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Verbal prefixation in Slavic raises several problems, the most difficult and intriguing being the question of the relationship between the aspectual (grammatical) and the derivational (lexical) contribution of the verbal prefix (also referred to as a preverb). A related issue, essential for semanticists (of Cognitive Linguistics as well as Guillaumean persuasion) who believe that every form in language carries meaning, is the problem of the so-called ‘purely aspectual’ (Grzegorczykowa et al. 1984) or ‘empty’ (Shuyt 1990, Młynarczyk 2004) prefixes, i.e. preverbs added to an unprefixed imperfective base which do not change the lexical meaning of the verb, but cause the shift of the verb’s aspect into perfective.

The primary objective of this paper is to look at the meaning and function of one preverb only—the Polish preverb z- (realized as z-, s-, ze- –ś-), the most frequent ‘purely perfectivizing’ verbal prefix in contemporary Polish (Grzegorczykowa et al. 1984:491). Because of the frequency and productivity of the preverb z-, z-prefixed perfectives in Polish provide ample material for examining the exact semantic contribution of Slavic perfectivizing preverbs, a question of paramount importance in aspectual prefixation research. An immediate, practical goal of the present undertaking is to find out to what extent a classification (and description) of perfectives recently proposed by Janda (2006a, 2006b) for Russian can be useful in a semantic analysis of perfectivizing prefixes in Polish.

1. Janda’s four types of perfectives. In her recent work on aspect, Janda (2006a:2, 2006b:4) distinguishes four types of perfectives: Natural Perfectives (such as zrobić ‘get done’ in (1)), defined as perfectives which ‘describe the logical completion of the corresponding Imperfective Activity (and are thus denotationally equivalent to the Activity, differing from it only in terms of aspect)’; Specialized Perfectives (such as z(e)szyć ‘sew together’ in (2)), which ‘provide enough new semantic content to motivate the further derivation of corresponding Imperfectives’; Complex Acts (illustrated by posiedzieć ‘sit for a while’ in (3)), ‘which consist of an Activity combined with a limit, forming delimitatives, perduratives, ingessives, terminatives, and the like (aka much of what is often termed Aktionsarten)’ (Janda 2006a:2), and Single Acts, ‘which isolate a single cycle of a repeated Activity’ and are illustrated by spytac ‘ask a question’ in (4) and (9) as well as by the –ną-perfectives, such as mrugnąć ‘blink once’ in (10)a and chlapnąć ‘splash once’ in (11).

The z-prefixed Polish Natural Perfectives zrobić ‘get done’ and schować ‘get hidden’ in example (1) form aspectual pairs with the corresponding simplex imperfectives robić ‘be doing’ and chować ‘be hiding’. According to the Slavic grammatical tradition, the term ‘aspectual pairs’ is used in its narrow sense, i.e. to identify the IMP/PERF couples whose members are considered as two forms of the same verb, which is normally interpreted that
they are viewed as having the same lexical meaning (Młynarczyk 2004:46).1 Perfectivization by means of prefixation in such aspectual pairs is by some linguists (Shuyt 1990:293, 311; Młynarczyk 2004) referred to as ‘empty prefixation’.

(1) Aspectual Pairs with Natural Perfectives:

- robić ‘be doing’ [IMP] zrobić ‘get done’ [PERF]
- chować ‘be hiding’ [IMP] schować ‘get hidden’ [PERF]

a. Co robiłeś podczas mojej nieobecności?
   ‘What were you doing/did you do during my absence?’
   Gdzie chowaś listy od swojej dziewczyny?
   ‘Where do you hide/are you hiding letters from your girlfriend?’

b. Co zrobiłeś podczas mojej nieobecności?
   ‘What did you get done during my absence?’
   Gdzie schowaś te pieniądze?
   ‘Where will you hide this money?’

Following Janda’s definition of the second type of perfectives, based on the possibility of further derivation of related imperfectives (deperfectivization) by means of the imperfectivizing suffixes -ywa-, -ija-, Polish z-prefixed Specialized Perfectives in example (2) are placed in the IMPERFECTIVE-PERFECTIVE-SECONDARY IMPERFECTIVE ‘trios’ (term used after Schuyt 1990):

(2) Z-prefixed Specialized Perfectives in trios:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPERFECTIVE</th>
<th>PERFECTIVE</th>
<th>SECONDARY IMPERFECTIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>szyć ‘sew’</td>
<td>z(e)szyć ‘sew up/together’</td>
<td>z(e)szywać ‘keep sewing things together’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bić ‘beat’</td>
<td>zbić ‘beat together/up’</td>
<td>zbijać ‘beat together frequently’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>myć ‘wash’</td>
<td>zmyć ‘wash away’</td>
<td>zmywać ‘wash away/up many times’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Complex Acts, which according to Janda’s (2006a:2, 2006b:15) purely temporal description have to be non-completutable and durative, are represented by the po-prefixed temporal delimitatives posiedzieć ‘sit for a while’ and poczytać ‘read for a while’ and by the z-prefixing ingressives zgłępić ‘become stupid, go nuts’ and zrozumieć ‘come to understand, realize’, listed in (3):

(3) Complex Acts

- siedzieć ‘sit’
- czytać ‘read’
- rozumieć ‘understand’
- głupieć ‘go dumb repeatedly’
- posiedzieć ‘sit for a while’
- poczytać ‘read for a while’
- zrozumieć ‘come to understand, realize’
- zgłępić ‘become dumb, start acting stupid’

Polish Single Act perfectives illustrated in (4) are formed by means of the preverbs z- and za-and are represented by verbs expressing naturally repeated activities (in their simplex-imperfective and their derived-perfective forms), such as knocking, blinking, asking questions:
The semantic description of the four types of perfectives is given in (5). Each type is defined in terms of the following three dimensions of aspect and actionality proposed by the author ([Janda 2006a:2, 2006b:7]: CLODED vs. OPEN, which 'is ultimately synonymous with [the opposition] Perfective vs. Imperfective'; COMPLETABLE vs. NON-COMPLETABLE, where COMPLETABLE defines 'a situation which has a goal that can be fulfilled, and thus naturally ends in a change of state'; and DURATIVE vs. INSTANTANEOUS, which captures the opposition of durative vs. punctual, where OPEN (i.e. imperfective-simplex) situations express an on-going duration (as in krzyczeć 'cry' [IMP]) or the cyclic repetition of instantaneous events (as in pukać 'knock' [IMP]).

(5) Janda’s (2006b:15–16) description of perfectives:

Accomplishments (COMPLETABLE, DURATIVE)

Achievements (COMPLETABLE, INSTANTANEOUS)

Complex Acts (NON-COMPLETABLE, DURATIVE)

Single Acts (NON-COMPLETABLE, INSTANTANEOUS)

(NOTE: According to Janda (2006b:156), all four types of perfectives listed in (5) are closed by definition; Accomplishments and Achievements form a union and are jointly referred to as Completion Acts; the group of Completion Acts comprises Natural Perfectives and Specialized Perfectives.)

2. A CRITICAL DISCUSSION OF JANDA’S CATEGORIES. Janda’s claim that the traditional IMP/PERF ‘pair’ model does not provide a valid description of Slavic aspect is not new (see e.g. Sullivan & Bogdan 2002 and references quoted in Janda 2006b:26), but her semantic map of aspect and the underlying cluster model of perfectives based on four clearly defined types of the category appear very attractive as tools for a comprehensive analysis of the z-prefixed aspectual data in Polish.

2.1. PURELY ASPECTUAL Z-: NATURAL COMPLETION OR RESULTATIVE ACHIEVEMENT? The choice of the adjective ‘natural’ to refer to perfective counterparts of imperfective simplex verbs denoting the same activity in true ‘aspectual pairs’ (Janda 2006a:3), such as robić [IMP] ‘do’ vs. zrobić [PERF] ‘get done/finish doing’ in (i), is truly felicitous for it well reflects the underlying assumption of Cognitive Linguistics that no form in language (and that includes preverbs) should be called semantically empty. Even the staunch advocates of the concept of ‘empty prefixation’ (Schuyt 1990, Młynarczyk 2004) admit that ‘there is certainly a semantic distinction between the perfective and the non-perfective forms of any verb’ which is reflected in the opposition between the completeness and the incompleteness of an action (Młynarczyk 2004:46).
Natural Perfectives are defined as verbs expressing ‘the logical completion of the corresponding Imperfective Activity’ (Janda 2006b:4). Typically, they are created by adding a suitable perfectivizing prefix to the simplex form denoting an Activity and occur most frequently in aspectual-pair clusters. Since ‘the rise of purely aspectual pairs... is generally viewed as a recent development’, verbal prefixes which define the category of Natural Perfectives (mainly the preverbs ż- and po-) are described as ‘quite productive’ in modern Russian (Schuyt 1990:311) and in modern Czech.

The aspectual preverb ż- is also very productive in contemporary Polish, as testified to by the large number of ż-perfectivized loan-verbs, such as zweryfikować ‘verify’, zrewidować ‘revise’, stefonować się ‘phone’, etc. Some representative aspectual-pair clusters formed by means of ż-prefixation applied to loan-verbs are listed in (6):

(6) Ż-prefixed loan-verbs as Natural Perfectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPERFECTIVE</th>
<th>PERFECTIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>konstruować</td>
<td>skonstruować ‘construct’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nacjonalizować</td>
<td>znacjonalizować ‘nationalize’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>filmować</td>
<td>sfilmować ‘film’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Z-prefixed loan-verbs in (6) should be treated as prime examples of the category of Natural Perfectives: They certainly describe ‘the logical completion of the corresponding Imperfective Activity’, and none of them contains sufficient lexical content to motivate derivation of a secondary imperfective, which would place them in the category of Specialized Perfectives. The verb skonstruować in (6), as well as its native equivalent zbudować ‘build up’ in (7) (along with the perfectives zrobić, schować in (1)), are often quoted as typical examples of purely aspectual prefixation, but their membership in the category of Natural Perfectives requires discussion. The problem is illustrated by the English translations many Natural Perfectives can have depending on context. E.g., the verb zbudować translates as ‘finish building’ (7)a, which duly expresses ‘the logical completion of the corresponding imperfective’, or as ‘get (something) built’ (7)b, which renders the meaning of ‘bringing about/achieving a result’. The resultative effect of ż-prefixation, obvious in examples such as (7)b, allows to interpret ż-prefixed perfectives as a type of Aktionsarten (see Czochralski’s 1975 ‘resultative Aktionsarten’, discussed in Młynarczyk 2004:58–62), and as such (i.e. as Aktionsarten), they would have to be placed in Janda’s category of Complex Acts. On the other hand, Janda (2006a:2) characterizes Complex Acts as expressly non-completable, but since the sense of completion is clearly present in the ‘achieved result’ reading of these ż-perfectives (7)b, their classification as Complex Acts has to be rejected.

(7) a. Bazylikę w Łagiewnikach zbudowano przed przyjazdem Papieża.
   ‘The Łagiewniki basilica was built (was finished) before the Pope’s visit.’

   b. Budował ten dom przez trzy lata, ale w końcu go zbudował.
   ‘He was building the house for three years, but in the end he got it built.’
c. Jan jest teraz prawdziwym mężczyzną: ożenił się, zbudował dom, posadził drzewo i spłodził syna.

‘Jan is a true (truly accomplished) man now: he married, built a house, planted a tree and fathered (begat) a son.’

An application of the Secondary Imperfective test to verbs of the type *zbudować, skonstruować* yields negative results (*zbudowywać, *skonstruowywać*), so they cannot be considered Specialized Perfectives, either. The Single Act possibility is also ruled out because Single Acts (just as Complex Acts) are characterized by Janda (2006b:15) as non-completable. Thus, in terms of the four-way classification of perfectives, we are left with the initial, Natural Perfective option for these verbs. The semantic problem raised by the ‘achieved result’ reading illustrated by *zbudować* in example (7)b is a detail which could be solved by adding precision to the definition of the parameter completable, present in the joint characteristic of Natural and Specialized Perfectives which, in Janda (2006a:2), are both included in the larger category of Completion Acts. The fact that we needed to go through that whole round of reasoning suggests, however, that Janda’s interpretation of the term *Aktionsarten*, and of the category Completion Acts, as well as her explanation of the parameter completable (in terms of telicity, to the apparent exclusion of achievement) require specification. Polish uses of *z*-prefixed perfectives in context (such as (7)a) suggest that the ‘natural completion’ reading is produced whenever the time of the activity’s completion is clear in the speaker’s mind (see also examples such as *Bracia Wright zbudowali jeden z pierwszych samolotów* ‘The Wright Brothers built (completed the construction of) one of the first flying machines’, where the time of the event is common knowledge to both the speaker and the hearer, just as the time of Pope John-Paul II’s last visit to Poland, in (7)a, is well defined in the consciousness of the speakers of Polish). On the other hand, in the ‘achieved result’ reading of Natural *z*-Perfectives, as in (7)b, the time factor appears irrelevant. There are cases, however, where the two semantic effects (completion and achievement) seem blurred, as is the case in (7)c.

2.2. NATURAL Z-PERFECTIVES EXPRESSING SINGLE OCCURRENCE. The *z*-perfectivized loan-verb *zweryfikować* ‘finish verifying/get verified’ in example (8) points to the presence of another semantic element in the supposedly ‘empty’ aspectual preverb *z*, the single-occurrence reading:

(8) Musimy *zweryfikować* Pana dokumenty. Weryfikujemy dokumenty wszystkich cudzoziemców.

‘We have to verify [PERF] your documents. We verify [IMP] documents of all foreigners.’

*Zweryfikować* is categorized as a Natural Perfective according to Janda’s parameters for Completion Acts (closed and completable), but in contrast to the Natural Perfective *zbudować* ‘finish building/get built’ in example (7)b, which emphasizes the activity’s duration (the dimension durative), the activity *zweryfikować* ‘get verified’ in the context
of example (8) produces the semantic effect of a single-time occurrence (the dimension instantaneous). According to Janda’s (2006b) modified description of the four types of perfectives (5), the feature instantaneous characterizes the category of Single Acts and the category of Achievements (which includes both Natural Perfectives and Specialized Perfectives). That modified characteristic allows us to classify one-time perfective activities such as zweryfikować as Natural Perfectives, with the characteristic completable and instantaneous. A comparison of the semantic effects produced by the verbs zbudować in (7) and zweryfikować in (8) shows that Polish z-prefix Natural Perfectives can be characterized as either durative or instantaneous, which agrees with Janda’s (2006b, but not 2006a) description of Completion Acts.

The z-prefix aspectual perfectives in example (9): spytać ‘ask a question’ and zbłądzić ‘go astray (single occurrence)’ illustrate another semantic dimension of aspectual prefixation: they both evoke one-time activities, but in a different way, a fact which is reflected in the different categories of perfectives they are ascribed to according to Janda’s classification.

(9) Kto pyta nie zbłądzi, więc jeśli spytasz, na pewno nie zbłądzisz.
   ‘Who asks, will not go astray, so if you ask, you will surely not err.’
   [= ‘Take counsel that you may avoid mistakes’, a popular saying]

The sense of instantaneity is present with a different degree of intensity in each of the verbs, being clearly more pronounced in spytać than in zbłądzić. The only way to explain that impression (to my mind) is by referring to the difference in the semantic make-up of the simplex imperfectives the two perfectives have been derived from. The activity pytanie ‘ask’ could be interpreted as inherently frequentative for it can evoke a ‘series of mini sub-events’ (the events of asking individual questions), while the activity zbłądzić ‘walk with no idea of how to get somewhere; not knowing the way’ denotes a non-determined, continuous motion and would have the same aspectual characteristic [open, non-completable, durative] as the stock-example non-determined motion verb chodzić ‘walk about’ [imp] (Janda 2006a:5). Consequently, the z-prefix perfective spytać could be viewed as ‘an isolated single cycle of a repeated Activity’, an interpretation which defines it as a Single Act with the characteristic: closed, non-completable, instantaneous (Janda 2006b:15), whereas the z-prefix perfective zbłądzić would be classed as a Natural Perfective, i.e. a Completion Act with the characteristic: closed, completable, instantaneous, a description which groups it together with Achievement verbs such as zweryfikować (8). The conclusion following from the semantic analysis of the verbs spytać ‘ask on one occasion’ and zbłądzić ‘go astray, get lost (on one occasion)’ in (9) is that Polish z-prefix perfectives expressing one-time activities can represent either Natural Perfectives or Single Acts.

I should remark, however, that I feel a certain uneasiness in referring to the instantaneous activity zbłądzić, which evokes the moment of losing one’s way, as an Achievement, a term which Janda’s classification of aspectual situations (Janda 2006b:15) forces me to use. Nor am I perfectly comfortable with describing the activity of asking a definite question evoked by the verb spytać as ‘a situation without a goal’, a characteristic which follows from Janda’s definition of the parameter non-completable: ‘A situation is completable if it has
a goal that can be fulfilled, and thus naturally ends in a change of state’ (Janda 2006b:13). The verb *spytać* is inherently transitive (it contains a salient direct object *pytanie/pytania* ‘question(s)’ in its semantic make-up, evident in the verb’s paraphrase *zadać pytanie/pytania* ’put forward a question/questions’), and the activity of asking a question appears to me as a purposeful act. Such counter-intuitive decisions are required by the current version of the proposed model and have to be accepted for the time being.

### 2.3. THE SEMELFACTIVE -NĄ- VS. THE ASPECTUALLY NEUTRAL -NĄ-.

The single-occurrence meaning of Polish perfectives is rendered formally by two kinds of morphemes: the suffix –ną- (as in *krzyknąć ‘cry once’), or perfectivizing prefixes such as za- or z- (as in *zawołać ‘call out once’, *schrupać ‘eat up crunching - one-time occurrence’), the case in point being the z-prefixed perfective *spytać* ‘ask once’ discussed in section 2.2. The verbs listed in (10), which all contain the suffix –ną-, illustrate the variationist pertinence of this paper.

(10) a. blink:  
    mrugać - mrugnąć vs. zamrugać  
    knock:  
    pukać - puknąć vs. zapukać  
    crunch:  
    chrupnąć < chrupnąć - chrupnąc vs. schrupać  

b. pull:  
    ściągnąć < ciągnąć  
    bend:  
    zgiąć < giąć (gę)  
    cut:  
    ściąć < ciąć (tę)  

c. get slim:  
    schudnąć < chudnąć (< chudy ‘slim’)  
    get dry:  
    zeschnąć < schnąć (< suchy ‘dry’)  
    grow pale:  
    zblednąć < blednąć (< blady ‘pale’)

Polish has two –ną- morphemes: the semelfactive suffix -ną- (from the Latin *semel* ‘once’+ *facere* ‘do’), which derives Single Act perfectives from imperfective simplex bases, as in *mrugnąć ‘blink once’ in (10)a, and the aspectually neutral, non-derivational morpheme –ną-, which happens to be quite frequent in z-prefixed Specialized Perfectives (they do have corresponding secondary imperfectives), such as *ściągnąć ‘pull down’, *zgiąć ‘bend down’, *ściąć ‘cut down’ (for more examples see Tokarski 1978: 232–3) listed in (10)b. The z-prefixed perfectives exemplified in (10)c, such as *schudnąć ‘get slim’, *zeschnąć ‘dry up’, *zblednąć ‘go pale’, represent an important group of *bona fide* Natural Perfectives derived from adjective-based imperfectives, but they are eliminated from Janda’s classification because of their reference to states rather than activities. My comment concerning the z-prefixed perfectives of that group, i.e., (10)c, is that even though their ultimate simplex bases denote states, they represent an important aspect of perfectivity (a change of state) and therefore, should not be excluded from the model of perfectivity. The same observation applies to single-occurrence z-prefixed ingressives, such as *zrozumieć ‘get to understand’, *znarwić się ‘get worried’, *znienawidzieć ‘get to hate’, etc. (see example (3)), which appear to conform well to Janda’s description of Complex Acts but are also eliminated from the model because of their reference to states.
2.4. **Z-PREFIXED SINGLE ACTS.** Semantically, Single Acts are defined narrowly, as verbs which 'isolate a single cycle of a repeated activity' (Janda 2006b:3), and that’s in fact the only way they are presented in Janda’s aspect diagram and her semantic map of aspect. If taken *sensu stricto*, that description applies exclusively to the perfective members of aspectual pairs (such as *kichać/ kichnąć* ‘sneeze’), which denote inherently frequentative activities, such as sneezing, coughing, knocking, plucking, blinking, etc. The verbs in (10)a illustrate typical frequentative activities, yet their description as Single Acts is not without problems. Because their single-occurrence meaning is rendered either by the semelfactive suffix –*ną*- or by the perfectivizing prefix *za-*, they appear to contain two Single Acts in their clusters: one derived by the –*ną*- suffixation and one derived by aspectual prefixation. The situation is illustrated by the two perfectives formed from the imperfective *mrugać* ‘blink’, where *mrugnąć* ‘blink once’ refers to one physical blink, and *zamrugać* ‘blink for a while’ refers to one episode in a series of blinking episodes. The semantic difference between one-time *mrugnąć* and one-time *zamrugać* follows from the semantic nature of the repetition in the two cases (single event: single episode of repeated events). The nuance is not captured by Janda’s model, where both *mrugnąć* and *zamrugać* have to be classed as Single Acts. *Zamrugać* cannot be treated as a Specialized Perfective because it does not motivate derivation of a secondary imperfective -*z*-*zamrugiwać*. It cannot be a Complex Act either, because Complex Acts are defined as durative, and the characteristic instantaneous is excluded from the category. A semiotic description of Polish aspectual pairs proposed by Młynarczyk (2004:124–26) accounts for the difference by including the feature of duration in the semantic definition of single-occurrence verbs, but a modification of Janda’s model in that direction would lead to a contradiction (what’s instantaneous cannot be durative), unless two kinds of Single Acts were to be proposed, a modification which would cause further undesirable changes in the model.

Example (11) illustrates an easier case of a cluster based on the inherently frequentative imperfective simplex *chlapać* ‘splash’ with two perfective derivatives expressing one-time occurrence: the Single Act –*ną*- derivative *chlapnąć* and the Specialized Perfective *z*-prefixed derivative *schlapać*:

(11) a. Auta dziś strasznie *chlapią*. Właśnie *schlapał* mnie autobus.  
‘Cars splash terribly today. A bus has just splashed me.’

b. Janek *chlapnął* wodę na podłogę i jest mokra.  
‘Janek splashed water on the floor and it’s wet.’

The Specialized Perfective *schlapać* ‘make wet by splashing’ illustrates the lexical sense of ‘saturation with the effects of Activity’ (Bartnicka & Satkiewicz 2000) present in the non-aspectual content of the prefix *z*- in the group of perfectives including verbs such as *schłać się* ‘get oneself drunk (vulgar)’, *zgonić się* ‘get exhausted from running’ *zmachać się* ‘get tired after excessive activity’, etc.). The Single Act derivative *chlapnąć* ‘splash once’ is purely aspectual. This cluster causes no problems for Janda’s model. Yet, in the context of example (11)b, the Single Act verb *chlapnąć* ‘splash once’ conveys a strong impression of an achieved result, a characteristic excluded by the non-completatable definition of the category, so
there is another problem for the description of that type of perfectives. A possible solution might be to include the semelfactive -nq- verbs in the category of Natural Perfectives, with all the consequences of that move for the model.

3. CONCLUSION. First, z-prefixed perfectives are certainly not semantically empty for they express a sense of completion or achieved result (zbudować) as well as the sense of one-time occurrence (sprać). Second, Janda’s (2006b) model of aspect is extremely attractive because of its simplicity and visual elegance, but in order to be able to use it for a description of verbal prefixation data in Polish in clear conscience, the following issues have to be addressed:

a. An analysis of prefixed perfectives describing states (schudnąć, zrozumieć) has to be included in the model.
b. In the description of Natural Perfectives, the term Achievement could be changed to account for natural completion of negative activities (zbłądzić).
c. The description and the graphic representation of Single Acts in the model of formal grams for aspect (Figure 4) should be changed to reflect the possibility (admitted in Janda 2006a) of forming Single Acts by prefixation (Russian sxodit ‘round trip’; Polish spytac ‘ask on one occasion’).
d. A proviso has to be made for the DURATIVE feature in Single Acts formed by prefixation (zapukać ‘knock’, zamarć ‘blink’ vs. zawołać ‘call out’, schlapać ‘splash’). If they were to be classed alternately, as Complex Acts, a possibility of the feature INSTANTANEOUS would have to be considered for the Complex Act category.

1 Polish dictionaries (Dunaj 1996, Doroszewski 1980) indicate PERF or IMP counterparts of the verbal entries whenever possible thus reflecting the intuition of the language speakers as to which verbal forms are felt to be related solely by aspect. The pairings indicated in the dictionaries, however, do not always correspond to the views of individual linguists as to which verbs (especially in the case of prefixed perfectives) constitute an aspectual pair. In Janda’s (2006a:3) cluster model of aspectual relations an ‘aspectual pair’ is represented by a cluster consisting of an imperfective Activity and a Natural Perfective.

2 Schuylt observes that ‘except in the rare cases of the type soderzat, zaviset in Russian, or certain loan-translations—a prefix is always connected with terminative meaning’ and that purely aspectual opposition between a simplex and a prefixed compound is possible only if the activity denoted by the simplex contains (has a potential to express) a terminative meaning (‘The non-terminative meanings are, as in the verbs of the Russian type soderzat, incompatible with perfective aspect, and therefore, not involved in aspectual opposition; here, the addition of a prefix always brings about a lexical change’ (1990:311).

3 One would expect that Natural Perfectives should have a substantial representation among the different kinds of perfectives. However, according to Janda’s research, aspectual-pair clusters consisting of only an Activity and a Natural Perfective ‘account for only about 6% of Russian verbs’
In his research on verbal prefixation in Slavic, Dickey observes that *z*- is also the most productive prefix in Czech, whereas in Russian, the highest productivity status has been granted to the prefix *po*-. According to Chertkova (1996:123–24) *po* is statistically the single most productive prefix in the perfectivization of loan verbs in Russian, followed by *pro-, za-* and *s-* (2002:1).

When they first enter Polish, loan verbs are often not defined for aspect and are therefore considered as bi-aspectual. They can be used in imperfective as well as in perfective contexts, e.g. aprobować ‘approve’ is IMP in Właśnie aprobowujemy pana projekt ‘We are just approving your project’ [imp] while it functions as PERF in Na pewno po powrocie aprobuje twoją decyzję ‘He will certainly approve your decision after his return’ (Grzegorczykowa et al. 1984:215) or dedykować ‘dedicate’ in: Dedykuję tę książkę mojej żonie ‘I dedicate this book to my wife’ [IMP] versus Kiedyś dedykuję tomik wierszy mojej córce ‘One day I will dedicate a collection of poems to my daughter’ [PERF].

In her excellent dissertation on Polish morphological pairing, Młynarczyk quotes Czochralski’s (1975) interpretation of the well assimilated Polish loan verb *zreperować* ‘to have repaired,’ derived from the imperfective *reperować* ‘to be repairing’ by applying the empty prefix *z*- as a resultative Aktionsart (2004:62). Czochralski’s interpretation agrees with my intuition as to the meaning of the *z*-prefixed verbs under discussion.

The Secondary Imperfective test checks the possibility of forming a secondary imperfective from the derived perfective (in Polish, usually by means of the suffix -ywa-, as in the trio: *szyć* ‘sew’ [IMP]; *z(e)szyć* ‘sew together’ [PERF]; *z(e)szywać* ‘sew together many times’ [IMP]). It is one of the three tests proposed in the literature for distinguishing between aspectual and non-aspectual pairs (for the description of the Secondary Imperfective, Historical Present and Negative Imperative tests see Shuyt 1990:312 or Młynarczyk 2004:51–2).

The category of Completion Acts, distinguished in Janda 2006a (p.1) and mentioned in the discussion of Russian perfectivizing prefixes in Janda 2006b (p.16), is not listed among the possible aspectual situations in Russian enumerated in Janda 2006b (p.15); it seems that the author has decided to replace Completion Acts by two separate categories: Accomplishments (CLOSED, COMPLETABLE, AND DURATIVE) and Achievements (CLOSED, COMPLETABLE, AND INSTANTANEOUS) (Janda 2006b:15, diagram 3), but the relationship of these categories to Natural and Specialized Perfectives is not discussed.

A comment on the meaning of *z*-prefixed Specialized Perfectives is in order. In addition to making the simplex imperfectives perfective, *z*-prefixation in examples such as (10)b and (2) adds to the meaning conveyed by the unprefixed imperfective the sense of ‘a movement downward and out’ derived from the original ‘downward ablative’ (i.e. motion downward from a landmark) and ‘elative’ (i.e. motion out of) senses of the Old Church Slavonic (OCS) meanings of the prefix *iz*- (cf. *ściągnąć* ‘pull down’ *zgniąć* ‘bend down’, *ściąć* ‘cut down’, *zmyć* ‘wash off’). In the history of Polish (but not Russian), the OCS prefix *iz*- coalesced with the OCS prefix *sъ*- which, in addition to the ‘centripetal’ (i.e. motion from many directions to a single landmark) meaning, present in *z*-prefixed Specialized Perfectives such as *zeszyć* ‘sew together’, *zbić* ‘beat together/join together by beating’ (2), also had the ‘downward-ablative’ sense among its various meanings. According to Dickey (2005), the coalescence of the two OCS prefixes in languages which have no prefix *iz*- (Czech, Slovak, Sorbian and Polish) has led to the creation of the purely perfectivizing
prefix s-/z- which is very productive e.g. in perfectivizing loan-verbs (6). The names of the Aktion-art meanings of the ocs prefixes iz- and sЪ- are taken from Dickey (2005:727), who discusses the development of s-/z- in Slavic relying on the ocs examples and semantic categories originally distinguished by Słoński (1937).

10 Other clusters of the same type are based on the imperfectives: chrupać ‘crunch’, chlastać ‘hit repeatedly with a thin object’, chlustać ‘splash with large quantities of water’, lupać ‘hit repeatedly (about pain)’, walić ‘hit repeatedly and with force’, etc.

REFERENCES


