

# Lexicalization after grammaticalization in the development of Slovak adjectives ending in *-lý* originating from *l*-participles

Gabriela Múcsková, Comenius University and Slovak Academy of Sciences

*The paper deals with the development and current state of the Slovak participial forms, especially the participles with the formant -l- (the so-called l-participles) in the context of grammaticalization and lexicalization as complex and gradual changes. The analysis focuses on the group of “adjectives ending in -lý” as a result of “verb-to-adjective” lexicalization of former l-participles, which was conditioned by preceding grammaticalization of other members of the same participial paradigm. The group of lexemes identified in current Slovak descriptive grammatical and lexicographical works as “adjectives ending in -lý” is highly variable and includes a set of units of hybrid nature reflecting the overlapping of verbal and adjectival grammatical meanings and dynamic and static semantic components. Moreover, the group is rather limited, has irregular structural and derivational properties and is semantically rich, with extensive semantic derivation and polysemy. The characteristics of these units suggest a higher degree of their adjectivization, but the variability of the units reflects the different phases and degrees of this change, which was also influenced by language-planning factors in the Slovak historical context. Reconstruction of the phases of the adjectivization process, gradual decategorization and desemanticization, and reanalysis to a new structural and semantic class can serve as a contribution to more general questions about the nature of language change and its explanation.*

**Keywords:** *participle, lexicalization, adjectivization, grammaticalization, lexicography*

## 1. Introduction

Linguistic descriptions of grammatical, word-formation and lexical structures are abstract reflexive constructs establishing boundaries between structural levels, parts of speech, categories and paradigms inside the language. The relativity of such descriptions is indicated in the dynamics and variation of the synchronous use of language, as well as in the existence of transitional units that, due to their hybrid structural nature, transcend the boundaries of language levels or parts of speech and their categories (cf. e.g. Komárek 2006: 21). This is even more evident in the diachronic descriptions of language, where dynamics and variation constitute an essential part of language changes as gradual and complex processes. The transitional units are, from a diachronic point of view, subject to a gradual transformation among levels and categories of the language structure.

Such transformation is basis of language changes known as grammaticalization and lexicalization. The grammaticalization as “the process by which grammar is created” (Croft 2001: 366) is usually defined as “the development from lexical to grammatical forms and from grammatical to even more grammatical forms” (Heine & Kuteva 2004: 2). On the other hand, lexicalization is broadly defined as “adaption into the lexicon” (Brinton & Traugott 2005: 89) or more precisely: “the change whereby in certain linguistic contexts speakers use a syntactic construction or word formation as a new contentful form with formal and semantic properties that

are not completely derivable or predictable from the constituents of the construction or the word formation pattern. Over time there may be further loss of internal constituency and the item may become more lexical” (ibid.: 96).

Both processes were often perceived as opposite and differentiated (cf. Hopper & Traugott 1993; see also Ružička 1966: 29). However, being long and gradual, they involve mutually related and subsequent processes that motivate or influence other grammatical and lexical changes, so they can also motivate one another or be interconnected. In addition to the complexity and gradualness that may be manifested by the gradual achievement of phases and parameters in their course, grammaticalization and lexicalization have in common also (prevailingly) unidirectionality of the process and the fact that both are accompanied by reanalysis, as a change “(...) in the structure of an expression or class of expressions that does not involve any immediate or intrinsic modification of its surface manifestation” (Langacker 1977: 58).

As an interesting instance of the interrelation and overlapping of the grammaticalization and lexicalization processes (as well as of the interrelation and overlapping of the structural grammatical and lexical categories), we consider the class of participles, which are originally members of the verb paradigm with some adjectival properties. These adjectival grammatical properties can – in the case of individual units – motivate the transformation (or transposition; see Karlík 2003: 133, 136 with respect to units with the formant *-n/-t-*) of participial verb-forms into lexical adjectives, which also includes the change or reanalysis of the grammatical desinence into a word-formation suffix. In this paper, we present a diachronic view of the historical emergence, further development and current state of participial forms in the Slovak language, focusing on the participles formed with the formant *-l-* (the so-called *l*-participles) in the context of grammaticalization and lexicalization (more specifically, adjectivization). We deal in more detail with the lexicalization – more precisely adjectivization – of the so-called composite forms (see 2.2) of original participles, which in contemporary grammatical descriptions are known as adjectives ending in *-lý*, i.e. as a word-formation group with the reanalysed suffix *-lý* of the word-formation status. Attention will also be paid to their reflexive grammatical and lexicographical processing concerning their categorization in the language structure. We follow this group of items in the “verb-to-adjective” process, and identify the semantic and categorial changes.

## 2. Slovak participles – introductory overview

Participles as a distinct morphological subgroup have a special status in the grammatical system and they “figure in several discussions of lexicalization and grammaticalization because the forms often have a variety of functions” (Brinton & Traugott 2005: 111). Traditional grammatical structural descriptions perceive them as units that are (or have become historically) members of the verb paradigm, but characterize them as “indeterminate verb-forms”<sup>1</sup> (Ružička 1966: 491), which “stand at the very edge of the verb paradigm”<sup>2</sup> (ibid.: 30). At the same time, participles semantically and formally overlap with adjectives because they denote a quality of the entity and express grammatical meanings characteristic of adjectives. In Slovak, they have adjectival

---

<sup>1</sup> “neurčité slovesné tvary”

<sup>2</sup> “stojá na samom okraji slovesnej paradigmy”

(nominal) declension, (to a varying extent also) gradability and typical adjectival word-formation (see § 2.1).

Slovak grammars usually distinguish three (or four) types of participles in the contemporary Slovak language, which are classified according to verbal grammatical categories of tense and voice:

**1) Present active participles** – emerged from the Proto-Slavic (hereinafter PSL) *-nt-* participles (Krajčovič 1988: 145; Stanislav 436–439); today they are made up only of imperfective personal verbs with the ending *-úci* (*-úca*, *-úce*) or *-iaci* (*-iaca*, *-iace*) / *-aci* (*-aca*, *-ace*), except for verbs functioning as copulas (e.g. *byť* ‘to be’, *stávať sa* ‘to become’, modal verbs, etc.). From the semantic point of view, they express the present dynamic attribute of the entity (Ružička 1966: 491).

**2) Past active participles** – originate in PSL *-s-* participles; today they are formed with the ending *-vší* (*-všia*, *-všie*) only from perfective verbs, whose infinitive stem ends with vowel or diphthong. They express the past dynamic attribute of the entity, which reflects an action realized before the time of the utterance. In contemporary Slovak, they gradually disappear and they are perceived as literary. However, in the historical varieties of Slovak, as well as in the old written documents, these forms were more frequent and they were formed from verbs of all verb classes (Krajčovič 1988: 146; Ružička 1966: 493ff).

**3) Passive participles** – formed with the endings *-tý* (*-tá*, *-té*), *-ný* (*-ná*, *-né*) or *-ený* (*-ená*, *-ené*) – historically classified as past passive participles (Krajčovič 1988: 146).<sup>3</sup> They denote a passively acquired state (or quality) of the entity often including a resultative semantic component.<sup>4</sup> They are very productive in contemporary Slovak because – in connection with the forms of *byť* ‘be’ – they became parts of the grammaticalized analytical passive constructions (*je chválený* ‘he is praised’) that appeared first in the literary style under the influence of Latin (in historical Slovak also due to contacts with the Czech language) and later became a regular part of the verbal paradigm. Currently, the productivity of these analytical passive constructions is supported by the influence of English.

**4)** In the Slovak grammatical works, another term “participle” can be encountered – in the construction “***l*-participle**” (*l-ové príčastie*). This term is used to denote the verb-form with the formant *-l-*, which is part of analytical preterite constructions (*robil som* ‘I did’). In fact, this form does not have participial character in the contemporary language; therefore, in academic works it is named “*l*-form” (see § 3.1). The name “participle” is motivated by a grammatical tradition that results from the participial origin of this form. The original *l*-participles, in historical grammars also called “perfect active participles II” (Stanislav 1967: 441), have a special position among the set of Slovak participles and are going to be a subject of this paper.

## 2.1 Participles as a transitional grammatical and lexical subgroup

---

<sup>3</sup> PSL had also a special form for present passive participles formed with the suffixes *-mъ*, *-ma*, *-mo*, which have not been preserved; they are documented only in a few relics in the contemporary language (*vedomý* ‘conscious’, *známy* ‘known’) (Krajčovič 1988: 146).

<sup>4</sup> In fact, the semantic characteristics of the Slovak passive participles is more complex and differentiated (cf. Ružička 1966: 495ff; Horecký, Buzássyová & Bosák et al. 1989: 200ff), but for our analysis, it is not necessary to specify it in detail.

The transient nature of participles lies in the accumulation of verbal (dynamic) and adjectival (static) grammatical characteristics and functions that are maintained or to differing degree reduced within each participial subgroup, or even in individual units. Thanks to this diversity, they are the subject of language changes, of dynamic tendencies and internal variation that document the mutual interrelation of grammaticalization and lexicalization processes (see Brinton & Traugott 2005: 89ff). This is also the reason why these units have been given particular attention in historical linguistic works in terms of the verb-to-adjective transformation in the process of adjectivization, and in the synchronic linguistics in terms of their grammatical affiliation to verbal or adjectival (resp. nominal) paradigm, not only at the level of grammatical descriptions of language, but also in lexicography.

On the one hand, they originate in verb base and semantically – to varying degrees – preserve the meaning of the action, on the other hand, they acquire the meaning of quality and integrate into the category of adjectives, cf.:

*cestujúci* ‘traveller’ is apparently related to *cestovať* ‘to travel’, but *budúci* ‘future’ (e.g. *budúci čas* ‘future tense’, *budúca generácia* ‘future generation’) has an obscured relation with the verb *budú* (PSL \**bǫdǫtŭ* ‘they will be’) grammaticalized later as an auxiliary in the analytical future tense constructions (cf. Králik 2015)

or

*písaný* ‘written’ is clearly related to *písať* ‘to write’, but *vzdelaný* ‘educated’ has an obscured origin in the PSL \**dělati* ‘to do’ and the Czech *vz-dělati* ‘to cultivate’ (e.g. soil), metaphorically transferred to ‘to ennoble, to educate’ (cf. Králik 2015)

Their grammatical characteristics, manifested in form, ranks them into the category of adjectives, which is even more apparent in Slovak (as well as in most other Slavic languages) as an inflected language, because they acquire adjectival declension expressing nominal categories such as grammatical gender, number and case. To a varying extent, they also preserve the verbal grammemes of voice (active and passive), aspect, and partially also tense (mainly those that have preserved the resultative meaning), and also some syntactic properties of verbs (valency).

The question of ambiguous categorization with respect to a particular part of speech, as well as the adjectivization (resp. the succession of the verb-to-adjective transformation), is in Slovak linguistics more perceived and studied in detail in the case of passive participles (original past passive participles) with the formant *-n-* or *-t-*.<sup>5</sup> In the academic *Morphology of the Slovak language* (Ružička 1966: 556), the transformation of the passive participles to adjectives is assessed as a “common phenomenon”, and it is argued that: “the perception of the participle as the adjective is just a matter of stabilizing a certain usage (when it starts to be used as an adjective).

---

<sup>5</sup> A detailed analysis the adjectivization of *-n-* and *-t-* participles has been done by Sejáková (1995); cf. also her chapter in Horecký, Buzássyová & Bosák et al. 1989: 200–211. In addition to the formal structural criteria, Králik suggests differentiating adjectival constructions from verbal passive constructions based on their semantic properties, with regard to the meaning of the adjective and the meaning of the participle (for more see Králik 2003: 141-142).

The passive participle is either an adjective or a virtual adjective (it can be used as an adjective)”.<sup>6</sup> In the statement about the stabilization of a certain usage and about the virtuality of the participle as an adjective we can see a connection with the graduality of this linguistic change and with its possible historical and contemporary variability. This can be identified not only in the case of passive participles, but also in the historical as well as the present forms of the original active past participles with the formant *-l-*, which is the subject of this paper (§ 3).

In the process of adjectivization – depending also on the meaning and further semantic derivation – the participles besides nominal adjective declension often (but not always) acquire adjectival gradability (e.g. *vzdelanejší* ‘more educated’; but not *\*písanejší* ‘more written’), form negative antonyms (*nevzdelaný* ‘uneducated’, *nepísaný* ‘unwritten’), and/or they adopt derivational properties typical of adjectives, i.e. they create adverbs with the suffixes *-e*, *-o* (*vzdelane*, e.g. *rozprávať*, *vyzerat’ vzdelane* ‘to speak, look educated’) or abstract nouns with the suffix *-osť* (*vzdelanosť* ‘(status of) education’). These characteristics have been defined as criteria for classifying the original verbal participles as adjectives (Ružička 1966: 231). However, more detailed and complex grammatical and lexicological works (Horecký, Buzássyová & Bosák et al. 1989: 200ff; Sejáková 1995 and others), as well as lexicographical practices, show that these criteria are not unequivocal and cannot be generally applied and fully accepted. For example, when compiling dictionaries, lexicographers still consider many questionable issues due to the overlapping of grammatical characteristics of verbs and adjectives, but the reason of the ambiguity lies predominantly in the fact that the verb-to-adjective transformation process is accompanied by various semantic changes, such as 1) desemantization of the verb grammatical meanings, 2) metonymic transposition, and 3) semantic derivation and the rise of polysemy. The aim of this paper is not to find another, more reliable criterion, but (on the example of participles with the formant *-l-*) to show the importance of the semantic background of the gradualness of the adjectivization process as a type of language change.

## 2.2 Diachronic note

For the following interpretation, it is necessary to add a brief diachronic note. As mentioned above, due to the transitional position between verbs and adjectives, the participles as members of verbal paradigm express also the grammatical categories of adjectival inflexion.

Analogically with the declension system of PSL adjectives, they had two types of adjectival declension – 1) **substantival** (or short) declension with endings of noun paradigms and 2) **composite** (or long) declension adopted from the declension of former pronouns (cf. Lamprecht, Šlosar & Bauer 1986: 138). Both forms could occur in the attributive or predicative position, the substantival predominantly in the predicative position and the composite in the attributive. The composite forms emerged from the former syntactic construction of the substantival form of adjective and the form of PSL demonstrative *jb*, *ja*, *je*, which had the function to denote a known, concrete or unique referent. After reanalysis, the syntactic construction changed to an analytical

---

<sup>6</sup> “chápanie prídavia ako adjektíva je len otázka ustálenia istého úzu (aby sa ako adjektívum začalo používať). Trpné prídavie je alebo už adjektívum alebo virtuálne adjektívum (možno ho použiť ako adjektívum).“ English transl. by G. M.

and later, after phonological changes, to a synthesized form of the adjective with a grammatical function (category) of definiteness (Krajčovič 1988: 113; for more detail see Múcsková 2012).

In later development the systems of substantival and composite adjectival forms diverged. While the substantival forms gradually lost their structural character and disappeared (in the current Slovak language only a few lexicalized relics have been preserved; they have been more widely preserved in Czech in a predicative position – cf. Krajčovič 1988: 114), the composite pronominal forms lost their grammatical category of definiteness and became the only regular structural members of adjectival declension. Along with other adjectives, also the participial declension has undergone analogous development, and only the composite forms have been preserved as productive (there are only a few lexicalized short forms of the original passive participles, e.g. *hoden* ‘worthy’, *vinen* ‘guilty’, *dlžen* ‘owed’, etc.); in dictionaries they are classified as “adjectival nominal forms” (prídavný menný tvar).<sup>7</sup>

But the *l*-participles have undergone markedly different divergent development of substantival and composite forms. The substantival forms have been preserved and structurally generalised in their nominative forms because they have been grammaticalized in the analytical preterite verb-forms (see § 3.1; for more detail see Múcsková 2016) and the composite forms are, in contemporary Slovak grammars, categorized as the word-formation group “adjectives ending in *-lý*” (or *-l*-deverbal adjectives; cf. Karlík & Migdalski 2017), which gives the impression that they – as a whole group – have been fully lexicalized in the process of adjectivization. Our analysis (see § 3.2) shows that this group of “adjectives ending in *-lý*” is still very diverse and variable – it is not uniformly adjectivized but reflects different stages of the adjectivization process.

### 3. *L*-participles – a “disappeared” participial subgroup

Participles with the formant *-l-* historically developed from Indo-European deverbal adjectives formed from intransitive verbs with the suffix *-l-*, which originally had the meaning ‘tendency or propensity to do the activity expressed by the verb’<sup>8</sup> or later also the meaning ‘quality as a result of the previous action’ (cf. Lamprecht, Šlosar & Bauer 1986: 307–312; Damborský 1967: 127; recently Múcsková 2016: 45ff). After these adjectives acquired the resultative participial character in the Proto-Slavic period, they started to rank in the number of other participles (also former deverbal adjectives) with the formants *-nt-*, *-s-*, *-m-*, *-n-* and *-t-* and became a part of verb paradigm (cf. Dostál 1953: 268; Zubatý 1980: 52ff). In terms of grammatical categories, they functioned as past (or perfect) and active participles, in opposition to past passive, present active and present passive participles, but their specificity – in comparison with the other participles – lies in the divergent development of substantival (short) and composite (long) declension forms and in their further syntactic and morphological development.

In this paper, we focus on the group of composite forms and the process of their adjectivization, but this process is closely related to the development in the group of substantival declension forms, so we briefly describe it in the following section.

---

<sup>7</sup> See e.g. grammatical definition of given examples in Slovak dictionaries available at <https://slovník.juls.savba.sk/>

<sup>8</sup> Preserved e.g. in today’s adjectives *ospalý* ‘sleepy’ (i.e. ‘tending to sleep’), *dbalý* ‘conscientious’ (or who tends to be concerned) etc.

### 3.1 Substantival (short) forms in the context of grammaticalization

The substantival forms of the PSL deverbal adjectives with the formant *-l-* were used mainly in the predicative position. Together with present forms of the verb *byť* ‘to be’ in the function of copula, they formed syntactic verbo-nominal constructions with the meaning ‘to be the one who tends to do the action expressed by the verb’ (e.g. the construction *\*paděly jesmь* had the meaning ‘I am the one who tends to fall’). After the adjectives had acquired the resultative participial character (changed into so-called *l*-participles or past active participles), the construction with the copula *byť* ‘to be’ had changed its meaning to ‘the present state of the subject as a result of some previous action’ (i.e. ‘I am the one who has fallen’). Further development followed the stages of the grammaticalization process (stated by Lehmann 2015: 137ff), in which the syntactic construction was transformed into an analytical grammatical form accompanied by a reanalysis based on metonymy, i.e. transformation of the hierarchy of categorial and sub-categorial semantic components (from state to action). The result of this process is the analytical construction denoting a past event with a consequence to the presence (‘I have fallen down’) that has ranked into the system of the PSL past tenses as a grammatical form of the “perfect”. After the loss of PSL synthetic forms (imperfect and aorist) and the emergence of the category of aspect, the analytical construction of the perfect with the resultative meaning was generalized, gained productivity and was transformed into the general preterite.<sup>9</sup> Similarly, the original substantival forms of the *l*-participle became part of other analytical verb-forms – plusquamperfect and conditional constructions.

Unlike the extinct or declining substantival forms of the other participial types, the substantival variants of *l*-participles were preserved and underwent the process of paradigmaticization and generalization to the whole category of verbs. On the other hand, in the scope of the emergence of analytical grammatical constructions and rise of abstract grammatical meanings (grammemes), they have lost their functional and semantic autonomy and discreteness. In the process of semantic reanalysis and therefrom resulting decategorization, *l*-participles (as components of the analytical grammatical constructions) lost the semantic component of quality and denoted only the meaning of action. They have lost their adjectival declension and have been fossilized in the nominative forms (Damborský 1967; Stanislav 1987: 114). From among the nominal grammatical characteristics they have partially (in the singular forms) preserved the formants – congruent grammatical morphemes – reflecting nominal gender.

After the loss of flexion, they ceased to be perceived as substantival grammatical forms, or participles in the true sense of the word, and began to be perceived as verb units, which functioned as the *l*-basis of the analytical verb-forms (cf. Kopečný et al. 1980: 110; Damborský 1967: 12); the former derivational formant *-l* has been transferred to an abstract grammatical morpheme – the preterite marker (cf. Andresen 1987: 26; Ivanov 1983: 351).

---

<sup>9</sup> The gradual emergence and further development of the analytical grammatical form of the Proto-Slavic perfect and its later development into general preterite, as it is known in contemporary Slovak, was the subject of the work by Múcsková (2016). Her interpretation is based on the grammaticalization theory of Bernd Heine and Tania Kuteva (Heine 2003; Heine and Kuteva 2004, 2005), Paul J. Hopper and Elizabeth C. Traugott (2003), Christian Lehmann (2015) and others.

In conclusion, it can be summarized that the semantic and functional changes of the original *l*-participles in their substantival variants carried out in the process of grammaticalization of the analytical verb-forms caused the separation of these forms from the other types of participles, therefore recently they should not be referred to as participles but as *l*-forms (Pauliny 1947: 61; Ružička 1966: 474; Komárek 2006: 124; Andresen 1987: 26). Moreover, the grammaticalization process of the development of analytical constructions containing the original substantival *l*-participial forms could act as a motivating factor for the more pronounced lexicalization process of composite variants of *l*-participles (§ 3.2).<sup>10</sup>

### 3.2 Composite (long) forms in the context of lexicalization

As mentioned before, in contemporary Slovak grammars the original *l*-participles with long (or composite) declension are not (unlike the other participial groups) named “participles”.<sup>11</sup> They are categorized as a word-formation group of “adjectives ending in *-ly*”, which gives the impression that they – as a whole group – have been completely lexicalized in the process of adjectivization.<sup>12</sup> The analysis of currently recorded “adjectives ending in *-ly*”, which come from the Proto-Slavic active past participles with resultative meaning, shows that most of the individual units have indeed gone through the process of adjectivization, but to varying degrees. The whole group is highly variable, formally (by the degree of adopting the grammatical categories and derivative properties typical of adjectives), but especially semantically (with regard to their apparent relation to the verb, preservation of the active voice, resultativeness, semantic derivation and polysemy). In the paper, we will pay attention mainly to the semantic aspects of the adjectivization process with respect to the analysed participial units.

Our analysis is based on 380 lexical units excerpted from the dictionaries of contemporary standard Slovak.<sup>13</sup> These units were also confronted with data in the *Concise etymological*

---

<sup>10</sup> Similar divergent development in English in case of present participles ending in *-ing* was presented by Brinton & Traugott (2005: 111–122).

<sup>11</sup> Paradoxically, the short forms in the analytical preterite constructions are still often referred to as *l*-participles, despite having undergone the grammaticalization process accompanied by desemantization and loss of grammatical and semantic traits of participles (§ 3.1).

<sup>12</sup> As stated in the *Morphology of the Slovak language* (Ružička 1966: 232), these units have “full adjectival validity” (“plnú adjektívnu platnosť”), or they are referred to as “verbal adjectives ending in *-ly*” (“slovesné prídavné meno na *-ly*”) (ibid.: 495). Ján Horecký also excludes them from the system of verbal forms (Horecký 1995: 339). In Czech and Polish, as the Slavic languages closely related to Slovak, the original *l*-participles have been preserved to a greater extent; therefore those that have retained the participial character are still classified as participles and are distinguished from units that have been adjectivized (cf. Damborský 1967: 17; Klemensiewicz, Lehr-Splawiński & Urbańczyk 1955: 383–384; Kowalska 1976; Nagórko 2012: 220 and others).

<sup>13</sup> *Krátke slovník slovenského jazyka* [Concise dictionary of the Slovak language] (2003) – hereinafter KSSJ, *Slovník súčasného slovenského jazyka* [Dictionary of the Contemporary Slovak Language] (2006–2015) – hereinafter SSSJ and *Slovník slovenského jazyka* [Dictionary of the Slovak Language] (1959–1968) – hereinafter SSJ. The dictionaries are available at the web-portal <https://slovník.juls.savba.sk/>.

The results presented in this paper do not include examples from historical and dialectal lexicographical works; we just briefly state that *l*-participles were more productive and frequent in written historical documents from the Slovak territory, but their language was highly influenced by Latin and the historical Czech language, what distorts the picture of the real functioning of these units in the historical Slovak language. As far as Slovak dialects are



*dictionary of Slovak* (Králík 2015) in order to verify their etymological participial origin, thereby excluding formally similar units that are not deverbals but come from original autonomous adjectives (e.g. *malý* ‘little, small’, *celý* ‘whole’, *milý* ‘kind’, *zlý* ‘bad’, etc.)<sup>14</sup>, in which the consonant *l* is a part of the word base. The whole corpus includes also units that cannot be clearly perceived as original PSL perfect active participles. Some of them are continuants of older Indo-European deverbal adjectives (e.g. *jedlý* ‘eatable’ related to Latin *edulis* – cf. Králík 2015) or there is also a subgroup of more recent adjectives ending in *-lý* analogously formed from preterite verb-forms (*l*-forms), which are usually secondary verbs derived from the nominal base (e.g. *nažltlý* ‘yellowish’ from *žltnúť* ‘to turn yellow’ derived from the adjective *žltý* ‘yellow’). Some of these units have also been verified in the *Slovak National Corpus*<sup>15</sup> to determine their real use and productivity; in addition, we have found some new units that are not recorded in the dictionaries.<sup>16</sup>

Despite the above-mentioned fact that all analysed units are categorized as adjectives in the dictionaries examined, our analysis shows that they differ in the degree of adjectivization and form a relatively non-homogeneous group of units (alike Kyseľová 2012: 260). The entire material analysed was divided into semantic subgroups according to the degree of preservation or bleaching of the semantic components and categorial characteristics typical of the participles as units of the verb paradigm, i.e.:

- a clear semantic correlation with the meaning of the basic verb or a decline of awareness of the semantic relationship with the verb;
- the presence of semantic derivation and the rise of polysemy, suggesting a higher degree of autonomy and independence of the transformed adjective (cf. Damborský 1967: 17ff);
- the presence/absence of the semantic component of resultativeness (related to the grammatical meaning of the perfect tense and perfective aspect) and the active voice, which are in the basis of the original meaning ‘quality or status as a result of some previous action that has been performed by the subject’.

These mutually conditioned and interrelated semantic changes are present in different ways and to varying degrees in almost every individual adjective, resp. participle that has been investigated. Therefore, the whole group appears to be very diverse and dynamic, and the delimited (and at the

---

concerned, *l*-participles are more productive in West-Slovak dialects (adjacent to the Moravian area), but the situation has not yet been reliably researched and requires special attention (cf. Štolc 1978: 173–174).

<sup>14</sup> Also J. Damborský (1967: 13) declares the need to distinguish true participles with the formant *-l-* from autonomous adjectives ending in *-lý*.

<sup>15</sup> <http://korpus.juls.savba.sk>

<sup>16</sup> A large set of units with the suffix *-lý* (and with some verbal prefix) in the Czech language has been introduced by Čermák (2008, 2016) who examined the circumfix constructions of the word-formation adjectival macro-type *prefix + (stem) – suffix -lý*. He considers all units in this group to be adjectives and does not take into account the diachronic aspect and their participial origin. However, his finding that these deverbative adjectives ending in *-lý* usually occur with some verbal prefix and they are not peripheral but create a word-formation macro-type, can be explained by the historical development of these units. The macro-type character stems from the fact that they were initially parts of grammatical paradigm. The prefixation is related to their original resultative meaning, as well as to the emergence of the category of aspect and later productivity of the prefixation in forming the perfective members of the opposition.

same time overlapping) subgroups represent just the most significant stages of the adjectivization process, of course, with some degree of simplification and generalization. In our description, we will proceed retrospectively – starting with fully adjectivized units and ending with those that still retain all the characteristics of participles as members of the verb paradigm.

### 3.2.1 Adjectives of an obscured *l*-participial origin

The highest degree of adjectivization can be attributed to adjectives whose participial origin is not apparent and in the common language awareness of the language users also the connection with the basic verb has been lost, mainly due to:

**a)** the loss of the original verb base in the contemporary language and the subsequent reanalysis, due to which the original formant *l* is perceived as part of the adjectival base; the historical participial origin of these adjectives can only be revealed by etymological reconstruction, e.g.:

**teplý** ‘warm’ – from the unpreserved Indo-European base *\*tep-* with the meaning ‘to be warm’ (Králik 2015);

**ojedinělý** ‘isolated, sporadic, unique’ – from the old and today lost verb *ojediniet’* ‘to be left alone’ (ibid.);

**mdlý** ‘insipid, bland, or dull’ – from PSL verb *\*mьděti* ‘to rot, decay, decompose’ (ibid.) which has not been preserved, as well as the original meaning of the participle *mdlý* ‘what has rotted, smouldered, decomposed’ has changed (today lexeme *mdlý* is not used in connection with e.g. tree or forest). The current meanings of the adjective *mdlý* (in the dictionaries analysed: 1. ‘slack, tired’; 2. ‘weak, lacklustre’ etc.) are the results of a later metaphorical transformation.

or **b)** the original verb still exists, but after gradual semantic derivation the semantic affinity between the action (expressed by the verb) and the quality or state (as the result of the action expressed by the adjective) has bleached out and users usually do not realize the historical relationship between the verb and the adjective, e.g.:

**smělý** ‘bold, daring’ – originally it was an *l*-participle of the verb *\*sьměti* – later *smiet’* ‘may, to be allowed’, which is a modal verb today; both related units – *smělý* and *smiet’* – originate from the same verbal paradigm of the Indo-European etymon *\*mē-, mō-, mǝ-* with the meaning ‘to strive intensively for something’ and have undergone divergent semantic development. The meaning of the verb developed into ‘to dare to do something’ and further to the modal ‘to be allowed to, may’; the original resultative meaning of *l*-participle has been transformed from ‘the one who was allowed to do something’ to ‘the one who has dared to do something’ and finally to the contemporary qualitative meaning ‘daring, bold’ (Králik 2015);

**čulý** ‘spry, lively’ – which is the original *l*-participle of the verb *čut’* ‘to hear; to recognize, to feel (with senses)’<sup>17</sup>; the participial resultative meaning ‘the one who has heard, recognized, felt’ has changed into the meaning of present quality ‘who perceives, reacts’ (Králik 2015). The contemporary meaning is broad, and it has developed not only into ‘lively, spry’ but also into

---

<sup>17</sup> Which is a little bit archaic today, but well preserved in prefixed forms *počut’, začut’* ‘to hear’, *načúvat’* ‘to listen to’, etc.). The meaning ‘to feel’ is also present in the today’s archaic negative counterpart *nečulý* – ‘insensitive’.

‘quick, agile, active, eventful’ etc., and it is metaphorically transferred to collocations with names of inanimate objects (traffic, village) or abstract phenomena (life, relationships, friendship, etc.); this semantic transformation has motivated the loss of awareness of the correlation with the basic meaning ‘to hear’;

**nevrly** ‘grumpy, surly’ – an antonym of the no more existing word \**vrly*, which was formed from *vriet* ‘to boil’. Today’s variant form is *vrelý* and its original meaning ‘what has boiled’ and ‘hot’ was later metaphorically transformed into ‘warm, amiable, pleasant’ (Králik 2015; see § 3.2.2).

### 3.2.2 Adjectives with an obscured l-participial meaning

The more representative group consists of units that are apparently related to the verb base and this relationship is evident, but semantically they refer to sustained quality or property of someone or something not specified as to time, e.g.:

**svetly** ‘light, bright’ – formed from *svietit* ‘to shine, to light’;

**trvalý** ‘lasting, permanent’ – originating in *trvat* ‘to last, to continue’;

**bdelý** ‘watchful, wakeful’ – related to *bdiet* ‘to be awake’;

**kyslý** ‘sour’ – formed from *kysnúť* ‘to sour, to turn sour’;

etc.

They have lost the semantic component of resultativeness, as well as the closely related verbal grammatical meaning of the perfect tense denoting a past event with its consequence up to the present<sup>18</sup> and the meaning of the perfective aspect that both – the perfect tense and perfective aspect – were characteristic of their original participial nature. These participial semantic components have gradually bleached and lost during the historical development. Therefore, these units started to function as adjectives and they have become integrated into this category also by their structural properties: they can be gradable (*svetlejší, najsvetlejší*), derived into adverbs (*trvale, bdelo*) or into nouns (*bdelosť, trvalosť*), and can occur in attributive and predicative positions. The fact that they express the sustained quality of the entity is also reflected in their dictionary definitions, where they are often explained by the present active participles (ending in *-úci*) as equivalents, cf. e.g.:

**svetly** ‘light, bright’

1. majúci slabšiu (farebnú) intenzitu, bledý, jasný, (...) – ‘having a weaker (colour) intensity, pale, clear’

2. majúci dost’ svetla, ožiarený svetlom, jasný, (...) – ‘having enough light, illuminated by light, clear’

3. vydávajúci svetlo, žiariaci, jasný: (...) – ‘emitting light, shining, clear’.<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>18</sup> In case of adjective *kyslý*, it is possible to distinguish the non-resultative quality of being sour (e.g. lemon) or the quality which is a result of some chemical process of souring (acidification; e.g. milk, cream, gherkin etc.); in this case the meaning is resultative. When the quality of being sour is not desired and we speak about e.g. spoiled food which has turned sour (e.g. milk, wine, soup etc.), the prefixed passive participle *skysnutý* is used.

<sup>19</sup> According to KSSJ.

As adjectives, they often undergo the process of semantic derivation and acquire polysemic character with secondary metaphorical meanings, usually expressive or literary, like the other two meanings of the word *svetlý*:

5. *expr.* radostný, šťastný, priaznivý (...) – ‘*expr.* joyful, happy, favourable’ (e. g. future)

6. *kniž.* vznešený, ušľachtilý – ‘*liter.* noble, illustrious’ (e.g. memory);<sup>20</sup>

or the metaphorical meaning of *kyslý* – ‘reflecting dissatisfaction, disgust, unfriendly, bitter’ (e.g. smile) or *bdelý* – ‘watchful, vigilant’ (e.g. guardian, mind).

Sometimes the basic meaning closely associated with the meaning of the source verb has been lost and in the contemporary language such adjectives function only in their metaphorical meanings, e.g.

*skvelý* – formed from the verb *skviet’ sa* ‘to glitter, sparkle’ has only metaphorical meanings:

1. nádherný, prepychový [beautiful, luxurious], e.g. hotel

2. znamenitý, vynikajúci [excellent], e.g. speech;<sup>21</sup>

*vrelý* – formed from *vriet’* ‘to boil’ has only literary meaning ‘warm, honest’ (e.g. feelings) and the use of this adjective with the original resultative meaning directly related to the verb, i.e. ‘something that has got to a boiling point’ or ‘boiling, hot’ is labelled as colloquial (KSSJ) or dialectal (SSJ). However, this is also related to the language policy and the regulatory function of standard language dictionaries (cf. § 3.2.3).

*zbehlý* ‘proficient, expert’ – is formed from *zbehnúť* ‘to run away’ and its original meaning ‘sb. who has run away, escaped’ is documented only in historical texts or dictionaries.

The overlapping of dynamic (and resultative) and static (qualitative) components is documented on examples that are related to perfective (usually prefixed) verbs with the resultative semantic component, which is perceived to a certain degree, but in the meaning of the adjectives, the component of current or sustained quality prevails, e.g.:

*zaostalý* ‘backward, retarded’ – from the perfective *zaostat’* ‘to fall behind’;

*osamelý* ‘lonely, alone’ – from *osamiet’* ‘to become lonely, to be left alone’.

Such units of hybrid character, with regard to the proportion of their dynamic (perfectiveness and resultativeness) and static (current or sustained quality) components – are closed to units described in the following section.

### 3.2.3 *L-participial adjectives with preserved resultative meaning*

Following the sequence and the gradualness of the adjectivization process of the former *l*-participles, the presence or absence of the semantic component of resultativeness appears to be a

---

<sup>20</sup> *ibid.*

<sup>21</sup> *ibid.*

key point. As mentioned above, old PSL deverbal adjectives with the suffix *-l-* acquired the component of resultativeness after the semantic change based on metonymy: from the ‘tendency or propensity to do something’ to ‘quality as a result of the previous action’. This semantic change motivated the formation of the specific and in the past productive participial subgroup, which was on the one hand closely related to semantic changes accompanying the grammaticalization of the Proto-Slavic perfect (see § 3.1) and, on the other hand, a base for a new participial group of past active participles, with adjectivization tendencies.

The largest subgroup (more than 220 units) of the forms analysed in our research consists of units that in their meaning have retained the semantic component ‘quality or state as a result of some previous action’ and their direct relation to the base verb is evident, so they (at least in their basic meanings) can be classified as resultative participles. This subgroup has been delimited on the base of the presence of the above-mentioned properties, but regarding further semantic changes, the whole subgroup appears to be very heterogeneous with different amounts of dynamic and static properties; therefore, these units are referred to as *l*-participial adjectives:

*zrelý* ‘ripe, mature’ – formed from *zriet’* ‘to ripen, to mature’;

*hnilý* ‘rotten, decayed’ – from *hniť* ‘to rot, to decay’;

*minulý* ‘past’ – related to *minút’ sa* ‘to pass, to be gone’.

Except for a few examples (like the three mentioned above), the *l*-participial adjectives are mostly formed from the prefixed intransitive perfective verbs where the category of the perfective aspect also presupposes the semantic component of resultativeness, e.g.:

*dospělý* ‘adult’ – from *dospiet’* ‘to have grown up’;

*zachovalý* ‘well-preserved’ – from *zachovat’ (sa)* ‘to have preserve (oneself)’;

*zosnulý* or *zomrelý* ‘deceased, dead’ – from *zosnúť, zomriet’* ‘to have died’ (*zosnulý* is a euphemistic expression for ‘dead’ related to (now archaic) *zosnúť*, literally ‘to fall asleep’, but it is used only in the meaning ‘to have died’);

*zastaralý* ‘outdated, obsolete’ – from *zastarat’* ‘to become outdated, obsolete’, which is a secondary verb derived from the adjective *starý* ‘old’ (its deverbal origin can be found as far back as in the Indo-European stem *stā-* ‘to stand’; cf. Králik 2015);

*pozostalý* ‘who remained alive, survivor (usually about relatives)’ – from *pozostat’* ‘to have remained’;

*uplynulý* ‘past’ – from *uplynúť* ‘to have passed’;

etc.

The participial character, the resultative meaning and the clear relationship to the verb base of these units are maintained in their basic meanings, but in case of other – semantically derived and metaphorical – meanings they occur in new collocations and express a sustained quality not specified as to time. In these lexias (members of the polysemic lexeme), they diverge from the verbal paradigm and merge into the category of qualitative adjectives – cf. metaphorical meanings of *hnilý* – ‘lazy’, *zrelý* – ‘mature’ (e.g. man or artist), *minulý* ‘last’ (e.g. year or issue of a journal, etc.), *pokročilý* ‘advanced’ (related to *pokročiť* with the basic meaning ‘to take a step forward’ and secondary ‘to progress’), *skleslý* ‘sad and depressed, dejected’ (e.g. man or mood) formed from

*sklesnúť* ‘to have fallen, decreased’ etc. The semantic (metaphorical) derivation, accompanied by the emergence of polysemy and the bleaching or loss of the basic meanings (both lexical and grammatical), is also perceived as one of the signs of adjectivization process.<sup>22</sup>

The subgroup of the *l*-participial adjectives with preserved resultative meaning documents another semantic change in their evolution, and that is the loss of grammatical meaning of the active voice (the original *l*-participles were active, i.e. the meaning ‘quality as a result of the previous action’ means that the previous action has been carried out by the subject). This change concerns a large number of this subgroup and is interrelated to synonymization with the passive (*-n-*, *-t-*) participles; both participial subgroups have in common that they refer to the past action, have the resultative meaning, and in the PSL period they were predominantly derived from intransitive verbs.<sup>23</sup> The loss or the neutralization of the active voice is also evident in the lexicographical processing of these units, when<sup>24</sup>:

1) the passive participles (usually prefixed) are used as equivalents in the meaning descriptions:

SSSJ: **hnilý** *-lá -lé* príd. **1.** ktorý podľahol hntiu (...) syn. zhnitý – ‘which has decayed (...), synonymous decayed’;

KSSJ: **zrelý** *príd. 1.* kt. dozrel, dozretý – ‘which has ripened, ripe’;

KSSJ: **zachovalý** *príd. kniž.* zachovaný – ‘preserved’;

KSSJ: **skleslý** *príd. kniž.* skl’účený, sklesnutý – ‘gloomy, dejected’;  
etc.

2) *l*-participial adjective and past participle are given as synonyms in the headwords of the entry:

KSSJ: zomretý, *kniž.* **zomrelý** – ‘deceased, dead’;

KSSJ: **utkvený**, **utkvelý** – ‘fixed’;

SSJ: zastaraný, *star. i* **zastaralý** *príd.* – ‘outdated, obsolete’.

3) passive participle is given as a cross-reference:

SSJ: **zvädlý** *p.* zvädnutý;

SSJ: **opilý** *p.* opitý.

These lexicographical practices document the semantic and functional convergence of units coming from two participial subgroups and their synonymization (which is, of course, associated also with bleaching of the passive voice component on the part of original passive participles<sup>25</sup>).

---

<sup>22</sup> In the case of passive participles, in dictionary conceptions the emergence of polysemy is a criterion for processing the unit as a separate entry.

<sup>23</sup> Also Komárek (2006: 125) says that “Míšení přičestí na *-ný/-tý* s přičestím na *-lý* (...) vyplývá z toho, že u nepředmětových sloves se rozlišování těchto přičestí neuplatňuje.” [The mixing of the participles ending in *-ný/-tý* with the participles ending in *-lý* (...) results from the fact that in the case of intransitive verbs the distinction between these participles does not exist. English transl. by G. M.]

<sup>24</sup> Passive participles underlined by G. M.

<sup>25</sup> That is why the *Morphology of the Slovak language* (Ružička 1966: 495) states: “Tento neurčitý slovesný tvar sa nazýva trpným príd. príčastím, hoci často ani nemá trpný význam a nepoužíva sa v pasívnych konštrukciách. Bolo by teda lepšie pomenovať ho podľa formálneho príznaku *n-t-ovým* príd. príčastím, (...)” – This indeterminate verb-form is called

There are a few examples where the related *l*-participial adjectives and passive participles semantically preserve the categorial difference of voice, e.g.:

*zaslúžilý* ‘having merits’ (e.g. artist, worker; i.e. it is used in collocations with persons) and *zaslúžený* ‘well-deserved, obtained on the basis of merit’ (e.g. deserved success, rest) – both from *zaslúžiť si* ‘to deserve’;

*padlý* ‘fallen’ in metaphorical collocation *padlý vojak* ‘fallen soldier’ (i.e. a soldier who died in battle) and *padlá žena* ‘fallen woman’ (i.e. immoral) and *padnutý* – ‘who or what has dropped to the ground, fallen’ (e.g. tree) (cf. Horecký 1995: 342).

The gradual semantic convergence of both participial subgroups has led to the emergence of numerous competitive variants and synonyms. During later development, the passive participles became more productive and many of the *l*-participial adjectives gradually ceased to be used and became archaic. This fact is also reflected in the lexicographical works, in which these lexemes are characterized as stylistically marked and referred to as literary (*kniž.*) or archaic (*zastar.*). Archaization of the *l*-participial adjectives with resultative meaning is evident from the comparison of the older dictionary SSJ (1959–1968) and the newer KSSJ (2003): the SSJ contains 190 lexemes of this type more than the KSSJ. Almost all these lexemes have in their semantic definitions one (sometimes both) of the stylistic field labels (*kniž.* and/or *zastar.*) and the corresponding passive participles as semantic equivalents. Only 33 adjectives with preserved participial meaning are included in the recent KSSJ<sup>26</sup>; the other *l*-participial adjectives have been replaced by equivalent passive participles.

Ján Horecký in his article *Adjectives ending in -lý* (1995) presented very similar results from the comparison of two editions of *The Rules of Slovak Orthography (Pravidlá slovenského pravopisu* – hereinafter PSP) – 1940 and 1991; in PSP 1940 there were registered more than 100 lexemes, while in 1991 they were reduced to only a half of this number.<sup>27</sup> According to Horecký, among the units ending in *-lý* those disappeared that have equivalent forms ending in *-ný/-tý*, because these express the resultative meaning more clearly; units that do not have the *-n/-t-* equivalent are retained, as well as the units with an obscured relation to the basic verb and its meaning (Horecký 1995: 341).

A comparison of the number of individual units of *l*-participial adjectives in two dictionaries (and in two editions of PSP) indicates to a certain extent the natural tendency of archaization of the *l*-forms in the development of the Slovak language. It should be added that the Slovak language policy of the 20<sup>th</sup> century significantly influenced the difference in the number of units listed in the dictionaries and played an important role in the decline of the *l*-participial adjectives from the vocabulary. In the early 1960s (when the SSJ was being prepared) language policy promoted the convergence of Slovak and Czech, and codification of the Slovak language

---

passive participle, although it often has no passive meaning and is not used in passive constructions. It would be better to call it according to its formal sign an *n-/t-* participle, (...). English transl. by G. M.

<sup>26</sup> Of course, in KSSJ, there are more adjectives ending in *-lý*, but they belong to the 1<sup>st</sup> and the 2<sup>nd</sup> subgroups.

<sup>27</sup> However, into his analysis Horecký included all adjectives ending in *-lý* of the participial origin and did not divide them into semantic subgroups. Our statistics also include instances mentioned in section 3.2.4.

supported the use of lexical units that were common to Czech. Therefore, the number of *l*-participial adjectives in the SSJ may also include contact Czech lexemes that have not been fully established in language practice of that time.<sup>28</sup> However, in the second half of the 1960s, the Slovak language policy reverted to protective purist attitudes (known also from the 1930s) and endeavoured to eliminate units considered to be Czech; among them the *l*-participial adjectives (cf. Lifanov 2006: 240–241; Kyseľová 2012; Nábělková 2014: 80–81).

In codification and other linguistic works focused on language regulation, authors recommended to avoid the forms ending in *-lý* and replace them with forms of passive participles (cf. Jánošík 1936–37: 133; Peciar 1946, 1980). Therefore, in the normative dictionary KSSJ some *l*-forms are marked as incorrect and there are recommended forms introduced with the label *správ.* ‘correct’, e.g.: **nahorklý**, *správ.* **horkastý** ‘bitterish’; **prepadlý**, *správ.* **prepadnutý** ‘sunken’ (e.g. face, cheeks). The consequence of this language policy means, on the one hand, significant elimination of the *l*-participial adjectives (or proper *l*-participles – see § 3.2.4), on the other hand, the existence of units which are common in language practice but are not accepted by codification, e.g. *zastaralý* ‘outdated’, has more than 1700 occurrences in the Slovak national corpus (cf. Kyseľová 2012: 259).

### 3.2.4 True past active *l*-participles

In the contemporary Slovak language, there is only a limited but stable group of units ending in *-lý*, which are apparently related to the verb base in its basic meaning, preserved the resultativeness and the active voice, so they retain the original participial character and can be considered part of the verb paradigm. These units often have low collocability and are used in the particular registers (administration, economics, poetics or historical texts). Typical representatives of this group are verba movendi – specifically, the prefixed derivatives of the verb *ísť* ‘go’:

**došlý** – ‘who/what has come’ used usually in administration in collocation with mail, invoice, payment, consignment, news etc.;

**zašlý** – ‘what has gone’ – a rather poetic expression in collocations with glory, times, etc.;

**prišlý** – ‘who/what has come’ – today quite archaic, used in religious or historical texts;

**novoprišlý** – ‘who has recently come’ – occurred in historical or administrative contexts (e.g. ethnic, emigrant, teacher, etc.);

**vyšlý** – ‘who/what has gone out’ – occurred in older historical literary texts; recently it is used in administration with payment, invoice, etc.

**ušlý** – ‘what has been lost’ – e.g. salary, profit, income, receipts, etc.; used more widely in the past, e.g. in the meaning ‘who escaped’ (prisoner, wife, horse) or ‘what has passed’ (year).

As Kyseľová shows (2012: 264), in the Slovak National Corpus it is possible to identify several new lexical units ending in *-lý*, which so far function as language innovations, having the character of occasionalisms (derived from the secondary verbs or verbal occasionalisms) or they are new contact borrowings from the Czech language (e.g. *zbastardelý* – from *bastard* – ‘who has lost good qualities or acquired features of a bad man, bastard’, *pojaponštely* – from *Japan* – ‘what has taken

<sup>28</sup> As already mentioned, in the Czech language, the *l*-participial adjectives have been largely preserved and many of them are still productive.



on Japanese character' (e.g. music), *spovrchneľý* – from the secondary verb derived from the adjective *povrchný* 'superficial' – with the meaning 'who became less serious' (e.g. media), and others.

#### 4. Conclusions

The group of lexemes identified in Slovak descriptive grammatical and lexicographical works as "adjectives ending in *-ľý*" includes a variable set of units of hybrid nature. Their structural and semantic characteristics reflects the overlapping of the verbal and adjectival grammatical meanings and dynamic and static semantic components. Historically probably a larger and more homogeneous class of original perfect active participles used in resultative constructions lost its homogeneity and today it can generally be characterized as:

1) **limited** – units originating in verb base and now oscillating between participles and adjectives are neither formed from all (or from most of) verbs, nor from all perfective intransitive verbs, so they do not have structural character (unlike *-n/-t-* participles). In the process of the verb-to-adjective reanalysis and desemanticization (loss of resultative and active components), they diverged: they were transformed into adjectives, or they competed and later were substituted by *-n/-t-* participles. It can be said that their productivity has been gradually decreasing, even though occasionally new lexemes of the true *l*-participial character appeared and still appear;

2) **irregular** as to structural and derivational properties – except for the above-mentioned fact that they acquire the adjectival gradability and function as the base for the derivation into adverbs and abstract and personal nouns to a varying extent, they do not regularly form negative opposites (e.g. *\*vrľý* – *nevrľý* 'grumpy, surly', *bdely* 'watchful, wakeful' – *\*nebdely*);

3) **semantically rich** – with a high degree of metaphorical semantic derivation, and often with the loss of the original basic meaning and with rise of polysemy. However, the verb-to-adjective reanalysis is a transformation based on metonymy.

The above properties are characteristic of individualism, which is more typical for lexical units (adjectives and substantivized adjectives) than for members of grammatical paradigm (like verbal participles). Compared to other groups of participles, they are characterized by a higher degree of adjectivization (lexicalization), but this change is not completed and generalized in the whole class of units and the differences in losing and acquiring grammatical categorial meanings reflect the different phases and degrees of this change – as it is claimed in the definition of lexicalization given in the introduction: "Over time there may be further loss of internal constituency and the item may become more lexical." (Brinton & Traugott 2005: 96 – see § 1). Reconstruction of these phases, gradual decategorization and desemanticization, and reanalysis into a new structural and semantic class can serve as a contribution to more general questions about the nature of language change and its explanation.

The development of PSL perfect active participles with the formant *-l-* shows an interrelation between lexicalization and grammaticalization, as the original members of the same grammatical paradigm connected with oppositional relations have diverged after overcoming these two seemingly opposite changes. The analysis of grammaticalization of the substantival (short) forms of the original *l*-participles to analytical verb constructions has manifested that this process could be one of the motivating factors of the later paradigmatic, functional and semantic changes

of the *l*-participle forms with a long (composite) declension, as well as of their decline in productivity (cf. Múcsková 2016: 149; see also Damborský 1967: 10). This decline – also influenced by the historical language-planning factors – is still a source of language dynamics and variation.

## References

- Andersen, Henning. 1987. From auxiliary to desinence. In Haris, Martin & Ramat, Paolo (eds.), *Historical development of auxiliaries*, 21–51. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Brinton, Laurel J. & Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. 2005. *Lexicalization and language change*. (Research Surveys in Linguistics). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Croft, William. 2000. *Explaining language change. An evolutionary approach*. Harlow: Longman.
- Croft, William. 2001. Typology. In Aronoff, Mark & Rees-Miller, Janie (eds.), *The Handbook of Linguistics*, 337–368. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Čermák, František. 2016. Diskrétní jednotky v jazyce: případ jednoho českého cirkumfixu. [Discrete Language Units: The Case of a Czech Circumfix.] *Jazykovedný časopis* 67(3). 273–282.
- Čermák, František. 2008. Diskrétní jednotky v jazyce: případ cirkumfixů. [Discrete Language Units: The case of circumfixes.] *Slovo a slovesnost* 69(1–2). 78–98.
- Damborský, Jan. 1967. *Participium l-ové ve slovanštině*. [L-participle in Slavic.] (Rozprawy Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego 15). Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
- Dostál, Antonín. 1953. Některé otázky vývoje slovanské konjugace a jejich řešení s hlediska vývojové gramatické stavby slovanských jazyků. [Some questions of the development of Slavic conjugation and their solutions with respect to the development of the grammatical structure of Slavic languages.] *Slavia. Časopis pro slovanskou filologii* 22(2–3). 267–275.
- Heine, Bernd. 2003. Grammaticalization. In Joseph, Brian D. & Janda, Richard D. (eds.), *The Handbook of Historical Linguistics*, 575–601. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Heine, Bernd & Kuteva, Tania. 2004. *World lexicon of grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hopper, Paul J. & Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. 1993. *Grammaticalization*. (Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics.) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hopper, Paul J. & Traugott, Elizabeth Closs. 2003. *Grammaticalization*. (Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics.) 2<sup>nd</sup> revised edn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Horecký, Ján. 1995. Prídavné mená na -lý. [Adjectives ending in -lý.] *Kultúra slova* 29(6). 338–342.
- Horecký, Ján & Buzássyová, Klára & Bosák, Ján et al. 1989. *Dynamika slovnej zásoby súčasnej slovenčiny*. [The Dynamism of the Wordstock of Contemporary Slovak]. Bratislava: Vydavateľstvo Slovenskej akadémie vied.

- Ivanov, Valerij V. 1983. *Istoričeskaja grammatika russkogo jazyka*. [The historical grammar of the Russian language]. Moskva: Posveščenie.
- Jánošík, Anton. 1936/37. Zo školskej slovenčiny. [From the school Slovak.] *Slovenská reč* 5(5–6). 133–
- Karlík, Petr. 2003. K vnitřní struktuře českých ?participií. [On the internal structure of Czech ?participles.] *Sborník prací Filozofické fakulty brněnské univerzity - Linguistica Brunensia*. A51(1), 133-145. Brno: Masarykova univerzita.
- Karlík, Petr & Migdalski, Krzysztof. 2017. -L-PARTICIPIUM. [-L-PARTICIPLE.] In Karlík, Petr & Nekula, Marek & Pleskalová, Jana (eds.), *CzechEncy – Nový encyklopedický slovník češtiny*. (<https://www.czechency.org/slovník/-L-PARTICIPIUM>) (Accessed 2019-11-23.)
- Klemensiewicz, Zenon & Lehr-Splawiński, Tadeusz & Urbańczyk, Stanisław. 1955. *Gramatyka historyczna języka polskiego*. [The historical grammar of the Polish language.] Warszawa: Państwowe wydawnictwo naukowe.
- Kopečný, František et al. 1980. *Etymologický slovník slovanských jazyků. Slova gramatická a zájmena. Svazek 2. Spojky, částice, zájmena a zájmenná adverbia*. [Etymological dictionary of Slavic languages. Grammatical words and pronouns. Volume 2. Conjunctions, particles, pronouns and pronominal adverbs.] Praha: Academia.
- Kowalska, Alina. 1976. *Ewolucja analitycznych form czasownikowych z imiesłowem na -l w języku polskim*. [The evolution of analytical verb forms with the ł-participle in the Polish language.] Katowice: Uniwersytet Śląski.
- Komárek, Miroslav. 2006. *Příspěvky k české morfologii*. [Contributions to the Czech morphology.] Olomouc: Periplum, družstvo nakladatelů.
- Krajčovič, Rudolf. 1988. *Vývin slovenského jazyka a dialektológia*. [Development of the Slovak language and dialectology.] Bratislava: Slovenské pedagogické nakladateľstvo.
- Králik, Lubor. 2015. *Stručný etymologický slovník slovenčiny*. [Concise etymological dictionary of Slovak.] Bratislava: Veda, vydavateľstvo SAV.
- Kysel'ová, Miroslava. 2012. Verbálne participiá a adjektíva tvorené koncovkou *-lý* v slovenčine, češtine a poľštine (vývoj a súčasné tendencie). In Příhoda, Marek & Kedron, Kateřina & Černý, Marcel (eds.). *Prolínání slovanských prostředí*, 259–267. Praha: Filozofická fakulta Univerzity Karlovy v Praze – Červený Kostelec: Pavel Mervart.
- Langacker, Ronald W. 1977. Syntactic reanalysis. In Li, Charles N. (ed.). *Mechanisms of Syntactic Change*, 57–139. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Lamprecht, Arnošt & Šlosar, Dušan & Bauer, Jaroslav. 1986. *Historická mluvnice češtiny*. [Historical grammar of the Czech language.] Praha: Státní pedagogické nakladatelství.
- Lehmann, Christian. 2002. *Thoughts on grammaticalization*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Arbeitspapiere des Seminars für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Erfurt 9). Erfurt: Seminar für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität.

- Lifanov, Konstantin. 2006. Debohémizácia slováckého literaturného jazyka v XX. veke kak prodolženie processov dokodifikacionného perioda. [Debohémization of the Slovak literary language in the 20<sup>th</sup> century as a continuation of processes of the pre-codification period.] In Jesenšek, Marko & Zorko, Zinka (eds.). *Jezikovna predanost. Jubilejni zbornik akad. prof. dr. Jožetu Toporišiču ob 80-letnici. (Zora 44)*. 234–245. Maribor: Slavistično društvo – Ljubljana: SAZU.
- Múcsková, Gabriela. 2012. The category of definiteness in relation to the lexical and grammatical development of the Slovak language. In Janyšková, Ilona & Karlíková, Helena (eds.) *Theory and Empiricism in Slavonic Diachronic Linguistics*, 423–433. Praha: Nakladatelství Lidové noviny.
- Múcsková, Gabriela. 2016. *Jazykové zmeny v historickom vývine gramatických tvarov z aspektu gramatikalizácie (na príklade vývinu slovenského präterita)*. [Language changes in the historical development of grammatical forms from a grammaticalization perspective (on the example of the development of the Slovak preterite).] Bratislava: Univerzita Komenského.
- Múcsková, Gabriela. 2017. O slovenskom purizme a anti-purizme v kontexte jazykových ideológií. [About Slovak purism and anti-purism in the context of language ideologies.] In Lanstyák, István & Múcsková, Gabriela & Tancer, Jozef (eds.). *Jazyky a jazykové ideológie v kontexte viacjazyčnosti na Slovensku*, 39–79. Bratislava: Univerzita Komenského.
- Nábělková, Mira. 2014. The case of Czech-Slovak language contact and contact-induced phenomena. In Besters-Dilger, Juliane & Dermarkar, Cynthia & Pfänder, Stefan & Rabus, Achim (eds.), *Congruence in contact-induced language change. Language families, typological resemblance, and perceived similarity*, 61–92. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Nagórko, Alicja. 2012. *Podręczna gramatyka języka polskiego*. [The practical grammar of the Polish language.] Warszawa: Wydawnictwo naukowe PWN.
- Pauliny, Eugen. 1947. *Nárečie zátopových osád na hornej Orave*. [The dialect of the flood settlements in the upper Orava.] Martin: Matica slovenská.
- Peciar, Štefan. 1946. Prídavné mená na *-lý*. [Adjectives ending in *-lý*.] *Slovenská reč* 12(1–2). 64–65.
- Peciar, Štefan. 1980. Aký postoj zaujať k prídavnému menu *okázalý*? [What attitude to take to the adjective *okázalý*?] *Kultúra slova* 14(3). 74–77.
- Ružička, Jozef et al. 1966. *Morfológia slovenského jazyka*. [Morphology of the Slovak language.] Bratislava: Vydavateľstvo SAV 1966.
- Sejáková, Jana. 1995. *Adjektivizácia n-/t-ových prídavných prídavných v súčasnej slovenčine*. [Adjektivization of the n-/t-participles in contemporary Slovak.] Bratislava: Jazykovedný ústav Ľ. Štúra SAV 1995. (Doctoral dissertation.)
- Sokolová, Miloslava & Žigo, Pavol. 2014. *Verbálne kategórie aspekt a tempus v slovenčine*. [The verb categories of aspect and tense in Slovak.] Bratislava: Veda, vydavateľstvo SAV.
- Stanislav, Ján. 1967. *Dejiny slovenského jazyka 2. Tvaroslovie*. [History of the Slovak language 2. Morphology.] Bratislava: Vydavateľstvo Slovenskej akadémie vied.

Stanislav, Ján. 1987. *Starosloviensky jazyk 2. Morfológia*. [Old Church Slavonic 2. Morphology.] Bratislava: Slovenské pedagogické nakladateľstvo.

Štolc, Jozef. 1978. *Atlas slovenského jazyka II. Flexia. Časť druhá – úvod, komentáre*. [Atlas of the Slovak language II. Inflexion. The second part – introduction, commentaries.] Bratislava: Veda, vydavateľstvo SAV.

Zubatý, Josef. 1980. *České sloveso*. [The Czech verb.] Praha: Academia, nakladatelství Československé akademie věd. (reprint of edition published in 1921).

## Sources

### SSJ

Peciar, Štefan (ed.) 1959. *Slovník slovenského jazyka. I. A–K*. [Dictionary of Slovak Language. A–K.] Bratislava: Vydavateľstvo SAV.

Peciar, Štefan (ed.) 1960. *Slovník slovenského jazyka. II. L–O*. [Dictionary of Slovak Language. L–O.] Bratislava: Vydavateľstvo SAV.

Peciar, Štefan (ed.) 1963. *Slovník slovenského jazyka. III. P–R*. [Dictionary of Slovak Language. P–R.] Bratislava: Vydavateľstvo SAV.

Peciar, Štefan (ed.) 1964. *Slovník slovenského jazyka. IV. S–U*. [Dictionary of Slovak Language. S–U.] Bratislava: Vydavateľstvo SAV.

Peciar, Štefan (ed.) 1965. *Slovník slovenského jazyka. V. V–Ž*. [Dictionary of Slovak Language. V–Ž.] Bratislava: Vydavateľstvo SAV.

### KSSJ

Kačala, Ján & Pisárčiková, Mária & Považaj, Matej. (eds.) 2003. *Krátky slovník slovenského jazyka*. [A concise dictionary of Slovak language.] Bratislava: Veda, vydavateľstvo SAV.

### SSSJ

Buzássyová, Klára & Jarošová, Alexandra (eds.). 2006. *Slovník súčasného slovenského jazyka. A–G*. [Dictionary of contemporary Slovak language. A–G.] Bratislava: Veda, vydavateľstvo SAV.

Jarošová, Alexandra & Buzássyová, Klára (eds.). 2011. *Slovník súčasného slovenského jazyka. H–L*. [Dictionary of contemporary Slovak language. H–L.] Bratislava: Veda, vydavateľstvo SAV.

Jarošová, Alexandra (ed.). 2015. *Slovník súčasného slovenského jazyka. M–N*. [Dictionary of contemporary Slovak language. M–N.] Bratislava: Veda, vydavateľstvo SAV.

### SNK

*Slovenský národný korpus*. [Slovak National Corpus] – prim-8.0-public-vyv. Bratislava: Jazykovedný ústav Ľ. Štúra SAV 2018. (<http://korpus.juls.savba.sk>)

## Acknowledgements

The present paper is based on research carried out within two research projects: “Jazyková zmena v historickom vývine jazyka a v procese formovania jeho spisovnej variety 2” [Language change in the historical development of language and in the process of formation of its standard variety 2] (VEGA 1/0681/17) and “Slovník slovenských nářečí” [Dictionary of the Slovak dialects] (VEGA 2/0126/18).

At the same time, I would like to thank the anonymous reviewer for his/her suggestions and comments, and the guest editor of the volume Ada Böhmerová for her proofreading and help.

*Gabriela Múcsková*

*Department of the Slovak Language, Faculty of Arts of Comenius University &*

*Ludovít Štúr Institute of Linguistics of the Slovak Academy of Sciences*

*Bratislava*

*Slovakia*

[gabriela.mucskova@uniba.sk](mailto:gabriela.mucskova@uniba.sk)

In SKASE Journal of Theoretical Linguistics [online]. 2019, vol. 16, no. 3[cit. 2019-11-30]. Available on web page [http://www.skase.sk/Volumes/JTL41/pdf\\_doc/09.pdf](http://www.skase.sk/Volumes/JTL41/pdf_doc/09.pdf). ISSN 1336-782X