 834) and **kradjaščyj** (Urody, Bože, na trudjaščoho, na ledaščoho, na prosjaščoho, na kradjaščoho i na vsjakuju dolju Hr. II 16), **kusjučyj** (Kusjuči muxy Čyhыр, p. Hr. I, 868), **lysnučyj** (R.-Ukr. Sl. AN, 229)¹²²), **ljakučyj** (Levč. 133. Hr. I, 928), **majučyj** (Kam. p. Hr. I, 950)¹²³), **meljučyj** (Meljučyj mlyn Vas. 72. Hr. I, 952), **nevmyruščyj** (Ja vičnyj obraz vaš, ja dux vaš nevmyruščyj K. XII. 75. — Naša syła nevmyrušča K. PS. 31. Hr. I, 1077), **nevterpučyj** (V nevterpučyx mukax stohnaly Stor. MPr. 129. Hr. I, 1077-78), **nemynučyj** (-ščyj) (Bidu pobačyv nemynuču Kotl. En. IV, 12. Hr. I, 1087.—Smert' nemynušča doroha Pr. ibid.),

119) Comp.: Dast' tebě Hd' srđca horjušče Vtz. XXVIII, 65 accord. XIV c. Srezn. I, 562. — Bě ubo zlatica horjušča Kozm. Ind. ibid.

120) F. Miklosich. Vergl. Stambb. der sl. Sprachen, 1875, p. 203.

121) Hrinčenko creates the two forms: žyvljuščyj and žyvučyj (-ščyj) as identical.

122) Abbr.: Rosijs'ko-Ukrajins'kyj slovnyc. Ac. Sc. 1948.

123) See K. Myxalčuk i A. Krymskij. Programma dlja sobiranija govorov malorusškogo narečija. Sb. ORJaS. AN. XXXVII, No. 4, 1910, p. 153.

nevsydjučyj (Hr. I, 1077), neposyduščyj and neposydjuščyj (Nihde miseja ne zahrije, takyj neposydjuščyj¹²⁴), nevsypuščyj (Xozjajkoju zrobylas' nevsypuščoju na vse selo Rudč. Sk. I, 179. Hr. I, 1077), nepam'jatuščyj (Hr. I, 1089), nepytuščyj (Poobidavšy, staly kružlatory horilku, a Ivaško, jak nepytuščyj, vyjšov z xaty Stor. 162. O. Kurylo. op. cit. 16), neprosypuščyj (I movyla vona, neprosypušča zljuka Man. Bajk. 8), oručyj (U mene pluh oručyj Vovč. p. Hr. II, 68), paljučyj (Paljuča horilka N.-Vol. p. — Uže na koni i xvist obhoriv, takyj to paljučyj toj zmiy Rudč. Sk. II, 118, Hr. II, 94 — Polky polky! V paljučim poli byti, idut' i padajut', nesamovyti Man. Bajk. 10), paxnučyj, paxnjučyj, paxnuščyj and paxnjuščyj (Paxnjučyj perec' N.-Vol. p. — Oj ty, divčyno, ty paxnjušče zillja Čub. V, 391. — Čebrec' — zillja paxnušče Polt. p. Hr. II, 10), pekučyj (Pekučyj viter N.-Vol. p. — Žurba pekuča MV. I, 13. Hr. II, 109), prahnučyj (-ščyj) Buv jem prahnuščyj, — ne napojelyste mene Hn. II, 81. — Ja na horilku ne prahnučyj Skvyr. p. Hr. II, 1909), revučyj (Ščob lany šyrokopoli i Dnipro, i kruči buly vydni, bulo čuty, jak reve revučyj Ševč. Hr. II, 520), rodjučyj (-ščyj) (Mak rodjučyj buv XS. I, 75. — Rodjuča zemlja. Rodjuče derevo Myl. 172. — Iz nevoli na rodjušču zemlu vyseljaje K. Psal. 150. Hr. II, 539), rostjučyj (Mius. okr. Hr. II, 591 — ja dobryj i rostučyj Man. Bajk. 73), smerdjučyj, smerdjačyj (Hryzemsja, mov sobaky, za maslom smerdjučym Ševč. Hr. II, 666), spivučyj (Holosok tyxyj, spivučyj O. 1862. IX. 69. Hr. II, 687), spljuščyj (Spljuščyj pes ne uhonyt' zajeja Nom. No. 7205. Hr. II, 690), tonučyj (Tonučyj i brytvy xopyt'sja Nom. No. 9784. Hr. II, 783), tjahučyj (Vovč. p. Hr. II, 812), tjamučyj (-ščyj) (Vin čolovik tjamučyj, ne zopsuje dila Polt. p. — Pavlo Pidduben' duže tjamuščyj čolovik K. DS. 31. Hr. II, 813), xapuščyj (U pohano zamykanyx bojkivs'kyx xatax niščo ne bulo pevne pered jiji xapuščymy palejamy I. Franko¹²⁵), ciljuščyj (R.-Ukr. Sl. AN. 764) and sciljuščyj (H. Sab. 141), ščypučyj (Hr. II, 1036).

Adjectives with suffixes -ač, -jač, (-ašč, -jašč) are relatively less widespread and, as can be noticed, less productive in the Uk-

124) F. Miklosich. *Vergl. Synt.* p. 819.

125) See Ju. Šerech. *Narys sučasnoji ukrajins'koji literaturnoji movy.* München, 1951, p. 235.

rainian language ¹²⁶). E. g.: **blahašcyj** (Ne zavvažyv i ne čuv slova jiji blahaščoho MV. II, 117. Hr. I, 112), and **blahušcyj** (Ibid., 114), **bludjašcyj** (Bludjašcyj syn Hr. I, 119), **bohobojašcyj** (Jaki ljudy staly nebohobojašči Lebed. p. Hr. I, 121), **boljašcyj** (Boljašča stohnala Myr. Pov. II, 99.—Kateryna z boljaščoji i očeť ne zvodyť Ševč. 115. Hr. I, 127), **hodjašcyj** (Koly hodjašcyj z joho kin' — jid' na njomu u sič Star. I, 122. — Ni soročečky, ni odežynky hodjaščoji MV. I, 52. Hr. I, 340), **huljašcyj** (Huljašča skotyna. Čolovik huljašcyj Čub. V, 672. Hr. I, 381), **zarobljašcyj** (Ja zarobljašcyj čolovik N.-Vol. p. Hr. I, 626), **kryčašcyj** (Kryčaščoju superečnistju Jefremov) ¹²⁷), **ljub'jačcyj** (Takyj vin buv ljub'jačcyj do mene MV. I, 2. Hr. I, 923), **nezdoljašcyj** (Jij materi žal kydaty, ščo taka vona duže nezdoljašča Čern. p. Hr. I, 1084), **nemovljačcyj** (Hr. I, 1087), **propašcyj** (Vona z toboju bude propašča Rudč. Sk. I, 62. Hr. II, 479), **prosjšačcyj** (Urody, Bože, na . . . prosjšaščoho Hr. II, 488), **sluxašcyj** (Usim holovam sluxaščym na mnohi lita) ¹²⁸), **terpljačcyj** (Boh velykoterpljačcyj Vas. p. Hr. I, 174), **trudjašcyj** (A trudjašče, a čepurne, a robotjašče Ševč. Hr. II, 799).

Some adjectives of doubtful derivation are rather to be considered of participial origin, as, e. g.: **ležačcyj** (Pid ležačcyj kamin' voda ne teče Nom. No. 7204), **nezrjačcyj** (Znovu škuru derete z brativ nezrjačcyx, hrečkosijiv Ševč. 211. Hr. I, 1085), **letjačcyj** (Letjaču ptyčju b'je Kaniv. p. Hr. I, 892-3). Hrinčenko gives alongside the latter, an example of the same meaning: **letjuču** (Z pystolju kuleju letjuču ptyčju b'je Stor. II, 222. Ibid.). This example, taken by Hrinčenko from Storoženko is incorrect, because the form "letjučcyj" (e.g. letjuča myš) is of verbal derivation and cannot be used in this meaning. Also obviously of participial derivation is the form: **kruhoidučcyj** (Nad hlybokym kruhoidučym jarom stojit' u rujinax kolys' pyšnyj zamok K. (O. 1861. II. 234) (Hr. I, 848-9).

It has been said above that adjectives of verbal origin belong structurally to the order of adjectives of general verbal derivation.

126) Comp.: O. Kurylo "Suffixes -uč, (-juč), -ušč (-jušč) dominate as against suffixes -ač, (-jač), -ašč (-jašč), regardless of the nature of the root (stem of the present tense in the verb from which the adjective of this category is derived" (Op. cit. p. 17).

127) See P. Buzuk. "Visnyk Odes'koji Komisiji Krajeznav.", 1925.

128) See O. Kurylo. Uvahy, p. 13.

This means that structurally they are not close to participles, but to adjectives created from verbs with different suffixes: **-lyvyj**, **-nyj**, **-kyj**, etc. All these suffixes introduce their peculiar shade into the meaning of adjectives. The most widespread of them in the Ukrainian language is the suffix **-lyvyj** denoting an internal characteristic, also of suitability or tendency: **zadumlyvyj**, **pokirlyvyj**, **buntivlyvyj**, **balaklyvyj**, **zradlyvyj**, **vertlyvyj**, **v'jidlyvyj**, **drimlyvyj**, **žurlyvyj**, **tužlyvyj**, etc. also (infrequently) the suffix **-yvyj** with the same meaning: **plaksyvyj**.¹²⁹⁾

Indicative of the structural proximity of these adjectives is the fact that suffixes sometimes compete with each other. Thus, with the suffixes **-učyj** (**-jučyj**) the following suffixes may compete:

-lyvyj: **balakučyj** and **balaklyvyj** (Pannočka taka vesela, balaklyva MV. O. 1862. III. 48.. Hr. I, 66), **brykučyj** and **bryklyvyj** (Hr. I, 141), **hovorjučyj** and **hovorlyvyj** (Hovorlyva, jak horobčyk Kb. Hr. I, 338¹³⁰⁾, **homonjučyj** and **homonlyvyj** (Hr. I, 349), **drimučyj** and **drimlyvyj** (Vitrec' drimlyvyj jakyjs' paše MV. II. 78. Hr. I, 487), **drjapučyj** and **drjaplyvyj** (Hr. I, 493), **zavydjučyj** and **zavydlyvyj** (Divčata zavydlyvi O. 1861. X. 57. Hr. I, 552)¹³¹⁾, **pam'jatuščyj** and **pam'jatlyvyj** (Nyvrja pam'jatlyva, ne zabula ničoho Myr. Pov. I, 132. Hr. II, 95) and a few more: **blyskučyj** — **blyskotlyvyj**, **kusjučyj** — **kuslyvyj**, **plodjučyj** — **plidlyvyj** (also: **plidnyj**), **robotjaščyj**, **robuščyj** — **robitlyvyj** (also: **robitnyj**), **skrypučyj** = **skryplyvyj**, **spivučyj** — **spivlyvyj**, **beručyj** — **berlyvyj**, etc.¹³²⁾

-nyj: **zupaljuščyj** and **zupalnyj** (H. Sab. 121), **ljakučyj** and **ljačnyj** (Žel'ex. Hr. I, 930), **pam'jatuščyj** and **pam'jatnyj** (Hr. II, 95) and others.

-kyj: **hovorjučyj** and **hovirkyj** (Stari ljudy hovirki H. Barv. 316. Hr. I, 338), **homonjučyj** and **hominkyj** (Toržyšča hominki K. Dz. 6. I, 349), **p'janjučyj** and **p'jankyj** (R.-Ukr. Sl. AN. 355) and others.

129) O. Synjavs'kyj. Normy ukrajins'koji literaturnoji movy, Lviv, 1941, p. 13.

130) Comp. in Georg. Amart. XI c.: o reči ne hovorlyvč. I. Sreznevskij. Materijaly dla slovarja dr.-russkogo jazyka, I, 520.

131) Comp. in Hryhor. Nazijanz. XI c. and Zb. 1073: zavid'liva i rop'tiva ouma sušte. Sreznevskij. I.

132) See O. Kurylo, Uvahy, p. 18.

These adjectives of verbal derivation tempted some scholars to assemble them under the term "participium". This was done by A. Noreen ¹³³), and R. Smal-Stoc'kyj followed him in the above cited work. Moreover, under the term "participium", Noreen assembles also participles with these adjectives. He only distinguishes two orders among them: the temporal and the modal. Among the temporal he specifically includes participles of the active present tense, and among the modal adjectives of verbal derivation. R. Smal-Stoc'kyj calls them "modal participia" and divides them into four groups:

1) Participium possibilitatis: **ponjatnyj, platnyj** (Germ. dankbar, fassbar).

2) Participium habilitatis: **tancjurystyj, zapalystyj** (Germ. haltbar, redegewand).

3) Participium necessitatis: **verwerflich, tadelnswert, wünschenswert**.

4) Participium tendentiae: **xytkyj, hovirkyj** (Germ. gefügig, gesprächig).

The Ukrainian language has only three groups out of those four: possibilitatis, habilitatis and tendentiae. ¹³⁴).

But all these assumptions of Noreen are built on erroneous methological foundations, as forms of entirely different structure cannot be mechanically joined under a common term "participium", a term whose direct object is to signify forms which have exclusively a temporal meaning.

2. In the Russian language this group of adjectives is also known mainly with accentuated suffixes **-uč, -juč (-ušč, -jušč)**: **begučij** (Begučij kon' H. Sab. 13), **dremučij** (Čto, dremučij les, prizadumalsja? A. Kole. Uš. I, 800) ¹³⁵), **žgučij** (Žgučije luči solnca Uš. I, 849), **zaviduščij** (Popovskije ruki zagrebuščije, glaza zaviduščije Posl. Uš. I, 901), **zagrebuščij** (Uš. I, 918) ¹³⁶), **imuščij** (Imuščije klassy naselenija Uš. I, 1198; H. Sab. 138) and **neimuščij**

133) A. Noreen. Einführung in die wissenschaftliche Betrachtung der Sprache, p. 409.

134) R. Smal-Stoc'kyj, op. cit. pp. 81-82.

135) Abbrev.: Tolkovyj slovar' russkogo jazyka pod. red. D. Ušakova.

136) Adjectives "zaviduščij", "zagrebuščij" are classified by Ušakov as "prostoreč". Comp. Ukrainian: zavyduščyj (-juščyj), zahrebuščyj.

(Neimuščeje naselenije Uš. II, 510¹³⁷), **koljučij** (Koljučij kust šipovnika. Figuratively: Koljučije glaza. Koljučij jazyk. Uš. I, 1415), **letučij** (Luna osvješčajet snjeg letučij Uš. II, 52), **linjučij** (Linjučaja kraska Uš. II, 66), **lipučij** (Vot lipučij, privjazalsja, kak pes k moloku Ognev. Uš. II, 67), **mogučij** (Mogučij dub Uš. II, 240), **padučij** (Padučaja zvjezda Uš. III, 16), **paxučij** (Paxučaja trava. Jest' u nas myla paxučije. Nekrasov. Uš. III, 73)¹³⁸), **plakučij** (Plakučaja bereza R.-Ukr. Sl. AN. 420), **plovučij** (Plovučij most. Plovučij material Uš. III, 301) and **plyvučij** (Plyvučaja glina Uš. III, 311; H. Sab. 274), **ploduščij** (Volki počti so vsemi porodami sobak dajut ploduščije pomjesi Uš. III, 303), **polzučij** (Polzučije rastenija Uš. III, 518), **tekučij** (Tekučije tjela. Figuratively: Tekučaja rabočaja sila Uš. IV, 668), **tolkučij** (Only in the spoken expression: "Tolkučij rynok" Uš. IV, 729), **treskučij** (Treskučie drova Uš. IV, 789. — Treskučij moroz. R.-Ukr. Sl. AN. 708), **tjagučij** (Patoka tjaguča. Figuratively: Medljenno tekli slova tjagučije Nekrasov. Uš. IV, 847). We are not quoting here numerous derivations from adjective stems with an augmented-superlative meaning, as e. g.: **zljuščij**, **žadnjuščij**, **tolstjuščij**, **xudjuščij**, and others¹³⁹). We have discussed this category of adjectives above.

Forms with the suffix **-jašč** (also with an emphasized meaning): **guljaščij**, **zavaljaščij**, **rabotjaščij**, and some others are not productive in the Russian language.¹⁴⁰)

In the Russian language all these adjectives belong to the same structural order as some other adjectives of verbal creation, as e. g.: some adjectives with the suffix **-livyj** (like in the Ukrainian language): **bojazlivyj** (H. Sab. 26), **vorčlivyj** (H. Sab. 49), **govorlivyj** (H. Sab. 77) and others. Also some adjectives with the suffix **-itelnyj**: **celitelnyj**¹⁴¹), (H. Sab. 141). But these are only separate adjectives. The basic mass of adjectives, however, in particular those with suffixes **-itelnyj**, **-atelnyj**, belong to the same structural order as adjectives of participial origin ("okačestvlennyje pričastija" according to the term of V. Vinogradov, op. cit. 214). E. g.: **spasi-**

137) The adjective "imuščyj" is classified by Ušakov as "knižn."

138) Comp. Ukr.: paxučyj and paxuščyj Hr. II, 107.

139) See V. Vinogradov. Russkij jazyk, 1947, p. 241.

140) *ibid.* p. 242.

141) Comp. Ukrainian: ciljuščyj, sciljuščyj.

telnij (spasajuščij), vozmutitelnyj (vozmuščajuščij), podgotovitelnij (podgotovljajuščij) and others.

3. In the Belorussian language there is also a preponderance of adjectives with accentuated suffixes -uč, -juč: **boljučij** (Xvaeiv za boljučij palec 30)¹⁴², **viduščij** and **vidučij** (Zdorovyj i vidučij, a po xod'be xodzie'. Časom i vidučij ne vidzie' 57), **nevidučij** and **neviduščij** (S nevidučoho nema pomoči. Podarice miloscinki mne neviduščemu 328), **živučij** (Berezka) (nastojka na berezovyje pušinki) živuča, zali proreh, zaraz zaživec' 155), **žihučij** (Krapiva žihuča, ibid.), **zabijučij** (Zabijučaja horelka. Zabijuščij med 159), **linučij** (Linučij koler 268), **nejdučij** (Nejdučaja voda hniec' 332), **neminuščij** (Neminuščaja hrozic' beda 333), **neumiruščij** (Neumiruščij starik 338), **xodzjučij** (Xodzjučij pomer 681). Some examples have been graciously given us by the Belorussian scholar Prof. Ja. Stankevič (quoted according to his orthography): **bliskučy** (Bliskučy gudzik), **lovučy** (Lovučy kot), **njasuščy** (Njasuščaja kuryca), **žebruščy** (Žebruščy dzed)¹⁴³. From the XVI manuscript "Alkitab" analyzed by Prof. Ja. Stankevič: **paxuščy** (Paxuščymi paxami njxacju).

Forms with suffixes -ač, -jač occur less frequently: **zavaljaščij** (Zavaljaščuju dav kosu 161), **pohuljaščij** (Vozmi hetu kosu ena u mene pohuljaščaja 438), **posluxačij** (Xlopec vo vsem posluxačij 480).

4. Some traces of these creations are also found in the Polish language: **cierpiący** (Ulicą szed jakiś cierpiący), **grzmiący** (Głos miał niski, grzmiący)¹⁴⁴, **bolący** (Stronie bol cej wolno tego dogładać, jako i gdzie więzien siedzi).¹⁴⁵

5. Traces of these creations are also preserved in the Czech language: **kvetoucí strom**, **trpící žena**¹⁴⁶

142) Examples are from N. Nosovič. Slovar belorusskogo narečija St. Petersburg. 1870.

143) Prof. Ja. Stankevič explains that forms "bliskučy, lovuščy" cannot be derived from participles because "the plural is "lovjac', bliščac', and not lovc', bliskuc'." On the other hand although the 3rd pers. plural of "nesušča" is nesuc', yet, says Ja. Stankevič "it is impossible that there could be Church Slav. influence in the language of a common peasant."

144) T. Lehr-Spławiński. Nowy słownik języka polskiego. I, 415, 1106.

145) J. Karłowicz, I, 102.

146) Dr. F. Travníček, Historická mluvnice česko-slovenska. Řada spisů duchovědných. Svazek 2. 1935. V Praze, 342-43.

See J. Mazon. Grammaire de la langue tchèque. Paris, 1952, p. 165.

6. Also in the Bulgarian language: *letjašč'* (*Letjašča zvezda. Vidjat' mnoho letjašcy zvezdy L.D. 1869. 39*). Djuvernua translates it with the corresponding Russian adjective form: "padučaja zvezda." 147)

7. These creations are also known to the Serb language: *vruć*, *mógúć*, *t'ekúća vóda*, 148) *plovuć*, *jmuć*, and others. 149)

8. In the Slovene language: *tekoča voda*, *skeleča rana*, and others. 150)

In resuming of what was said, we can state in general outline the following:

1. Participles of the active present tense as a separate verbal category are not peculiar to living Slavic languages. They have survived, in some to a greater, in some to a lesser degree, as, to a certain extent artificial creations which developed mainly under the influence of the old book language of South Slavic literature. Of all Slavic languages, the Russian literary language, which, during the process of its formation was under a strong influence of the Old Church book Slavic language, has probably preserved most participles of the active present tense.

2. In its development this group of participles underwent considerable categorical changes. The main cause of this was their syntactical function. a) Thus, in the apositive function participles in their short form became transformed into a new grammatical category: gerundives. Every Slavic gerundive comprises a form of a short participle which, having lost the designation of gender and number, acquired the meaning of an adverbial word. b) On the other hand, in their pronominal (short) predicative function, participles of the Slavic languages formerly had more of a predicative force with more independence (*I jest' cerki ta stojašči vъ Korsuně hradě*" Lavr. 1.). Having, in this function, a tendency towards the verb ("*Az jes'm tvorjaj čudesa*") they later trans-

147) A. Duvernois. *Slovar bolgarskogo jazyka po pamjatnikam narodnoj slovesnosti i proizvedenijam novejšej pečati*. Moscow, 1886. IV-VI, p. 1116.

148) A. Leskien. *Grammatik der serbo-kroatischen Sprache*. Heidelberg, 1914, p. 554.

149) F. Miklosich. *Vergl. Stammbild* 1875. p. 203.

150) F. Miklosich. *Spntax*. p. 821.

formed into verbs ("Ja tvorju čudesa"). c) In the attributive function, having formally acceded to pronominal adjectives, participles of the active present tense lose their verbality and accede categorically to adjectives (*virujučyj narod, xorujuča ljudyna*). In this function, participles of the active present tense have hardly survived in any Slavic folk languages. Only in literary languages (in some more, in others less), they have survived following old book traditions.

Even the Russian vernacular has not preserved participles of the active present tense in the attributive function, but the Russian literary language developed these forms to a large extent under the influence of the Church Slavic. It can be stated in general that in the Russian language participles of the active present tense have preserved a double categorical meaning, depending on the sentence structure: of participles (*ja vižu plačuščego rebenka*), and of adjectives (*on imjejet plačuščij vid*).

Participles of the active present tense have not survived in the Ukrainian language. In the literary language there is some tendency to use them in the attributive function, but in all such cases they assimilate with adjectives (*virujuča ljudyna*). Neither have they survived in other Slavic languages: Belorussian, Polish, Czech, Bulgarian, Serb, Slovene. They are occasionally used in the Polish language, but mainly in the literary language.

3. Adjectives of verbal derivation with participial formants: *-učyj, -jučyj, -áčyj, -jačyj* (*-uščyj, -juščyj, -aščyj, -jaščyj* (*paxučyj, koljučyj, tjamuščyj, huljaščyj*)) are in an entirely different category. This group of adjectives stems not from participles as has been erroneously explained heretofore; structurally these adjectives cannot be classed in the same order with participles (*plačuščyj rebenok*), nor with adjectives which developed from participles directly (*sluxajuča hromada*). These adjectives are not structurally close to participles, but to other adjectives of verbal derivation, as those, e. g. with suffixes *-lyvyj* in the Ukrainian language (*balakučyj — balaklyvyj*), and with the same kind of suffixes *-livyj* in the Russian language (*bojazlivyj, vorčlivyj*).

This structurally separate group is a very old creation; it is present in almost all Slavic languages: Ukrainian *boljučyj*, Russian *vonjučij*, Belorussian *lovuščy*, Polish *cierpiący*, Czech *kvetoucí*,

Bulgarian *letjašča zvezda*, Serb *tékuća vóda*, Slovene *skeleča rana*. At that, the most productive are creations with suffixes *-uč*, *-juč*, (*-ušč*, *-jušč*); less productive are those with suffixes *-ač*, *-jač*, (*-ašč*, *-jašč*).

From this, a proper scientifically substantiated terminology can be determined: participle (*čitajuščyj učeník*), adjective of participial derivation (*virujučyj narod*) and adjective of verbal derivation (*havkučyj sobaka*, *spivuča divčyna*).

ONOMASTICA

A topo- and anthroponymic series edited twice a year.

Editor: J. B. Rudnyékyj
University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Canada

To date the following issues have been published:

ONOMASTICA I: *The term and Name "Ukraine"* by J. B. Rudnyékyj, 132 p. Winnipeg, 1951. Price \$1.50.

ONOMASTICA II: *Canadian Place Names of Ukrainian Origin* by J. B. Rudnyékyj, 88 p. Winnipeg, 1952. Price \$1.00.

ONOMASTICA III: *The names "Galicia" and "Volynia"* by J. B. Rudnyékyj, 32 p. Winnipeg, 1952. Price \$0.50.

ONOMASTICA IV: *The Name "Ukraine" in South-Carpathia* by B. Barvinśkyj, 16 p. Winnipeg, 1952. Price \$0.50.

ONOMASTICA V: *L'origine du nom des Ruthenes* par B. O. Unbegaun, 13 p. Winnipeg, 1953. Prix \$0.50.

ONOMASTICA VI: *Contribution to the Methods in Onomastics* by G. M. Lucyk, 32 p. Winnipeg, 1953. Price \$0.50.

ONOMASTICA VII: *Canadian Toponymy and the Cultural Stratification of Canada* by W. Kirkeconnell, 16 p. Winnipeg, 1954. Price \$0.50.

ONOMASTICA VIII: *Guagninus' Toponymy of 1611* by O. Kupraneć, 32 p. Winnipeg, 1954. Price \$0.50.

ONOMASTICA IX: *Ukrainian Topo- and Anthroponymy in the Inter. Bot. Terminology* by M. Borovśkyj, Winnipeg, 1955. Price. \$1.00.

- ONOMASTICA X: *The Term and Name "Canada"* by I. Velyhor'skyj, Winnipeg, 1955. Price \$0.50.
- ONOMASTICA XI: *Canadian Slavic Namelore* by J. B. Rudny'ekyj, Winnipeg, 1956. Price \$0.50.
- ONOMASTICA XII: *Indian, Pseudo-Indian Place Names in the Canadian West* by Cyril Meredith Jones. Winnipeg, 1956. 24 p. Price \$0.50.
- ONOMASTICA XIII: *Sur quelques noms de lieu d'origine ukrainienne en Roumanie* par Petar Skok, Winnipeg, 1957. 16. p. Prix \$0.55.
- ONOMASTICA XIV: *Contribution to Onomastics* by Ivan Franko. Winnipeg, 1957. Price \$1.00.

Obtainable at:

UVAN

P.O. Box 3579, Station B.,
Winnipeg, Man., Canada

NAMES

JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN NAME SOCIETY

A quarterly devoted to the study of the etymology, origin, meaning, and application of all categories of names — geographical, personal, scientific, commercial, popular.

Subscription \$5.00 a year. Residents and libraries of the United States and Canada may become members of A N S. Annual dues \$5.00 which includes subscription to *Names* and the privilege of buying at cost other publications of the Society.

Address:

NAMES,
2413 Dwinelle Hall,
University of California
Berkeley, Calif., U.S.A.

Announcing

THE SLAVIC AND EAST EUROPEAN JOURNAL

The renamed, reorganized, and expanded quarterly publication of the American Association of Teachers of Slavic and East European Languages, now published through the facilities of Indiana University.

Scholarly and pedagogical articles in language, literature, folklore, and intellectual background; reviews, news, notes.

Subscription-membership: \$5.00 per year; \$2.00 to undergraduate and graduate students.

Subscriber-members receive, through an arrangement with the Slavic and East European Series of Indiana University, the following bonus volumes during 1957:

Indiana Slavic Studies, Volume I

and

*The 1956 American Bibliography of Slavic and East
European Studies in Linguistics, Literature,
Folklore, and Pedagogy.*

Articles, news, notes, and books for review should be sent to the Editor,

*J. T. Shaw,
Indiana University,
Bloomington, Indiana.*

For subscriptions, advertising rates, and back numbers, write to Executive Secretary-Treasurer of the AATSEEL,

*Edmund Ordon,
Wayne State University,
Detroit, Michigan.*

SLAVISTICA

Initiated in 1948.

Appears three times a year.

Editor: J. B. Rudnyčkyj,
University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Canada

- No. I — **The tasks of Slavic Philology and Ukrainian Slavistics** (in Ukrainian language), Augsburg, 1948.
- No. II — V. Chaplenko: **Ukrainianisms in the language of M. Hohol (N. Gogol)** (in Ukrainian language, with a French resumé), Augsburg, 1948.
- No. III — Ivan Sydoruk: **The problem of the Ukrainian White-Ruthenian Lingual Boundary** (in Ukrainian language, with English and German resúmes, 2 maps), Augsburg, 1948.
- No. IV — J. B. Rudnyčkyj: **Slavic and Baltic Universities in Exile**, (in English language), Winnipeg, 1949.
- No. V — J. Byrych: **A Page from Czech-Ukrainian Relations** (in Ukrainian language), Winnipeg, 1949.
- No. VI — R. Smal-Stocky: **The Origin of the Word "Rus"** (in English language), Winnipeg, 1949.
- No. VII — V. Chaplenko: **The Language of "Slovo o Polku Ihorevi"** (in Ukrainian language with an English resumé), Winnipeg, 1950.
- No. VIII — I. Mirtschuk: **Das Daemonische bei den Russen und den Ukrainern** (in German language), Augsburg, 1950.
- No. IX — J. B. Rudnyčkyj: **Slavistica Canadiana A.D. — MCML** (in English and Ukrainian), Winnipeg, 1950.
- No. X — Geo. W. Simpson: **The Names Rus', Russia, Ukraine and their Historical Background** (in Engl.), Winnipeg, 1951.
- No. XI — Metr. I. Ohienko: **An Early 17th cent. Ukrainian Russian Dictionary**. (In Ukr. and Russ. l.), Winnipeg, 1951.
- No. XII — V. J. Kaye: **Slavic Groups in Canada** (in Engl.), Winnipeg, 1951.

- No. XIII — P. Fylypovych: **Hohol's (Gogol's) Ukrainian Background**, (In Ukr.), Winnipeg, 1952.
- No. XIV — W. Kirkconnell: **Common English Loanwords in E. European Languages**. (In Engl. l.), Winnipeg, 1952.
- No. XV — J. B. Rudnye'kyj: **Slavica Canadiana A. D. 1951**. (In Engl. language), Winnipeg, 1952.
- No. XVI — J. Sherekh: **Participium Universale im Slavischen**, 1953. (in German language), Winnipeg, 1953.
- No. XVII — Lucyk, G. M.: **Old Church Slavic as a Religious Cult Language** (in Ukrainian with an Engl. resumé), Winnipeg, Man., 1953.
- No. XVIII — J. B. Rudnye'kyj: **Slavica Canadiana A. D. 1952** (Multilingual), Winnipeg, Man., 1953.
- No. XIX — I. Sydoruk: **Ideology of Cyrillo-Methodians**. (In Engl. language), Winnipeg-Chicago, 1954.
- No. XX — P. Kovaliv: **Ukrainian and the Slavic Languages** (In Ukr. language), Winnipeg, 1954.
- No. XXI — J. B. Rudnye'kyj: **Slavica Canadiana A.D. 1953** (Multilingual), Winnipeg, 1954.
- No. XXII — J. B. Rudnye'kyj: **Slavische und indogermanische Akzentdoubletten** (in German with English, French, Russian and Ukrainian summaries), Winnipeg, 1955.
- No. XXIII — W. J. Rose: **Cradle Days of Slavic Studies — Some Reflections** (in English), Winnipeg 1955.
- No. XXIV — J. B. Rudnye'kyj: **Slavica Canadiana A.D. 1954** (Multilingual), Winnipeg, 1955.
- No. XXV — V. Swoboda: **The "Slavonice" Part of the Oxford Heptaglot Lexicon**. A Ukrainian-Latin Vocabulary of the 1st Half of the 17th Century (in Ukrainian, English, and Latin). Winnipeg, 1956.
- No. XXVI — M. J. Mandryka: **A Phase of Bulgarian-Ukrainian Literary Relations**. Shevchenko's Influence on Bulgarian Poetry (in Ukrainian and Bulgarian), Winnipeg, 1956.

- No. XXVII — J. B. Rudnye'kyj: **Slavica Canadiana A.D. 1955**
(Multilingual), Winnipeg, 1956.
- No. XXVIII — A. Kluchko-Franko: **1. Franko's Manuscripts
in Canada.** (In Ukrainian). Winnipeg 1957.
- No. XXIX — P. Kovaliv: **Participial Adjectives in the Slavic
Languages.** (In English). Winnipeg 1957.
- No. XXX — J. B. Rudnye'kyj: **Slavica Canadiana A. D. 1956.**
(Multilingual). Winnipeg 1957.

Price: \$0.50 per copy (No. XXV — \$1.00)

Obtainable at:

UVAN P.O. 3597, Station B., Winnipeg, Man., Canada.