



**LACUS
FORUM
XXXI**

Interconnections

UIC
UNIVERSITY
OF ILLINOIS
AT CHICAGO

YOUR RIGHTS

This electronic copy is provided free of charge with no implied warranty. It is made available
to you under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial license
version 3.0

(<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/3.0/>)

Under this license you are free:

- **to Share** — to copy, distribute and transmit the work
- **to Remix** — to adapt the work

Under the following conditions:

- **Attribution** — You must attribute the work in the manner specified by the author
or licensor (but not in any way that suggests that they endorse you or your use of the
work).
- **Noncommercial** — You may not use this work for commercial purposes.

With the understanding that:

- **Waiver** — Any of the above conditions can be waived if you get permission from the
copyright holder.
- **Other Rights** — In no way are any of the following rights affected by the license:
 - Your fair dealing or fair use rights;
 - The author's moral rights;
 - Rights other persons may have either in the work itself or in how the work is
used, such as publicity or privacy rights.

Notice: For any reuse or distribution, you must make clear to others the license terms of
this work. The best way to do this is with a link to the web page cited above.

For inquiries concerning commercial use of this work, please visit
<http://www.lacus.org/volumes/republication>

Cover: The front cover of this document is licensed under the Creative Commons
Attribution-No Derivative Works 3.0 license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nd/3.0/>) and may not be altered in any fashion. The LACUS “lakes” logo and University
of Illinois at Chicago logo on the cover are trademarks of LACUS and the University of
Illinois at Chicago respectively. The University Illinois at Chicago logo is used here with
permission from the trademark holder. No license for use of these trademarks outside of
redistribution of this exact file is granted. These trademarks may not be included in any
adaptation of this work.

FOR THE UNITY OF MEANING OF THE POLISH VERBAL PREFIX ZA-

Barbara Bacz
Laval University

VERBAL PREFIXATION in Slavic (and thus also in Polish) is closely connected with the elusive phenomenon of Slavic aspect, since the commonly recognized, primary function of verbal prefixes is to indicate perfectivity. In the chapter on the morphology of Polish verbs (Wróbel 1984) in the representative *Gramatyka współczesnego języka polskiego* (Grzegorzczkowska et al. 1984), Wróbel states, 'from a formal point of view, a verbal derivative which differs from the verb's simplex form only in the presence of a native prefix (and, optionally, the postfix *się*) is always perfective' (Grzegorzczkowska et al. 1984:490, my translation)¹. The perfectivizing function of the prefix *za-*, counteracted by the imperfectivizing action of the stem suffix *-ywa-*, further overridden by the addition of a second prefix (*po-*), is illustrated in example (1) with a series of infinitives related to the simplex verb *pisać* 'write'. The layering of aspectual and semantic contrasts in the derivatives of the verb is represented by the pairs: *pisać* (IMP) 'write': *zapisać* (PRF) 'write something down'; *zapisać* (PRF) : *zapisywać* (IMP) 'write things down'; *zapisywać* (IMP) : *pozapisywać* (PRF) 'write down a concrete/limited number of things'.

- | | | | | |
|---------------------------|---|--|---|--------------------------|
| (1) a. <i>pisać</i> (IMP) | : | <i>zapisać</i> (PRF) | : | <i>zapisać się</i> (PRF) |
| 'write' | | <i>za-</i> write | | 'za-write oneself down?' |
| 'write something down' | | 'cover something with writing' | | 'register' |
| b. <i>zapisać</i> (PRF) | : | <i>zapisywać</i> (<i>się</i>) (IMP) | | |
| 'write something down' | | 'write things down'/register several times/
be engaged in the activity of registration' | | |
| c. <i>pisywać</i> (IMP) | : | <i>zapisywać</i> (IMP) | | |
| 'write frequently' | | 'write things down' | | |
| d. <i>zapisywać</i> (IMP) | : | <i>pozapisywać</i> (<i>się</i>) (PRF) | | |
| 'write things down' | | 'write down a limited number of things'/
'register for a limited number of activities' | | |

It has to be made clear that aspectual contrast in Slavic is a contrast between perfective and imperfective, the two terms being understood in their traditional sense as denoting processes that are viewed as complete and incomplete (the Polish terms are *aspekt dokonany/niedokonany* 'accomplished/not accomplished')². Unlike English and many other languages where the perfective/imperfective contrast is communicated only in the finite, tense-marked forms of the verb (usually the past tense), the

perfective/imperfective opposition in Slavic manifests itself obligatorily on all verbal forms, including the infinitive, the imperative and the participles.

As evidenced by the verb *zapisywać* (IMP) in example (1)c, which forms a contrastive semantic (but not aspectual) pair with the verb *pisywać* (IMP) in (1)c, the presence of a native prefix on a verbal derivative does not guarantee the verb's perfectivity—when the verb's stem contains an imperfective marker such as *-ywa-*, the verb remains imperfective in spite of the addition of a prefix. It is possible, however, to perfectivize the verb again by adding another preverbal prefix, as in the case of the verb *pozapisywać* (PRF) in (1)d, which has two preverbal prefixes: *po-* and *za-* on top of the imperfective marker *-ywa-*.

Verbal prefixes convey a rich array of meanings and adding them to the verbs' bases ('simplex forms') changes not only the aspect of the verb but also its semantic and syntactic characteristics. Therefore, from the point of view of the results verbal prefixation produces, the process in Slavic is both grammatical and lexical³. It is grammatical because prefixation affects the grammatical category of aspect, and it is lexical because by its nature it belongs to the domain of derivational morphology (and word-formation), and as such, has obvious effects on the verb's lexical meaning and syntactic behaviour⁴.

1. OBJECTIVE. *Za-* is classed among the oldest (Tabakowska 2003:157) of the sixteen non-foreign verbal prefixes in Polish (Grzegorzczkowska et al. 1984:470). It is very productive, being second only to the prefix *z-/s-* (as in *spisać* [*z-*write] 'produce a record in writing'), with a frequency of occurrence rate comparable to that of the native prefixes *po-* (*popisać się* 'give a show'), *wy-* (*wypisać się* 'write off the list'), *o-* (*opisać* 'describe'), *u-* (*upić* 'drink a bit of something'), *na-* (*napić się* 'have a drink'), *przy-* (*przypisać* 'ascribe to') (Grzegorzczkowska et al. 1984:471). It is identical in form to the preposition *za* 'behind, over, on the other side, for, instead of', to which it is generally assumed to be related both historically and in function (Townsend & Janda 1996:134, Tabakowska 2003: 156)⁵.

The aim of the present study is to show that just as the diverse uses of the preposition *za* can be related to the underlying, prototypical sense of spatial **location behind** a barrier (Bacz 1995, Bacz 2004), so can the various meanings of the verbal prefix *za-* be shown to be all somehow motivated by the idea of **crossing (going) over or behind** some boundary (in time or in space). It is assumed, in line with the cognitivist view of meaning, that visual perception of configurations in space underlies our understanding and conceptualization of all other relations, including relations expressed by language, and that spatial images (Langackerian *image schemas*) provide comprehensive (and easily comprehensible) semantic models for language categories⁶. Semantic parallelism between the preposition *za* and the verbal prefix *za-* in Polish has been argued for in a recent cognitivist article by Tabakowska (Tabakowska 2003); a cognitivist interpretation of two basic senses of the prefix *za-* (the sense of covering and the sense of preserving/ securing) was suggested in an earlier study on Polish perfectivizing prefixes by Dąbrowska (1996). My analysis of *za-* elaborates

on the findings of these authors while keeping in focus the idea of semantic unity of this notoriously diversified prefix.

2. ANALYSIS. The authors of the biggest recent *Słownik współczesnego języka polskiego [Dictionary of Contemporary Polish]* (Dunaj et al. 1996:1301) distinguish eight unrelated meanings for the prefix *za-*; a popular Polish grammar for foreigners (Bartnicka & Satkiewicz 2000:273), in an attempt to offer a comprehensible overview of the problem of *za-* for learners of Polish, suggests eleven different senses for the prefix. A semantic network model proposed for *za-* by Tabakowska (2003:172) reduces the perfectivizing uses of the prefix to five types related to two prototypical centres: a centre based on orientation of space relative to landmark as in the verb *zaskoczy kogoś* [*za*-jump somebody (from behind)] ‘surprise somebody’, which has inherent front/back orientation (Tabakowska 2003:168) and a centre based on orientation of space relative to observer (all other perfectivizing uses with landmarks of no distinguishable inherent orientation—Tabakowska 2003:168–71). In my own preliminary analysis of *za(-)* (Bac 1995), carried out from the perspective of the Guillaumian linguistics principle of the unity of sign and meaning, I suggest that the prefix requires two potential meanings: one to capture its intensifying function (as in *zaprzestać czegoś* (PRF) [*za*-stop something:GEN] ‘abandon some activity’; *zawrócić* (PRF) [*za*-come back] ‘turn back’) and one for the different varieties of its aspectual ‘going-over-and-behind’ sense. In this paper, I argue that the usage types distinguished for the prefix are all motivated by one underlying (prototypical) spatial sense of ‘going over and behind a boundary’ which delimits (in time or in space) the activity evoked by the verb. The usage types of *za-* discussed in this paper represent different extensions (different semantic variants) of the prefix’s prototypical meaning and are illustrated in examples (2) to (12) below. The sentence examples are my own, and they relate the uses of the prefix listed in the *Słownik współczesnego języka polskiego [SWJP]* (Dunaj 1996) and two Polish grammars, *Gramatyka współczesnego języka polskiego* (Grzegorzczkowska 1984) and *Gramatyka języka polskiego. Podręcznik dla cudzoziemców* (Bartnicka & Satkiewicz 2000).

The most frequently quoted use of *za-*, listed first in the dictionaries and grammars (see Dunaj 1996:1301, Bartnicka & Satkiewicz 2000:273), concerns the purely grammatical, perfectivizing function of the prefix, illustrated by the contrastive sentences (2)a and (2)b and a series of imperfective/perfective infinitives in (2)c⁷.

- (2) a. Czy tu można parkować?
if here can:3SG:IMPERSONAL park
Can one park here?
- b. Czy mogę gdzieś tutaj zaparkować/*parkować (samochód)?
if can:1SG somewhere here **za**-park/*park (car)
Can I park (the car)(= find a parking spot) somewhere here?
- c. palić : **za**-palić telefonować : **za**-telefonować
smoke **za**-smoke call **za**-call
‘to smoke’ ‘to have a smoke’ ‘to call’ ‘to make a call’

In the ‘pure perfectivity’ use of example (2), the difference between the imperfective and the perfective infinitives for the English verb *to park* (*parkować* versus *za-parkować* in (2)a and (2)b) can be interpreted as a difference between general and specific. In (2)a, the infinitive *parkować* evokes the activity of parking as a type of activity in general; in (2)b, the infinitive *za-parkować* calls to mind a specific instance of that activity (something like ‘to park once, on one occasion’). That’s why the imperfective, unprefix form is not compatible with grammatical elements that imply specificity, such as the specific trajector (the personal pronoun subject ‘I’ rather than the impersonal ‘one’—*mogę* versus *można* in Polish) and the indication of the event’s location (‘somewhere here’—*gdzieś tutaj*). The perfective versus imperfective distinction in Slavic can be visualized with the help of the nominal count-versus-mass concept of *boundedness* applied to activities expressed by verbs (see Langacker 1991:59–100): perfective verbs are seen as evoking processes in time that are constrained by being tied down to specific details (all this is covered by the broadest sense of the term *bounded*), while processes that are general and totally *unbounded* represent the category of imperfectives⁸.

The examples in (3), (4) and (5) show that the boundedness (perfectivity) of processes expressed by *za*-prefixed verbs manifests itself through different syntactic means. In (3)a, illustrating the aspectual pair *grać* ‘play’: *zagrać* ‘*za*-play something’, the perfectivity of the *za*-verb is reflected on the level of a sentence in the verb’s direct object, which, in terms of a cognitivist analysis, is the primary landmark of the evoked event. The spatial boundaries of this direct-object landmark impose a boundary on the process expressed by the verb. The prefix’s over-and-behind interpretation applies to the spatial boundaries of *Chopin’s mazurka* (the direct object) in (3)a which, by extension from the semantics of the intransitive-to-transitive shift in the verb *play*, has come to denote the boundary of the process. Additional examples (*zanucić*, *zakopać*) representing the intransitive to transitive shift resulting from *za*-prefixation are given in (3)b. See also *palić* ‘to smoke’ versus *zapalić* (*papierosa*) ‘to smoke a cigarette’ in (2)d.

- (3) a. *Mateusz za-grał mazurka Szopena.*
 Matthew *za*-played mazurka:ACC Chopin:GEN
 Matthew played a mazurka by Chopin.
- b. *nucić : za-nucić melodię*
 hum *za*-hum tune:ACC
 ‘to hum’ ‘to hum a tune’
- kopać w piasku : za-kopać autko w piasku*
 dig in sand:LOC *za*-dig toy car:ACC in sand:LOC
 ‘dig (= play) in sand’ ‘bury a toy-car in sand’

In (4)b, the boundary of the activity expressed by the verb *zajeżdżać* ‘arrive’ is provided by the spatial boundary of the adverbial nominal *dom* ‘home’ or *miejsce* ‘place, location’ (primary/secondary landmark), which overtly (the presence of the adverbial is

optional) specifies the destination (and therefore, the end limit) of the verb's activity of going somewhere. In the process of arriving at a destination, the trajector (the event's agent) is visualized as crossing the boundary separating 'home' from what is 'non-home'⁹.

- (4) a. *Powinniśmy już jechać do domu.*
 Should:1PL already go to home.
 We should be going home.
- b. *Nareszcie **za**jechaliśmy (do domu / na miejsce)*
 at last **za**-came/went:1PL (to home / at [our] place)
 At last we have arrived home.

In (5), the activities denoted by the *za*-verbs are bounded by their own end limit in time. The prefix indicates that the activity expressed by the simplex verb has come to its natural end because it has produced a change of state in the trajector (the object affected by the activity), the expectation of result constituting part of the meaning of the prefixed verb. The new state the activity's object finds itself in is a natural consequence of the activity expressed by the simplex verb; usually, it is a state of forced immobility or a state of death (real or metaphorical). The change (from action to state) the trajector undergoes (communicated by the *za*-perfectivization) can be represented as crossing (going over and behind) the end boundary of the activity expressed by the simplex verb. *Za*-verbs denoting a change of state resulting from the activity expressed by the simplex verb are characteristic of emphatic spoken style. They are often accompanied by the idiomatic expressions *na śmierć* 'until death', *na amen w pacierzu* 'to the amen in a prayer' (= for good, forever, never to be reversed) which intensify the impression of finality or 'a maximally negative consequence' (Grzegorzczkowska et al. 1984:486, my translation).

- (5) a. *Ta praca bardzo go męczy.*
 this job very much him:ACC tires
 This job makes him extremely tired.
- b. ***Za**-męczysz mnie tymi pytaniami na śmierć.*
 will **za**-tire:2SG me:ACC these questions:INSTR onto death:ACC
 You'll make me sick to death with these questions.
- c. *nudzić kogoś/się : **za**-nudzić kogoś/się (na śmierć)*
 bore somebody/oneself **za**-bore somebody/oneself to death
 'to bore/to be bored' 'to bore somebody stiff/to be bored stiff'
- bić (kogoś) : **za**-bić kogoś*
 beat (somebody) **za**-beat somebody
 'to beat somebody' 'to kill somebody by beating them'¹⁰

Many of the perfective *za*-verbs expressing ultimate consequences of the activity denoted by their imperfective simplex form, such as the verbs *zakleić* 'glue up' (note 10), *zalać* 'flood up' (6)a, *zaszyć* 'sew up' (6)b, *zabielić* 'make white', *zagrącić* 'cover with junk' (note 11) can also be classed with the usage type of the prefix described in the literature as representing the sense of 'covering' (Janda 1986:122, Dąbrowska 1996:482–83, Tabakowska 2003:170). In the covering use of *za*-, the primary landmark (the object affected by the action of the *za*-verb) is separated from view (i.e. put behind a barrier or boundary) by a secondary landmark (overtly specified or presupposed) which refers to the instrument in the activity denoted by the verb. In example (6a) *Sąsiedzi na górze lali wodę na podłogę i zalali nam mieszkanie* 'Our neighbours upstairs poured water on the floor and *za*-poured (flooded) our apartment', the primary landmark 'our apartment' is completely covered with the activity's instrument (secondary landmark) 'water', so that it cannot be seen. The secondary landmark (instrument of the verb's activity) evokes the barrier or a boundary the object of the activity is put behind.

- (6) a. *Sąsiedzi na górze lali wodę na podłogę i zalali*
 neighbours upstairs poured water:ACC on floor:ACC and *za*-poured
nam mieszkanie.
 us:DAT apartment
 Our neighbours upstairs poured water on the floor and flooded our apartment.
- b. *szyc* : *zaszyć* *chlapać (się)* : *zachlapać*
 sew *za*-sew splash *za*-splash
 'to sew' 'to sew up' 'to splash' 'to cover by splashing'¹¹

Contrasting with the ultimate completion sense of *za*-verbs (as in *zabić* 'kill', *zamęczyć* 'tire out', *zanudzić* 'bore to death', *zaszyć* 'cover by sewing up' in 5 and 6), whose activity brings about a change of state in the trajector, the *za*-examples in (7) evoke activities whose result could be called partial. Their effect is slight and less final, but they do bring about a change of state that can be represented as crossing a boundary, here the boundary between the activity and the resultant state. In (7)b, with the verb *zaciąć się* (*za*-cut) 'to nick one's chin', the boundary defining the end of the process is the physical, spatial boundary of the trajector's skin that was untouched and now has been gone through in the process of *za*-cutting.

- (7) a. *Te nożyczki dobrze tną.*
 these scissors well cut :3PL
 'These scissors cut well.'
- b. *Zaciąłem się przy goleniu.*
Za-cut:1SG:MASC myself at shaving.
 I've nicked my chin while shaving.

- c. *drapać* : *zadrapać*
 scratch : *za-scratch*
 'to scratch' 'to make a small scratch'

The examples in (8) contain intransitive verbs of short duration where the time limit of the verb's activity marks the boundary of the process on the time axis. By the very fact of coming to an end, activities of short duration imply a change (from the state of activity to the state of non-activity), which again can be represented as going over a boundary. The difference between the examples in (4) and those in (8) lies in the fact that the activities denoted by the *za*-verbs in (8) do not result from the activities denoted by their simplex verbs. Grammarians observe that *za*-verbs of short duration belong to the lexical class of verbs of perception: they usually describe phenomena that are perceived by the senses of sight, hearing, smell and taste, as evidenced by examples (8)b and (8)c.

- (8) a. *Telefon dzwonił dziś całe popołudnie*
 Phone was ringing today all afternoon:ACC
 'The phone has been ringing all afternoon today.'
- b. *Telefon zadzwonił i zamilkł.*
 phone *za*-rang and *za*-went silent
 'The phone rang once and stopped.'
- c. *świecić* : *zaświecić*
 shine *za*-shine
 'to shine' 'to shine for a moment/to start shining'
- pachnieć* : *zapachnieć*
 smell *za*-smell
 'to smell' 'to smell for a short while/to begin smelling'

Za- verbs of short duration are often classed together with inchoative verbs, such as the verbs *zakochać się* 'fall in love' (9)b or *zachorować* 'fall sick' (9)c. The meaning contributed to these inchoative verbs by *za-* is to emphasize the beginning of the activity. The boundary that is being crossed is again the boundary between non-activity and the activity expressed by the verb. The function of *za-* in this use is to provide a starting-point limit to the unbounded image of the verb's imperfective form.

- (9) a. *Janek kochał się w Marysi.*
 John loved himself in Mary.
 John was in love with Mary.
- b. *Janek zakochał się w Marysi.*
 John *za*-loved himself in Mary.
 John fell in love with Mary.

- (9) c. *chorować* : *zachorować* *świecić* : *zaświecić*
 be sick *za*-be sick shine *za*-shine
 'to be sick' 'to get sick' 'to shine' 'to begin shining'

Inchoative *za*-verbs (9) and *za*-verbs of short duration (8) focus on the fleeting character of the process denoted by the verb. In contrast to the examples in (8) and (9), the verbs with *za*- in the usage type illustrated in (10), i.e. *zaspać* 'oversleep', *zasiedzieć się* 'stay too long', and *zagapić się* 'look too long', express excess, i.e. going beyond what's considered the norm for the activity evoked (in either duration or in intensity). Exceeding the norm means going beyond the boundaries of what is accepted.

- (10) a. *Janek zaspał i spóźnił się do szkoły.*
 John *za*-slept and came late to school.
 John overslept and was late for school.
 b. *zasiedzieć się* *zagapić się*
 za-sit oneself *za*-look oneself
 'to stay too long' 'to look too intensely/to stare too long'

A semantic shift to the opposite is produced by prefixation with *za*- in the aspectual pairs of (11): *pomnieć* (IMP) 'remember' vs. *zapomnieć* (PRF) 'forget' and *bronić* (IMP) 'defend' vs. *zabronić* (PRF) 'forbid'. These uses still follow naturally from the image of going beyond a boundary. The activity of forgetting (*za*-remembering) something is separated from the activity of remembering by a barrier that hides the object that's forgotten (the trajector). The object that's forgotten is put behind the barrier marking the end of the activity of remembering and now, access to it is blocked. The case of *zabronić* 'forbid' can be explained as a metaphorical move beyond a barrier defining the limits of defending and protection, expressed by the simplex imperfective *bronić* (see Dąbrowska 1996:483 for a convincing explanation of the link between blocking access-protection and securing for future use). When access to the object of the activity of defending is blocked, contact with that object can be interpreted as metaphorically forbidden. (See also Tabakowska's 2003:170 discussion of *zabronić palenia* 'to forbid smoking'.) We can note in passing that the proximity of the notions of protecting and forbidding is well illustrated in the semantics of the French verb *défendre* which translates as *defend, protect against* (Polish *bronić*) in uses such as *défendre sa vie* 'defend one's life' or as *forbid* (Polish *zabronić*), in uses such as in the sentence *Il est défendu de parler au conducteur* 'It is forbidden to talk to the driver'.

- (11) a. *'Pomnij com ci przykazała'* (from a poem)
 remember:2SG-IMP what:1SG you:DAT bid:3SG:FEM
 Remember what I told you to do.
 b. *Zapomnij co ci powiedziałam.*
 Za-remember:2SG-IMP what you:DAT told:1SG:FEM
 Forget what I told you.

c. <i>bronić</i>	:	<i>zabronić</i>
defend		<i>za-</i> defend
'to defend, protect'		'to forbid'

In the final set of examples, (12), the function of *za-* can be described as intensifying. In a prevailing number of instances representing this usage, *za-* is added to verbs that are already perfective, so it cannot bring about their perfectivity. Its role, then, is to intensify the already perfective meaning of the verb¹². The examples in (12)a show that the presence of *za-* strengthens the impression of perfectivity conveyed by the verb by imposing an additional boundary (of a different kind) on an activity that has already been bounded. In the perfective infinitive *zastrzelić* (PRF) 'shoot down', derived through *za-*-prefixation to the perfective infinitive *strzelić* (PRF) 'fire a shot', the change-of-state/ultimate consequence perfective meaning (as illustrated in (5)) combines with the single occurrence meaning of the verb *strzelić* (PRF) 'fire a shot', which forms an aspectual pair with the imperfective *-a-* infinitive *strzelać* (IMP) 'shoot (several times)'. Thus, the addition of a prefix to a form that is already perfective strengthens the impression of perfectivity in the lexical meaning of the verb.

In (12)b, the addition of the prefix changes the stylistic value of the verb. The prefixed forms *zaprzestać* 'to stop', *zawezwać* 'to call', *zakupić* 'to purchase' are characteristic of formal Polish. One could argue that switching to a formal register represents the activity of crossing the line between the neutral and the marked on the level of style, and thus, going beyond a boundary.

(12) a. <i>strzelić</i> (PRF) :	<i>zastrzelić kogoś</i> (PRF)	vs. <i>strzelać</i> (IMP)
shoot once	<i>za-</i> shoot somebody	shoot
'to fire a shot'	'to shoot somebody down'	'to shoot'
b. <i>przestać</i> (PRF) :	<i>zaprzestać</i> (PRF)	
stop	<i>za-</i> stop	
'to stop'	'to stop'(formal)	
<i>wezwać</i> (PRF) :	<i>zawezwać</i> (PRF)	
call	<i>za-</i> call	
'to call'	'to call' (formal)	

3. CONCLUSION. The analysis of *za-*-prefixed Polish verbs has shown that verbal prefixation is never semantically vacuous, and that diverse uses of *za-*-prefixed verbs can be given a unified description. Whether the addition of the prefix changes the aspect or the lexical meaning of the verb, its semantic contribution can be represented as an extension of the underlying, prototypical sense of *za-* to communicate the idea of going over and behind a boundary.

¹ The perfectivization-by-prefixation rule does not apply when a foreign prefix, such as *re-* or *de(z)-*, or the very infrequent prefix *niedo-* are added to the verb's base, as illustrated by

the following sets of infinitives: *organizować* (IMP) 'organize' versus *reorganizować* (IMP) 'reorganize', *dezorganizować* (IMP) 'disorganize' but *zorganizować* (PRF) 'get organized'; *słyszeć* (IMP) 'hear' versus *niedosłyszeć* (IMP) 'not to hear well/ be hard of hearing' but *usłyszeć* (PRF) 'to hear (= to acknowledge having heard something, to learn something)', *zasłyszeć* (PRF) 'to learn something that's hearsay' (Grzegorzczkova et al. 1984:490).

- 2 This traditional definition of perfective/imperfective aspect does not agree with with Langacker's (1991:85–91) understanding of perfectivity as 'boundedness within the scope of predication'.
- 3 Examples of semantic and grammatical changes produced by prefixation with *za-* can be furnished by the aspectual pairs: *bić* (IMP) : *zabić* (PRF) and *sypać* (IMP) : *zasypać* (PRF). When *za-* is added to the imperfective infinitive *bić* 'beat', the perfective derivative is a different lexical verb *zabić* 'kill'. In the pair *sypać* 'fall (of snow)' : *zasypać* 'cover with a solid substance, such as snow', the imperfective **intransitive** verb *sypać*, as in: *Od rana dziś sypie i sypie* 'Since early morning today it's been snowing and snowing', changes its grammatical status and becomes the perfective **transitive** verb *zasypać*, as in: *Śnieg zasypał całe miasto* 'Snow has covered the whole town'.
- 4 Polish grammarians (see Grzegorzczkova et al. 1984 plus sources reviewed in Tabakowska 2003:154–58) distinguish cases of the so-called 'empty prefixes' in Polish, where the prefix appears to change neither the aspect nor the meaning of the verb, as in the verbs *powrócić* 'return' : *wrócić* 'return', *siąść* 'sit down' : *usiąść* 'sit down', all perfective (Grzegorzczkova et al. 1984:490). Tabakowska (2003:155) observes that the term 'empty prefix' is also used by some grammarians to refer to cases where the addition of a prefix produces a purely aspectual effect, with no changes to the lexical meaning of the verb. My own conviction (which follows from both Cognitive Linguistics and the Guillaumian Psychomechanics of Language) is that there are no semantically empty morphemes and that the meaning of the so-called 'empty' or 'merely aspectual' elements can always be identified, provided an appropriate semantic analysis is carried out.
- 5 Townsend and Janda (1996:134) observe that 'the subordination of the analytic to the synthetic is exemplified by *Slavic treatment of prepositions* (an analytic item) as *prefixes* (a synthetic item) in treating both as components in phonetic words' [my emphasis]; following her survey of the literature on aspect in Polish, Tabakowska (2003:156) states that 'it is generally assumed that in Old Polish it was prepositions excerpted from adverbial prepositional phrases that were originally used as aspectual verbal prefixes'.
- 6 This view, in my opinion, agrees with the Guillaumian concept of *the potential significate* if we admit that graphic models of potential significates represent spatial imagery. (See Guillaume 1984 for the concept of *the potential significate*.)
- 7 Bartnicka and Satkiewicz (2000:273) observe that *za-* has purely aspectual function when added to verbs of foreign origin with *-owa-* in their stem, as in: *za-obszernować* 'to notice/observe something', *za-gwarantować* 'to guarantee something', *za-instalować* 'to install something'. Tabakowska's examples of 'pure perfectives' with *za-* are the intransitive verbs: *za-szczekać* 'to give a bark', *za-żartować* 'to crack a joke', *za-salutować* 'to give a salute' and the transitive verb *za-śpiewać* 'sing (up) a song' (Tabakowska 2003:171) (cf. my 'verbs of short duration').

- ⁸ It should be kept in mind that the opposition between the perfective and imperfective in Slavic does not parallel the difference between the progressive and simple in English.
- ⁹ Other *za-*verbs which denote activities whose boundaries are determined by the boundaries of adverbial nominals of place are: *za-jść* 'to reach a destination by walking' (versus: *iść* 'to go somewhere on foot'), *za-brnąć* 'to reach a destination by wading' (versus: *brnąć* 'to go somewhere by wading'), *za-wędrować* 'to reach a destination after some roaming about' (versus *wędrować* 'to walk about, roam') etc. (see Tabakowska 2003:169 and Bartnicka & Satkiewicz 2000: 273).
- ¹⁰ Other examples of this type are *jeździć* 'to drive' vs. *za-jeździć samochód (na śmierć)* 'to *za*-drive the car to death (to use it up)'; *kleić* 'to glue' vs. *za-kleić na amen* 'to glue something up for eternity'. When the imperfective verb *sypać* is transitive, as in the expression *sypać kwiatki-ACC* 'throw flowers', its perfective counterpart *za-sypać kwiatkami-INSTR* 'cover up with flowers' requires the Instrumental case-marking on the nominal *kwiatki* 'flowers'. The grammatical change of case from ACC to INSTR in this example denotes a semantic change of the role assumed by the entity 'flowers': from the object/patient of the activity of throwing to the participant/instrument of that activity.
- ¹¹ Other examples of this type include cases of deadjectival and denominal derivatives, such as: *bielić* 'to make white' vs. *za-bielić (zupę) śmietaną* 'to make (the soup) white by adding cream' (from the adjective *biały* 'white'), *za-gracić [za-junk]* 'to cover with junk' (from the noun *graty* 'junk'). For a discussion see Dąbrowska 1996.
- ¹² The intensifying function of *za-* has also been recognized in aspectual pairs, such as *ofiarować się* (IMP) 'to offer oneself': *za-ofiarować się* (PRF) 'to offer oneself up' (Bartnicka & Satkiewicz 2000:273), where the prefix is said to intensify the lexical meaning of the activity denoted by the verb on top of (or perhaps because of) its perfectivizing effect (which in the case of *zaofiarować się* can be described as a 'one-time particularization').

REFERENCES

- BACZ, BARBARA. 1995. Searching for the potential significate of the Polish morpheme *za(-)* in its uses as a preposition and a prefix. Paper presented at Acfas 1995 in Chicoutimi, Québec.
- . 2004. A la recherche du signifié de puissance de la préposition polonaise *za*. *Syntagmes prépositionnels avec za* comme structures avec un point de repère. *Modèles linguistiques*, Tome XXV, 1–2, vol. 49–50 [Actes du Xe colloque international de l'AIPL « Genèse de la phrase dans la diversité des langues », (Oloron-Sainte-Marie, France)], 377–85.
- BARTNICKA, BARBARA & HALINA SATKIEWICZ. 2000. *Gramatyka języka polskiego. Podręcznik dla cudzoziemców*. Warszawa: Wiedza Powszechna.
- DĄBROWSKA, EWA. 1996. The spatial structuring of events. A study of Polish perfectivizing prefixes. In *The construal of space in language and thought*, ed. by Martin Pütz & René Dirven, 467–90. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- DUNAJ, BOGUSŁAW. 1996. *Słownik współczesnego języka polskiego*. Warszawa: Wilga.

- GRZEGORCZYKOWA, RENATA, ROMAN LASKOWSKI & HENRYK WRÓBEL. 1984. *Gramatyka współczesnego języka polskiego. Morfologia*. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
- GUILLAUME, GUSTAVE. 1984. *Foundations for a science of language (Current issues in linguistic theory 31)*, ed. by Konrad Koerner. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- LANGACKER, RONALD W. 1991. Nouns and verbs. In *Concept, image and symbol*, ed. by René Dirven & Ronald Langacker, 59–100. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- JANDA, LAURA A. 1986. A semantic analysis of the Russian verbal prefixes *za-*, *pere-*, *do-* and *ot-*. München: Verlag Otto Sagner.
- TABAKOWSKA, ELŻBIETA. 2003. Space and time in Polish: The verbal preposition *za* and the verbal prefix *za-*. In *Motivation in language. Language studies in honor of Günter Radden (Current issues in linguistic theory 243)*, ed. by Hubert Cuyckens et al., 153–77. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- TOWNSEND, CHARLES E. & LAURA A. JANDA. 1996. *Common and comparative Slavic. Phonology and inflection*. Columbus, Ohio: Slavica Publishers.

