Studies on the Polish verbal prefix prze-

Genis, R.M.

Citation for published version (APA):

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, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.
0 Introduction

The present chapter is mainly concerned with the participtaion of so-called verbs of motion prefixed by the Polish verbal prefix *prze-* in syntactic constructions with and without prepositional complement, and the constraints that can be established. In this research we restricted ourselves to constructions referring to so-called spatial predicates.

In the following we will discuss the various complementary constructions with and without preposition. We will end with a tentative formulation as to the criteria that seem to play a role in what I will term the soft opposition between the following prototypical examples:

(1) \[ \text{Ania przeszła ulicę...} \]
    \[ \text{Ania}_{\text{NOM}} \text{ through-went}_{\text{P}} \text{ street}_{\text{ACC}} ... \]

(2) \[ \text{Ania przeszła przez ulicę...} \]
    \[ \text{Ania}_{\text{NOM}} \text{ through-went}_{\text{P}} \text{ through street}_{\text{ACC}} ... \]

Both of these could be translated as 'Ania (has) crossed the street' and thus they are at least near synonyms. In the following we will paraphrase this opposition as follows:
STUDIES ON THE POLISH VERBAL PREFIX **PRZE**-

**przeVM NP<sub>ACC</sub>: przeVM przez NP<sub>ACC</sub>**

VM = verb of motion  
NP<sub>ACC</sub> = accusative noun phrase

In order to justify and complete the full picture surrounding this opposition we will need to have a look at other prepositional as well as non-prepositional complements that occur with **przeVM**. This we will do starting with the prepositional complements that came to light through searches in the Amsterdam Polish text corpus. From there we will progress with a discussion of non-prepositional complements. Finally we will turn to the above opposition.

0.1 Kudra
First we must look at an important paper that touches on these matters. In her excellent article, Kudra (1993:38) points out that **prze**- usually renders a verb of motion transitive (although such verbs do certainly not occur exclusively with accusative objects as instrumental objects as well as prepositional ones abound). This must be the most significant syntactic quality of **prze**-. It is the single most productive prefix in this respect and according to Kudra the number of derivatives exceeds that even of prefix **o-** || **ob(e)**-. According to Kudra, from a semantic point of view the accusative object functions as an adjunct of place. The same seems to apply to constructions in which such a compound would be combined with a complement including the preposition **przez**. In fact, she seems to reckon that most non-prepositional objects of verbs of motion with the prefix **prze**- are semantically interchangeable with objects involving **przez** and all her examples constitute the meaning “move across in space”. The perlative adjunct of space that is connotated adds information as to the ‘path’ of the action expressed by the base verb of a compound. Additionally, compounds with **prze**- may have an object in the instrumental case rendering a meaning, which Kudra describes simply as “adjuncts of place with perlative direction”.
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Kudra then lists the remaining prepositional objects that according to her occur with compounds of verbs of motion with prefix \textit{prze-}. The table below gives an overview of Kudra’s discussion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>prepositional complement(s)</th>
<th>approximate translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>\textit{do} \textit{NP}_{GEN}</td>
<td>'to / toward ...'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{na} \textit{NP}_{ACC}</td>
<td>'onto / into / to ...'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{od} \textit{NP}<em>{GEN} \textit{do} \textit{NP}</em>{GEN}</td>
<td>'from ... to ...'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{po} \textit{NP}_{LOC}</td>
<td>'after ...'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{pod} (\textit{przed}) \textit{NP}_{INSTR}</td>
<td>'under ...'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{przed} \textit{NP}_{INSTR}</td>
<td>'in front of ...'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{przez} \textit{NP}_{ACC}</td>
<td>'through...' / ('over...')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{przy} \textit{NP}_{LOC}</td>
<td>'at ...'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{w} \textit{NP}_{ACC}</td>
<td>'into / onto / to ...'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{z} \textit{NP}<em>{GEN} \textit{do} \textit{NP}</em>{GEN}</td>
<td>'from ... to ...'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{z} \textit{NP}<em>{GEN} \textit{na} \textit{NP}</em>{ACC}</td>
<td>'from ... onto / into / to ...'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{za} \textit{NP}_{ACC}</td>
<td>'to (behind) ...'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{za} \textit{NP}_{INSTR}</td>
<td>'behind ...'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Kudra in all of these constructions we encounter perative meaning (’provided’ as it were by the prefix \textit{prze-}). In some, though, we receive additional information as to “the behaviour of the point that moves in space”; the adlative \textit{do} \textit{NP}_{GEN} and \textit{na} \textit{NP}_{ACC} as well as the ablative \textit{od} \textit{NP}_{GEN} (+ \textit{do} \textit{NP}_{GEN}), \textit{z} \textit{NP}_{GEN} (+ \textit{na} \textit{NP}_{ACC}) and \textit{za} \textit{NP}_{GEN} \textit{do} \textit{NP}_{GEN}.

1 \textit{PrzeVM} with prepositional complements

1.1 Some additions to Kudra’s list

On the basis of text corpora, material provided by native informants and dictionaries we have been able to confirm that prefixed verbs of motion can partake in constructions such as the ones described by Kudra. In addition to her list we found the following prepositional complements:
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>prepositional complement(s)</th>
<th>approximate translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>nad</em> NP_INSTR</td>
<td>‘over, above ...’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>obok</em> NP_GEN</td>
<td>‘next to, along ...’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>wzdłuż</em> NP_GEN</td>
<td>‘along...’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples of these are (3), (5) and (6), which will be discussed below.

1.2 A Classification: “Harmony” vs “Disharmony”

On account of the obviously shared formal, etymological and semantic properties of prefix *prze-* and preposition *przez* we have decided to term *prze* VM *przez* NP\_ACC a structure of PREFIX-PREPOSITION HARMONY. Structures where prepositional NP complement to a *prze* VM contains another preposition then represent PREFIX-PREPOSITION DISHARMONY.

This classification also makes sense with regards to the further syntactical semantic discussion as will be shown below.

1.2.1 Disharmony: *prze* VM xNP\_s.

Consider the following examples:

(3)  
*Przelecieli_p* nad miastem...
  Through-flew\_3.PL above city\_INSTR ...
  ‘They have flown / flew across over the city...’

This is *prze* VM *nad* NP\_INSTR which can be rendered schematically thus:

![Fig. 1 prze VM nad NP\_INSTR](image)
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The trajectory passes over the city, not actually having any contact with the city itself.

(4)  
**Przejdzie**, *pan (tą ulicą) od ładnej do pięknej, ...*  
through-goP sirNOM (this_streetINSTR) from ładnaGEN to pięknaGEN...  
‘You will have to walk (along this street) from Ładna street to Piękna street, ...’

*przeVM odNP<sub>GEN</sub> doNP<sub>GEN</sub> which can be viewed as:*

![Figure 2](image)

The route does not pass over the streets Ładna and Piękna, but it does have these as beginning and end situations.

(5)  
**Pani Hooch ... następnie przeszła**, wzdłuż szeregów dziewczyn ...  
Mrs. HoochNOM... next through-wentP along rowsGEN girls GEN...  
‘Next Mrs. Hooch passed along rows of girls ...’

*przeVM wzdłużNP<sub>GEN</sub> which can be viewed as:*
Mrs. Hooch walks along several lines of girls. She does of course not walk over the girls, who stand next to the route Mrs. Hooch actually traverses. Had the NP been singular, the picture would have resembled the following one even more.

\[(6) \quad \text{Warionucha \ przebiegł obok strzelnicy i ...} \]
\[\text{Warionucha, through-ran, next-to rifle-range, and ...} \]
\[\text{‘Warionucha ran along the rifle range and ...’} \]

*przeVM obokNP*\_\text{GEN}, which can be viewed as:

The route runs along the rifle range and not over it.

In (3) through (6) none of the NP are themselves part of the trajectory. They are however the means by which the actual domain crossed is identified.
Indeed, the actual domains crossed “exist” by virtue of the identifier: the domain ‘next to the rifle range’ (6) is identified as nothing other than that precisely because it is “next to the rifle range.” The same goes for examples (3) through (6), in which the gray areas are the domains identified by the NP, which are also in gray letters.

In fact we have found that in none of the studied structures of disharmony przeVM xNP, mentioned here in 0.1 and 1.1 the NP is itself part of the trajectory. We can state NP =/= domain of the trajectory. This peculiarity sets the structures of disharmony apart from the structure we qualified as one of harmony (przeVM przez NPACC) as in the latter the NP itself is part of the trajectory as we shall try to demonstrate below.

1.2.2 Harmony: przeVM przez NPACC.

No doubt in this construction the prefix and preposition double up and “join forces” as it were to bring to the fore the basic perative meaning of ‘crossing’.

(7) Ania przeszła przez ulicę.
    AniaNOM through-wentP through streetACC.
    ‘Ania (has) crossed the/a street.’

Fig. 5 przeVM przez NPACC
Please note that the trajectory A → B crosses the domain 'street' C, and that \( \text{przezNP}_{\text{ACC}} \) expresses that the entirety of C is encompassed. In other words NP = domain of trajectory. We have found various NP partaking in this construction. These range from such spatially perceived entities as \( \text{deszcz} \) 'rain' to \( \text{ciało} \) 'body', but most often they would be "geographical area's of space" such as \( \text{pole} \) 'field', \( \text{prowincja} \) 'province', \( \text{kraj} \) 'country' and also \( \text{korytarz} \) 'corridor'. All of these have in common that they feature a boundary through which one enters the NP's spatial entity (in (7): crossing from A to C) as well as a boundary through which one leaves the spatial entity (from C to B). These boundaries are crossed and so they form more or less square angles with the route of the trajectory. The spatial entity is perceived as a whole, a totality, through which the trajectory crosses, without much attention to the way the represented space is crossed or of what it consists.

2 PrzeVM with a non-prepositional complement
2.1 PrzeVM with the Instrumental

Examples are quite rare. The following are the only two that could be drawn from the Amsterdam Polish Text Corpus.

(8) \( \text{Doliną jej przechodzi, droga prowadząca przez Bałkany do Kazanliku, do Eski-Saghra i dalej do Adrianopola.} \)

Valley_INSTR her_GEN through-goes, road_leading_NOM through Balkans_ACC to Kazanlik_GEN to Eski-Saghra(GEN) and further to Adrianopol_GEN.

'Along the valley runs a road that leads through the Balkans to Kazanlik, to Eski-Saghra and on to Adrianopol.'
IV PREPOSITIONAL VERSUS NON-PREPOSITIONAL COMPLEMENTS

(9)  
A we dnie wracał spokój, od czasu do czasu przechodził główną ulicą, Kreszczatikiem albo Wladimirska, pułk niemieckich huzarów.

And in daytime quiet would return, from time to time through the main street, Kreszczatik or Wladimirka, regiment of German hussars.

‘In daytime quiet would return, [and/but] from time to time a regiment of German hussars went down the main street, down Kreszczatik street or down Wladimirka street.’

For (9) we provide the following schematic representation:

Native speakers confirm that the German hussars marched “through at least a certain (considerable) part of the Main Street.” The boundaries of the trajectory give us our orientation and seem to run along the trajectory and not across as in (7): the Main Street indicates as it were the route that should coincide with the trajectory, but it does not indicate precisely the extent to which the street is followed nor does it deal with crossing any borders into the domain that forms the background to the trajectory. Furthermore, although we still have Kudra’s “perlative” meaning (1993:38), as far as the ‘crossing of the domain’ itself is concerned, we lack the notion of inherent totality that is present in (7). All of this may be due to the fact that in this strongly processual, imperfective (intra-terminal iterative) context the actual crossing of the boundaries at start and
finish of the landmark is not relevant. The space between these boundaries is then presented stretched up as it were.

2.2 PrzeVM with the Accusative
Prefix prze- can render an otherwise intransitive verb of motion transitive and so, the following example, tested with native informants is not surprising:

(10) \[ \textit{Ania przeszła ulicę...} \]
\[ \textit{Ania} \text{through-went}, \text{streetACC}... \]
\[ \text{a. Ania} \text{(has) crossed the street....} \]

This meaning, given here in translation, is by no means the obvious choice for native speakers when they are dealing first and foremost with the action of going across such as illustrated above in figure 5. Asked for a clarification as to the appropriateness of this sentence, native informants invariably point to the fact it should primarily be seen in a different context, which could be: Ania, while trying to find a certain street (C), overlooked it, actually walked passed the turn-of and missed it. I propose the following schematic visualisation, in which the trajectory\(^4\) is the route Ania possibly followed.

![Fig. 7 przeVM NP_{ACC} 1](image)

This can be translated as:
b. ‘Ania walked passed the street (that she was looking for).’

Native speakers confirmed that (10b) is the first and foremost meaning of (10) that comes to mind. Meanings such as (10a) are however not impossible for the basic structure *prze*VM NP<sub>acc</sub>, but they usually seem to occur in conjunction with more information, such as the following rather more typical example adapted from Szymczak (1973 : przejść):

(11)  *Przeszli p rzekę w bród.*

through-went3-sg. river<sub>acc</sub> in ford<sub>acc</sub>.

‘They crossed the river through a ford.’

This sentence structure (*prze*VM NP<sub>acc</sub>) seems at first glance to be synonymous with (7) and (10a) as far as spatial parameters and trajectory are concerned. However, considering (11), native informants agreed that, although the translation ‘to cross’ for *przejść* is in essence correct, it can only occur here, because we are dealing with a situation in which the actual act of ‘crossing’ is not foremost in the speaker’s mind. He is rather more concerned with the mode of dealing with getting to the other side of the river, here: ‘wading through a ford’; it would have been more normal to swim or to sail. Furthermore, there was a conviction, that the trajectory of the crossing, in view of the difficulties of the wading process, could not really be expected to be a straight line, nor are A and B necessarily directly opposite to each other. And so for this particular sentence we have to add some elements to our schematic representation:
Note, that the base meaning ‘crossing from A to B’ is present in this example, albeit in the background of the speaker’s mind; the communicative goal of this sentence is to point out how B was attained and not that it was attained. Note also, that the structures of neither (10) nor (11) would be considered to be applicable in situations where the actual “crossing action” would be foremost in the speakers mind; both examples (12) and (13) below were discarded as “not likely” in such a context.

(12) Przeszli rzekę. <not likely>
    through-went3,3-pl rzekęACC.
    ‘They (have) crossed the/a river.’

(13) Ania przeszła ulicę. <not likely>
    AniaNOM through-went3 streetACC.
    ‘Ania (has) crossed the/a street.’

This concludes the inventory and basic description of sentence structures in which przęVM can take part. In the following we oppose the near synonym structures of example (7) on the one hand and (10a) and (11) on the other in order establish in more detail what justifies the existence of these two semantically parallel syntactical structures.
3 PrzeVM NP_{acc} : *prze*VM *przez* NP_{acc}.

With regards to example (7) of structure *prze*VM *przez* NP_{acc}, we established that *przez*NP_{acc} then expresses the entity (barrier) separating us from the other side and does not indicate a trajectory. The main focus of the utterance then is towards the action of ‘getting across / to the other side of the identified domain’. The crossing is perceived in its entirety, its totality. There usually is no focus on the domain crossed and hardly ever on the way in which the domain is crossed. We found that such sentences typically are embedded in a sequence of events, a narrative, of which the crossing action was merely a part. We propose to call it NARRATIVE FOCUS. The narrative focal nature of (7) is further emphasised by the impression of native informants, that such sentences are clearly intended to lead up to a continuation of the narrative on the other side; something is going to happen or going to be done on the other side. There is more to the story over there and the fact that the domain had to be crossed was almost circumstantial information and could even be intended to be mentioned “in passing”. Also, there is a strong feeling expressed by native speakers that the trajectory is perceived as straight, or at least, that it is straight enough not to distract away from the main focus of the sentence. Whether it is straight or not may actually be of no consequence or interest to the speaker as the main focus is on getting across.

This structure is semantically relatively simple, as we are dealing merely with this ‘crossing’ of a spatial domain that is established by *przez* NP_{acc}. Semantically speaking NP_{acc} as in example (11) is more complex, for apart from establishing the domain and the crossing thereof, this structure deals with a further semantic element. In fact the main focus of the speaker is not on the “reaching of the other side” nor on the establishment or localisation of the domain. We propose to term this DESCRIPTIVE FOCUS, as the “description” typically concerns the nature of the spatial domain designated by the NP_{acc} itself or the modus operandi employed to cross it.
It would seem then, that a certain amount of “pollution” of the basic perlative meaning as in (7) is necessary to allow a non-prepositional complement to be used in contexts in which the spatial meaning of the prefix is present albeit not foremost in the speaker’s mind (but in the background or as a basic minimal condition). We have in fact not been able to persuade native speakers to such constructions as in (12) and (13) nor to produce one on request. Interestingly though, native speakers value (14a) below as “not likely” rather than “incorrect”:

(14a)  Przeszli through-went through river through ford.

‘They (have) crossed the/a river through a ford.’

Of course, since the fact that here a barrier is not crossed in the easy, “normal” fashion (bridge, boat) but in a way that requires an (untypical) physical effort; we may assume that this particular construction may be viewed as “on the edge”.

If we then proceed with comparing the following pair, we must conclude, that the constituent na pasach does not provide enough reason to distract the main focus from the circumstances that need to be focussed on. And so...

(14b)  Ania through-went through street on zebra-crossing.

‘Ania crossed the/a street at the zebra crossing.’

... is accepted as normal, whilst...

(14c)  *Ania through-went street on zebra-crossing.

‘Ania crossed the/a street at the zebra crossing.’

... is discarded as incorrect. We suppose crossing the street at a zebra crossing is
a rather normal thing to do and so needs not to be brought to the fore as it were, by a non-prepositional NP.

Most often the main focus in the non-prepositional complement structure is on the modus operandi (= MO). Consider the following examples from Polish literature.

\[(15a)\] Drobiazg zwierzęcy wpadłszy w popłoch przebiegał na oilep arenę lub bił głowami w kraty...

\[
\begin{align*}
group_{\text{animal}}^\text{nom} \text{ having-fallen}^\text{inf} & \ \text{in panic}^\text{acc} \ \text{through-ran}^\text{ien} \ \text{on blind}^\text{acc} \ \text{arena}^\text{acc} \\
or bangs^\text{ien} \ \text{heads}^\text{inf} \ \text{in bars}^\text{acc}.
\end{align*}
\]

‘The group of small animals, seized by panic, ran across the arena without looking or banged their heads against the bars...’

MO: \textit{by panic, without looking}

\[(15b)\] Jacyś ludzie przebiegają, miasto i ciskają, w domy płonące, pochodnie...

\[
\begin{align*}
some_{\text{people}}^\text{nom} \ \text{through-run}^\text{ien} \ \text{city}^\text{acc} \ \text{and throw}^\text{ien} \ \text{in houses}^\text{acc} \\
\text{flaming}^\text{ien} \ \text{torches}^\text{acc}.
\end{align*}
\]

‘Some people are running across the city and are throwing flaming torches...’

MO: \textit{and are throwing (whilst throwing...)}

\[(15c)\] Sam przebiegam, miasto dniem i nocą, licząc, na traf szczęśliwy.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Self} \ \text{through-run}^\text{ien} \text{-1-PR} \ \text{city}^\text{acc} \ \text{day}^\text{ien} \ \text{and day}^\text{ien} \ \text{counting} \ \text{on encounter}^\text{en} \ \text{lucky}^\text{acc}.
\end{align*}
\]

‘Myself, I run across town day and night, hoping for a lucky encounter.’

MO: \textit{hoping for a lucky encounter}
Gladiatorowie, pijani winem złupionym w Emporium, połączywszy się w duże gromady przebiegali; z dzikimi okrzykami place przydrożne, rozpedzając ludzi, tratując, łupiąc.

'The gladiators, drunk on wine they pillaged from the Emporium, after having joint into large crowds ran across the wayside squares with wild shrieks, whilst dispersing people, trampling, looting.'

NB. Note that the spatial parameter here consists of an undefined number of “wayside squares”. This plurality makes it less likely that there would be a question of an attainable other side.

Thousands of people day and night ran across the streets wailing.

NB. Note that the spatial parameter here consists of an undefined number of “streets”. This plurality makes it less likely that there would be a question of an attainable other side.

How difficult it was for me to regain an easy breath, how much I tired myself running (through) several paces...
MO: *I tired myself*

Note that all the above examples (15a) through (15f) of modus operandi concern imperfective verbs. There seems to be a semantically motivated correlation between the use of non-prepositional complements and the often-implied lack of attaining the end of an action as expressed by imperfective verbs.

Furthermore (15a) through (15f) all seem to deal with situations in which the non-attainment of “the other side” seems to take place within the boundaries of explicitly mentioned domains and not across these boundaries as in (7), (11). All seem to describe situations for which a clear-cut case for a single run across the mentioned domain cannot be made. The likelihood here is that the actions consist of multiple or at least undefined runs covering the domain. In (15a) through (15c) the domains are simple spaces: ‘arena’, ‘town’. I propose the following schematic representation:

![Diagram](image)

Fig. 9 *przeVM, NP_{AIE} 1*

whereas in (15d) and (15e) these spaces are defined as consisting of a ‘number of wayside squares’ and ‘number of streets’. Less clear as perhaps these latter two are, they are nonetheless still quite easily defined as to their character in the above sentences by the following schematic representation.
Here the actual motion (and trajectory) is as it were spatially expressed by ‘streets’ (or ‘wayside squares) that run across the actual spatial domain formed by the further unmentioned conglomeration of these streets (or wayside squares).

For (15f) we interpret the space as being represented by slightly other means. The space in (15f) is actually quantified as being the size of ‘several paces’. Dramatically speaking it is the placing of the steps required to make paces that provoke the tiring effect. Space here is drawn slightly further into the realm of metaphor.

In the present examples there is clearly never an intention of reaching the opposite side of the spatial unit and the motion takes place within this spatial entity. It is in fact quite possible that its extremities are reached. More significantly however, the outer extremities are clearly not presented as being crossed. The imperfectivity of the verbs in these examples accounts for the multiplicity of the motion across and possibly also the non-attainment of the other side. The lack of preposition in the complement accounts in turn for the focus on the MO: we are clearly dealing with a descriptive focus.

In the following example the use of the imperfective verb itself is motivated by the focus on the action of the crossing rather than the attainment of the other
side.

(15g) ...trzymał, od czasu przyjazdu do Ancjum rozstawne konie, aby móc w jak najkrótszym czasie przebiegać, przestrzeń dzielącą go od Rzymu.

... kepł się, arrival to Ancjum, harnessed_horses, in-order be-able, in as shortest_time, through-run, space_dividing, him from Rome.

‘...since arriving in Antium he kept harnessed horses in order to be able to hurry across the space dividing him from Rome in the shortest possible time.’

MO: in the shortest possible time

There was but a single similar example containing a perfective rather than imperfective verb.

(15h) On sam, przebiegłszy jak burza śpiące Laurentum, zawrócił...

he_himself, having_through-ran, like storm sleeping_Laurentum, returned...

‘He himself, after having run like a storm across sleepy Laurentum, returned...’

MO: like a storm

NB. which by the way does not focus on getting to the other side.

Examples of perfective verbs with non-prepositional complements that we found are most often cases where the focus is on the distance or the type of terrain expressed.
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(16a) W siedem minut przejechał, osiem wiorst, wpadł na Rozjazd Wołynski...

in seven minutes through-drove eight verst in-fell on junction Wołynski ...

‘In seven minutes time he drove across the distance of eight verst, arrived at Wolynski junction ...’

Distance (corroborated, as it were, by the added scope of ‘eight verst’).

(16b) Dopiero przebiegłszy kilka zaułków i spostrzegłszy jakichś robotników idących z dala naprzeciw, uspokoił się nieco.

only having run across several lanes and having noticed some workmen who where coming towards him from a distance did he calm down a bit.

Terrain (added scope: several lanes).

The nature of the two objects in (16a - distance) and (16b - terrain + quantification) emphasises that the focus is narrative and on the ‘(circumstances of the) crossing’ as such rather than descriptive and on ‘reaching the other side’.

4 Conclusions

The functions for non-prepositional complements to verbs of motion with prefix *prze-* in both the Accusative as well as the Instrumental would seem to correlate with Jakobson’s designated functions for these cases in Russian (Jakobson 1971: 23-71). His accusative object is the primary focus of the action expressed by the verb. In Polish there seems to be a soft opposition between the non-prepositional complement NP and the prepositional complement...
przez\(NP_{acc}\). This opposition is one of focus: \(NP_{acc}\) goes along with Jakobson’s Accusative-object function of “bringing to the fore” the spatial entity expressed by Accusative object and/or, mutatis mutandis the mode of crossing that spatial entity, whereas \(przezNP_{acc}\) focuses more simply on “reaching the opposite side of the domain at hand.”

We have seen in (8) and (9) that Instrumental objects also occur as non-prepositional complement to verbs of motion with prefix \(prze-\). As far as we are aware only Kudra describes these. To paraphrase her words: “These are adjuncts of place with a perlative direction.” We have demonstrated that the instrumental complement \(NP_{instr}\) localises the route of the trajectory by profiling the extremes of the domain that run parallel to the trajectory whereas the Accusative object \(NP_{acc}\) either deals with crossing both the starting and ending extremities of the domain as in (10a), or does not deal with crossing these boundaries at all but rather with “missing” the domain altogether as in (10b).

Verbs of motion with prefix \(prze-\) form syntactical structures with prepositional complements of two types: harmonic constructions with complements including preposition \(przez\) as well as “disharmonic” constructions with a number of other prepositions. \(NP\) following \(przez\) (harmony) are part of the domain across which the trajectory runs, whereas \(NP\) following other prepositions (disharmony) merely localise the domain through which the trajectory runs without themselves being part of that domain.