UNIVERSITY OF AMSTERDAM

UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

Polish dictionaries and the treatment of verbal aspect

Genis, R.

Publication date
2012
Document Version
Final published version
Published in
Between West and East: Festschrift for Wim Honselaar, on the occasion of his 65th Birthday

Link to publication

Citation for published version (APA):
Genis, R. (2012). Polish dictionaries and the treatment of verbal aspect. In R. Genis, E. de Haard, J. Kalsbeek, E. Keizer, & J. Stelleman (Eds.), *Between West and East: Festschrift for Wim Honselaar, on the occasion of his 65th Birthday* (pp. 175-198). (Pegasus Oost-Europese studies; No. 20). Pegasus.

General rights
It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations
If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, P.O. Box 19185, 1000 GD Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

UvA-DARE is a service provided by the library of the University of Amsterdam (https://dare.uva.nl)

Download date:15 Sept 2026

POLISH DICTIONARIES AND THE TREATMENT OF VERBAL ASPECT

René Genis

0 Preliminaries

The grammatical category of aspect in Slavic languages, including Polish, is nowadays generally considered to have two values: IMPERFECTIVE and PERFECTIVE. Most verbs belong to either one of these two 'aspects' and are marked as such in dictionaries, just as substantives are marked for gender.

In order to help us along in dealing with the problems Slavic verbal aspect poses to the makers of dictionaries, I would like to introduce the symbol V, which stands for the lexical meaning of a verb regardless of the meaning type, such as for example states, activities, accomplishments or achievements in the classification of Vendler (1967b), or indeed any other such classification.

It is often thought that each V is represented by two verbs in Slavic languages: one imperfective, the other perfective, so that the full range of temporal forms may be expressed.[1] Indeed, there are many such ASPECTUAL PAIRS, e.g. *wracać*$_{\text{i}}$: *wrócić*$_{\text{p}}$ 'return', *pisać*$_{\text{i}}$: *napisać*$_{\text{p}}$ 'write', *ziewać*$_{\text{i}}$: *ziewnąć*$_{\text{p}}$ 'yawn' etc.[2] As two aspectual partners share a V, they warrant a dictionary treatment that explicates their 'pairedness', and traditionally, they are dealt with within a single 'joint' entry. However, the semantic relationship between two aspectually opposed partners may vary greatly, as do the opinions on the acceptability of two given verbs as an aspectual pair.[3] Moreover, the morphology of Slavic aspectual oppositions is not straightforward and in this respect there are different types of pairs.

At this point, mention should be made of the fact that many V are not represented by aspectual pairs, or, to put it the other way round, many verbs do not have a partner of the opposing aspect. Such V may appear in one of the two aspects only and we speak of IMPERFECTIVA TANTUM, e.g. *leżeć*$_{\text{i}}$ 'lie' and PERFECTIVA TANTUM, e.g. *lec*$_{\text{p}}$ 'lie down' and *pospacerować*$_{\text{p}}$ 'walk for a while'.

Finally, there are the so-called BI-ASPECTUALS, here exemplified by *kazać*$_{i/p}$ 'order', *abdykować*$_{i/p}$ 'abdicate'. In these, V has two aspects but only a single lexeme.[4]

Bi-aspectuals do not really pose a problem for the dictionary maker; a simple label indicating the aspectual nature suffices. The labelling for the (im)perfectiva tantum is similarly easy but these verbs are problematic in as far as the assignment to this group is concerned. This rather depends on the pairability of a given verbal lexeme of one aspect to another with the opposing aspect, and so, this matter is connected to the problem of the semantic nature of the opposition of aspectual partners and to one's definition of the aspectual pair.

All in all, the 'triple' variability outlined above – the semantic nature of pairedness, the different opinions and views on pairedness and the morphological complexity – in all likelihood lies at the basis of the fact that there are quite considerable differences in the treatment of verbal aspect in the various dictionaries, especially concerning aspectual pairs.

In section one of this paper, I will discuss the morphological side of the matter as well as some basic underlying semantic issues in order to set the scene for section two, which takes a look at the way in which the morphological types are dealt with in the major Polish monolingual dictionaries. Section three discusses additional, mostly semantic issues and views, on the basis of which there will be some tentative recommendations.

1 An outline of aspect morphology and some semantic issues

1.1 Suffixal pairs

The pair *wracać*$_i$: *wrócić*$_p$ 'return' is our first example and it belongs to the relatively small group of simplex-only pairs: neither imperfective nor perfective member sports a verbal prefix. Most pairs of this type, however, consist of compound partners that have the same verbal prefix, e.g. *zaprosić*$_p$: *zapraszać*$_i$ 'invite', *przepisać*$_p$: *przepisywać*$_i$ 'rewrite/ copy', *ogrzać*$_p$: *ogrzewać*$_i$ 'heat' and many more. Especially with the prefixed pairs it is not unusual to mention the perfective member first (also in dictionary entries as we shall see below) and many

Poles would instinctively feel that the imperfective is derived from the perfective. The supposed order of the derivation needs not concern us here, but we can say that the two members of this kind of aspectual pair are morphologically opposed by their respective so-called THEMATIC SUFFIXES in all paradigmatic forms. This means that the partners are opposed by belonging to different conjugational classes. In the following example the thematic suffix is put between hyphens.

Perfective
przepis-a-ć 'rewrite', *przepis-a-łem* 'I rewrote' | *przepisz-Ø-ę*, 'I write', *przepisz-Ø-esz* 'you write' etc.[5]

Imperfective
przepis-ywa-ć 'rewrite', *przepis-ywa-łem* 'I rewrote' | *przepis-uj-ę*, 'I write', *przepis-uj-esz* 'you write' etc.

The thematic suffixes of these two verbs may be summarised *-a-* | *-Ø-* for, in this case, the perfective verb and *-ywa-* | *-uj-* for the imperfective verb. Morphologically opposed alternations within a paradigm are separated by a vertical line |.

It would be attractive to see a paradigmatic system in the morphology of this type of opposition; such lexemes would then constitute a single verb with (a single V and) a broad paradigm covering both aspects. Unfortunately this is difficult to uphold for Polish, as a given thematic suffix is not constantly paired with one particular other thematic suffix and quite a few of them oppose different ones in several verb pairs. Also, thematic suffixes are not in principle restricted to any one of the two aspects and *-a-* | *-Ø-*, in our example the marker of perfectivity (when opposed to *-ywa-* | *-uj-* in an aspectual pair) is a case in point: when opposed to certain other suffixes it marks imperfectivity, e.g. *skocz-y-ć*$_{p}$: *skak-a-ć*$_{i}$ 'jump'.[6]

Establishing the pair status of partners such as these should pose no problem whatsoever for the lexicographer, as both members undoubtedly share the same V. However, there are a few issues that crop up when looking at the dictionaries, which I shall do in section two, and also when one studies the actual semantics, which I shall do in section three.

1.2 MS -pairs (Multiplicative vs. Semelfactive pairs)

For want of a better name, I have dubbed the following type of morphological opposition MS-PAIR. In fact, these are a type of suffixal pair, that typically has a perfective member with the thematic suffix *-ną-* | *-n-* (e-conjugation) and an imperfective with another thematic suffix. Often the latter is *-a-* | -Ø- (a-conjugation), but others also occur. Here is a list of examples.

kichać$_i$	'sneeze'	*kichnąć*$_p$	'give a sneeze'
klęczeć$_i$	'kneel (continuously)'	*klęknąć*$_p$	'kneel (once)'
kopać$_i$	'give kicks'	*kopnąć*$_p$	'kick (once)'
krzyczeć$_i$	'yell'	*krzyknąć*$_p$	'give a yell'
machać$_i$	'wave'	*machnąć*$_p$	'give a single wave'
świstać$_i$	'whistle (continuously)'	*świsnąć*$_p$	'whistle a single sound'
szarpać$_i$	'tug'	*szarpnąć*$_p$	'give a tug'
tykać$_i$	'touch' (continuously)	*tknąć*$_p$	'touch (once)'
ziewać$_i$	'yawn (continuously)'	*ziewnąć*$_p$	'give a single yawn'

As may be surmised from the meanings of these pairs, the perfective member always indicates a SEMELFACTIVE V, whilst the imperfective is the equivalent MULTIPLICATIVE V. Because of this slight deviation from the principle that aspectual partners share exactly the same V (see 1 above), as well as the fact that the imperfective members may be perceived as activities, making them aterminative, the status of aspectual pair is less clear for these verbs than for the suffixal pairs of section 1.1.[7] However, the semantic opposition involved is very regular and naturally connected to the V of this class of pairs. I will return to these pairs in section three.

1.3 SC-pairs (Simplex$_i$-Compound$_p$ pairs)

Verb pairs of this type consist of a non-prefixed SIMPLEX and a derived prefixed COMPOUND: *czytać*$_i$: *przeczytać*$_p$ 'read', *rozumieć*$_i$: *zrozumieć*$_p$ 'understand' etc. This is the way of presenting this kind of pair in textbooks and two of the more recent dictionaries. If V is the same for each of the two members of such a pair, we must conclude that the prefix should not actually add any lexical meaning to the

compound: its function is purely grammatical and when prefixes are used in this way we refer to them as EMPTY PREFIXES.[8] This emptiness is not evident though, as all of the prefixes occur in derived compounds with the lexical meaning of the prefix clearly present, cf. *pisać*$_{i}$ 'write' → *przepisać*$_{p}$ 'copy/rewrite'. This example shows that the addition of the prefix to the imperfective simplex changes the meaning and also results in a perfective compound. As the perfective compound often has an imperfective aspectual partner, termed a SECONDARY IMPERFECTIVE, with which it forms a (suffixal) pair – here *przepisywać*$_{i}$ 'copy/rewrite' and so the same V – we may not say that prefixes are markers of perfectivity. In principle any of the different prefixes may occur as empty prefix, but some do so more often than others.[9]

Morphonologically speaking the processes involved in deriving a prefixed perfective verb from a simplex are quite simple. The semantic side of this process is not so straightforward and involves the lexical semantic feature terminativity. As I have discussed extensively elsewhere (Genis 2008a: 103-127), the perfective partner of the pairs under scrutiny in this paragraph only opposes the terminative meanings / usages of the imperfective counterpart. The latter principle only holds true, though, if we adhere strictly to the premise that the only difference between the two partners is the aspectual value and that the V is exactly the same for both members. An imperfective simplex, however, usually has aterminative meaning(s) too. In fact, this/these form the basic meaning(s) of such simple verbs. In order to elucidate this somewhat I will discuss a few simple examples of such a verb pair in significant predicates. Given the space available, this can only be a very brief account and for a fuller treatment I refer to the publication mentioned above as well as to Schlegel (1999: 38 a.f.), whose Russian examples I have rendered into Polish and to which I then added some further examples to complete this overview. The interpretation of these examples is based on the default reading by native speakers.

(1) a On pisał$_{i}$ (= on jest pisarzem).
He wrote-Ipf
'He wrote' (= 'he was a writer') [–terminative]

(1) b *On napisał$_{p}$.
He wrote-Pf
*'He wrote/has written.'

(2) a On pisał$_{i}$ poematy.
He wrote-Ipf poems-Acc.
'He wrote poems.' [–terminative]
(2) b On napisał$_{p}$ poematy.
He wrote-Pf poems-Acc.
?'He wrote poems.'

(3) a On pisał$_{i}$ poezję.
He wrote-Ipf poetry-Acc.
'He wrote poetry.' [–terminative]
(3) b *On napisał$_{p}$ poezję.
He wrote-Pf poetry-Acc.
*'He wrote poetry.'

(4) a On pisał$_{i}$ nowy poemat.
He wrote-Ipf new_poem-Acc.
'He was writing a new poem.' [+terminative]
(4) b On napisał$_{p}$ nowy poemat.
He wrote-Pf new_poem-Acc.
'He has written/wrote a new poem.' [+terminative]

In example 1a the predicate is not quantified (= not terminative) and the conjugated verb *pisać*$_{i}$ does not convey any terminativity either. The perfective verb in 1b is ungrammatical in this context as perfective verbs are always terminative and only partake in terminative predicates. In example 4 the predicate is extended with a clearly quantified direct object; this predicate is already terminative in 4a and so it can be opposed by a perfective predicate as in 4b. Such terminativisation is not possible for 2a and 3a, as the predicate (here, actually, the direct object as a component part of the predicate) is not (sufficiently) quantified. Therefore, perfective counterparts 2b and 3b are not possible. 2b is impossible in

the reading with an unquantified amount of poems, but it is readily interpreted in a quantified way – *poemat* 'poem' is a countable and so allows for this. Its reading would then be 'He wrote some poems'. As *poezja* 'poetry' is not a countable, example 3b cannot be interpreted this way.[10] This central issue will return in section three.

In the light of the above it might seem surprising that imperfective simplexes can serve as pure aspectual partners to prefixed and so explicitly terminative perfectives at all.[11] In fact, as terminativity is a lexical semantic component of (almost) every prefix's meaning, we may comfortably state that no prefix is truly empty, not even in lexical semantic terms, such as is suggested by the term 'empty prefix'.[12] The principle underlying the pairedness, though, is the fact that the simplex may be used in terminative predicates (terminativised by e.g. the object in the sentence) and as such can be opposed by a prefixed and so explicitly terminative, perfective compound. As the predicate is already terminative the prefix adds perfectivity while the terminativity is doubled in the predicate and therefore not an explicit addition on that level. The perfective partner is explicit as to terminativity but when the imperfective simplex partakes in a terminative predicate, there is no loss of terminativity. Although all Slavic languages form secondary imperfectives, in the light of the above, it does not seem strange that not all Slavic languages formed secondary imperfectives for all V of this type and there is some clear variation.[13]

1.4 Suppletive pairs

We speak of SUPPLETIVE ASPECTUAL PARTNERS when a pair consists of two verbs that lack any morphological relationship. Typical Polish examples are *brać*$_{\text{i}}$: *wziąć*$_{\text{p}}$ 'take, grab' and *kłaść*$_{\text{i}}$: *położyć*$_{\text{p}}$ 'put down'. As long as the V is the same in both the perfective and imperfective partner there should be no objection in recognising these as aspectual pairs. However, our perusal of the various dictionaries in section two reveals a rather mixed treatment for the two sample pairs we gave here, as well as for other verb pairs of this type.

1.5 Over-complete 'pairs'?

In Polish there is a limited and unproductive class of FREQUENTATIVE VERBS, whose meaning includes not mere 'open' (= unquantified) repetition – for which any imperfective may serve – but a habitual notion or such like, e.g. *pisywać*$_{i}$ 'write regularly', *czytywać*$_{i}$ 'read regularly' etc. They are always imperfective simplexes and may seem to be an 'extra' second imperfective member to the aspectual pairs *pisać*$_{i}$: *napisać*$_{p}$ and *czytać*$_{i}$: *przeczytać*$_{p}$ 'read' respectively. However, I rather think that the frequentative verb is not a pure aspectual partner and the semantic element [+/–frequentativity] is not a grammatical feature. These verbs should be dealt with separately in a Polish dictionary and generally they are.

A similar situation is encountered for the class of VERBS OF MOTION that have an imperfective denoting movement with a determined direction and another imperfective verb explicating a movement without such a determined direction. Here too, I would agree with the dictionaries in their separate treatment as these verbs are differentiated by the lexical element [+/–determinate direction] and so do not share an exactly similar V. An added problem here is that no perfective verb actually comes through the test posed by the premise that both the perfective and imperfective member of a true and pure aspectual pair share exactly the same V. Simplex verbs of motion do not come in aspectual pairs.

The case of the ASPECTUAL TRIPLETS such as *jeść*$_{i}$ – *zjeść*$_{p}$ – *zjadać*$_{i}$ 'eat (up)' is less easy to dismiss from our consideration on purely lexical semantic grounds. The secondary imperfective presents a heightened terminativity as opposed to the non-prefixed imperfective, which can also be used in aterminative predicates. As terminativity is part and parcel of the V of a perfective verb, the one in this set is quite neutral. And so, which opposition is the actual aspectual pair? The pair *jeść*$_{i}$ – *zjeść*$_{p}$ 'eat' may be akin to the SC-pairs of section 1.3, whilst *zjeść*$_{p}$ – *zjadać*$_{i}$ 'eat up' may be likened to the suffixal pairs of 1.1 (cf. Genis 2008a: 127 a.f.). I will not go into a further discussion about this type of verb for reasons of space, as well as the fact that such triplets are rather rare in Polish.

2 The pair-status in the dictionaries

In the references section of this paper I have made a separate listing of the Polish

dictionaries scrutinised and these include all the major monolingual dictionaries, as well as *SJPL*, the earliest dictionary on my list, which is principally monolingual although it treats etymology extensively and so includes many other languages. I added the nicknames under which some of the more classic dictionaries are generally known in Polish linguistics and, following that local custom, I use abbreviations referring to these nicknames in the main body of my text.[14]

Turning our attention first to the suffixal pairs, it is striking that the order in which the two partners of simplex pairs are listed varies greatly: *SWJP* consistently and as a matter of policy explicated in the introduction (1996: xxix), gives the imperfective first and both members receive an aspect label. *SWa* gives the perfective first and labels only the imperfective member. *ISJP* in principle arranges the partners imperfective – perfective (except when they share the same prefix).[15] *USJP* sticks to the order perfective – imperfective and does not list *wracać*$_{\text{i}}$ separately with a reference to *wrócić*$_{\text{p}}$, even though it is some distance away. *SJPL* displays the two verbs jointly and often with many other related forms as well, so, whether or not the intention is to present aspectual pairs is unclear, perhaps even doubtful. This dictionary uses labels that point to 'more' than aspect and also to a very different concept about dealing with verbs. For example, *wrócić*$_{\text{p}}$ is labelled *niedok*[*onany*] 'imperfective' (!) and *wracać*$_{\text{i}}$ has *contin*[*uativum*], a label that is not clarified in the introduction, but it undoubtedly means 'verb expressing a continuous, on-going event'. Many simplex pairs receive the same or a similar treatment. It is quite clear that this magnificent early dictionary dates from before the modern studies on aspect. Although tradition has it that *SWi*, including its strategies, was largely based on *SJPL*, in this respect *SWi* makes more modern choices in providing (the right!) aspectual labels for each member and placing them jointly in single entries, with the imperfective first. *PSWP* is quite unique in its handling of aspectual matters and no two verbs are ever presented as equal partners, but reference to the other aspectual form of a pair is made on entry level in the grammatical section. All types of suffixal pairs receive this treatment. On the meaning level the aspectual partner is not mentioned anymore and does not occur in the examples except in those cases where one aspectual form refers to the aspectual partner and has no separate, aspect-particular meanings. The handling

of aspect by *PSWP* may at first glance seem uniform, but the above description will already have shown that that is only so to a certain extent.

All other scrutinised dictionaries are inconsistent in the order of presentation and provide no clue as to the guiding principles.

Suffixal pairs with prefixes receive a similarly differentiated treatment and again *SWJP* is the most consistent, mentioning all imperfectives first. Also consistent is *PSWP* as each partner has its own entry: of this type of pair the other member is always mentioned. The other dictionaries in principle have the perfective member first; this means that *ISJP* presents this type in a reversed order compared to the simplex pairs, discussed above. Dictionaries differ somewhat in the amount of secondary imperfectives mentioned and *SJPSz* seems to have more than most others. This need not concern us much as forming such verbs is largely a productive process. *SJPL*, again, is interesting in its labelling, especially of secondary imperfectives, and *przepisywać*$_{i}$ is marked, not as imperfective, but as *frequ*[*entativum*]. Nowadays, certainly, this verb can be used to denote repetition (although e.g. *SJPD* does not mention it as such explicitly), but apart from that, it can also be used for a processual, single event. Interestingly, *przegwizdywać*$_{i}$ is given the explicit labels *contin*[*uativum*] *frequ*[*entativum*] by *SJPL*, which must point to the fact that Linde, its maker, at least for this verb, was aware of the two meanings – TERMINAL ITERATIVE and INTRATERMINAL/PROCESSUAL – in which secondary imperfectives may often be used (cf. Barentsen 1985: 88 a.f.).[16] *SJPD* separates the terminal iterative meaning of quite a large number of imperfective lexemes from the entry for the aspectual pair and so seems to distance itself from the premise that all imperfective verbs may express so-called 'open' or 'unbounded' repetition. I will return to these issues in section three.

As he seems primarily interested in presenting as many words with the same morphological basis as possible in single articles, Linde in his *SJPL* also displays the partners of MS-pairs in a fashion that feels somewhat disconnected from the aspectual matter. He often labels the perfective member of this type *jedn*[*o*]*tl*[*iwe*] (= *instantaneum*) 'singular action'. The imperfective usually receives the description *act. contin*[*uativum*] 'continuous action'. Apt as a description, this is however not an aspectual designation. *SWi* treats some aspectual partners of this

type separately, without reference to each other, e.g. *machać*$_{i}$: *machnąć*$_{p}$ 'wave', giving the perfective verb the label *jedntl.* like Linde. Most other examples are treated as pair, with the imperfective marked as such and the perfective *jedntl*. All other dictionaries pair these verbs and denote aspect explicitly (*PSWP*, again, through reference). The order of their presentation varies, although all dictionaries seem consistent in themselves.

By far the most complex matter is presented by the SC-pairs and the dictionary treatment is very diverse indeed. The dictionaries *SJPL, SWi, SWa, SJPD, SJPSz, PSWP* and *USJP* (!) – I would call these the 'classic' set – categorically do not mention SC-pairs and members are dealt with as separate lexemes, even lacking direct entry-level references to each other. Only one dictionary, *SJPSz*, actually states this policy explicitly: "Nie łączymy w pary [...] czasowników niedokonanych z dokonanymi różniących się prefiksem (np. *bagatelizować – zbagatelizować*)" ['we do not connect into pairs imperfective verbs with perfective verbs that differ by having a prefix ...'] (1978: XV). The remaining two dictionaries, *SWJP* and *ISJP* do include these aspectual pairs. *SWJP* is slightly more progressive in that the treatment equals that of other aspectual pairs in all respects and the two members are clearly presented as belonging to a single lexeme, with the imperfective mentioned first. The terminative and aterminative meanings (and examples) of the imperfective are often dealt with in the joint entry without mention that they should not necessarily be connected to the perfective verb, even though there is a separate entry for the imperfective simplex: e.g. *dzieci uczą się pisać*$_{i}$ 'the children are learning to write' is listed under the aspectual pair although the verb *pisać*$_{i}$ cannot be substituted by the perfective counterpart. I will return to this in section three below. *ISJP* gives the perfectives of this kind of pair a separate entry often without reference to the imperfective counterpart (as in the case of *napisać*$_{p}$). In its entry, the imperfective is not paired to its perfective in the same way as the type *machać*$_{i}$: *machnąć*$_{p}$ 'wave' discussed in 1.2 but reference to that counterpart is made in a separate section of the dictionary article in the margin, devoted amongst others, to grammatical information. This gives the impression that these verbs are not really presented as pairs or equal partners, at best they seem to have a lesser status.

Turning to the suppletive pairs but staying with *ISJP*, one notices that this publication lists various meanings with the verb *brać*$_{i}$ 'take' and refers to *wziąć*$_{p}$ (as an aspectual partner?) where it deems this appropriate on the meaning-level. At *wziąć*$_{p}$ it mentions *brać*$_{i}$ as a complete imperfective equivalent. *Położyć*$_{p}$ receives a rather different treatment and the imperfective *kłaść*$_{i}$ is not mentioned at all, whereas *położyć*$_{p}$ is referred to in the grammatical, marginal information in the entry of *kłaść*$_{i}$. The mixed treatment for two of this series of pairs is a prelude to the varied treatment encountered in other dictionaries. Again, the clearest is *SWJP* and it recognises and mentions both these pairs as aspectual partners (and all other such suppletive pairs receive the same treatment). *SJPSz* does not join them into pairs and has separate entries. *USJP* mimics this treatment. *SJPD* joins *brać*$_{i}$ and *wziąć*$_{p}$ but deals with *kłaść*$_{i}$ and *położyć*$_{p}$ separately. Likewise, *PSWP* joins *brać*$_{i}$ and *wziąć*$_{p}$ and several other suppletive partners (in its usual way by reference) but *kłaść*$_{i}$ and *położyć*$_{p}$ and a few others are not associated with each other in any way whatsoever. No explanation could be found for this disparate handling. *SWa* pairs both examples up but does not refer to *położyć*$_{p}$ in the separate entry for *kłaść*$_{i}$. *SWi* and *SJPL* do not present these as pairs but in treating the meanings they refer quite adamantly at *wziąć*$_{p}$ to *brać*$_{i}$; e.g. *SWi* states at one point*:* "[...] dokonać branie, we wszystkich znaczeniach słowa *Brać* (ob. ten wyraz) [...]" [' ... execute taking, in all meanings of the word *brać* (see that word) ...'] and *SJPL* has: "we wszystkich znaczeniach masz pod słowem *brać*" ['in all meanings you have under the word *brać*']. For *kłaść*$_{i}$ and *położyć*$_{p}$ there is no such clear reference.

The following table sums up the treatment as aspectual pair of the various types of opposition described in the previous paragraphs. The dictionaries are listed in chronological order and I have added the date of publication (of the first volume); to date not all of the fifty planned volumes of *PSWP* are published, but as the first volume appeared in 1994, its position on the list reflects were it is situated in terms of its conceptualisation.

		1.1 suffixal	1.2 MS-pair	1.3 SC-pair	1.4 suppletive
SJPL	1807	?	?	no	no
SWi	1861	yes	yes (mostly)	no	yes (mostly)
SWa	1900	yes	yes	no	yes (mostly)
SJPD	1958	yes	yes	no	mixed
SJPSz	1978	yes	yes	no	no
PSWP	1994	yes (ref.)	yes (ref.)	no	mixed
SWJP	1996	yes	yes	yes	yes
ISJP	2000	yes	yes	yes (varied)	yes/no
USJP	2003	yes	yes	no	no

Probably all dictionaries, certainly the more recent ones, have underlying principles that make the treatment of aspectual pairs consistent in some way or other; I have not looked into the possible reasons for this variety. However, it must be significant that, using the dictionaries only and not seeking deeper insights in their compilation through reading specialist publications (such as is most often the case with day-to-day users), this 'consistency' seems somewhat obscure in most cases.

It is worth noting that the earlier dictionaries, from *SJPL* up to *SJPSz* as well as *PSWP* and *USJP* probably lean more towards treating aspect primarily with regard to its morphology, which then rules out SC-pairs and often also suppletive pairs.[17] Only *SWJP* and *ISJP* take the semantic side of the matter into account, largely resulting in the inclusion of SC-pairs.

I will end this discussion of the situation encountered in the dictionaries with the thought that the earlier dictionaries might not actually be indicating aspect (in the modern sense) at all. I already hinted to that earlier and in fact, it would not at all be surprising if this were so. The labels (often very apt, and sometimes quite erroneous – as I hope I have demonstrated) encountered in *SJPL* and *SWi,* which were discussed in the preceding paragraphs, point to various meanings that crop up (more or less regularly) within aspectual oppositions rather than to aspect, as a binary category, itself.

3 Taking the semantics a little further

In the following section I will look at some issues connected more closely to the semantic side of the matter and the resulting thoughts on the pair status and aspectual treatment by dictionaries. A good reason to let the semantics prevail over the morphology lies in the fact that aspect morphology is of a rather messy nature, such as I outlined before. That in itself shows that it is primarily a semantic category. In this discussion I shall adhere to the principle that true and pure aspectual pairedness implies that the two members of the opposition share V and on the semantic level differ in nothing other than aspect. This leads to the connected premise, that all perfective V are terminative whereas imperfective V may be terminative or aterminative. Hence, a terminative V may be represented by an aspectual pair, whereas aterminative V are the domain of imperfectiva tantum only.

As may be surmised from the table in the previous paragraph, the two categories of aspectual pairs that receive the most varied treatment in dictionaries are the SC-pairs and the suppletive pairs. Not a lot can be added about the latter, as for these the guiding principle is simply the V: as long as it includes terminativity two verbs of unrelated form may be treated as an aspectual pair. However, the morphological unclarity must have played a role in producing the variety in the treatment of dictionaries.

Also semantically the SC-pairs are by far the most troublesome as we already saw in 1.3. The complicated nature of these pairs is probably reflected in the fact that only the most recent dictionaries include them as such.[17] As was pointed out, a key notion is that of terminativity. Much to its merit, *ISJP* is the only dictionary that mentions the term *terminativity* in its introduction (2000: XVIII). The author writes of the "aterminative use" of the imperfective verb, but I have not found that this induced him to consequently give them a treatment separate from the perfective counterpart.[18] This rather makes me think that this dictionary categorises terminativity as a feature belonging to grammar and resulting from the grammatical opposition of aspect per se, for SC-pairs only. This does not prevent the less prepared user, especially the foreign student – this dictionary explicitly states these among their target group of users – from getting an unintended

impression about the pairedness of some lexemes. The first meaning for *pisać*$_{i}$ is "jeśli piszemy jakieś słowa lub liczby, to kreślimy je ręcznie na czymś [...]" ['when we write some words or numbers, than we draw them by hand on something [...]'], and this is accompanied in the grammatical section by perfective *napisać*$_{p}$ as well as the information that this is a transitive verb. Especially the latter qualification comes out in the explanation. It is, however, accompanied by examples , such as[*d*]*zieci pisały*$_{i}$ *z przerażającymi błędami ortograficznymi* 'the children wrote with shocking orthographical mistakes'. The verb under scrutiny may be transitive, but it is a fact that it can, and here *is*, used intransitively. In my view it is exactly the absence of a clearly quantified object (cf. 1.3 and especially the discussion of the examples 1-4) in this sentence that makes it impossible to render it with a perfective verb, even though the unprepared user will certainly get that impression. At this point I will return to the examples 2ab and 3ab, for they show that it is not merely the presence or absence of a direct object that makes the difference. In the opposition 2a : 2b there is a difference in meaning concerning the quantification of the object that is connected to the verbal aspect of the imperfective and perfective opponent verbs, which are, therefore in this respect not a pure opposition such as meant by the premise that V should be the same in both aspectual partners. For the moment I will pass at answering the question, whether one should view this as a grammatical or as a lexical issue. I would like to present the situation for these examples schematically as follows:

2a ipf [–quantified] : 2b *pf [–quantified]
2a ipf [+quantified] : 2b pf [+quantified]

I would like to conclude that the aspectual pair can only function for the [+quantified] meaning and the [–quantified] and therefore [–terminative] meaning allows only for imperfective aspect. Yet, if one rather treats this as a grammatical and regular issue, this should not have to be explicated in a dictionary, strictly speaking. Even so, it would then be good to avoid the wrong impression caused by examples such as those found profusely in *ISJP* and even *SWJP* (cf. section two), which might appear to be quite minimal, but actually provide confusion on the collocational level, in particular for non-Polish users.

In my opinion, the double nature of the simplex verb [+/−terminative] and the question of the status of terminativity need to be sorted out before one can formulate an optimal dictionary treatment. I think that terminativity is best dealt with as a lexical semantic feature. Consequently, the presence or absence of terminativity may be treated as part of the inherent meaning of verbal lexemes. This means that simplex verbs may, for example, appear in two entries: once as aterminative verb without opposing perfective, once with the terminative meaning(s) accompanied by the perfective partner:

I. *pisać*$_{\text{i}}$: Ø → [−terminative] (NB. transitive and intransitive)
II. *pisać*$_{\text{i}}$: *napisać*$_{\text{p}}$ → [+terminative] (NB. transitive)

These verbs have already received quite a bit of attention here and they are a straightforward set if dealt with in this way. The imperfective of meaning I is an activity. The aspectual pair of meaning II is an accomplishment and the imperfective may be used iteratively as well as processualy.

(5) a Synku, co robisz$_{\text{i}}$? – Właśnie piszę$_{\text{i}}$.
Son, what you_do-ipf? – Just_now I_write-Ipf.
'Son, what are you doing? – At the moment I am writing.'

(5) b Codziennie piszę$_{\text{i}}$ list.
Every_day I_write-Ipf letter.
'I write a letter every day.'

(5) c Piszę$_{\text{i}}$ list. Jutro go napiszę$_{\text{p}}$.
I_write-Ipf letter. Tomorrow it I_write-Pf.
'I am writing a letter. Tomorrow I will finish it.'

The fact that there is, for these verbs, a full set of possibilities and usages is due to the type of terminativity we are dealing with. Processual transformative meanings such as these entail a process that takes time before a new state (here: the presence of a finished letter) is reached. There are many more examples of verbs with this kind of semantic relationship involving this type of terminativity.

Slightly more complicated cases are presented by verbs with a different kind of

terminativity. The following set and examples may serve as an illustration.

I. *rozumieć*$_{i}$: Ø → [−terminative]
II. *rozumieć*$_{i}$: *zrozumieć*$_{p}$ → [+terminative]

(6) a Rozumiem$_{i}$ to wyjaśnienie.
I_understand-Ipf that explanation.
'I understand that explanation.' (= I came to understanding earlier and now I am in a state of understanding that explanation)

(6) b Zawsze jak tłumaczę$_{i}$ nowy problem, to on rozumie$_{i}$ natychmiast.
always when I_explain-Ipf new problem, then he understands-Ipf immediately.
'Whenever I explain a new problem, he understands (= 'comes to understanding') immediately.'

(6) c On cię nie zrozumiał$_{p}$, jak powiedziałeś "filc".
he you not understood-Pf when you-said-Pf "felt".
'he did not understand (= came to understanding) you when you said "felt".'

Here the imperfective *rozumieć*$_{i}$ of meaning I is a state: 'understanding'. The aspectual pair of meaning II is ingressive and means 'to come to understanding', an achievement in Vendler's classification (1967). In terms of Barentsen's classification of terminativity, the latter is of the momentary-transformational type (1995: 378). According to the same author, though, non-processual-transformational terminativity is perhaps more apt as a descriptive term (Barentsen 2007: personal communication, Cf. Genis 2008a: 79). In 6b the imperfective clearly denotes iterativity. The perfective situation in 6c presents a single (quantified) event of 'coming to understanding'. Other typical examples of this type are *wierzyć*$_{i}$ 'believe' (aterminative), *wierzyć*$_{i}$: *uwierzyć*$_{p}$ 'begin to believe' (terminative) and *pamiętać*$_{i}$ 'remember' (aterminative: 'to have in one's memory'), *pamiętać*$_{i}$: *zapamiętać*$_{p}$ 'remember' (terminative: 'to put into one's memory') ,

chcieć$_{i}$ 'want', *chcieć*$_{i}$: *zechcieć*$_{p}$ 'start wanting' and quite a few more.

Similar in some respects is the aspectual pair *gubić*$_{i}$: *zgubić*$_{p}$ 'to lose', a highly terminative meaning. Again, in the classification of Barentsen this is a momentary-transformational type of terminativity. This particular meaning corresponds – for Polish that is – to Vendler's achievements and there is, at least in the perception of Polish speakers, no process involved in 'losing': the situational change involved is at once, and has no duration. Although the notion to which this might apply in English is probably not unimaginable, Poles cannot actually say **właśnie w tym momencie Jan gubi*$_{i}$ *klucz* 'precisely at this moment John is losing his key', whilst *co poniedziałek gubię*$_{i}$ *swój klucz* 'every Monday I lose my key' is perfectly possible. This means that in the aspectual opposition presented by this kind of verb pair the imperfective partner can only be used for iterativity and that a single processual terminative reading corresponding to 5c for *pisać*$_{i}$ is impossible. Thus, for this kind of pair in this particular meaning and context, we only need to provide a single entry:

I. *gubić*$_{i}$: *zgubić*$_{p}$ → [+terminative]

Of course, in a monolingual dictionary the native speaker of Polish would not need a specification of the restriction to iterative use for the imperfective partner. In bilingual dictionaries it would be a good thing if, either through labelling or a very apt description of the meaning, this would be made clear, especially in the light of the difference with e.g. English, which I pointed out.

It is difficult to find very clear examples of this kind of verb. In fact, even the example of *gubić*$_{i}$ only applies for its literal use concerning a single object; sentences such as *Alan powoli gubi*$_{i}$ *się pomiędzy snem a jawą* [...] 'Alan slowly loses himself between dream and reality [...]' and *Marysia powoli gubi*$_{i}$ *kilogramy* 'Marysia slowly loses kilo's' demonstrate that matters may be slightly more complex than they appear at first. In these cases, though, the presentation of the distributive nature of the predicate could play a part: Alan, then, loses the grip on reality in several small (subsequent?) steps, whilst Marysia loses weight noticeably every time she can count another kilogram. Other examples of such verbs may be *znajdować*$_{i}$: *znaleźć*$_{p}$ 'find', also in the literal meaning, and ingressives such as

zaśpiewać$_{p}$: *zaśpiewywać*$_{i}$ 'begin to sing'. In *SJPSz* and its recent successor *USJP* as well as in *SWJP* the ingressive meaning is lacking although native informants confirm its use in both aspects. Perhaps it has become less common. The latter example presents a complex case in another respect, though, as the perfective also means simply 'to sing (a song etc.)' and in that meaning forms an aspectual pair with simplex *śpiewać*$_{i}$, at least, according to *SWJP*. If one would choose to include both meanings in a dictionary, one would have to make sure the aspectual pairing is carefully presented.

'sing'

I. *śpiewać*$_{i}$: Ø → [−terminative] (NB. transitive and intransitive)

II. *śpiewać*$_{i}$: *zaśpiewać*$_{p}$ → [+terminative] (NB. transitive)

'begin to sing'

I. *zaśpiewać*$_{p}$: *zaśpiewywać*$_{i}$ → [+terminative]

The latter pair, *zaśpiewać*$_{p}$: *zaśpiewywać*$_{i}$ is of the suffixal type (cf. section 1). It takes us back to the discussion in section 2 about the use of secondary imperfectives for terminal iterative use on the one hand and intraterminal/processual use on the other. It was already mentioned there that secondary imperfectives can always be employed for iterative contexts but that the intraterminal/processual meaning is restricted to meanings that involve a process and therefore may have duration. Interestingly, *zaśpiewywać*$_{i}$ 'to begin to sing' is of the non-processual type of terminativity and is therefore restricted to iterative use. This is strongly linked to the lexical meaning and probably obvious, even to a non-native speaker using a monolingual Polish dictionary. One might even consider not making a point of specifying it in bilingual dictionaries, although it may help the non-Pole to be told that the imperfective of the pair *przepisać*$_{p}$: *przepisywać*$_{i}$ 'to copy'/'rewrite' can be used for both imperfective meanings. An example of each one would clarify a great deal.

We already saw that compilers of dictionaries have paired verbs that we have termed MS-pairs since the very earliest of the dictionaries scrutinised. Between the partners of such pairs there is always an aspectual opposition and a specific

semantic relationship, but, as was mentioned earlier (cf. section 1.2) in terms of the premise that true aspectual partners share exactly the same V and differ only in the designated aspect, these verbs are somewhat problematic. In terms of terminativity they also present a specific case. The perfective member denotes a single execution of an action that is usually perceived as lasting a very short time and that ends in a situation that is, to all intents and purposes, equal to the situation before the action; e.g. *machnął*$_{p}$ *ręką* 'he gave a single wave with his hand'. The inclusion of 'return to the same situation' is significant as this allows an immediate consecutive execution of the same action. Added together in a string, we have the V expressed by the imperfective member: *machał*$_{i}$ *ręką* 'he waved with his hand (= gave an unquantified amount of consecutive waves)', or *macha*$_{i}$ *ręką* 'he is waving with his hand', which may easily be perceived as an aterminative activity, no matter how segmental it may be. Moreover, it seems that a series of unquantified waves may also be taken as a unit that in itself may be repeated, such as in the following instance: *co jakiś czas nasza królowa machała*$_{i}$ *ręką do publiczności zgromadzonej wzdłuż ulic w Hadze* 'every now and then our queen waved to the public that had gathered along the streets in The Hague'. Surely the queen would not give single waves.

Although the complexities presented by these verbs have not yet been fully discussed, in terms of their possible treatment in dictionaries there seems to be little doubt as to their pair-status. Much more doubtful, at least in my opinion, which seems to be reflected in the treatment of most dictionaries, would be the presentation of opposing verbs like *spacerować*$_{i}$ 'wander' ~ *pospacerować*$_{p}$ 'wander a while' as pairs. Here, there is a clear difference of meaning between the partners, indicated by 'a while' for the delimitative perfective. Delimitatives should always be treated as perfectivum tantum. One might think that the same would apply for perduratives such as *przespacerować*$_{p}$ *(dwie godziny)* 'to wander (two hours)'. However, although rare, for Polish it was possible to find several V that form aspectual pairs such as *przespać*$_{p}$: *przesypiać*$_{i}$ *(noc)* 'to sleep (through the night)', *przesiadać*$_{p}$: *przesiadywać*$_{i}$ *(jakiś czas)* 'to spend (some time) sitting' etc. (cf. Genis 2008b: 133-140). These pairs belong to the same type as *zaśpiewać*$_{p}$: *zaśpiewywać*$_{p}$ as the imperfective member can only denote iterativity.

This probably concludes the repertoire of types of aspectual pairs, such as they may be included into dictionaries, although further research may, of course, yield more types.

4 Concluding remarks

I think I have demonstrated that the test of adhering to the two premises mentioned at the beginning of section three is successful: they order the various aspectual pairs into a very limited number of types that are also clearly definable as to the use of the respective members. Of course, the real variation, and so the actual problem, is found with the imperfective members, which either may or may not be used for single, intraterminal/processual events. The fact that the amount of types is limited and that the characteristics of each type are clear is encouraging for the dictionary maker (and indeed user), although it has to be admitted that establishing to which type a given pair belongs may not always be straightforward. Of course, the compilers of *ISJP* but especially of *SWJP* should be praised for their modern and generally sound semantics-based treatment of aspect and especially for the inclusion of SC-pairs. In my opinion the SC-pairs may benefit most from a clear treatment in terms of (a clear concept of) terminativity, as simplexes usually have an aterminative meaning from which perfective 'partners' must be kept away. Until and unless a terminative use for any given imperfective simplex can be established, formulating an aspectual pair is out of the question.

The meaning types we have seen actually resemble the indications of the labels we found in *SJPL*. I do not advocate a return to that kind of treatment, but it is worth considering the addition of further information of that kind to the aspectual labelling. Of course, as already pointed out, this would mainly be for non-native speaker use of dictionaries and as most Polish monolingual dictionaries target native speakers, it is possible that they would benefit little from such additions, although the general, clear-cut approach to the organisation of aspectual pairs may also found to be of use by this group of users. Certainly, these principles may be applied to bilingual dictionaries (in which they are also mostly lacking as far as I have been able to ascertain). In the following editions of the Polish-Dutch dictionary, which is actually largely based on *SWJP* with respect to

its aspectual treatment, attention will also be given to this matter and lexemes may receive a different treatment than is currently the case.

University of Amsterdam

Notes

1 In the remainder of this paper it will become apparent that this is an oversimplification. Another oversimplification is the often encountered view of that very temporal system, which can be presented as in the following table with supposed aspectual pair *pisać*$_{i}$: *napisać*$_{p}$ 'write' conjugated for the first person singular in all tenses.

tense \ aspect	ipf verb - *pisać*	pf verb - *napisać*
present	*piszę*	Ø
future	*będę pisał*	*napiszę*
past	*pisałem*	*napisałem*

Please note that the paradigms for imperfective present and perfective future are the same for this kind of aspectual pair; Slavists often speak of IMPERFECTIVE PRESENT and PERFECTIVE PRESENT respectively. Although the view this table represents is in essence correct, much more can, and indeed has been said about it. It would go beyond the scope and need for the matter at hand in this paper to pursue it here.

2 Throughout this paper I have indexed the aspect of verbal lexemes with subscripts: $_{i}$ = imperfective, $_{p}$ = perfective. The abbreviations Ipf and Pf for 'imperfective' and 'perfective' respectively are used in other places than the indexes. The colon : is used as a separator between partners of an aspectual pair, whilst the tilde ~ between verbs indicates that I have not accepted these as an aspectual pair. Typically, the imperfective member is mentioned before the perfective member, although sometimes the order may be reversed, usually to explicate (perceived) derivational hierarchy.

3 In fact, the three examples of pairs given here are not treated as such in all dictionaries. For the moment I will leave this an open matter.

4 The number of bi-aspectuals differs quite considerably per Slavic language and this is often due to the speed with which borrowed verbs are adapted to the aspectual system. In some languages, like Russian, such verbs often remain bi-aspectual, while Polish forms aspectual pairs comparatively quickly, employing the same morphological material as is described here in sections 1.1 through 1.4 (cf. also Kudlińska 1988). As a result, in Polish bi-aspectuals are quite rare.

5 Apart from the morphological alternation in the case of this verb, there is also the phonological alternation /s/ : /ʃ/. Phonological alternations have in themselves no bearing on the matter at hand and we will disregard them in the remainder of this paper.

6 See Wróbel (1984: 492-493) for an exhaustive description.

7 Please note that in this text I use the term terminativity and its derivatives in the wider sense posited and described by Barentsen (1995). For an outline in English, see Genis (2008a: 69-91).

8 The term *empty prefix* is not a very happy one as prefixes are never really empty (cf. Genis 2008a: 195). As this term is well established I have used it in this paper.

9 See Genis (2008a: 182-185) for a discussion and a count of empty prefixes in Polish.

10 The lexeme *poezja* may also be used in the meaning 'poem'. As such it is countable.

11 In Genis (2008a: 103-114) I argued that prefix meaning almost always adds explicit terminativity to a compound of which the base simplex is not explicitly terminative.
12 See Genis (2008a: 173-194) for a listing and discussion of the mechanisms that allow for a prefix's inherent lexical meaning to be 'switched off' in compounds formed with particular simplexes.
13 That does not go to say that no Slavic language formed a secondary imperfective in all cases. Especially Bulgarian seems to abound in them. It has e.g. a secondary imperfective *napisvam*$_{\text{i}}$ to perfective *napiša*$_{\text{p}}$. This is then an aspectual pair separate from the simplex *piša*$_{\text{i}}$ 'write'. In Polish there is no such secondary imperfective and the aspectual pair is *pisać*$_{\text{i}}$ *: napisać*$_{\text{p}}$ 'write'. For a discussion of Bulgarian, see Aronson (1985).
14 Cf. e.g. the contribution of Krystyna Waszakowa in this very Festschrift.
15 This order is outlined in the introduction (*ISJP*: 2000: xviii). However, *kupić*$_{\text{p}}$: *kupować*$_{\text{i}}$ 'buy' is reversed.
16 The labels Linde gives to such verbs in his *SJPL* may be a worthwhile clue about the semantic development by secondary imperfectives into the domain of processual, single event marking: the fact that *przegwizdywać*$_{\text{i}}$ receives both labels, *contin*[*uativum*] *frequ*[*entativum*], whilst *przepisywać*$_{\text{i}}$ and many other such verbs receive only *frequ*[*entativum*], whereas nowadays processual usage is quite normal, may be an indication that the indicated shift, at least for some lexemes, took place within the last 200 years.
17 It is important to note that, in its introduction, *USJP* mentions that it is the successor to *SJPSz* although it is heavily reworked, updated etc. In matters aspectual its policy was, evidently, not altered. For this reason this most recent of our dictionaries presents a reversal of the progress in the presentation of aspect and aspectual insights, such as we see in the slightly earlier *ISJP* and *SWJP*. *PSWP*, almost contemporaneous with *SWJP* although new volumes are still being published, also adheres to the more classic treatment.
18 In fact, the author mentions aterminative use for *all* imperfectives. It needs no further elucidation that this clearly presents a different view on aspect and aspectual opposition to the one I employ.

References – dictionaries

ISJP Bańko, Mirosław (ed.) 2000. *Inny słownik języka polskiego*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
PSWP Zgółkowa, Halina (ed.) 1994 -. *Praktyczny słownik współczesnej polszczyzny.* Poznań: Wydawnictwo Kurpisz.
SJPD Doroszewski, Witold (ed.) 1958-1968. *Słownik języka polskiego.* Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Wiedza Powszechna.
SJPL Linde, M. Samuel Bogumił 1807-1814. *Słownik języka polskiego.* Warszawa: U autora. Linde, M. Samuel Bogumił 1854-1860. *Słownik języka polskiego.* Lwów: W drukarni Zakładu Ossolińskich.
SJPSz Szymczak, Mieczysław (ed.) 1978-1981. *Słownik języka polskiego.* Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
SWa '*Słownik warszawski*' ('the Warsaw dictionary'); Karłowicz, J., Kryński A., Niedźwiedzki A. 1900 –1927. *Słownik języka polskiego*. Warszawa: W drukarni E. Lubowskiego i S-ki.
SWi *'Słownik wileński'* ('the Wilno dictionary'); Zdanowicz, Aleksander et al. 1861. *Słownik języka polskiego.* Wilno: Wydany staraniem i kosztem Maurycego Orgelbranda.
SWJP Dunaj, Bogusław (ed.) 1996. *Słownik współczesnego języka polskiego*. Warszawa: Wilga.
USJP Dubisz, Stanisław (ed.) 2003. *Uniwersalny słownik języka polskiego*. *Vols I-VI.* Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

References – other

Agrell, Sigurd 1908. *Aspektänderung und Aktionsartbildung beim polnischen Zeitworte: ein Beitrag zum Studium der Indogermanischen Präverba und ihrer Bedeutungsfunktionen.* Lunds Universitets Årskrift. N.F. Afd. 1 Bd 4. Nr 2. Lund: Håkan Ohlssons Buchdruckerei.

Agrell, Sigurd 1918. *Przedrostki postaciowe czasowników polskich*. Materiały i prace Komisji językowej Akademii umiejętności w Krakowie, 8. Kraków: Nakładem Akademii Umiejętności.

Aronson, Howard I. 1985. 'Form, Function, and the "Perfective" in Bulgarian.' In: Flier, Michael S. and Timberlake, Alan (eds.), 274-285.

Barentsen, Adriaan 1985. *'Tijd', 'aspect' en de conjunctie* poka *– over betekenis en gebruik van enkele vormen in het moderne Russisch*. Amsterdam.

Barentsen, Adriaan. Адриан Барентсен 1995. 'Трехступенчатая модель инварианта совершенного вида в русском языке'. In: Karolak, St. (ed.), 1-26.

Flier, Michael S. and Timberlake, Alan (eds.) 1985. *The Scope of Slavic Aspect.* UCLA Slavic Studies, 12. Columbus, Ohio: Slavica Publishers, Inc.

Genis. R.M. 2008a. *Studies on the Polish verbal prefix* prze-. Pegasus Oost Europese Studies, 7. Amsterdam: Uitgeverij Pegasus.

Genis. R.M. 2008b. 'Perdurativity in Polish – 100 years after Agrell'. In: Houtzagers et al. (eds.), 107-143.

Grzegorczykowa, Renata, Laskowski, Roman, Wróbel, Henryk (eds.) 1984. *Gramatyka współczesnego języka polskiego: morfologia*. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.

Houtzagers, Peter, Kalsbeek, Janneke, Schaeken, Jos (eds.) 2008. *Dutch Contributions to the Fourteenth International Congress of Slavists – Ohrid September 10-16, 2008, Linguistics*. Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics, 34.

Karolak, St. (ed.). Кароляк, Ст. (ред.) 1995. *Семантика и структура славянского вида*, I. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Naukowe WSP.

Kudlińska, Halina 1988. 'Dwuaspektowe czasowniki pochodzenia obcego we współczesnym języku polskim.' *Rozprawy Komisji Językowej,* XXXIV, 121-126.

Schlegel, Hans 1999. *Zur Rolle der Terminativität/Aterminativität (T/AT) im Aspekt- und Aspektbildungssystem der russischen Sprache der Gegenwart. Ein Beitrag zur Theorie der Aspektualität*. Specimina Philologiae Slavicae, 124. München.

Vendler, Zeno 1967a. 'Verbs and Times.' In: Vendler, Zeno (ed.), 97-121.

Vendler, Zeno (ed.) 1967b. *Linguistics in philosophy.* Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press.

Wróbel, Henryk 1984. 'Słowotwórstwo czasowników.' In: Grzegorczykowa et al. (eds.), 467-511.