ФІЛОЛОГІЧНІ ДОСЛІДЖЕННЯ

Péter Pátrovics,
Ph.D., habilitated doctor and associate professor
head of the Polish Department
of the Eötvös Loránd University (ELTE) Budapest
ORCID 0000-0002-4226-3576
patrovics.peter@btk.elte.hu

HOMEOSTASIS AND COMPENSATION AS LINGUISTIC PHENOMENA (COMPETITION OF ASPECT AND TENSE ON THE EXAMPLE OF SLAVIC LANGUAGES WITH SPECIAL REGARD TO POLISH)

The present paper deals with two universal linguistic phenomena, homeostasis and compensation. The author examines their function in relation to two categories, aspect and tense in the history of the Slavic languages. It is beyond doubt that one of the most important categories of the Slavic verb is aspect the origin of which may lie in the Proto-Indo-European language. The effects of its emergence as a verbal category were far-reaching and can be well traced in the history of the most Slavic languages. Taking a close look to the linguistic data, it seems quite obvious that the categories of tense and aspect were closely related and did interact, creating different patterns in modern Slavic languages. A certain competition between the category of aspect and that of tense can already be observed in Old Slavic and also in Old Russian and Old Polish where tenses like the aorist and the imperfect were becoming increasingly obsolete. The perfect, on the contrary, has gained ground, while the pluperfect has almost completely fallen into disuse. In the further development, the aspectual opposition also extended to the future tenses thereby affecting the entire tense system. This scenario took place everywhere in the East and West Slavic languages with some nuanced differences. Consequently, in the aspect-tense system of the modern East and West Slavic languages the tendency of the category of aspect to prevail over the category of tense together with the gradual decline in the number of tenses seems to be quite clear. The South Slavic languages, however, have taken a slightly different path showing perhaps the most complex picture. Although the Serbian and Croatian languages have preserved the old tenses, their use is rather limited. In terms of their aspectual development, these languages are getting closer and closer to the Eastern and Western Slavic language groups. In contrast, in Bulgarian and Macedonian one can see an intricate interplay of the aspectual system and the developed tense system. In the case of the change of the different Slavic languages, the phenomenon of linguistic compensation can be observed in all cases on the example of aspect and tense categories as the main means of striving to maintain linguistic homeostasis.
Keywords: linguistic homeostasis, compensation, aspect, tense, Old Slavic, Slavic languages, Polish

Péter Pátrovics. Homeostaza i kompensacja jako zjawiska językowe (konkurencja aspektu i czasu na przykładzie języków słowiańskich ze szczególnym uwzględnieniem języka polskiego)
Niniejszy artykuł traktuje o dwóch uniwersalnych zjawiskach językowych, homeostazie i kompensacji. Autor analizuje ich funkcję w odniesieniu do dwóch kategorii, aspektu i czasu w historii języków słowiańskich. Nie ulega wątpliwości, że jedną z najważniejszych kategorii słowiańskiego czasownika jest aspekt, który pochodzi z języka praindoeuropekjskiego. Skutki jego pojawienia się jako kategorii werbalnej były dalekosiężne i dobrze prześledzone w historii języków słowiańskich. Przyglądając się bliżej danym językowym, wydaje się całkiem oczywiste, że kategoria czasu i aspektu były ze sobą ściśle związane i współgrały, tworząc różne wzorce we współczesnych

językach słowiańskich. Pewną konkurencję między kategorią aspektu a kategorią czasu daje się już zaobserwować w języku starosłowiańskim, a także w staroruskim i staropolskim, gdzie czasy takie jak aoryst i imperfekt coraz bardziej zanikały. Perfekt, w przeciwieństwie do nich, rozprzestrzeniał się, podczas gdy czas zaprzeszły prawie całkowicie wyszedł z użycia. W toku dalszego rozwoju opozycja aspektowa rozszerzyła się także na czasy przyszłe, wpływając tym samym na cały system czasów gramatycznych. Ten scenariusz miał miejsce wszędzie w językach wschodniosłowiańskich i zachodniosłowiańskich z pewnymi niuansami różnic. Zatem w systemie aspektowo-czasowym współczesnych języków wschodnio- i zachodniosłowiańskich dość wyraźna wydaje się tendencja do dominacji kategorii aspektu nad kategorią czasu wraz ze stopniowym zmnienszaniem się liczby czasów. Jednak języki południowosłowiańskie obrały nieco inną drogę, ukazując chyba najbardziej złożony obraz wśród języków słowiańskich. Chociaż języki serbski i chorwacki zachowały stare czasy, zakres ich użycia jest raczej ograniczony. Pod względem rozwoju aspektowego języki te coraz bardziej zbliżają się do grup języków wschodnio- i zachodniosłowiańskich. Z kolei w bułgarskim i macedońskim można zaobserwować zawiłe współgranie systemu aspektowego i rozwiniętego systemu czasów gramatycznych. W przypadku zmiany różnych języków słowiańskich można zaobserwować zjawisko kompensacji językowej jako główny środek dążenia do utrzymania homeostazy językowej na przykładzie kategorii aspektu i czasu.

Słowa kluczowe: *homeostaza językowa, kompensacja, aspekt, czas, język starosłowiański, języki słowiańskie, język polski*

Петер Патрович. Гомеостаз і компенсація як мовні явища (конкуренція виду та часу на прикладі слов'янських мов, з особливим акцентом на польску мову)

У статті йдеться про два універсальні лінгвістичні явища – гомеостаз і компенсацію. Автор аналізує їхню функцію стосовно двох категорій – виду та часу – в історії слов'яських мов. Безсумнівно, що однією з найважливіших категорій слов'янського дієслова є вид, що походить із праіндоєвропейської мови. Наслідки її виникнення як словесної категорії були далекосляжними й добре простежуваними в історії слов'янських мов. При детальнішому розгляді лінгвістичних даних здається цілком очевидним, що категорії часу та виду були тісно пов'язані та взаємодіяли, створюючи різні закономірності в сучасних слов'янських мовах. Певну конкуренцію між категоріями виду й часу можна спостерігати вже в старослов'янській мові, а також у давньоруській та давньопольській, де часи аорист та імперфект почали зникати. Перфект, на відміну від них, поширювався, а плюсквамперфект майже повністю застарів. У ході подальшого розвитку видова опозиція також поширилася на майбутні часи, уплинувши в такий спосіб на всю систему часів. Цей сценарій відбувався повсюдно в східно- і західнослов'янських мовах з певними відмінностями. Отже, у видово-часовій системі сучасних східно- та західнослов'янських мов досить чітко виявляється тенденція домінування видової категорії над часовою разом із поступовим зменшенням кількості часів. Проте південнослов'янські мови пішли трохи іншим шляхом, показавши чи не найскладнішу картину слов'янських мов. Хоча сербська та хорватська мови зберегли старі часи, сфера їх використання досить обмежена. За видовим розвитком ці мови все ближче і ближче наближаються до східно- і західнослов'янських груп. Натомість у болгарській та македонській мовах можна спостерігати складну взаємодію системи видів і розвиненої системи часів. У різних слов'янських мовах феномен мовної компенсації можна спостерігати як основний засіб прагнення до підтримки мовного гомеостазу на прикладі категорії виду и часу.

Ключові слова: *мовний гомеостаз, компенсація, вид, час, старослов'янська мова, слов'янські мови, польска мова*

Introductory remarks. Linguistic homeostasis can be defined as a property of natural human languages that enables them, despite their permanent change, to function as a system of permanence and to be able to convey approximately identical messages. One of the possible means of maintaining linguistic homeostasis is compensation, during which the role of certain categories

and structures of the language, which are declining or falling into disuse, is taken over, in part or in full, by other categories and structures. In the present paper, I examine these processes in terms of two linguistic categories: aspect and tense, using the example of Slavic languages, especially Polish.

Old Church Slavic, Old Polish and Old Russian Texts as a Source for Studying the Competition of Aspect and Tense. The Slavic languages took a different path of development than German, in which the role of the once strong aspect category was gradually taken over by tenses. The cause of the divergent developmental tendencies lies in the difference of the conditions that prevailed in the German and the Slavic languages. While the number of tenses was very limited in Old High German, Old Church Slavic had a developed tense system that could also express aspectual meanings. The aspectual opposition of meaning in the past: punctual vs. durative was represented in Old Church Slavic by the tenses: aorist vs. imperfect. The imperfect in Old Church Slavic expressed an action in the past that was durative or repeated several times.

(A)

(A) rabъ bolę zъlě **umiraaše**

(the) slave **was** ill and **about to die**[1]

(Lk 7,2 Zg.)

The aorist, on the other hand, indicated a punctual (and thus completed) action in the past. (B)

(B) **nasadi** vinogradъ i oplotomъ i **ogradi**

(he) **planted** a vineyard (and) **put** a hedge around it

(Mt 21,33 Zg)

The perfect was rarely used in Old Church Slavic. It expressed an event that was directly related to the present. The perfect tense was a compound tense consisting of the present tense form of the auxiliary *byti* (to be) and the perfect participle of the main verb. (C)

(C) věmь ěko otъ Boga **prišelъ esi** učitelь

(I) know, that you **are** a teacher who **has come** from God

[Jn 3,2 example from 1, p. 71]

In the Old Church Slavic texts, the second and third person forms of the singular of the perfect occurred most frequently, as these forms were identical in the aorist, and the perfect was used to avoid homonymy. Opinions are divided on the meaning and use of the past perfect in Old Church Slavic, which was also a compound tense. Some researchers (e.g. Cz. Bartula, A. M. Selishchew, Z. Stieber) believe that the past perfect expressed an activity that preceded another activity (Da.), others (e.g. A. Vaillant, A. Hollós) claim that the use of the past perfect was not tied to strict rules. According to the opinion of the linguists belonging to the latter group, the aorist (Db.) could also indicate the prematurity of an action (see 2 and 3).

(D) a i **bě** vьsь gradъ **sъbralъ sę** kъ dvьremъ, i icěli mnogy nedǫžьnyją

The whole town **was gathered** at the door. He **cured** many who were sick...

(Mk 1,33–34 Zg)

b i jegda **porǫgašę sę** jemu. **sъvlěšę sъ** njego prapǫdъ

And when they **had mocked** him, they **stripped** him of the purple cloak...

(Mk 15,20 Zg)

Whatever the true meaning of the past perfect, one thing is clear: the rules governing the use of tenses in Old Church Slavic were by no means as strict as they are in some modern Western European languages. This seems to be supported not only by the fact that the aorist and the perfect

---

[1] The English equivalents of all the biblical texts in this paper are based on *The New American Bible*, Catholic Book Publishing CO. New York, 1991.

tense could appear in different roles, but also the not fully grammaticized category of the future tense, as pointed out by Bajerski [4, p. 67] among others.[2]

I see the main reason for these phenomena in the fact that in Old Church Slavic there was another category besides the tense category, namely that of the aspect.[3] These two categories, linked in a certain way, competed with each other. In Old Church Slavic, tenses still played a leading role, while the aspect was in a developmental stage. There were, however, a few verbs, the aspectual value of which was already established in earlier periods. (E)

(E) tvoriti (impf.) → sъtvoriti (pf.) 'to create'
  dělati (impf.) → sъdělati (pf.) 'to make'

The main means used to determine the aspectual value of verbs in Slavic languages are suffixes and prefixes. This was also the case in Old Church Slavic. None the less, in some Old Church Slavic (and even Old Russian[4]) texts there are prefixed verbs that show themselves as imperfectives, although they would be clearly identified as perfectives in modern Russian. (F)

(F) Old Russian:
  ...v nje že **vtečet** dněprъ rěka. dněprъ bo **poteče** iz okovьskago lěsa **potečetь** na polъdne.

  a dvina is togo že lěsa **potečet** a idet na polunočьe...

  ...the Dnieper **flows into** it. The Dnieper because it **flows out** of the Okow forest and **flows**

  south. The Dvina **flows out** of the same forest and **flows** north.
                    [Lav.l.3. Example from 6, p. 284]

The following quotations are good examples of the fact that the verbs *iść* 'to go' and *wieść* 'to carry' which are clearly imperfective in modern Polish, may have had a perfective meaning in Old Polish.[5] (G)

(G) Old Polish:
  Posadzi dzeyczyo pod drzewem... y **gydze** precz y **szyødze** od nyego na dostrzelenyu
  (Biblia Królowej Zofii, Gen 21, 5)

  'So she **put** the child down under a shrub, and then **went** and **sat down** about a bowshot away.'

---

[2] In Old Church Slavic and Late Common Slavic, the future meaning could be expressed either with the present tense of the perfective verbs, or with the help of the *byti*, which in this case functioned as an auxiliary verb. In Old Church Slavic, the periphrastic future tense formation was still rather sporadic, but in Late Common Slavic it gradually gained ground. The verbs like *byti* (to be) *načęti* (to begin), *vьčęti* (to begin), *iměti* (to have) and *chotěti* (to want) participated in this analytic future tense formation as auxiliaries. Those forms that were formed with the auxiliary verb *byti* (bˉ d-) and ended in the *l*-participle had a meaning of the fore-future (i.e. futurum exactum) in Old Church Slavic. The construction *chotěti* (Serb. *hteti* / Croat. *htjeti*) + infinitive (pf. or impf.) is continued in Serbian and Croatian and is used as future tense, for example *ja ću čitati* (impf.) / *pročitati* (pf.) *knjigu*. ('I will or want to read/read through the book.'). The possibility of combining the auxiliary verb *hteti* or *htjeti* and a perfective verb (e.g. *pročitati* 'to read through') in this construction is often regarded as conclusive evidence for the fact that the aspectual usage in Serbian or Croatian (e.g., because of the preservation of the old tenses) is looser than in the East and West Slavic languages, in which such a construction would be considered highly ungrammatical. None the less, one should not forget that the verb *chotěti* (Serb. *hteti* /Croat. *htjeti*) has a different semantics and thus a different (possibly wider) range of selection than the verb *byti*, which is a general auxiliary verb of the future tense in all East and West Slavic languages.

[3] The aspect is a grammatical category that Proto-Slavic inherited from Indo-European and transformed in a special way. By general consent, the verbal aspect, as it appears in the modern Slavic languages, is already the result of a peculiar Slavic language development. Aspectual meanings in modern Slavic languages are predominantly expressed using morphological means (i.e. prefixes and suffixes) (cf. 5, 7).

[4] The term 'Old Russian' is somewhat misleading since it has nothing to do with the Muscovite state, which did not even exist at the time. The Old Russian language was not uniform, it should be seen as a set of East Slavic dialects used in the Kievan Rus' and other centers of power in the East Slavic territory, such as Novgorod, Smolensk and Pskov.

[5] In van Wijk's opinion, verbs like *iść* 'to go', *nieść* 'to lead', *wieść* 'to carry', *wieźć* 'to carry' could develop the perfective meaning due to the definitiveness that these verbs contain in their semantics [7, p. 238–257], see furthermore [8, p. 38–57; 9, p. 258–264].

A oni powiedzieli: iż go Panu potrzeba. I **wiedli** je do Jezusa. I... wsadzili...

(Biblia Wujka, Lk 19, p. 34–35)

'They answered: „The Master has need of it". So they **brought** it to Jesus ... and threw...'

A gdisz **wyedze** gy na wirzch gori Fegor... powye gemu Balaam

(Biblia Królowej Zofii, Num XXIII, 28)

'So he **took** Baalam to the top of Peor … Balaam then **said** to him'

A oni powiedzieli: iż go Panu potrzeba. I **wiedli** je do Jezusa. I... wsadzili...

(Biblia Wujka, Lk XIX, 34-35)

'They answered: „The Master has need of it". So they **brought** it to Jesus ... and threw...'

...przygedze Ezau, nawarzyw karmyey s swego lowu, a **nyesse** oczczu. Y rzece…

(Biblia Królowej Zofii, Gen XXVII, 30)

'Esau came, with his catch prepared a dish and **brought** it to his father (to eat). And said…'

[Examples from 7, p. 247]

The aforementioned examples confirm that the means of expression of the aspect in Old Russian and Old Polish were not yet fully systematically established. Although there were some restrictions related to the aspect of the verb (e.g. the imperfect tense could only be formed from imperfectives, while the aorist could only be formed from perfectives) deviations from these rules were also possible [for further details see 6, p. 285].

Instead of the verbs highlighted in bold in the above quotations, the perfect forms of prefixed verbs should be used everywhere in modern Polish, cf.: *gydze* → *poszła* 'went'; *wyedze* → *przywiódł* / *przyprowadził* 'took'; *wiedli* → *przyprowadzili* (*Jezusowi*) 'brought (him to Jesus); *nyesse* → *przyniósł* 'brought'; *niósł* → *przyniósł*[6] 'brought'. The monodirectional verbs of motion in the above quotations were often used in a perfective meaning in Old Polish.

The development tendencies in the independent life of the various Slavic languages were not uniform. Most of the time, the number of tenses was reduced in favor of the aspect.[7] This applies, for example, to Russian, as it does to almost all East and West Slavic languages. Klemensiewicz, Lehr-Spławiński and Urbańczyk [13, p. 369] trace back to the development of the aspect system that the aorist and the imperfect in the West Slavic (e.g. in Polish) fell early in disuse which eventually led to systemic changes. As a result, the once complex tense system collapsed and thus, in part, the aspect category began to convey meanings previously expressed by the aorist and by the imperfect. The pluperfect, which, although mostly in a purely stylistic function, occurs in some Polish written records and even in 19th century literary texts, is now virtually completely out of use. Its function has been taken over by the anterior adverbial participle in modern Polish.

In the case of the East Slavic, this process began very early, in the period of the Old Russian language. Janakieva [14], a researcher of Old Russian, points out that the old tenses, such as the aorist or the imperfect, were replaced by the perfect in the earliest Russian written records. In the linguistic record called *Russkaya Pravda* (an early Russian code of law) the percentage of the aorist is only 6,5%. This is 70% less than in the *Codex Marianus*, which is considered an Old Church Slavic linguistic record (for the use of tenses in the *Codex Marianus* see Jeżowa [15, p 17–39]. Uspensky [16, p 81] remarks in his book that the 19th century linguistic record *Russkaya Pravda* is not fully under the influence of Old Church Slavic and reflects the characteristic features of an East Slavic colloquial language of the given period. Among the characteristic features of this East Slavic colloquial language, he understands, among other things, the increasing use of the perfect. However, with regard to *Russkaya Pravda*, it should also be mentioned that in this case, the genre

---

[6] N. van Wijk points out that Linde used the form *doniósł* pfv. instead of *niósł* ipfv. when rendering the above line (7, p. 247).

[7] Although Jászay accepted to some extent the possibility of inverse proportionality between the developed aspect system and the complex tense system of a given language, he also made some critical comments on my previous findings [cf. 10, p. 69–6; 11, p. 55–92; 12, p. 163].

of this linguistic record (code) also requires the use of the perfect tense, which somewhat nuances Uspensky's opinion cited above.

Referring to the use of the perfect tense, Stieber [17, p 233] remarks that this compound tense occurs much more frequently in the *Kievan leaves* and the *Fragment from Freisingen* than in other Old Church Slavic texts. Since these written records form a transition to the West Slavic dialects, one can conclude that the perfect on the border of the South and West Slavic dialects was used more often in the 10th century than in the south.

The Situation in modern Slavic Languages. In most of the modern East and West Slavic languages, the former perfect is the only tense used to express past actions. This perfect occurs in two forms: a perfective and an imperfective. The only exception in this regard are the Sorbian languages (Upper and Lower Sorbian), in which the aorist and the imperfect tense are preserved as separate forms [18, p. 10]. These tenses show a certain selection restriction, which is related to aspect: the aorist tense can only be formed from perfective verbs, the imperfect tense only from imperfective verbs (in this regard see 19, p. 113–121 and 20, p. 123–131). (H)

(H) a. Imperfect: b. Aorist:
    njesech   donjesech
    'I brought'   'I got it there'
    slyšach   spalich
    'I heard'   'I lit it'
    [examples from 21, 168]

This, however, only applies to the literary language, since the aorist and the imperfect are no longer used in the vernacular language spoken in the lower part of Lusatia. The future tense formation is also interesting. While in the Sorbian literary languages no periphrastic future tense formation is possible with perfective verbs, the dialects are not restricted in this respect, since in addition to the imperfectives, perfectives can also participate in the periphrastic future tense formation. (I)

(I) Sorbian (Neustadt Dialect)
    budźomu *ryć* (impf.)
    budźomu *zryć* (pf.)
    'we will dig'

Stieber [17, p. 243] sees the cause of this phenomenon in the fact that the synthetic future tense is rarely used in dialects. But he does not give a more valid reason. In my opinion, the aforesaid (i.e. the two Sorbian) languages are in a transition phase. While the old tenses fell into disuse in the dialects and the synthetic future tense could not yet be systematically established, the original situation in the literary languages remained intact. From these facts it emerges that the aspect in the Sorbian literary languages probably has a similar status as it had in the Old Church Slavic, while in the dialects it develops in a direction already known from the West Slavic languages. When the literary languages will follow the dialects in this respect is questionable. But one thing is clear: when examining the Sorbian language situation and its particularities, one should not ignore the areal factors (including the influence of the neighboring Slavic languages, i.e. Czech, Polish, and German).[8]

In the south Slavic language area, in contrast to the East and West Slavic, the old tenses have been preserved. This applies fully to Macedonian and Bulgarian, less to Croatian or Serbian.

---

[8] In my opinion, it is possible that German had an influence on the Sorbian literary languages insofar as some old tenses have been preserved in them. This cannot be ruled out when one considers that the earliest written records date from the 16th century and many of them are translations from German. Such an explanation seems to be acceptable, all the more since I remember that nobody doubts the influence of the German in the case of the Sorbian demonstratives, which are often used in the role of an article. The Sorbian dialects, in contrast to the literary languages, are influenced by Czech and Polish, which explains the reason for a development similar to these languages.

The Slovenian language is similar to Czech in this respect, as it has considerably reduced the number of its tenses.

In Serbian and Croatian, one can only talk about preserving the old tense system in a certain sense. In Serbian, if at all, the imperfect tense is formed only from imperfectives, the aorist from both (i.e. both imperfectives and perfectives). Stieber [17, p. 232] draws attention to the fact that the synthetic tenses have been replaced by the perfect in most of the Serbo-Croatian language area (J), insofar as they are rarely used nowadays in cities like Zagreb, Belgrade and Split. In Serbian and Croatian, aorist and imperfect forms usually seem obsolete, except in some Eastern Serbian dialects [22, p. 169]. In everyday speech, the forms of the imperfect have fallen into disuse, most of them can only be found in folk tales, sayings, or folk songs.

(J) Modern Serbian

Pčele **proletahu** tamo-amo. (imperfect tense)

Pčele **su proletale** tamo-amo. (perfect tense)

'The bees **flew** back and forth.'

In the spoken language, the forms of the pluperfect have also been replaced by the forms of the perfect. (K)

(K) Modern Serbian

Kad sam stigao kući, on **bejaše otišao**. (plusquamperfect tense)

Kad sam stigao kući, on **je** već **otišao**. (perfect tense)

'By the time I got home, he **had** already **left**.'

The situation is a little different in Bulgarian and Macedonian, in which the tense system inherited from Old Church Slavic has been completely preserved. In these languages, the imperfect and the aorist can be formed from either stem of verbs, i.e. imperfectives and perfectives, without limitation and are used extensively, although there are some considerable neutralizations. There are also certain differences between the meanings of these four forms (about the coexistence of aspect and the aorist: imperfect opposition in Bulgarian see [23; 24, p. 161–168; 25; 22–42, 26, p. 59–61].

On the basis of these linguistic facts, it can be stated that the South Slavic languages show a certain forking in terms of the aspect – tense relation. In Slovenian, Croatian, and Serbian the once highly developed tense system has been dismantled in favor of the aspect. In Bulgarian and Macedonian, on the other hand, the tense system coexists with the aspect category but the aspect category is to some extent superior to the tense category. The fact that the rules of the aspectual usage in Serbian and Croatian are in some sense more permissive than in most East and West Slavic languages can be explained by the fact that the aspect as a category has not yet reached a high level of development. One should not forget that in the Serbo-Croatian linguistic area, albeit to a limited extent, in addition to the category of aspect, the old tenses (i.e. the aorist and the imperfect) are still in use.

Conclusions. The aforesaid facts make the following generalization possible: languages that have a developed system of aspect mostly do not have a developed system of tenses. If both are present in a language, one category is stronger and the other weaker.

When I call a category "strong", I mean that its use is tied to strict rules and that it appears to be systematically established. When I label a category as "weak", it means the opposite. Consider the possibility of participating of perfective verbs in the periphrastic future tense in Croatian and Serbian or compare Bulgarian and Macedonian with Russian or Polish in terms of aspectual usage, on this point see also [27, p. 304–305]. The aforementioned case of the compensation of aspect and tenses accompanying the process of linguistic change, can also be interpreted as a specific intralingual compensation. I use the word *compensation* here in a general linguistic sense, and understand it to be a linguistic means that enables languages to express approximately identical content regardless of their permanent change. Since the compensation exists in all languages of the world, it can be viewed as a universal phenomenon.

9

Two different types of compensation are to be distinguished: a) intralingual – compensation within a language, b) interlingual – compensation of the meaning (e.g. that of the aspect) between different languages [see 28, p. 447–451; 29, 218–224].

On the basis of the linguistic facts, it can be stated that in the case of a linguistic category falling into disuse, either a new category arises which compensates for the deficiencies caused by the decline of a category, or an already existing category takes over the function of the declined category. As completely new categories are rarely created in languages, the latter seems to be more common. Linguistic compensation serves as a means of maintaining linguistic homeostasis, which in this context is to be understood as the stability of certain language functions.

Список скорочених джерел

K.Zogr. Codex Zographensis 1000. Quattuor evangeliorum codex glagoliticus olim Zographensis nunc Petropolitanus / Бунина М. К. Система времен старославянского глагола. Москва: Издательство АН СССР, 1959.

ЛетЛав. 1377 Летопись по Лаврентьевскому списку. I. 3 / Борковский В. И., Кузнецов П. С. Историческая грамматика русского языка. Москва: Наука, 1965.

Wuj. 1599 Biblia Jakuba Wujka. Warszawa: Brytyjskie i Zagraniczne Towarzystwo Biblijne, 1923.

Król.Zof. *1455* Biblia Królowej Zofii (szaroszpatacka) wraz ze staroczeskim przekładem Biblii / wyd. S. Urbańczyk i V. Kyas, Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich. i PAN, 1965–1971.

References (translated & transliterated)

K.Zogr. Codex Zographensis 1000. Quattuor evangeliorum codex glagoliticus olim Zographensis nunc Petropolitanus [The Glagolitic Code of the Four Gospels "Zographensis" also known as of St. Petersburg] [in:] Bunina, M. K. (1959). *Sistema vremion staroslavyanskogo glagola [The tense system of the Old Slavic verb]*. Moskva: Izdatelstvo AN SSSR [in Russian].

LetLav. 1377 Letopis po Lavrentevskomu spisku. I. 3 [The Lavrent'evskian Chronicle. I. 3] [in:] Borkovskiy, V. I. & Kuznetsov, P. S. (1965). *Istoricheskaya grammatika russkogo yazyka [Old Russian historical grammar]*. Moskva: Nauka [in Russian].

Wuj. 1599 *Biblia Jakuba Wujka. [Jakub Wujek's Bible].* (1923). Warszawa: Brytyjskie i Zagraniczne Towarzystwo Biblijne [in Polish].

Król.Zof. 1455 Urbańczyk, S. & Kyas, V. (Eds.). (1965–1971). *Biblia Królowej Zofii (szaroszpatacka) wraz ze staroczeskim przekładem Biblii [Queen Sophia's (Szaroszpatak) Bible with an Old Bohemian translation of the Bible]*. Wrocław: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich. i PAN [in Polish].

Список використаних джерел та літератури

1. Бунина М. К. Система времен старославянского глагола. Москва: Издательство АН СССР, 1959. 160 с.
2. Селищев А. М. Старославянский язык: в 2-х ч. Москва: Учпедгиз, 1951–1952.
3. Vaillant A. Manuel de vieux slave. Grammaire. Paris: Institut d'Études Slaves, 1948. Vol. 1. 375 p.
4. Bajerski T. Słowiańskie przedrostki czasownikowe i aspekt. *Munera linguistica Ladislao Kuraszkiewicz dedicata*. Wrocław – Warszawa – Kraków: Ossolineum, 1993. S. 63–67.
5. Jászay L. Лекции по глагольному виду. Budapest: Nemzeti Tankönyvkiadó, 1993. 84 с.
6. Борковский В. И., Кузнецов П. С. Историческая грамматика русского языка. Москва: Наука,1965. 555 с.
7. Wijk van N. О происхождении видов славянского глагола. *Вопросы глагольного вида* / под ред. Ю. С. Маслова. Москва: Издательство иностранной литературы, 1962. С. 238–257.
8. Machek V. Sur l'origine des aspects verbaux en slave. *IV Международный съезд славистов*. Москва: Издательство АН СССР, 1958. С. 38–57.
9. Kuryłowicz J. Происхождение славянских глагольных видов. *Вопросы глагольного вида* / под ред. Ю. С. Маслова. Москва: Издательство иностранной литературы, 1962. С. 258–264.
10. Pátrovics P. Az aspektus története és tipológiája. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 2004. 212 p.
11. Pátrovics P. On Case Morphology and Word Order Variation in Bulgarian and German. *Anzeiger für slavische Philologie*. 2004. Band XXXII. P. 55–92.
12. Krékits J., Jászay L. Szláv igeaspektus különös tekintettel az orosz nyelvre. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 2008. 341 p.

13. Klemensiewicz Z., Lehr-Spławiński T., Urbańczyk S. Gramatyka historyczna języka polskiego. Warszawa: PWN, 1955. 369 s.

14. Янакиева И. В. Система спрягаемых глагольных форм в языке деловой и бытовой письменности древнерусского Северо-Запада XI–XIII вв. Москва : АКД, 1977. 306 с.

15. Jeżowa M. Praeterita proste w Kodeksie Mariańskim (w porównaniu z formami tekstu greckiego). *Badania nad czasownikiem w językach słowiańskich. Typologia i konfrontacja /* red. St. Dziechciaruk. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, 1993. S. 14–71.

16. Успенский Б. А. История русского литературного языка (XI–XVII вв.). Budapest : Tankönyvkiadó, 1988. 81 с.

17. Stieber Z. Zarys gramatyki porównawczej języków słowiańskich. Warszawa: PWN, 1979. 268 s.

18. Sussex R., Cubberley P. The Slavic Languages. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011. 10 p.

19. Dostál A. Aorist a imperfektum v lužické srbštině z hlediska slovesného vidu. *AUCPhil., Slavica Pragensia I.* Praha, 1959. S. 113–121.

20. Mareš F. V. Praeteritum simplex v lužické srbštině. *AUCPhil., Slavica Pragensia I.* Praha, 1959. S. 123–131.

21. 21. H. Tóth, I. *Bevezetés a szláv nyelvtudományba.* Szeged: JATEPress, 1996. 168 p.

22. Towsend Ch. E., Janda L. A. Gemeinslawisch und Slawisch im Vergleich. Einführung in die Entwicklung von Phonologie und Flexion. Slavistische Beiträge 416. Bd. 12. München: Verlag Otto Sagner, 2002. 169 s.

23. Guentcheva Z. Temps et aspect: l'exemple du bulgare contemporain. Paris: Edition du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, Sciences du langage, 1990.

24. Конески Б. Граматика на македонскиот литературен азик. Скопје: Култура, 1954. С. 161–168.

25. Станков В. Конкуренция на глаголните видове в българския книжовен език. София: Издателство на Българската Академия на Науките, 1976. С. 22–42.

26. Stambolieva M. Building up aspect. A study of aspect and related categories in Bulgarian, with parallels in English and French. Bern: Peter Lang Verlag, 2008. P. 59–61.

27. Rospond St. Gramatyka historyczna języka polskiego. Warszawa: PWN, 1979. S. 304–305.

28. Pátrovics P. The category of aspect and its compensation in some non-aspectual languages. *Nyelv – Stílus – Irodalom. Köszöntő könyv Péter Mihály 70. születésnapjára*. Budapest: ELTE BTK Keleti Szláv és Balti Filológiai Tanszék, 1998. P. 447–451.

29. Pátrovics P. Użycie aspektów w języku polskim i węgierskim. Beiträge zum 18. Arbeitstreffen der Europäischen Slavistischen Linguistik (Polyslav) Bd. 60. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag., 2016. S. 218–224.

References (translated & transliterated)

1. Bunina, M. K. (1959). Sistema vremion staroslavyanskogo glagola [The tense system of the Old Slavic verb]. Moskva: Izdatelstvo AN SSSR [in Russian].

2. Selishchev, A. M. (1951–1952). Staroslavyanskiy yazyk [Old Slavic]. Moskva: Uchpedgiz [in Russian].

3. Vaillant, A. (1948). Manuel de vieux slave. I. Grammaire [Handbook of the Old Slavic. I. Grammar]. Paris: Institut d' Études Slaves [in French].

4. Bajerski, T. (1993). Słowiańskie przedrostki czasownikowe i aspekt [Slavic verbal prefixes and aspect]. Munera linguistica Ladislao Kuraszkiewicz dedicata – Munera linguistica in the honor of Władysław Kuraszkiewicz (pp. 63–67). Wrocław – Warszawa – Kraków: Ossolineum [in Polish].

5. Jászay, L. (1993). Lekcii po glagolnomu vidu [Lectures on verbal aspect]. Budapest: Nemzeti Tankönyvkiadó [in Russian].

6. Borkovskiy, V. I. & Kuznetsov, P. S. (1965). Istoricheskaya grammatika russkogo yazyka [Old Russian historical grammar]. Moskva: Nauka [in Russian].

7. Wijk, van N. (1962). O proiskhozhdenii vidov slavyanskogo glagola [On the origin of the Slavic verbal aspect]. Yu. S. Maslov (Ed.), Voprosy glagolnogo vida – Issues of verbal aspect (pp. 238–257). Moskva: Izdatelstvo inostrannoy literatury [in Russian].

8. Machek, V. (1958). Sur l'origine des aspects verbaux en slave [On the origin of the Slavic verbal aspect]. IV Mezhdunarodnyy syezd slavistov – 4th International Conference of Slavists (pp. 38–57). Moskva: Izdatelstvo AN SSSR [in French].

9. Kuryłowicz, J. (1962). Proiskhozhdeniye slavyanskikh glagolnykh vidov [The origin of the Slavic verbal aspect]. Yu. S. Maslov (Ed.), Voprosy glagolnogo vida – Issues of verbal aspect (pp. 258–264). Moskva: Izdatelstvo inostrannoj literatury [in Russian].

10. Pátrovics, P. (2004). Az aspektus története és tipológiája [History and typology of aspect]. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó [in Hungarian].

11. Pátrovics, P. (2004). On Case Morphology and Word Order Variation in Bulgarian and German. Anzeiger für slavische Philologie, 32, 55–92 [in English].

12. Krékits, J. & Jászay, L. (2008). Szláv igeaspektus különös tekintettel az orosz nyelvre [The Slavic verbal aspect with special regard to Russian]. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó [in Hungarian].

13. Klemensiewicz, Z., Lehr-Spławiński, T. & Urbańczyk, S. (1955). Gramatyka historyczna języka polskiego [Historical grammar of the Polish language]. Warszawa: PWN [in Polish].

14. Yanakieva, I. V. (1977). Sistema spriagayemikh glagolnykh form v yazyke delovoy i bytovoy pismennosti drevnerusskogo Severo-Zapada XI–XIII vekov [The system of conjugated verbs in the official and private writing of the Northwest of Old Russian territory in the 11th-13th century]. Moskva: AKD [in Russian].

15. Jeżowa, M. (1993). Praeterita proste w Kodeksie Mariańskim (w porównaniu z formami tekstu greckiego) [The simple preterit forms in the Codex Marianus (compared to the simple preterit forms occurring in the Greek text)]. St. Dziechciaruk (Ed.), Badania nad czasownikiem w językach słowiańskich. Typologia i konfrontacja – Research on the verbs of the Slavic languages. Typology and comparison (pp. 14–71). Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego [in Polish].

16. Uspenskiy, B. A. (1988). Istoriya russkogo literaturnogo yazyka (XI–XVII vekov) [The history of the Russian literary language of the 11th–17th century]. Budapest: Tankönyvkiadó [in Russian].

17. Stieber, Z. (1979). Zarys gramatyki porównawczej języków słowiańskich [An outline of the comparative grammar of the Slavic languages]. Warszawa: PWN [in Polish].

18. Sussex, R. & Cubberley, P. (2011). The Slavic Languages. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press [in English].

19. Dostál, A. (1959). Aorist a imperfektum v lužické srbštině z hlediska slovesného vidu [The aorist and the imperfect in the Sorbian language from the viewpoint of verbal aspect]. AUCPhil., Slavica Pragensia I (pp. 113–121). Praha [in Czech].

20. Mareš, F. V. (1959). Praeteritum simplex v lužické srbštině [The simple preterit in Sorbian]. AUCPhil., Slavica Pragensia I (pp. 123–131). Praha [in Czech].

21. H. Tóth, I. (1996). Bevezetés a szláv nyelvtudományba [Introduction to the Slavic linguistics]. Szeged: JATEPress [in Hungarian].

22. Towsend, Ch. E. & Janda, L. A. (2002). Gemeinslawisch und Slawisch im Vergleich. Einführung in die Entwicklung von Phonologie und Flexion. Slavistische Beiträge 416. Bd. 12 [Common Slavic and Slavic in comparison. An introduction to the development of phonology and inflection. Contributions to the Slavic Studies 416. Vol. 12]. München: Verlag Otto Sagner [in German].

23. Guentcheva, Z. (1990). Temps et aspect: l'exemple du bulgare contemporain [Tenses and aspect. The example of modern Bulgarian]. Paris: Edition du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, Sciences du langage [in French].

24. Koneski, B. (1954). Gramatika na makedonskiot literaturen azyk II [Grammar of the modern Macedonian literary language]. Skopje: Kultura [in Macedonian].

25. Stankov, V. (1976). Konkurencija na glagolnite vidove v bălgarskija knizhoven ezik [Competition of aspectual forms in the Bulgarian literary language]. Sofija: Izdatelstvo na Bălgarskata Akademija na Naukite [in Bulgarian].

26. Stambolieva, M. (2008). Building up aspect. A study of aspect and related categories in Bulgarian, with parallels in English and French. Bern: Peter Lang Verlag [in English].

27. Rospond, St. (1979). Gramatyka historyczna języka polskiego [Historical grammar of the Polish language]. Warszawa: PWN [in Polish].

28. Pátrovics, P. (1998). The category of aspect and its compensation in some non-aspectual languages. Nyelv – Stílus – Irodalom. Köszöntő könyv Péter Mihály 70. Születésnapjára – Language – Style – Literature. Studies in honor of the the 70-year-old professor, Mihály Péter (pp. 447–451). Budapest: ELTE BTK Keleti Szláv és Balti Filológiai Tanszék [in English].

29. Pátrovics, P. (2016). Użycie aspektów w języku polskim i węgierskim [Aspectual usage in Polish and Hungarian]. Beiträge zum 18. Arbeitstreffen der Europäischen Slavistischen Linguistik (Polyslav) Bd. 60. – Contributions to the 18th working meeting of European Slavic Linguistics (Polyslav). (Vol. 60), (pp. 218–224). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag [in Polish].