



**LACUS
FORUM
XXXVII**

**Communication and Cognition:
Multidisciplinary Perspectives**

McMaster
University 

Reprint

LACUS Forum 37 Referees

Barbara Bacz
David C. Bennett
Lucas van Buuren
Douglas W. Coleman
Kara VanDam



Patrick Duffley
Connie Eble
Sheila Embleton
John Hewson
ShinJa Hwang



Michael Kliffer
Sydney M. Lamb
Alan K. Melby
Robert Orr
Alex Sévigny



H. Stephen Straight
William J. Sullivan
Patricia Casey Sutcliffe
Bernard Sypniewski
Sarah Tsiang



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 McMaster University logo on the cover are trademarks of LACUS and McMaster University respectively. **The McMaster University logo is used here with permission from the trademark holder. No license for use of this trademarks outside of redistribution of this exact file is granted. This trademark may not be included in any adaptation of this work.**

LACUS FORUM XXXVII

**COMMUNICATION AND COGNITION:
MULTIDISCIPLINARY PERSPECTIVES**

EDITED BY

**Michael D. Kliffer
Alex Sévigny
Patricia Casey Sutcliffe
William J. Sullivan
Daniel S. Mailman**



III



Morphology



PREFIXATION AND LOAN VERBS IN POLISH

Barbara Bacz
Université Laval

Abstract. This paper explores the link between prefixation and aspect in non-Slavic verbs which have assimilated into the system of Polish. To assure an expression of aspectuality most foreign verbs acquire a perfectivizing prefix which distinguishes the simplex imperfective form from its prefixed perfective counterpart (French *engager* > Polish *angażować*^t : *zangażować*^p). An examination of loan verb prefixation sheds light on the unorthodox behavior of bi-aspectuals, a small class of verbs which express both aspects with no recourse to perfectivizing prefixation (*kanonizować*^{u/p} ‘canonize’). The possibility of applying to Polish the morphological and semantic criteria which in Russian have been found to determine whether a loan verb remains bi-aspectual or acquires aspectuality is discussed. It is suggested that the delimitative *po-* test and the criterion of completability, which have proven successful in distinguishing bi-aspectual from non-bi-aspectual loans in Russian, are not sufficient to determine the aspectual status of loan verbs in Polish.

Keywords: Loan Verbs, Perfectivizing Prefixation, Aspectual Status, Bi-aspectuals, Imperfectives, Delimitative *Po-*Test, Completability, Semantic Classes

Languages: Polish, Russian, French, German, Latin, Italian, Common Slavic, English

WHEN A NON-SLAVIC VERB ENTERS A HIGHLY INFLECTIONAL SLAVIC LANGUAGE LIKE POLISH, it adopts the morphological look of a Polish verb, guaranteed by two verbal suffixes: *owa*, typically occurring in verbs borrowed from German, such as *szmuglować* (< German *schmuggeln*), and *izowa*, added mainly to loans from Latin or French, such as *nacjonalizować* (< Latin *natio*; French *nationaliser*) (Giraud-Weber 1998:73). While the suffix *owa* is common in both native and foreign verbs *całować* ‘kiss’, *polować* ‘hunt’ versus *izolować* ‘isolate’, *montować* ‘assemble, set up’), the suffix *izowa* is generally added only to loan verbs (i.e. verbs of non-Slavic origin, such as *organizować* ‘organize’, *specjalizować* ‘specialize’ (Giraud-Weber 1998:73). Loan-verb suffixation in Polish is more straightforward than loan-verb suffixation in Russian, where verbs of foreign origin can acquire four different suffixes: *ova* (*komponovat* ‘compose’), *izova* (*decentralizovat* ‘decentralize’), *irova* (*demaskirovat* ‘unmask’ – cf. Polish *demaskować*), and *izirova* (*ironizirovat* ‘mock’ – cf. Polish *ironizować*).¹

More important than the morphological look of a foreign verb in a Slavic language is its ability to function within the grammatical system of that language. To become

¹ According to Guiraud-Weber (1998:68), the choice of a particular suffix in Russian loan verbs does not depend on morphophonemic criteria or the loan verb’s language of origin, but on the time when the loan verb entered Russian and on its immediate language source.

part of the verbal system of Polish, loan verbs have to acquire a means for expressing aspect, a grammatical category obligatory in Slavic. All Slavic verbs express aspect, and dictionaries classify each verb as either imperfective, perfective, or bi-aspectual (both imperfective and perfective, depending on use). The aspectual categorization of a verb is, as a rule, indicated by the verb's morphology: perfectivizing prefixes and imperfectivizing suffixes. Prototypically, addition of a prefix indicates the verb's perfectivity while the presence of a suffix points to its imperfectivity. In the majority of cases, the verb's simplex (unprefixed and unsuffixed) form is imperfective by default, as in *pisaćⁱ* 'write'². In non-simplex Polish verbs, imperfectivity is guaranteed, and overtly expressed, by the imperfectivizing suffix *-i/ywa-*, as in *pisywaćⁱ* 'write many times', *przepisywaćⁱ* 'rewrite many times'. Perfectivity, again prototypically, is morphologically assured by means of a perfectivizing prefix (sixteen native prefixes are used for perfectivization in Polish), as in *przepisać^p* 'write again'; *zapisać^p* 'za-write', i.e. write down, sign up for, cover with writing'; *wpisać^p* 'write in'; *podpisać^p* 'sign, write under', etc. or by means of the semelfactive suffix *-nq-*, as in *skubaćⁱ* 'pluck out' vs. *skubnąć^p* 'pluck out once'.

1. LOAN VERB ASPECTUALIZATION IN SLAVIC. Loan verbs (in Polish as well as in Russian) resist aspectual suffixation: imperfectivization of a loan verb by means of a suffix (added to unprefixed as well as prefixed perfectives) is possible but rare (Giraud-Weber 1998:71)³, and adding the semelfactive suffix to a foreign stem is high-

² Following the convention used by Slavicists, I am using the superscript letters 'i' and 'p' to denote the verb's imperfective /i/ or perfective /p/ aspectual status. Bogdan & Sullivan (2009:77) suggest that the aspect of a native verb with a simplex stem is determined by the verb's *Aktionsart* ("the aspect of a morphologically simplex stem reflects the *Aktionsart* of its meaning"). A dictionary search the authors conducted on the verbs of a dictionary, described in chapter 5 of the book, offers partial empirical support for the intuitive observation that the Polish verbs' simplex forms are predominantly imperfective. That is what could be expected from the semantics of these verbs, since the vast majority of the simplex-form verbs communicate states or ongoing activities.

³ In Russian, some examples are: *(za)arestovat^p : arestovyvatⁱ*, *mobilizovat^p : mobilizovyvatⁱ* and *zarekomendovat^p : zarekomendovyvatⁱ* (secondary imperfectivization). According to Weber (1998:71) imperfectivization by means of a suffix added to a simple, unprefixed perfective represents an archaic derivation type in modern Russian ("un *procédé vieilli*"). It is practically unused in Polish, where the corresponding imperfective formations **aresztowywać*, **mobilizowywać*, **zarekomendowywać* are not attested. However, the SPP lists examples such as *zmasowywać*, the imperfective counterpart of the perfective verb *zmasować* 'amass', but marks the imperfective form as rare. To my native intuition, the secondary imperfective of the impf-pf-impf triplet: *montować* 'assemble' - *wymontować* 'take a part out of a structure or a mechanism' - *wymontowywać* 'take out a part of a mechanism frequently' is quite natural, but I find the secondary imperfectives **zlikwidowywać* (< *likwidować* - *zlikwidować* 'liquidate one thing' - resultative sense), **polikwidowywać* (< *likwidować* : *polikwidować* 'liquidate many things' - distributive sense) or **zanalizowywać* (< *analizować* : *zanalizować* 'analyze' - resultative sense) unacceptable. The reasons are clearly lexical, for it is difficult to imagine situations that warrant repetition of the resultative actions of having liquidated or having analyzed something (even though, as one of the paper's reviewers has pointed out, situations that warrant repetition of the resultative can exist and can be imagined). By contrast, the same part of a mechanical device or equipment can be taken out for repair several times.

ly exceptional⁴. Therefore, the most common method of assuring aspectuality in a borrowed verb is perfectivizing prefixation (in both languages – see Giraud-Weber 1998:70, 74). Loan verb perfectivizing prefixation means that a native prefix is added to a loan verb to make it able to express perfectivity. In the process, the original foreign verb turns into two nativized verbs which form an aspectual pair: with the simplex form reserved for expressing imperfectivity and the prefixed form becoming its perfective counterpart. Example (1) illustrates the assimilation process of the French verbs *engager* and *monter* in Polish:

(1)	<u>French</u>		<u>Polish</u>	
	<i>engager</i>	>	<i>angażowaćⁱ</i>	‘engage’
			<i>zaangażować^p</i>	‘engage’
	<i>monter</i>	>	<i>montowaćⁱ</i>	‘assemble’
			<i>zmontować^p</i>	‘assemble’

The aim of this paper is to examine the relationship between verb prefixation and aspect on the material of borrowed non-Slavic verbs which have become part of the verb system of Polish. Assimilated loan verbs provide excellent data for studying Slavic aspect for two reasons. First, in loans the process of acquiring aspectuality has been reduced to one major method – that of perfectivizing prefixation. Second, the semantics of loan verbs is as a rule less complex than the semantics of native verbs; the lexical meaning of borrowed verbs is usually narrower than the original meaning these loan verbs had in the source language or have today in non-Slavic European languages. For instance, as Giraud-Weber (1998:68) observes, the verb *arrêter* in French (from Latin *arresto*) has many more senses than the Russian loan verb *arestovať* ‘arrest’, whose usage, like that of the Polish *aresztować*, is restricted to the domain of criminology. Another example of semantic specialization in verbal borrowings into Slavic can be provided by the loan verb *akompaniować* ‘accompany’ (from Italian *accompagnare*), which in Polish (and also in Russian) is used only in reference to musical accompaniment. The meanings of the loan verbs *aresztować* and *akompaniować* in Polish are illustrated by the sentences in (2) and in (3)⁵:

- (2) *aresztowaćⁱ* / *zaaresztować^p* ‘put under arrest’:
Wczoraj policja zaaresztowała^p Janka.
 ‘Yesterday the police **arrested** Janek.’

Giraud-Weber (1998:71) observes that in Russian, aspectual pairs created by suffixation of prefixed perfectives (secondary imperfectivization) are frequent in verbs of Slavic origin, but rare in non-Slavic verbal loans: “*Ces couples sont fréquents essentiellement parmi les verbes à racine slave; les verbes empruntés sont rares ici.*” Later on, she adds that in Polish such pairs are more common than in Russian: “[*l]es couples verbaux dits de corrélation avec un imparfaitif secondaire dérivé du perfectif préverbe (du type odizolować : odizolowywać) [...] sont en polonaise plus courants qu’en russe*” (Giraud-Weber’s 1998:75, my emphasis)

⁴ The only semelfactive perfectives in *-ną-* built on foreign verb bases I am aware of in Polish are: *fundnąć* (the colloquial variant of *zafundować*) ‘to pay for somebody on one occasion’ and *kliknąć* ‘to click a computer key’. In Russian, the stock examples of perfective *-nu-* suffixation are *risknut’* ‘to risk once’ and *spekul’nut’* ‘to speculate once’ (Włodarczyk 1997:101)

⁵ According to the *Słownik Wyrazów Obcych* (SWO), the Polish loan verb *aresztować* is a borrowing from Medieval Latin (< Latin *arresto*) while *akompaniować* entered Polish via Italian

- (3) *akompaniować*ⁱ / *poakompaniować*^p ‘accompany somebody on an instrument, e.g., play the piano when somebody sings’
Każdy student szkoły muzycznej musi mieć osobę, która poakompaniuje^p mu podczas zajęć i podczas prób. (Google, May 1, 2010)
 ‘Every music school student must have a person who **will accompany** them during practical classes and at rehearsals.’

2. CHOICE OF A PERFECTIVIZING PREFIX. Loan verbs can perfectivize by means of different perfectivizing prefixes. The prefix *za-* in *zaaresztować* (2) expresses the sense of completion (result) of a one-time, concrete activity; the prefix *po-* in *poakompaniować* (3) represents a use not yet attested in standard dictionaries of Polish, but quite possible and likely. The use of the prefix is delimitative for it indicates that the activity will last for a short while (during rehearsals and practical classes). As in verbs of Slavic origin, the choice of a perfectivizing prefix in loans is motivated by the prefix’s lexical meaning and its compatibility with the lexical meaning of the verb. As evidenced by the list in (4), the Polish loan verb *klasyfikować* ‘classify’ can combine with the prefixes: *s-*, *za-*, *po-*, *prze-* to express different modes of action (*Aktionsarten*) following from the specific goals of the action of classifying⁶. (The meanings contributed by the prefixes *s-*, *za-*, *po-*, *prze-* in the perfective correlates of *klasyfikować* ‘classify’ are indicated in brackets)

- (4) *klasyfikować*ⁱ ‘classify’

vs.

sklasyfikować^p ‘classify, assign to a class or classes’ (perfective *s-*)

zaklasyfikować^p ‘accept in/ admit into a class’ (prospective *za-*)⁷

poklasyfikować^p ‘place in many classes’ (distributive *po-*)

przeklasyfikować^p ‘place in a new class’ (place-changing *prze-*)

Only one of the possible prefixed forms of a verb is normally considered as a true perfective partner of its unprefixed imperfective. The largest dictionary of contemporary Polish (SWJP 1996:380) chooses the *s-*prefixed form *sklasyfikować* as the perfective, aspectual-pair counterpart of the imperfective *klasyfikować*, but the distributive *po-* prefixed near-synonym is listed in the same entry. Stanisławski’s (1990) *Great Polish-English Dictionary (GPED)* lists the *s-* derivative as the only (and therefore aspectual) perfective counterpart of the loan⁸.

(< Italian *accompagnare*), probably at the time of strong Italian influence during the reign of Queen Bona in the 16th century. (See Karpluk 1993:48)

⁶ Commenting on the prefixation possibilities in Russian loans Giraud-Weber (1998:70) suggests that several prefixes are attached to verbs with ‘concrete’ meanings, such as the technical verbs describing various modalities of action, e.g. the Russian verb *šlifovat’* (Polish: *szlifować*) borrowed from German, can accept four different prefixes (*za-*, *pere-*, *ot-*, *vy-*) to describe different ways of carrying out the activity of cutting and polishing glass or metals.

⁷ In choosing the qualification ‘prospective’ to describe this usage I am following the classification of the meanings of *za-* proposed by Łaziński (2008:9, ms). Prospective *za-* indicates actions done with a future use in mind, as in *zapisać* ‘write down to be used later on’.

⁸ Interestingly, Russian employs the prefix *ras-* in the natural perfective counterpart of the loan

3. PRODUCTIVITY OF PERFECTIVIZING PREFIXES. Some perfectivizing prefixes are more productive than others. This tendency should be reflected in loan-verb prefixation, where prototypically, the primary purpose of a prefix is to express perfectivity (rather than the *Aktionsart* manner in which the action is completed)⁹. It has been noted by several authors (Grzegorzczkowska et al. 1984, Giraud-Weber 1998:75, Łaziński 2008:8, ms) that the most frequent perfectivizing prefixes in contemporary Polish are *s-/z-* and *za-*¹⁰. Łaziński (2008:8, ms) also observes that 778 out of a total of 1997 (i.e. 39%) aspectual pairs listed in *Wielki Słownik Polsko-Angielski PWN-Oxford* (2003) are formed with the *s-*prefixed perfectives. According to his research, *za-* prefixation comes second in frequency, with 366 aspectual pairs.

In Russian, the prefix *po-* has generally been recognized as the most productive overall perfectivizer (Dickey 2007:330, after Čertkova 1996; see also Włodarczyk 1997:56, after Avilova 1968). The difference between the two languages in this respect is well demonstrated by the contrast in perfectivizing prefixation of the corresponding (native and loan) verbs in Polish and in Russian, exemplified in (5):

(5)	<u>Polish</u>	<u>Russian</u>	
	(z) <i>budować</i>	(po) <i>stroit</i>	‘to build’
	(s) <i>tracić</i>	(po) <i>terjat</i>	‘to lose (money)’
	(s) <i>formułować</i>	(po) <i>formulirovat</i>	‘to formulate’
	(s) <i>formatować</i>	(po) <i>formatirovat</i>	‘to format’
	(Dickey 2005:36)		

The difference in productivity between two ‘strongest’ prefixes in Polish and Russian (the prefixes *s-* and *po-*) suggests that the semantic networks of these two prefixes are different in the two languages. They each come from the same Common Slavic (CS) sources, but they must have developed in different ways in Polish and in Russian, which would affect the aspectual systems of the two languages.¹¹

It is interesting (and significant for the contrastive theories of Slavic aspect) that the prefixes considered as the most productive overall perfectivizers (*s-/z-* in Polish and *po-* in Russian) have not been found to be the commonest in borrowed verbs. In Russian loan verbs the prefix *po-* used as a natural, aspectual-pair forming perfectivizer has been classed among the least frequent prefixes. Avilova (1968:67) “ranks *po-* eighth in a list of ten prefixes used by borrowed bi-aspectual verbs” (as reported in Janda 2007b:98). According to Giraud-Weber’s research on loan verb prefixation in Russian and Polish¹², the most frequent loan perfectivizers in Russian are the prefixes

verb for ‘classify’: *rasklassifirovat*’ (Janda 2007b:95). (See also Russian *raskritikovat* ‘vis-à-vis’ Polish *skrytykować* ‘criticize’). Such differences in perfectivizing prefixation point to the (culture-determined?) differences in the mental construal of the same activity in the two languages.

⁹ A perfectivizing prefix obviously fulfills both functions in a loan verb, but it seems logical to assume that perfectivizing as such comes before perfectivizing in a specific manner.

¹⁰Of a different opinion are scholars who include the delimitative *po-* perfectives (*posiedzieć* ‘sit for some time’, *poleżeć* ‘lie for some time’) in the category of pure perfectivizers (*preverbes vides*). Their opinion is that *po-* is the primary productive prefix in Polish. (For discussion see Bacz 2007.)

¹¹ See Dickey (2008) for discussion of the historical development of *po-* in Russian.

¹²Giraud-Weber obtained her figures from a study of the loan verbs culled from the Russian

za-, *pro-* and *s-* (Giraud-Weber 1998:70). She states (Giraud-Weber 1998:75) that in Polish, the commonest perfectivizers of loan verbs are the prefixes *za-* and *s-/z-*, in that order. Thus, while in Polish, productivity estimates for the most frequent overall perfectivizing prefixes can be said to correspond to the productivity of the most frequent prefixes in loan verbs, in Russian, prefix productivity estimates appear to be markedly different for the two types of verbs.

This discrepancy in the productivity ratings between overall perfectivizers and loan verb perfectivizers in Russian can in part be attributed to the difference in the scholars' views concerning the status of the delimitative prefix *po-* in the formation of Russian aspectual pairs (for discussion see Włodarczyk 1997). A change in the semantic network of the Russian *po-* that took place in the 17th century and resulted in the shift of the delimitative sense of the prefix to the central, prototype position, argued for by Dickey (2005, 2007, 2008), may also have affected aspectologists' estimates of the prefix's productivity¹³.

The Polish-versus-Russian difference in prefix productivity in loans indicates that the aspectual assimilation process (via prefixation) is different in the two languages. It also suggests that the meaning of the corresponding perfectivizing prefixes may not be the same in the eyes of the speakers of Polish and the speakers of Russian.

4. BI-ASPECTUAL VERBS IN POLISH VERSUS RUSSIAN. A major difference between the aspectual systems of Polish and Russian, reflected in the loan-verb assimilation process, concerns a group of verbs known as bi-aspectuals, i.e. verbs which have only one morphological form (dictionaries mark bi-aspectual verbs as both imperfective and perfective) and express aspect through context. A typical Polish bi-aspectual would be the verb *kanonizować* 'canonize', which has no aspectual morphology but is unambiguously imperfective when it refers to the present (6a), and unambiguously perfective when it indicates the future (6b):

- (6) a. *W tej chwili Papież **kanonizuje**^d trzech wietnamskich męczenników.*
'At this moment the Pope **is canonizing** three Vietnamese martyrs.'
- b. *Papież **kanonizuje**^e Brata André w październiku tego roku.*
'The Pope **will canonize** Frère André in October this year.'

Polish and Russian differ significantly in the number of bi-aspectuals contained in their lexicons. In Russian, the proportion of bi-aspectual verbs in the lexicon is significant. According to the statistics quoted in Janda (2007a), in the loan verbs alone 60%, i.e. more than 300 verbs, are bi-aspectual; Giraud-Weber (1998:72), following the statistics provided in Čertkova (1996:105-109), estimates the number of bi-aspectual loans at 500-600 lexemes. In recent publications on Russian, bi-aspectuals are

newspapers from the years 1996-1997 (Giraud-Weber 1998:7, fn.2)

¹³The prefix *po-* (its aspectual role, current semantic status and historical development) has become of crucial theoretical importance in recent cognitive studies of aspect, particularly in Russian but also and in the pan-Slavic context. Dickey (2008) has used the *po-* productivity card as the basic piece of evidence for his east-west aspectual division of Slavic, and Janda (2007b) has used the delimitative *po-* based litmus test to define Russian bi-aspectual loans.

considered to form a class and are recognized as a separate category in the Russian verb system. (Giraud-Weber 1998:72, 76).¹⁴

In Polish, the number of bi-aspectual verbs is very low. Grammars list only a handful of examples that have the characteristic of unquestionable bi-aspectuals, and they are viewed as exceptions, a small peripheral group of verbs in the Polish aspectual system. The fact that the number of bi-aspectual loans in Polish is much smaller than in Russian is explained by the ability of the Polish aspectual system to assimilate newly acquired verbs immediately after they enter the language. Polish loan verbs are equipped with aspectual morphology (perfectivizing prefixes) practically upon arrival and they seem in no need of going through the intermediate stage of bi-aspectuality, vital – so it seems – in the process of loan assimilation in Russian, as evident from the following description by Janda (2007b:105): “... when a foreign verb arrives in the Russian lexicon, it starts out with no aspectual morphology As a new immigrant to Russian, a pilgrim verb has only its lexical meaning at the outset.”

Concerning the process of loan assimilation in Polish, Giraud-Weber (1998:74) observes that Polish speakers perceive loan verbs as imperfective, which allows them to apply a “quasi-immediate” perfectivization by prefixation¹⁵.

Bi-aspectuals of Slavic provenance are also more frequent in Russian than in Polish, which may have influenced (by providing a model of non-morphological aspectual expression) the treatment of foreign verbs that are newcomers to the Russian system. Examples of non-foreign verbs in Polish and Russian which obviously have the same Slavic roots but represent different aspectual categories in the two languages are given in (7):

(7)	<u>Polish</u>	<u>Russian</u>	
	<i>żeńić (się)^f / ożenić (się)^p</i>	<i>ženit (sja)^{fp}</i>	‘marry, get married’
	<i>ranić^t / zranić^p</i>	<i>ranit^{vp}</i>	‘wound’, hurt’
	(Włodarczyk 1997:83)		

5. ASPECTUAL CLASSIFICATION OF CORRESPONDING LOAN VERBS IN POLISH AND IN RUSSIAN. Polish and Russian assign different aspectual status to newly arrived loan verbs almost as a rule: while Russian tends to preserve bi-aspectuality, even if it is only a temporary state of affairs,¹⁶ the system of Polish imposes unambiguous aspectual morphology on loan verbs from the very beginning.¹⁷ A comparison I have performed

¹⁴But according to Isačenko and Avilova, bi-aspectuals are viewed as an anomaly in the Russian aspectual system (Giraud-Weber 1998,fn. 5)

¹⁵Cf.: “*On a l'impression que les emprunts verbaux aux langues européennes sont perçus d'emblée par les polonophones comme imperfectifs ce qui permet une perfectivisation par préfixation quasi immédiate*” (Giraud-Weber 1998:74).

¹⁶Janda (2007a:105) observes that even typical Russian bi-aspectuals “may later acquire the morphology of the Russian aspectual system.”

¹⁷In her comments on bi-aspectuality in Polish and in Russian, Włodarczyk (1997:84) quotes the opinion of K. Netteberg (1953 :72): “... *le polonais montre une tendance à se débarrasser de cette ambiguïté dans l'aspect, souvent à l'aide de la dérivation [...] et le plus souvent par la préfixation. Cette tendance [...] est en train de transformer le système des aspects en un système dont chaque verbe est ou bien perfectif ou bien imperfectif et où il n'y a pas de verbe*

manually between a 56-item sample of unquestionably bi-aspectual loans in Russian listed in Janda (2007a:100-101, table 2(a)18) and the corresponding loan verbs in Polish reveals that 87% (49 out of 56 comparable items) of the Polish equivalents of Russian bi-aspectual loan verbs have perfective, prefix-marked counterparts and are therefore unambiguously imperfective in the Polish verb system. The examples in (8) illustrate the difference in aspectual classification of the corresponding borrowed verbs in the two languages:

(8) <u>Polish imperfectives</u>	<u>Russian bi-aspectuals</u>	
<i>abonowaćⁱ / zaabonować^p</i>	<i>abonirovat^{i/p}</i>	‘subscribe’
<i>demaskowaćⁱ / zdemaskować^p</i>	<i>demaskirovat^{i/p}</i>	‘unmask’
<i>europaizowaćⁱ / zeuropaizować^p</i>	<i>evropeizirovat^{i/p}</i>	‘Europeanize’
<i>niuansowaćⁱ / zniuansować^p</i>	<i>njuansirovat^{i/p}</i>	‘supply nuances’
(Janda 2007b: 100)		

The juxtaposition in (8) raises the question of a possible theoretical significance of the difference in aspectual assimilation of loan verbs between Russian and Polish. A close association between loan verbs and bi-aspectuality has been noted in both languages¹⁹, but why should the same foreign verb become bi-aspectual in Russian and imperfective in Polish? That is, why are certain loan verbs bi-aspectual in Russian while the corresponding loan verbs in Polish are imperfective?

Janda (2007b:84) asks a similar question about aspect assignment in Russian, trying to find out “why [in the process of loan-verb assimilation] some foreign verbs become bi-aspectual upon their arrival into the language while others become imperfective simplexes.” Janda’s (2007a) paper reports the results of an empirical study conducted on 550 loan verbs in Russian (listed in Wheeler’s 1972/1992 Russian-English dictionary) in an attempt to identify critical semantic and behavioral differences between imperfective and bi-aspectual verbs. The study compared the behavior of bi-aspectual versus non-bi-aspectual loans with respect to the possibility of forming delimitative *po-* perfectives, i.e. perfectives that express the sense of “do X for a while”. The *po-* test, for which the Internet search engines were used extensively, was to verify the correlation, predicted by the cluster model of aspect in Russian,²⁰ between the semantic profiles of bi-aspectual versus imperfective loans and the abil-

à double aspect. Cette tendance semble être bien plus faible en russe[...]”

¹⁸Janda (2007a:100-101) lists 70 unquestionably bi-aspectual Russian verbs (well-attested verbs that have yielded zero *po-* prefixed hits in the search she performed). In my estimate (based on my native-speaker knowledge of Polish), only 56 of these verbs have corresponding loan-verb equivalents in Polish.

¹⁹The opinion that “most bi-aspectuals are foreign and foreign verbs are often bi-aspectual” has been voiced by Janda (2007b:84) about Russian and by Włodarczyk (1997:83) about Polish.

²⁰The cluster model predicts that imperfective (simplex) verbs form complex act (i.e. delimitative *po-* prefixed) perfectives (Janda 2007b:94-95). See Bacz (2007) for a discussion of the first version of the cluster model. Modifications to the model have been proposed in Makarova & Janda (2009) “Do it once: A case study of the Russian *-nu-* semelfactives” published in *Scando-Slavica* 55, 78-99. See Bacz (2010) for a discussion of the modified version of the cluster model from the perspective of Polish.

ity of these two types of loan verbs to combine with the delimitative *po-* prefix. The study has shown that borrowed imperfective verbs allow “non-completable construals” (i.e. admit of an atelic semantic interpretation) and can therefore easily form *po-* prefixed perfectives while borrowed bi-aspectuals tend to have completable construals (i.e. are highly telic in their semantic profile) and therefore as a rule do not accept the delimitative *po-* prefixation. Additionally, the statistics revealed in the course of the study have demonstrated that contrary to the popular tacit assumption that borrowed verbs are nearly all bi-aspectual (Janda 2007b:91), almost 40% of these loans are actually imperfective.

6. DEFINING BI-ASPECTUAL LOAN VERBS IN RUSSIAN. Two important generalizations about bi-aspectual loan verbs in Russian were made on the basis of Janda’s findings: (a) “Bi-aspectuals refer to actions that are construable **only** [my emphasis] as completable, involving changing the state or arrangement of something” (Janda 2007b:105), and (b) “Bi-aspectual borrowed verbs are less prone to create *po-* forms than imperfective borrowed verbs” (Janda 2007b:83).

Thus, according to the findings of Janda’s study, the answer to the question of when and why a foreign verb becomes bi-aspectual ultimately lies in the verb’s lexical meaning: if a verb is strongly telic (i.e., if it is “construable as completable” or if it “necessarily describes results (or progress toward results)” (Janda 2007b:105), it becomes bi-aspectual and can function in perfective contexts on the strength of its completability, no perfectivizing morphology is required. Also, because of its completability, a verb with a highly telic construal is not likely to occur in “do-it-for-a-while” contexts and thus resists delimitative *po-* prefixation. Alternately, if a borrowed verb denotes an activity that can be imagined as non-completable, it is likely to accept delimitative *po-* prefixation, can form perfective counterparts by means of other prefixes and upon arrival in Russian is classified as a non-bi-aspectual, i.e. as an imperfective.

Janda checked all loan verbs in Russian for the possibility of delimitative *po-* prefixation. Her experiment has confirmed a correlation between resistance to *po-* prefixation and bi-aspectuality in Russian loans. The findings of the experiment she conducted suggest that the *po-* prefixation test could be used in Russian to determine a borrowed verb’s aspectual assignment.

7. SAMPLE ANALYSIS OF CORRESPONDING LOAN VERBS IN RUSSIAN AND IN POLISH. I have examined three high-frequency loan-verb bi-aspectuals in Russian from Janda’s (2007b: 100) list in Table 2(a) in terms of the defining criteria for loan-verb bi-aspectuality proposed in the 2007b paper and I have compared these bi-aspectuals with their loan verb equivalents in Polish. The Russian bi-aspectual verbs randomly chosen for discussion: *desertirovat* ‘desert’, *germanizirovat* ‘Germanize’, and *reducirovat* ‘reduce’ are juxtaposed with their corresponding loan verbs in Polish in (11). While the Russian verbs in (11) are bi-aspectual, their Polish equivalents are morphologically marked for aspect and have the simplex imperfective and the prefixed perfective forms:

(11) <u>Russian</u>	<u>Polish</u>	
<i>desertirovat'</i> ^{vp}	<i>dezertrowaćⁱ / zdezertrować^p</i>	'desert'
<i>germanizirovat'</i> ^{vp}	<i>germanizowaćⁱ / zgermanizować^p</i>	'Germanize'
<i>reducirovat'</i> ^{vp}	<i>redukowaćⁱ / zredukować^p</i>	'reduce'

All three of the Russian verbs were found to have no delimitative *po-* uses (zero *po-* hits). The actions they express can all be described as goal oriented, i.e. completable: deserting (the army) necessarily involves a change of location; when one Germanizes somebody, progress toward the state of being Germanized is necessarily presupposed; when something undergoes reduction, a change of state involving size from unreduced to reduced is unavoidable. What's more, the verbs represent the semantic subtypes identified as exclusive to bi-aspectual loans: removal, cultural/linguistic change of state, physical change of state, respectively. According to the criteria established for imperfective loan verbs in Russian (description of human behaviors associated with various social and professional settings, possibility of being used intransitively, acceptance of the delimitative *po-* prefixation [Janda 2007b:104]), the verbs *desertirovat'*, *germanizirovat'* and *reducirovat'* have to be bi-aspectual, because they do not conform to any of these criteria.

The equivalent loan verbs in Polish *dezertrowaćⁱ*, *germanizowaćⁱ*, *redukowaćⁱ* are classified as imperfectives for they all have perfective, morphologically identifiable counterparts formed by means of perfectivizing prefixes. As far as can be judged from the equivalent English translations, the Polish verbs have the same meanings as their loan-verb counterparts in Russian. Thus, their semantic construals can safely be defined as completable, and the semantic subtypes they can be assigned to are also: removal, cultural/linguistic change of state and physical change of state. However, a Polish speaker can easily imagine the actions of Germanizing and reducing in the delimitative (attenuative) *po-* context of "did X for a while" or "did a bit of X/did X for a bit". An attested example of the delimitative *po-* Germanize is quoted in (12):

- (12) *A potem się was trochę pogermanizuje. Niemcy zawsze chętnie będą miały od wschodniej strony rezerwuar taniej siły roboczej.*
 'And then you **will be Germanized a little**. Germany will always gladly have a reservoir of cheap labor on the east side.'
 (forum.gazeta.pl.-10.12.2008)

The verb *germanizować* 'Germanize' expresses a cultural/linguistic change but it allows a non-completable construal, since the progress towards a new state is long and can be temporarily interrupted.

8. CONCLUSION. The following conclusions can be drawn from the comparison of loan-verb assimilation into the aspectual systems of Polish and Russian in terms of the aspect-assignment criteria proposed for Russian by Janda (2007a):

- (1) A solid statistics-based study of Polish bi-aspectual loans is required to establish the semantic profile of the few borrowed verbs that have not acquired perfectivizing prefixation.

- (2) The correlation between completability and resistance to the delimitative *po-* prefixation, established for bi-aspectual loan verbs in Russian, is observed in Polish but is not as strong as postulated for Russian. Loans that are bi-aspectual in Russian but imperfective in Polish accept the delimitative prefix *po-* more freely.
- (3) The overall semantic characteristic and certain semantic types identified as exclusive to bi-aspectual loans in Russian cannot be used to define bi-aspectual loans in Polish because in Polish they characterize imperfective loans.

In sum, foreign verb assimilation into the aspectual system of Polish is different from the assimilation of borrowed verbs in Russian, and the delimitative *po-* test, which has been shown to be a good indicator of loan bi-aspectuality in Russian (Janda 2007b), appears to be a much less reliable indicator of the aspectual status of verb loans in Polish.

REFERENCES

- AVILOVA, NATAL'JA S. 1968. *Dvuidovyje glagoly s zaimstvovannoju osnovoj v russkom literaturnom jazyke novogo vremeni*. *Voprosy jazykoznanija* 5, 65-78.
- BACZ, BARBARA. 2007. *Verbal prefixation in Slavic: Z-prefixed perfectives in Polish*. *LACUČ forum* XXXIII.249-259.
- . 2010 (ms). *Reflections on semelfactivity in Polish*. Paper presented at the 10th annual conference of the Slavic Cognitive Linguistics Association at Brown University, Providence, Rhode Island.
- BOGDAN, DAVID R., & WILLIAM J SULLIVAN. 2009. *The tense-aspect system of Polish narrative*. *LINCOM Studies in Slavic Linguistics* 35. Muenchen: Lincom. EUROPA.
- ČERTKOVA, MARINA. 1996. *Grammatičeskaja kategorija vida v sovremennom russkom jazyke*. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Moskovskogo universiteta.
- DUNAJ, BOGUSŁAW, ED. 1996. *Słownik współczesnego języka polskiego (SWJP)*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo WILGA.
- DICKEY, STEPHEN M. 2005. *S-/Z- and the grammaticalization of aspect in Slavic*. *Slovene Linguistic Studies* 5. Ljubljana: Lawrence, 3-55.
- . 2007. *A prototype account of the development of delimitative po- in Russian*. In *Cognitive paths into the Slavic domain* ed. by Dagmar Divjak & Agata Kochańsk, 326-71. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- . 2008. *The varying role of po- in the grammaticalization of Slavic aspectual systems: sequences of events, delimitatives, and German language contact*. (MS)
- GIRAUD-WEBER, MARGUERITE. 1998. *La préfixation des emprunts verbaux en russe et en polonais*. *Etudes slaves*, Paris, LXX/1.67-77.

- GRZEGORCZYKOWA, RENATA, LASKOWSKI, ROMAN, & HENRYK WRÓBEL. 1984. *Gramatyka współczesnego języka polskiego. Morfologia*. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
- Janda, LAURA A. 2007a. *Aspectual clusters of Russian verbs*. *Studies in Language* 31(3), 607-648.
- . 2007b. *What makes Russian bi-aspectual verbs special? In Cognitive paths into the Slavic domain* ed. by Dagmar Divjak & Agata Kočańska, 83-109. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- KARPLUK, MARIA. 1993. *Mowa naszych przodków*. Kraków: Towarzystwo Miłośników Języka Polskiego.
- ŁAZIŃSKI, MAREK. 2008 (ms). *O głosowaniu i zagłosowaniu*. Polityczne aspekty aspektu.
- MAKAROVA, ANASTASIA & LAURA A Janda. 2009. "Do it once: A case study of Russian -nu- semelfactives." *Scando-Slavica* 55 (2009), 78-99.
- NETTEBERG, K. 1953. *Etudes sur le verbe polonais*. Copenhagen: Rosenkilde og Bagger.
- ON-LINE SŁOWNIK JĘZYKA POLSKIEGO PWN (SJP) @ www.sjp.pwn.pl
- STANISŁAWSKI, JAN, ED. 1990. *The Great Polish-English Dictionary (GPED)*. Warszawa: Wiedza Powszechna.
- TOKARSKI, JAN, ED. 1980. *Słownik wyrazów obcych PWN (SWO)*. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
- WHEELER, MARCUS. 1972/1992. *The Oxford Russian-English Dictionary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- WŁODARCZYK, HÉLÈNE. 1997. *L'aspect verbal dans le contexte en polonais et en russe*. Paris : Institut d'études slaves.