



UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

Studies on the Polisch verbal prefix prze-

Genis, R.M.

Publication date
2008

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Genis, R. M. (2008). *Studies on the Polisch verbal prefix prze-*. Uitgeverij 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, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

NOTES

Chapter I

1 The inventory of cognates of the Proto-Slavic prefixes **per(i)- / (*prě-)* and **pro- / *pra-* for all Slavic languages is in appendix 1. According to Brückner (1927) the *pro-* in *prowadzić*, *prowadzać* ‘lead, conduct’ is a relic of this prefix in Polish. According to him Polish (and some other languages) originally had both *pro-* and *prze-*, but the functions of *pro-* were taken over by *prze-*. Bańkowski (2000) confirms this process and adds that that could happen because the two prefixes are semantically very close.

2 For a discussion of Russian *nepe- : npo-* we refer to Flier (1975, 1985). For the rather more complex opposition which, in spite of the common heritage nevertheless seems to exist between *npe- : nepe-*, we refer to Soudakoff (1975).

3 Flier typifies the opposition between *nepe-* and *npo-* as one of (- domainial) and (+ domainial) (1975: 220 etc.).

4 We refer here to Chapters II and especially III in which we outline our view on so-called “empty” prefixes, a term which we also used in an earlier publication (Genis 2003).

5 This example may also mean ‘I have rewritten the article’. The present argument would also be applicable for this meaning.

6 Flier puts it like this: Verbal prefixes, like prepositions, ultimately make reference to abstract delimitation, dimension, and direction, eliciting metaphorical interpretations of these notions in non-spatial universes (1975: 219).

7 A quite considerable amount of pre-grouping was necessary as otherwise we would have to succumb to the rather daunting fact that we would theoretically have to establish a variant meaning for *prze-* for each compound in which it occurs!

8 Please note that many of the verbs with *prze-* form syntactic structures with preposition *przez* with a seemingly similar meaning. In chapter IV we will discuss some problems concerning the combinatory restrictions that are in force here.

9 Please note that the outer border, although not clearly indicated in the drawing, is in fact also implied in this situation; it is situated at the Q-end of the tube.

10 Grochowska (1979: 5.14) implies that these verbs are in fact cases of *prze-* as empty prefix. Indeed, native speakers often provide them as “pure” aspectual pairs. We are not here concerned with aspectual pairing, but Doroszewski (1958-69: *prze-, i an j*) seems to disagree with Grochowska as he separates his meaning “j. ogarnięcie czynnością kolejno różnych przedmiotów, aż do wyczerpania zakresu” ‘encompass a sequence of different objects with an action, until the reach is exhausted’ from “i. doprowadzenia czynności do końca, skutku, celu”, ‘bring an action to its end, consequence or goal’. The latter of which seems to point to so-called “pure” perfectivisation.

11 This description is cited from Stanisławski (1983: *przebadać*). The lemma *przebadać* from Doroszewski (1958-69) provides a meaning that would point out the variant nature of the multiplicity

implied: “zbadać wiele, wielu, wszystkich po kolei; zbadać wieloma sposobami, pod wieloma względami”, ‘examine many, many people, consecutively; examine in many ways, in many respects’ This is confirmed by the very clear treatment of this lemma in Bańko (2000: *przebadać*).

12 This can also mean ‘We spent a lot of time playing’. It is not uncommon that one and the same compound with a prefix can render several variant meanings of that prefix. These perdurative meanings will follow below in 2.8.

13 In *przehandlował żonę, życie, sumienie*, the meaning of ‘bad trade, losing money’ does not necessarily emerge as confirmed by native informants. These are mere lexicalised phraseological extensions with a basic meaning of treason, treachery or betrayal of ones wife, life or conscience.

14 Grochowska (1979) classifies these verbs and their specific meaning as “isolated” and consequently does not take them into account in her discussion of variant meanings for *prze-*.

15 Of course we do not take into account the non-temporal but clearly phraseological meaning as seen in *przejeździł połowę budżetu* ‘he squandered half of the budget.’

16 Interestingly, when compared with (5) above, it seems immediately clear that *przejeździć* is the preferred verb for meanings that may point in some way or other to ‘distance covered’. Native speakers were quite adamant about the fact that **przejechał całą benzynę* is clearly a faulty construction.

17 For more on such structures, see chapter IV.

18 The verb *przeźryścić* is encountered far more often in a different meaning: ‘cleaning out hollow objects or glass’, as in the following examples taken from Polański (1992: III 442):

Kierowca przeźryścił gaźnik i filtr powietrza.

‘The driver cleaned the carburettor and the air filter.’

Wojtek zdjął okulary, przeźryścił je chusteczką.

‘Wojtek took off his glasses and cleaned them with a handkerchief.’

The former is analogous with verbs mentioned in *prze_{1.5}* and also even *prze_{1.2}*, as is the latter, when we realise Wojtek is concerned with making his glasses transparent again. Often types of meaning presented here can be interpreted in more than one way only.

19 Interestingly, most of the simplexes with which these verbs are compounded, have corresponding perfectives ending in *-nąć* or prefixed with *za-*. In the following table one could argue that not all of these are strictly speaking aspectual pairs. Aspectual matters are not in fact the topic of this chapter.

| | | | |
|---------------------|------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|
| <i>brzmieć</i> | <i>zabrzmieć</i> | <i>przebrzmieć</i> | <i>przebrzmiewać</i> |
| <i>dzwonić</i> | <i>zadzwonić</i> | <i>przedzwoić</i> | <i>przedzwaniać</i> |
| <i>dźwięczeć</i> | <i>dźwięknąć</i> | <i>przeddźwięczeć</i> | |
| <i>grzmieć</i> | <i>zagrzmieć</i> | <i>przegrzmieć</i> | |
| <i>gwizdać</i> | <i>gwizdnąć</i> | <i>przegwizdać</i> | <i>przegwizdywać</i> |
| <i>huczeć/hukać</i> | <i>huknąć</i> | <i>przehuczeć</i> | |
| <i>piać</i> | <i>zapiać</i> | <i>przepiać</i> | |
| <i>piszczeć</i> | <i>pisnąć</i> | <i>przepiszczuć</i> | |
| <i>kwitnąć</i> | <i>zakwitnąć</i> | <i>przekwitnąć</i> | <i>przekwitać</i> |

20 See Flier (1975: 220 a.f.).

21 These examples are taken from Flier (1975: 222).

Chapter II

1 I am grateful to Adrie Barentsen for pointing this out to me.

2 As we pointed out earlier in this chapter, Maslov actually introduced the notion into Slavic studies already in 1948.

3 It should be noted that the event does not have to include any kind of development as might be suspected by the tilted line and the model is intended in a more abstract fashion.

4 In Barentsen (2003: 378) this type of terminativity is termed “momentaan-transformatief”, ‘momentary-transformative.’

5 More on the verb *zaspiewać* will follow in 1.4.

6 In such deverbal perfective verbs the perfectivizing role of the formant is clear. Non-deverbal derivative verbs with this suffix can in fact be imperfective such as *ciągnąć* ‘pull’, *płynąć* ‘swim, flow’, *sunąć* ‘shove’, *chłonąć* ‘absorb’. or indeed perfective such as *lunąć* ‘start pooring’ and *wionąć* ‘whiff’.

7 In chapter III paragraph 1 we return to the matter of multiplicative and semelfactive verbs in a discussion of the view of Młynarczyk about these types of verb (2004: 124-126).

8 At this point we will briefly turn to the findings of Karolak (1992: 94, 97). In his view imperfective verbs may assume perfectivity by limitation of the process with a temporal interval. This can either be expressed by the prefix *po-* thus forming his “czasowniki limitatywne”, which correspond to delimitative verbs. But limitation may also be achieved by adjuncts of time and so, according to Karolak both *skomponował operę* ‘he composed an opera’ and *komponował operę dwie tygodnie* ‘he has been composing an opera for two weeks’ (our underline) are both perfective. We do agree that the object in the sentence as well as the adjunct of time may be perceived as modifying the otherwise atterminative notion of *komponować* ‘compose’ into a terminative one (compare our discussion in paragraphs 2.3 and 2.3.1 of this chapter). We do not feel that it is necessary to talk of perfectivity though, and we would rather prefer a model in which verb forms do not switch between the aspects (as this is apparently the case with Karolak here, our usual subscript aspect markings have been left out in this note). It is also not necessary, as it suffices to explain this in terms of terminativity, which exists in both aspects. This discrepancy of views is largely due to the fact that Karolak’s elegant explanations involve an analysis of aspect on a much deeper semantic level, which, as can be surmised from the above, allows him to detach it to a greater extent from the actual forms.

9 A little earlier we already pointed out that Bondarko (1991: 198) speaks of terminativity “in a wide sense”.

10 It is not right though to leave the matter there without pointing out that several authors have presented their views on these delimitatives as they form a specific problem. We would like to mention that, although it is probably clear what the exact meaning is of such *po-*compounds, it remains difficult to find a place for them in the various models. It would seem though, that the problem rather arises from the fact that authors imply different definitions of the terms terminativity and indeed also telicity, which we discuss in 1.3. Nübler (1993: 301-305) for

example, holds to the principle that the term terminativity should be reserved for verbs whose own lexical meaning includes a dynamic event that logically leads to a closing boundary. For him then delimitatives should be described as “perfective-aterminative” and verbs of this kind are telic though, because in his model perfectivisation equals telicification of the “semantics” of a verb, albeit not of the “content” of the verb.

11 In fact in Barentsen (2003: 381) one and the same scheme is used to represent both delimitativity and perdurativity.

12 Of course, syntactically there is clearly no difference between examples (4) and (5); both domains are treated as (accusative) objects.

13 According to Łaziński / Wiemer (1996: 106) following Karolak (1993: 95) imperfectiva tantum can even assume perfective meaning! See our footnote 8. We will not go that far.

14 It may be clear that the systemic occurrence of prefixes in imperfective verbs leads us to object to the term “perfectivising prefix” as used for example by Młynarczyk (2001:272 and throughout 2004).

15 Usage as for single events in the historic present are probably also possible but need to be further researched for Polish.

16 Would the second verb be perfective, then we would be dealing with a sequence of events:

Jak zadzwoniłem, Ania akurat przepisała_p swój artykuł.

When I phoned, Ania had just (finished) rewritten / copied her article.

17 Please note also, that sentence (9) can also be interpreted as a combination of a focus on the process of the event and the repeat of the event. The above example could then mean ‘When I phoned, Ania was rewriting her article over and over again’.

18 Polish has in fact several suffixes which specialise in this and, as far as we are aware, appear in prefixed verbs only: *-ywa- / -iwa-* (: *-uję* etc.), *-wa-* (: *-wam* etc.), *-ewa-* (: *-ewam* etc.), *-ywa- / -iwa-* (: *-ywam / -iwam* etc.) as in e.g. *opisywać* ‘describe’, *rozmywać* ‘wash away’, *omdlewać* ‘faint’, *wygrywać* ‘loose’. There are further suffixes, several of which also have this function whilst appearing with prefixed verbs, but they are used in compounds and simplexes for both aspects.

19 Dickey (2000: 13) sums up the Vendler (1957) based classification of types of “verbal situations” quite compactly, and, although it is indeed currently the most widespread classification, we include it here for the sake of completeness. The four classes are then:

- a. STATES: “non-dynamic situations without natural conclusions”, e.g. *know, hate*;
- b. ACTIVITIES: “dynamic processes where any part is of the same nature as the whole”, e.g. *dance, read*;
- c. ACCOMPLISHMENTS: “goal directed situations [...] characterized by the presence of an activity preceding the end-point”, e.g. *read a book, walk a mile*;
- d. ACHIEVEMENTS: “instantaneous leaps from one state into another without an accompanying activity”, e.g. *notice, begin*.

For the present discussion also interesting is the directly following comment by Dickey: “Accomplishments and achievements are telic, i.e. they are goal oriented and contain inherent limits, whereas activities and states do not, and are thus atelic.”

20 A possible exception might be verbs such as *prze(d)czuć* : *prze(d)czuwać* ‘sense in advance’.

NOTES

21 The formation of semelfactive verbs is apparently still productive as is evidenced by the probably substandard recent *kliknąć* ‘click’ as utilized especially in reference to computer mouse events and *dzwónknąć* ‘phone’.

22 Processual-transformative verbs can also be used to describe intraterminal situations with repeat. See also note 17 above.

23 It is interesting to note that the meaning of perfective compound *zaśpiewać_p* can be either ‘start to sing’ or ‘sing entirely’ depending on the perceived “size” of the direct object. Compare in this respect the sentences

Jan zaśpiewał_p piosenkę.

Jan sung a song || Jan started singing a song.

and

Jan zaśpiewał_p arię.

Jan started to sing an aria.

These differences are not restricted to the past tense. The lexical meaning of prefix *za-* would often be connected to events that are momentary or at least very limited in scope. We would suppose that a speaker could consider a song to be small enough to fit entirely within this scope, whereas an aria is too large and hence the *za-*compound assumes an inchoative function. This is not the place to go further into the functioning of prefix *za-*.

24 At this point Comrie adds a footnote referring to discussions on this topic by Dowty (1972), Verkuyl (1972) and Vendler (1967:104).

25 Schlegel bases himself largely on: Koševaya 1972.

26 An interesting parallel with the notion of so-called “real” and “periferal” participants as discussed by Ebeling (2006: 254) forces itself upon us. It is highly tempting to liken Schlegel’s non-quantified object (in the singular) to the periferal participants with Ebeling, as both seem to play a role that, compared to the full potential role of the direct object is reduced to a status that is more like that of an adjunct. It goes without saying that a full holistic argumentation for this suggestion would require more research.

27 The authors refer to Holvoet (1989:49, 64), who also discusses this, albeit in a somewhat different light.

28 The matter of acknowledging aspectual pairs, especially in cases of so-called prefix-pairs (in which one member, the imperfect is a simplex and the other, the perfective is a prefixed compound) is complex. Views range from Isačenko (1960), who holds that any prefix-pair is suspect as there is always also a change of the semantics provided by the prefix, through to Młynarczyk (2004: 6, 11) who leaves the decision to whether a pair is a pure aspectual pair to the intuition of the native and so does not analyse what criteria may be at play in native intuition. Although we agree that native intuition is an important factor to reckon with, we rather tend to agree with another Polish native’s view on this when he states “Resorting to semantic intuitions in order to form a semantic pattern would lower the methodological standard” (Labenz 2004: 17).

29 This list of proposed triplets was compiled on the basis of modern dictionaries with prefix pair reference as well as older works for suffix pairs and is not meant to be exhaustive. It is also a curious fact that Slavic languages do not share the same collection of aspectual triplets. For Russian e.g. Barentsen (2003: 387) mentions:

| | | | |
|----------------|-------------------|--------------------|-------------|
| <i>читать</i> | <i>прочитать</i> | <i>прочитывать</i> | ‘write’ |
| <i>пахать</i> | <i>вспахать</i> | <i>вспахивать</i> | ‘plough’ |
| <i>пудрить</i> | <i>напудрить</i> | <i>напудривать</i> | ‘powder’ |
| <i>слабеть</i> | <i>ослабеть</i> | <i>ослабевать</i> | ‘weaken’ |
| <i>стыть</i> | <i>остыть</i> | <i>остывать</i> | ‘cool down’ |
| <i>гибнуть</i> | <i>погибнуть</i> | <i>погибать</i> | ‘perish’ |
| <i>пухнуть</i> | <i>распухнуть</i> | <i>распухать</i> | ‘swell up’ |
| <i>гореть</i> | <i>сгореть</i> | <i>сгорать</i> | ‘burn up’ |
| <i>жечь</i> | <i>сжечь</i> | <i>сжигать</i> | ‘burn’ |
| <i>есть</i> | <i>съесть</i> | <i>съедать</i> | ‘eat up’ |

30 This is then somewhat different from Russian, which anyway seems to have more such triplets. The prefixed imperfectives of Russian triplets such as *прочитывать* ‘read (through)’ and *сгорать* ‘burn (up)’ and maybe others too are used for the process variant of imperfective terminativity. The Polish cognate *przeczytywać* ‘read (through)’ will be dealt with in paragraph 4, whilst *zgorać* is nowadays generally labelled as outdated. Although we have too little data to confirm this conclusively, it would seem that the function of the imperfectives in Polish triplets is a little more clear than in Russian: the unprefixated form can be used to focus on the process expressed by the verb, the prefixed imperfective seems to be only used for notions where a repeat is involved.

31 Interestingly though, native informants do point out that there is another totally acceptable rendition of this sentence utilising a frequentative verb: *codziennie rano czytuje całą gazetę od A do Z*. In this rendition too, terminativity is provided by the clearly as such presented discrete object and there is no possibility of leaving the modifiers out as in the Russian model of (2).

32 It is our impression that it is a general difference between Russian and Polish that Polish relies more on adjuncts and such like to express matters which in Russian are expressed through aspect. Research still needs to be done to establish this clearly for other verbs and instances.

33 This matter is discussed by Młynarczyk (2001: 282) from a very different angle, in an attempt to compare the aspectual phenomena of Dutch and Polish.

34 Dahl (1981: 87, 88) also discusses this matter vis à vis telicity.

35 For a discussion of the residual lexical meaning of so-called empty prefixes see Genis (2003).

36 Example (75) can also be translated ‘Ania spent a long time reading in “Pan Tadeusz”’. Here we are not concerned with this reading.

37 The full text can be found on: <http://www.intratext.com/Catalogo/Autori/AUT1336.HTM>.

38 This sentence is of course grammatically incorrect as the subjects belonging to the gerund and the main verb are not the same.

39 On the internet the triplets *pisać : napisać : pisać* also seems to function. It falls beyond our *prze-*oriented scope to go into this in too much detail, but it is interesting to note that this second of what we called earlier “prototypical” aspectual prefix pairs should also not be entirely devoid of residue prefix meaning.

40 Although in this particular instance Barentsen would have us read his abbreviation *tr* as “transitus”, thus avoiding the discussion that the term *terminus* would imply a preceding process phase.

41 This problem is discussed in Barentsen (2003: 386) and Genis (1997 and 2003).

Chapter III

1 The term “empty” when used to describe a verbal prefix entails that an imperfective base simplex is prefixed to form a perfective compositum that opposes the base simplex in nothing other than the aspectual value.

2 The term “PURE” ASPECTUAL PAIR refers to such verb pairs that oppose only in aspectual value, one member being imperfective, the other perfective. A “pure” aspectual partner is then either one of the members of such a pair.

3 We have ourselves actually used the term ‘neutralisation’ in this respect (Genis 2003). In actual fact this term is not very well suited as whichever way one views the matter, prefixes, even when they are used in the accepted sense of “empty”, still signal terminativity, which is a lexical semantic element. It is the terminativity, which can be seen to induce as it were the perfectivity.

4 We have adopted the term PREFIX-PAIR to refer to aspectual pairs of which the imperfective member is a simplex (sometimes referred to as “base verb”) and the perfective member is a prefixed compound. The prefix should be lexically “empty” in the perfective member. The prototypical example is the pair *pisać* : *napisać* ‘write’.

5 Or indeed PERFECTIVA TANTUM, but that is a principally completely different issue, which we shall not address here.

6 We find it very difficult to reconcile Vendler’s “achievements” with Młynarczyk’s “culminations” and she may have done so herself, judging from the careful way she expresses herself. Adrie Barentsen pointed out to us that in fact the term “culmination” may be likened to Vendler’s “accomplishments” and Brecht apparently uses it as such in his publication of 1985.

7 Młynarczyk actually gives *grubnąć* : *zgrubnąć* as forms of this verb pair, even though these are lacking in modern dictionaries (notably Doroszewski (1958-69), Szymczak (1978), Dunaj (1996), Bańko (2000)). The fact that already the ‘Słownik Warszawski’ (1900-1927) labels these forms as “staropolski” indicates that it would have been better to render the modern *grubieć* : *zgrubieć* with the same meaning. To our knowledge only Dunaj (1996) acknowledges these latter forms as an aspectual pair, whilst Bańko (2000) seems to rather pair it with *pogrubieć*. Bańko’s suggestions that *po-* is the empty prefix here should not meet with Młynarczyk’s approval as according to her, all ‘gradual transitions’ take empty prefix *z(a)-* (2004: 130).

8 Other dictionaries also mention extensions such as *w szybę* ‘on a window pane’ but always with the same idea: to attract someone’s attention, either to open or to come to us etc.

9 This position raises all kinds of questions to do with how to deal with specific Aktionsarten, but we shall not enter that debate, as it would take us away too far from the immediate matter at hand.

10 In this chapter we have employed “ : ” between two verbs of differing aspect to indicate that they are an aspectual pair. When two such verbs are separated by “ - ” verbs oppose in aspect, but they are not an aspectual pair.

11 There is also an aspectual pair *poczytać* : *poczytywać* ‘interpret’, which, on account of its highly lexicalised meaning was not listed here.

12 Śmiech (1967: 84, 85 as well as 1970: 147) makes a very interesting historical linguistic point that is relevant to this issue. He mentions that imperfective members of certain prefix-pairs in

modern Polish were actually formed by deprefixation of the perfective. He includes the following examples: *zapłacić*_p : *placić* ‘pay’ (instead of erstwhile *zapłacać*), *ożenić*_p (*się*) : *żenić* (*się*) ‘marry (a woman)’ (instead of erstwhile *ożeniać* (*się*)). We would think that the model presented by pairs such as *pisać* : *napisać*_p, with its rather weak prefix meaning in the perfective member is present quite strongly in the mind of Poles and so some pairs with two prefixed members actually turned into prefix-pairs. Perhaps the lexical meaning is felt as unnecessary, even superfluous in the imperfective, while the notion of terminativity is still very necessary for the perfective member.

13 Actually, it does occur albeit very rarely. On the internet a certain amount of ‘hits’ cropped up, but nothing even remotely close to the amounts gathered for instance for the forms of *przeczytywać*, which we reported and described in chapter II, paragraph 4. *Napisywać* is also in Doroszewski (1958-69).

14 This is the total number of prefixed perfective verbs per prefix given.

15 No distributive verbs of the type *poodchodzić*_p are included in this count.

16 A further statistic not included in this table concerns the total of 4293 prefixed verbs. 66.5% of these have a prefixed imperfective whilst 3.2% have no imperfective. The table does show that the remaining 30.3% of these constitute a prefix-pair.

17 Without mentioning the syntactical complications.

18 For which see also Genis (1997)

19 We rather think that *przebadać* has a lexical meaning as described in chapter I paragraph 2.1.6 and so would not constitute a clear ‘pure’ aspectual partner to *badać*. This would go for the other examples in this series too. Sometimes and in certain contexts the perceived meaning of a given prefixed compound such as this is so close to that of another prefixed compound that it seems hard for natives to keep their usage separate. It is nonetheless interesting that verbs in this particular series are at least perceived to have compounds with the same two prefixes as candidates for perfective counterparts.

20 Bańkowski (2000: I 342) mentions 1861 as the first attestation of *ekscytować* whereas *podniecać* : *podniecić*_p were already present in the 16th century according to Bańkowski (2000: II 663)

21 Interestingly this kind of ‘arrival’ is exactly as this matter is envisaged by Dutch, which uses the word *aankomen*, 1. ‘arrive’ and 2. ‘gain weight’.

Chapter IV

1 In various publications, notably Włodarczyk (1997: 116) for Polish, there are various lists of verbs that should be termed “verbs of motion”. I have restricted my research to the following undisputed set: *przejsić*_p : *przechodzić*, *przebiec*_p / *przebiegnąć*_p: *przebiegać*, *przejechać*_p : *przejeździć*, *przepłynąć*_p : *przepływać*, *przelecieć*_p : *przelatywać*, *przefrunąć*_p : *przefrunąć*_p.

2 In her introduction Kudra (1993: 11) refers to Weinsberg (1973: 22) for the use of this terminology. Weinsberg describes perlativity as being characterised by a localisation by means of “przecinania” ‘cutting through’.

3 Constructions of harmony, which present a semantically “pure” situation, are by no means restricted to *prze-* and *przez*. In fact, on the basis of corpus research we have been able to establish similar cases for a number of other combinations; most of these lack the opposition with non-

NOTES

prepositional complements such as (1) and (2) above. As yet we consider *prze-* unique in being able to figure in both non-prepositional constructions as well as prepositional constructions with etymological counterpart *przez*.

| prefix | harmony | non-prepositional (spatial) usage |
|------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| <i>w-</i> | <i>w</i> NP _{Acc.} | not attested |
| <i>do-</i> | <i>do</i> NP _{Gen.} | not attested |
| <i>od(e)-</i> | <i>od</i> NP _{Gen.} | not attested |
| <i>pod(e)-</i> | <i>pod(e)</i> NP _{Acc.} | not attested |
| <i>z(e)- / s- / ś-</i> | <i>z</i> NP _{Gen.} | not attested |

In all of these constructions prefix-meaning and preposition-meaning double up to give a meaning that is the base meaning of the prefix and preposition under consideration. Most of the prefixes mentioned here also appear in constructions with noun phrases including other prepositions than their semantically and etymologically related counterparts, as does *prze-*.

On a purely semantic (non etymological) basis the following could also be considered.

| prefix | preposition | non-prepositional (spatial) usage |
|------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| <i>wy-</i> | <i>z</i> NP _{Gen.} | not attested |

See also a discussion of this type of construction in Kudra (1993).

4 In this example I would propose that, although trajectory $A \rightarrow B$ does not have clear starting and finishing points, there is still a case for these: they can be related to the corners of the street that is missed.

5 We have noticed that, most likely due to its very subtle nature, it is very difficult for native speakers to adhere to the semantic opposition between these two structures strictly, nor does it seem possible to persuade them to clear-cut statements to that effect.

