Marc L. Greenberg, Stephen M. Dickey
Univerza v Kanzasu

SLAVIC *JAZDITI* 'TO RIDE' AND ITS IMPLICATIONS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT THE CATEGORY OF (IN)DETERMINACY

Prispevek ponuja nov pogled na etimologijo slovanskega glagola *jȃzditi* 'jezditi' in obravnava implikacije za nastanek kategorije določnosti/nedoločnosti pri glagolih premikanja v slovanščini, ki izhajajo iz te nestandardne razlage. Avtorja trdita, da je glagolska osnova nastala kot glagol, ki pomeni niz dejavnosti (ang. *serial verb*), vsebujoč podedovana indoevropska korena za pomena 'potovati' in 'sedeti'. Táka tvorba navaja k misli, da je kategorija, ki se tradicionalno imenuje nedoločna, v resnici kategorija *načina premikanja*.

This paper presents a fresh look at the etymology of the Slavic verb *jȃzditi* 'ride' and discusses implications for the rise of the category of determinacy-indeterminacy in the verbs of motion in Slavic which follow from non-mainstream view of the etymology of this verb. The authors claim that the verb stem was formed as a serial verb containing both the inherited Indo-European elements 'travel' and 'sit'. The formation suggests that the category of verbs traditionally labeled »indeterminate« are in fact *manner of motion* verbs.

Ključne besede: indoevropščina, baltoslovanščina, praslovanščina, zahodna južnoslovanščina, etimologija, glagoli premikanja, glagolski vid, kategorija glagolske določnosti, vezljivost
Key words: Indo-European, Balto-Slavic, Proto-Slavic, Western South Slavic, etymology, verbs of motion, verbal aspect, determinacy, verbal government

The Slavic verb *jȃzditi* presents difficulties for reconstruction because only its first part (*ja-* < PIE *yeh_2-) straightforwardly relates to its Indo-European congeners, e.g., Li *jóti* 'to ride', 'travel' (Vilnius), La *jât* 'to ride, travel', Vd *yā́ti* 'travel', attested also in West Slavic: Cz *jet*, US *jěć*, OPo *jać*.[1] The simplex form is found as a relic (a collective form made from the past passive participle) of this verb in Sn *játa,* which preserves its original meaning pertaining to traveling, as of a pack of animals, flock of birds, or school of fish, e.g., the *Slovar slovenskega knjižnega jezika* defines *játa* under the first meaning as »večja skupina letečih ali plavajočih živali iste vrste: *ribje jate; jata škorcev, vran / zbiranje rib v jate ob drstitvi; leteti, potovati v jatah* // nav. ekspr. večja skupina letečih ali plavajočih predmetov sploh: *jata ladij, letal, strelic*.« The second element is formally and semantically ambiguous and has accordingly been interpreted in various ways, giving rise to widely differing opinions on its formation. Though previous explanations have their merits, none goes as far towards explaining not just the formal and semantic properties of the verb itself,

---

[1] This paper launches a wider investigation of the origin of the class of »(in)determinate« verbs in Slavic. The project originated with considerations of the etymology of *jazditi* (MLG) and grew into the larger endeavor in the course of discussions between SMD and MLG. Though the division of labor has roughly been between the theory of verbal aspect (SMD) and historical reconstruction (MLG), the ideas in the paper–and project in general–have grown organically into a coherent whole through mutual influence and critique between the principal investigators.

but also towards making sense of the rise of the special class of »(in)determinate« verbs in Slavic.

Before the disintegration of Proto-Slavic, Slavic *jǻzditi* meant 'ride (on horse-back)', i.e., 'go, sitting', cf., Po *jeździć*, Ru *ezdit'* 'ride', Ma *jazdi* 'rides'; BCS *jèzditi* 'ride on horseback', Sn *jézditi*. We shall now briefly consider earlier views on the etymology of PS *jǻzditi*.

Brugmann reconstructs Slavic *jazditi*, which he calls an »Iterativum zu […] *jachati* fungierende […] Verbum« as a compound from PIE *$\bar{e}$-sd-, i.e., *$\bar{e}$- 'prox-imity, direction towards' + 'sit', where the second element relates to the zero grade of *sed- as attested in the *l*-participle of Slavic *iti*: *šьd-* (1903–1904: 102–104). He interprets the first element as cognate to the productive Vedic verbal prefix *$\acute{\bar{a}}$- 'near, towards', which is generally combined with verbs of motion (Monier Williams [1899] 1981: s.v.), a prefix which survives only as a relic in other Indo-European languages: Gr *ēréma* 'softly, gently, slowly', OHG *āmād* 'Nachmahd, second mow-ing of grass; swathe'. He concludes that the formation is a deverbative noun *jazdъ* meaning 'Hingang' or 'das Sichaufmachen auf den Weg', whereby »doch ist die durch das Präfix anfänglich gegeben gewesene Begriffsfärbung frühe verloren ge-gangen.« While it is of course possible that Slavic, too, attests a relic of this prefix, its meaning hardly seems to fit with the meaning of the verb as a whole. Though the interpretation of the first element as this »prefix« strikes us as too far-fetched to be seriously entertained, positing the zero grade of *sed- as the second element–a solution rejected by later scholars–seems to us to be on the right track, a point to which we shall return below.

Vaillant considers *jazditi* denominative from *jazda*, which was in turn derived as a postverbal from *jaxati* with the suffix *-da* in a parallel fashion to *uzda*, *brъzda* ← *ob-rъtiti* (Vaillant 1966: 77). Sławski follows this line of reasoning as well, pointing out a number of Slavic noun formations extended with the suffix *-d-/*-dh-, which he calls 'expressive' (1974: 216). Trubačev also connects the form with the present tense stem *jad-*, where the final *-d* element is carried over from the simplex verb (in turn a parallel formation to *iti*: *id-) followed by an »expressive« suffix *-d-*, followed by dissimilation (cf. *gromada – *gromazditi) (Trubačev 1981: s.v.). It is not clear how one motivates *d > zd* (Sławski), nor how »expressivity« explains the formation of a noun like *jazdъ* or a verb like *jǻzditi*. These explanations can be abandoned as defective.

Snoj circumvents the shortcomings of earlier work by accounting for *-zd-* as a development from the imperative: *jazdi < *yeh_2d-d^hey (Snoj 2003: s.v.). This explanation is preferable to earlier ones in that the formal development is plausible and it felicitously accounts for a verb formation without recourse to deverbation. Moreover, it motivates the *-d-* element in the stem in a parallel fashion to that found in *id-* 'go' and *jad-* 'ride', which are Slavic innovations, cf. Li *eina* 'goes', *joja* 'rides on horseback' (Kortlandt 1979: 52). Thus *jǻzditi* would then be a »(causative)/ iterative« derived from the motion verb *jad-*. Though this explanation solves formal problems, it is hard to see why this formation would have been extended to *jǻzditi* and to no other verbs in the innovative *i*-class (Leskien's fourth class).

Nevertheless, Snoj points us towards our preferred solution to the etymology of *jǎzditi, one which has also been noticed at least by Schuyt (1990: 325) and Černyx (1994: s.v.), namely, that the verb is formed from the full grade *yeh$_2$- 'travel' + zero grade of *sed- 'sit'. This reconstruction makes sense formally, as it corresponds to a number of such compounds in (R[e]) + (R[Ø]) -sd-, e.g., PS *gròzdь (Ru grózd', Sn gròzd) < PIE *g^{h}rəs- 'vine' + *-sd- = 'vine-sitting' = 'grape', the first part originally meaning 'growing', cf. En grass (Snoj 1992: 198; 2003: s.v.); PS *borzdǎ (Ru borozdá, Sn brázda) < PIE *b^{h}orH 'work with a sharp object' + *-sd- = '(result of) sharp object sitting (in the earth)' = 'furrow', cf. En to bore 'to drill a hole' (Rix 2001: 80, Snoj 2003: s.v.); *pizdǎ (Ru pizdá, Sn pízda) < PIE *peys 'jab, push, stamp' + *-sd- = 'vulva' (Rix 2001: 466; Snoj 1992: 198, 2003: s.v.). Though it is conceivable that the path of derivation was first to the noun and later to the verb, viz. *jǎzdъ/jazdǎ 'ride' as *borzdǎ → *borzdǐti (following traditional assumptions about the formation of innovative i-class verbs), we consider it equally if not more plausible that in more recent formations not involving PIE o-grade nominal roots (e.g., xodǐti < xòdъ), especially those in which the putative noun lacked clearly concrete meanings which would give it a healthy independent existence, the path of derivation proceeded in the opposite direction.

The proposed etymology might shed light on the nature of the early indeterminate–determinate (indet–det) opposition. In this respect, it should be pointed out that the Slavic languages developed the putative indet–det opposition in different ways, which suggests that its original nature was not as clear as is commonly assumed. We suggest that »indeterminate« verbs were originally *manner of motion verbs*. This comports with the proposed etymology, which is most directly interpreted as reflecting the derivation of a manner of motion verb. In fact, the morphological sequence *yeh$_2$- + *-sd- 'go + sit' parallels the semantic structure in Talmy's (2000: 27–35) motion-event conflation for manner of motion verbs: a motion event ('go') combines with a manner co-event ('sit'). In addition, Old Church Slavic and Old Russian attestations of putative »indeterminate« verbs by no means exclude contexts of determinacy, as in the following example:

(1) Vъzide ty **ězdę** na svojei krъvi, jako na kolesnici.   [OCS]
    'You ascended <u>riding</u> <u>on</u> <u>your</u> <u>blood,</u> <u>as</u> <u>on</u> <u>a</u> <u>chariot</u>.'

(2) Na kolesnici ouzъrělъ jesi **ězdęščago**.   [ORu]
    'You have seen a <u>man</u> <u>riding</u> <u>in</u> <u>a</u> <u>chariot</u>.'

Such examples, which are easy to come by (and apparently easy to ignore), are quite problematic if one assumes that these verbs were specifically indeterminate/habitual; the problem disappears if they are taken to be manner of motion verbs. Note that in (1) the actual trajectory of the motion is expressed by vъzide 'ascended', whereas ēzdę 'riding' merely expresses the manner of the traversal of the trajectory, again paralleling Talmy's semantic structure.

Assuming that the motivation for the derivation of jǎzditi was to create a manner of motion verb, we suggest that the indet–det opposition as a grammatical opposition in Slavic was not originally »aspectual«; rather, in the original opposition the »indeter-

minate« motion verbs (e.g., OCS *xoditi* 'to walk') foregrounded the manner co-event in the conflation and backgrounded the motion event itself, whereas the »determinate« motion verbs (e.g., OCS *iti* 'to go') foregrounded the motion event and backgrounded the manner co-event.[2] A piece of circumstantial evidence for the hypothesis of *jǎzditi* and its peers as manner verbs is the fact that special manner of motion verbs are very common in languages of the world (and often have peculiar properties in the expression of linear motion events, cf., e.g., Horrocks 2004), whereas derivational oppositions in determinacy appear to be quite rare.[3]

Further, we suggest that the pairings in the indet–det opposition arose in different ways and at different times. Though this could also be true if these verbs originally expressed an aspectual distinction, it comports particularly well with the idea of an assortment manner verbs being derived and gradually organized into a grammatical aspectual opposition with their determinate correlates. One can only speculate on the original difference in meaning between **jǎzditi* and **jǎxati*; and though this issue is complicated by the persistence of **jǎti*,[4] we consider it likely that at some point the difference between these two verbs involved a distinction in diathesis. In BCS, which is characterized by a relatively conservative verbal system, the main difference between *jahati* and *jezditi* is that the former tends to be transitive, i.e., *jahati konja* 'ride a horse', whereas the latter is strictly intransitive, i.e., *jezditi *konja*/*na konju* 'ride (on) a horse'. (The morphosyntactic relationships are found also in Slovene.) In this respect, recalling the precise etymology suggested here, it should be pointed out that the government of *jezditi* is identical to that of *sjediti* 'sit' (*sjediti *konja/na konju* 'sit on a horse'). This fact makes quite a lot of sense if Slavic *jezditi* was originally involved with sitting, but is in need of explanation if another etymology is assumed.

Abbreviations

BCS = Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian, Cz = Czech, En = English, Gr = Greek, La = Latvian, Li = Lithuanian, Ma = Macedonian, O = Old, OCS = Old Church Slavic, OHG = Old High German, PIE = Indo-European, Po = Polish, PS = Proto-Slavic, Ru = Russian, Sn = Slovene, US = Upper Sorbian, Vd = Vedic

---

[2] A similar view is taken by Veyrenc (1966), who argues that in modern Russian the nature of *idti* and *xodit'* do not express an opposition in determinacy; rather, *idti* is a motion verb proper (*verbe de déplacement*), whereas *xodit'* is a kind of verb of activity (*verbe de fonction*). Veyrenc's conclusions on the nature of Russian *xodit'* offer intriguing, if indirect support for the hypothesis taken here.

[3] In this respect it is worth recalling Vaillant's (1939: 295–6) reservations regarding indet-det as an aspectual opposition in Slavic, which he characterizes as »*la malencontreuse expression d' 'aspect determiné' ou 'indéterminé'.*«

[4] Synchronically, no cross-Slavic unity exists in the determinate member: *jeti/jedu* (archaism) in West Slavic, *jexati/jedu* (conflated, innovative) in East Slavic, *jaxati/jašu* (generalizing the innovative stem and losing the original shape) in South Slavic. This complicates the question of exactly which verb would have been the determinate pair of *jazditi* in Common Slavic (especially given the coexistence of *jaxati* and *jeti* in West Slavic, e.g., Cz *jet* 'ride, drive' and *jechat* 'run, rush'), and is another problem that disappears if we assume that *jazditi* was originally an unpaired manner of motion verb.

References

AHLIN, Martin, BOKAL, Ljudmila, et al., 2001: *Slovar slovenskega knjižnega jezika* (Internet version). Ljubljana: Inštitut za slovenski jezik Frana Ramovša ZRC SAZU. URL: http://bos.zrc-sazu.si/sskj.html

BRUGMANN, Karl, 1903–1904: Beiträge zur griechischen, germanischen und slavischen Wortforschung. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 15: 87–104.

ČERNYX, P. Ja., 1994: *Istoriko-ètimologičeskij slovar' sovremennogo russkogo jazyka*, I: a–p. Moscow: Russkij jazyk.

HORROCKS, Geoffrey, 2004: Aspect and Verbs of Movement in the History of Greek: Why Pericles Could 'Walk into Town', but Karamanlis Could Not. Penney, J. H. W., ed. *Indo-European Perspectives. Studies in Honour of Anna Morpurgo Davies.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

KORTLANDT, Frederik, 1979: Toward a Reconstruction of the Balto-Slavic Verbal System. *Lingua* 49: 51–70.

MONIER, Williams, Sir Monier, [1899] 1981: *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary*. Delhi, Varanasi, Patna: Motilal Banarsidass.

RIX, Helmut, et al., 2001: *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben. Die Wurzeln und ihre Primärstammbildungen*. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag.

SCHUYT, R. N., 1990: *The morphology of Slavic Verbal Aspect: a Descriptive and Historical Study* (= *Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics*, 14). Amsterdam, Atlanta: Rodopi.

SŁAWSKI, F., 1974: O słowiańskich formacjach na *-do, -da, -dъ. Studie indoeuropejskie. Études indo-européennes*: 213–216. Wroclaw, Warsaw, Cracow, Gdansk: Wydawnictwo Polskiej akademii nauk.

SNOJ, Marko, 1992: K preučevanju starejših nominalnih kompozit: psl. **drozdъ* in **strъnadъ*. *Miklošičev zbornik* (= *Obdobja* 13): 193–200. Ljubljana: SAZU, Univerza v Ljubljani.

— —, 2003: *Slovenski etimološki slovar*. Ljubljana: Modrijan.

TALMY, Leonard, 2000: *Toward a Cognitive Semantics*. Volume II: *Typology and Process in Concept Structuring*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

TRUBAČEV, O. N. (ed.), 1981: *Ètimologičeskij slovar' slavjanskix jazykov* 8 (**xa–*jьvъlga*). Moscow: Nauka.

VAILLANT, André, 1966: *Grammaire Comparée des Langues Slaves*, Tome III: *Le Verbe*. Paris: Éditions Klincksieck.

— —, 1939: L'aspect verbal du slav commun; sa morphologisation. *Revue des Études Slaves* t. XIX, fasc. 3–4: 289–314.

VEYRENC, Jaques. 1966: Russe *idti* et *xodit':* movement de déplacement et movement de function. *Bulletin de la Societé de Linguistique de Paris*, t. LXI, fasc. 1: 21–41.

SLOVANSKI *JAZDITI 'JEZDITI' IN NJEGOVE IMPLIKACIJE ZA RAZVOJ KATEGORIJE (NE)DOLOČNOSTI

Razprava, ki je prvi poskus v sklopu širše raziskave začetkov kategorije določnosti pri glagolih premikanja v slovanščini, ponuja nov pogled na etimologijo slovanskega glagola **jȃzditi* 'jezditi' in obravnava implikacije za nastanek kategorije določnosti/nedoločnosti pri glagolih premikanja v slovanščini, ki izhajajo iz te nestandardne razlage. Avtorja trdita, da je beseda nastala kot glagol,

ki pomeni niz dejavnosti (ang. *serial verb*), vsebujoč podedovana indoevropska korena za pomena 'potovati' in 'sedeti'. Táka tvorba navaja k misli, da je kategorija, ki se tradicionalno imenuje nedoločna, v resnici kategorija *načina premikanja*. Predlagata, da se nasprotje nedoločnost : določnost v slovanščini prvotno ni nanašalo na glagolski vid, temveč da je bil v prvotnem nasprotju »nedoločnih« glagolov premikanja (npr. scsl. *xoditi* 'hoditi') v ospredju način premikanja kot sodogodek v povezavi z dogodkom premikanja samega v ozadju, medtem ko je bil pri »določnih« glagolih premikanja (npr. Scsl. *iti* 'iti') v ospredju dogodek premikanja in v ozadju načinski sodogodek. Nadaljnji dokaz za tak pogled, tako glede na etimologijo **jázditi kot tudi na implikacije za kategorijo »načina«, je mogoče najti v slovenščini in bosanščini/hrvaščini/srbščini, v katerih se ohranja prvotna razlika v vezljivosti med *jahati* in *jezditi,* pri čemer je prvi pretežno prehodni (*jahati konja*) in drugi obvezno neprehodni (*jezditi *konja*/*na konju*). To etimologijo podpira tudi dejstvo, da je vezljivost glagola *jezditi* enaka B/H/S *sjediti* (*sjediti *konja/na konju*) ali slov. *sedeti* (*sedeti *konja/na konju*).