Lexicalization of Upper Sorbian preverbs: Temporal-aspectual ramifications and the delimitation of German influence

Lexicalization of Upper Sorbian Preverbs: Temporal-Aspectual Ramifications and the Delimitation of German Influence

Gary H. Toops
Wichita State University

Lexicalization of Upper Sorbian Preverbs: Temporal-Aspectual Ramifications and the Delimitation of German Influence

GARY H. TOOPS
Wichita State University

I

In the Slavic linguistic literature, a number of syntactic and semantic phenomena observable in the contemporary West Slavic literary languages are attributed to German influence. This is generally the case in comparative and/or historical studies of Czech (and, by extension, Slovak) grammar, but especially so in the case of Upper and Lower Sorbian grammar.[1] The fact that the grammar of a particular Slavic language exhibits certain syntactico-semantic results of having been influenced by German is frequently presumed to mean that the Slavic language in question displays features resulting from direct imitation. Often such presumptions appear to render unnecessary the pursuit of further linguistic inquiry along the lines in question.[2] A predisposition to attribute various West Slavic grammatical phenomena solely to German influence may, in fact, obscure both an awareness and an understanding of grammatical processes operating *within* a particular Slavic language itself. A case in point is the interplay of verbal prefixation, tense and aspect in Upper Sorbian (hereafter, USo).

Further pursuing the delimitation of German influence undertaken in two previous publications by the present author,[3] this study proposes that the effect of German on the morphosemantics of USo verbs is less extensive than has heretofore been assumed. German influence is viewed here as extending directly to only a small segment of the overall USo verb system while acting at the same time as a catalyst for the intervention of other, intralinguistic factors. In this study, such factors are considered to be the prescriptive norms of the USo literary language ("spisowna rěč," "Schriftsprache"), lexical restrictions on the derivation of secondary imperfectives, and a re-interpretation of the imperfectivizing suffix *-owa-* (and, in some cases, *-a-*) in the USo popular language ("ludowa rěč," "Volkssprache").[4]

II

The verbal system of the USo literary language exhibits two aspects – perfective and imperfective. As in other Slavic languages, verbs usually occur in so-called "aspect pairs": basic imperfective verbs are paired with lexically synonymous perfective ones that are derived by means of stem prefixation, while basic perfective verbs and prefixally derived perfective verbs with lexi-

cal meaning distinct from that of the corresponding basic verb are paired with imperfective ones that are derived by means of stem suffixation. In the indicative mood, there are two synthetic tense forms – present/future ("non-past") and preterite (sometimes called "aorist" if the verb is perfective, "imperfect" if the verb is imperfective) – and three analytic tense forms – one future (formed, except in emphatic contexts, only from imperfective and biaspectual verbs[5]) and two past, viz., perfect and pluperfect. A fourth analytic tense form – the infrequently used iterative preterite – is omitted from consideration here, since it is identical to the present conditional. There are three persons – 1st, 2nd, and 3rd – and three numbers – singular, dual, and plural. Example (1), below, represents, in abbreviated form, the indicative paradigm of the verb *činić*^{i}/*sčinić*^{p} 'to do, to make':[6]

(1)	*činić*^{i}	*sčinić*^{p}
Present:	*ja činju, ty činiš, wón čini ...*	–
Preterite:	*ja činjach, ty činješe, wón činješe ...*	*ja sčinich, ty sčini, wón sčini ...*
Future:	*ja budu/ty budźeš/wón budźe činić ...*	*ja sčinju, ty sčiniš, wón sčini ...*
Perfect:	*ja sym/ty sy/wón je činił ...*	*ja sym/ty sy/wón je sčinił ...*
Pluperfect:	*ja běch/ty bě(še)/wón bě(še) činił ...*	*ja běch/ty bě(še)/wón bě(še) sčinił ...*

When a basic imperfective verb like *činić* is aspectually paired with a prefixally derived perfective verb – in this case, *sčinić*, – the prefix of the perfective verb is said to be "purely aspectual" (Russian *čisto vidovaja pristavka*) or lexically "empty" (French *préverbe vide*).[7] The empty prefix of this particular USo verb is genetically related to that of the Russian perfective verb *sdelat'* 'to do, to make' and the Polish perfective verb *zrobić* 'idem.' In general, corresponding imperfective verbs (so-called "secondary imperfectives") cannot be re-derived by suffixing the stems of perfective verbs that themselves have been derived by the addition of some lexically empty prefix to their basic stem. Thus, there is no prefixed imperfective verb **sdelyvat'* in Russian, **zrabiać* in Polish, or **sčinjeć* in USo.[8]

Moreover, temporal-aspectual considerations motivating the derivation of imperfective verbs from prefixed perfective ones (hence, occurrences of "aspect pairs") are considerably fewer in USo than in most other Slavic languages: even by the norms of the USo literary language, imperfective verb forms are indispensable only for conveying an action in the *præsens actualis* (or "continuous present," including "continuous present in the past" and "continuous present in the future" as well[9]) and in durative/stative timeframes.[10] Therefore, habitual or frequentative (i.e., "non-continuous") performances of an action, for example, can be conveyed in the present tense by perfective as well as imperfective verb forms. Thus, while Russian and Czech exhibit the aspectual pairs *najti*^{p}/*naxodit'*^{i} and *najít*^{p}/*nacházet*^{i} 'to find,' resp., USo correspondingly exhibits the aspectually unpaired perfective verb (*perfectivum tantum*) *namakać*^{p}. USo derives no lexically synonymous imperfective verb **namakować*^{i}, because the verb signifying 'to find' denotes an action that is

inherently resultative, hence, aspectually perfective.[11] For a speaker of USo there is no temporal-aspectual context in which an imperfective verb expressing the same lexical meaning could conceivably be indispensable. In response even to the English question "What are you doing right now?", for example, one cannot say *"I am finding my car keys."[12]

III

Published arguments surrounding tense and aspect usage in USo can be traced back at least to the mid-19th century. In his lengthy rebuttal to "Stosch the Blacksmith's libel against the linguistic-minded Wends," Jan Arnošt Smoleń in 1868 criticized the misuse of prefixally derived perfective verbs in Sorbian writings.[13] He argued, for example, that the following USo translation of a German Lutheran hymn was incorrect:[14]

(2)

German	USo (archaic orthography)
Wir glauben an den heiligen Geist, welcher ewiger Gott ist und wie vom Vater so auch vom Sonne *ausgeht.*	My wjerimy do ßwjatoh' Ducha, kiž je wječny Bóh a *wujndże* kaž wot Wótza tak wot Ssyna.

'We believe in the Holy Ghost, who is God eternal and descends/issues [USo: "descended/issued" ~ "will descend/will issue"] both from the Father and from the Son.'

Smoleń contended that USo *wuńdźe* (*"wujndże"*), being a prefixal derivative of the determinate verb *hić* 'to go,' is aspectually perfective and can therefore be interpreted only as a preterite-tense form signifying 'descended, issued' (German 'ausging') or as a synthetic future-tense form signifying 'will descend, will issue' (German 'ausgehen wird'). According to Smoleń, only the imperfective verb *wuchadźa* (infinitive *wuchadźeć*), with which *wuńdźe* (infinitive *wuńć*) is aspectually paired, could denote present time in accordance with the verb *ausgeht* of the German original.[15]

Around the turn of the century, Lev V. Ščerba wrote a graduation thesis on the influence of German on USo declension and conjugation. In it he stated:[16]

> German influence has a particularly strong presence in the USo verbal system. We can say without exaggeration that radical changes have taken place in this domain. The fact of the matter is that the category of aspect, which in other Slavic languages pervades the entire morphology of the verb, is, in all likelihood, altogether absent in USo, just as it is in German.

At the suggestion of J. Baudouin de Courtenay and Arnošt Muka (Ernst Mucke), Ščerba made his first trip to Lusatia in the summer of 1907. He spent "about two months" in the area of the now practically extinct Eastern Lower Sorbian or Mužakow (Bad-Muskau) dialect, having eventually taken up residence in the home of a Sorbian tailor in the village of Wuskidź (Weißkeißel). He spent another "ten days" there six years later, in 1913.[17] Using the linguistic material he had collected, Ščerba in 1915 published a

book, *Vostočnolužickoe naréčie*, in which he stated:[18]

> It seems to me that perfectivity, in the sense in which we conceive of it in Russian, does not at all exist in the Mužakow dialect. – Prefixes primarily impart to verbs a meaning of semelfactivity, which is underscored by [the existence of] corresponding iterative verbs; and [only] secondarily do they convey this or that shade of perfectivity, in accordance with their lexical meaning. – The more lexical [*soderžatel'nĕe*] the prefix, the less its perfectivizing meaning emerges; and the [lexically] emptier it is, the more clearly the latter emerges.

Although Ščerba's comments refer specifically to a Lower Sorbian (hereafter, LSo) dialect, they are nevertheless helpful in understanding aspect usage by contemporary USo speakers both in Bautzen and the "prestige" Catholic-dialect area (see below). Following is an excerpt of examples from the Mužakow dialect and their Russian glosses which Ščerba cited to illustrate his foregoing statements:[19]

(3)	Mužakow dialect	Russian gloss
	Lexical prefixes *rɔz-* and *ći-*	
(a)	*jɔ rczjazał* ("perfective")	*'ja razvjazal'* as well as *'razvjazyval'*
vs.	*jɔ rczjazował* ("imperfective")	*'ja razvjazyval neskol'ko raz'*
(b)	*jɔ ćibił* ("perfective")	*'ja pribil (k čemu-libo)'* as well as *'pribival'*
vs.	*jɔ ćibijał* ("imperfective")	*'ja pribival neskol'ko (veščej)'* or *'bil povtorno po čemu-libo'*
(c)	*jɔ ćicënił* ("perfective")	*'ja rastratil'* as well as *'tratil'*
vs.	*jɔ ćicën'ał* ("imperfective")	*'ja povtorno tratil'*
	Lexically "empty" prefixes *s-*, *hu-*, and *ći-*	
(d)	*jɔ spalił*	*'ja sžëg'* (only)
vs.	*jɔ palił*	*'ja žëg~sžigal'*
(e)	*jɔ hudoił*	*'ja vydoil do konca'* (only)
vs.	*jɔ doił*	*'ja doil~vydaival'*
(f)	*jɔ ćilipił*	*'ja nakleil (marku)'* (only)
vs.	*jɔ lipił*	*'ja nakleival'*

As illustrated by the summary of Ščerba's observations, presented above as example (3), prefixation of a basic verb stem in the Mužakow dialect did not necessarily entail perfectivization, even though prefixation of basic imperfective verb stems in Sorbian, as in the Slavic languages generally, ordinarily yields verbs whose aspect is perfective.[20] Where, as in the cases of *rɔz-* and *ći-*, the prefix was perceived by speakers of the Mužakow dialect to produce a verb whose lexical meaning was distinct from that of the non-prefixed verb (cf. *rɔz-jazał* 'untied' vs. *jazał* 'tied'; *ćibił* 'beat/drove/hammered into' vs. *bił* 'beat/hit/pounded'; *ćicënił* 'wasted/squandered' [German 'vertan' (infinitive *vertun*)] vs. *cënił* 'did' [German 'getan' (infinitive *tun*)][21]), Ščerba observed that the prefixed verb was neutral with regard to aspect or, simply, biaspectual. It was therefore necessary, in Ščerba's view, to gloss such verbs not only with aspectually perfective Russian verbs, but with imperfective Russian verbs as well. Because of the biaspectuality of these lexical derivatives in the Mužakow

dialect, the stem suffixes *-ova-* and *-'a-*, whose formal analogues in other Slavic languages are normally instrumental in rederiving imperfective verbs with the same lexical meaning as the corresponding prefixal perfectives, assumed, according to Ščerba, an additional semantic load. Not only were the secondary, suffixal derivatives (here, *rozjazovaŀ, ćibijaŀ, ćicën'aŀ*) unambiguously imperfective; they specifically denoted iterative and/or distributive performances of the action (hence the Russian glosses signifying 'untied several times,' 'hammered several [things]'/'pounded repeatedly on something,' 'wasted/squandered repeatedly,' resp.).

Where, in the cases of *s-* (*spaliŀ* 'burned'), *hu-* (*hudoiŀ* 'milked'), and *ći-* (*ćilipiŀ* 'glued/stuck [onto]'), the prefix was perceived as being lexically "empty," the prefixed verb forms functioned only as lexically synonymous, perfective counterparts to the imperfective basic (i.e., non-prefixed) verbs (*paliŀ, doiŀ, lipiŀ*, resp.). From the standpoint of modern aspectology, one must ascribe Ščerba's view of these prefixes as lexically "empty" (hence, "purely aspectual" – see above) either to their having no lexical meaning of their own (*s-*) or to their expressing a "sublexical meaning"[22] (Aktionsart) consistent with the semantics of the perfective aspect (here, completion of the action – *hu-*) or a lexical meaning already subsumed in the semantics of the basic verb stem (*ći-*).[23]

In 1959, Frido Michałk, motivated by the discrepancy between Ščerba's descriptions of Sorbian aspect usage and the prescriptions for aspect usage found in Sorbian school grammars, undertook to discover the true state of affairs among native speakers of USo whose speech had been least influenced by the norms of the USo literary language. In an article "On aspect in the Upper Sorbian popular language," Michałk presented data from interviews with speakers of three different USo dialects: the Koschen (town of Košyna [Groflkoschen, Kreis Senftenberg]) and Spreewitz (town of Nowe Město [Neustadt, Kreis Hoyerswerda]) dialects (which border on, but do not belong to the transitional LSo dialects) and the "prestige" Kamenz or Catholic dialect (towns of Radwor [Radibor, Kreis Bautzen] and Chróśćicy [Crostwitz, Kreis Kamenz]).[24]

On the basis of interviews like the following (example [4], below),[25] Michałk purported to demonstrate that, contrary to Ščerba's earlier observations, perfective/imperfective aspectual distinctions, far from having disappeared under German influence, were, in fact, faithfully realized by contemporary speakers of USo. At the same time, Michałk faulted Ščerba for not having reached his conclusions about Sorbian aspect usage on the basis of "relevant" temporal-aspectual contexts, i.e., those contexts in which a speaker was compelled to convey actions in the continuous present (*præsens actualis*), past, and future (see above):[26]

(4) (a) Q: How do you say 'to fry, to brown' (German *anbraten*) in Sorbian?
A: *Popjesć*. (Note: *popjesć* = literary USo *popjec* P)
Q: What are you doing in the kitchen?
A: *Ja rownje mjaso popječuju* I. (Note: *popječuju* < **popječować* I' I am just now browning meat.')
Q: How about *popječu* P?
A: *Popječu* P doesn't work, but *ja rownje pječu* I ('I am just now frying') is likewise okay.

(b) Q: Translate "The child will soon fall asleep."
A: *Dźěćo budźo glajch wusnyć* P.
Q: "She has just fallen asleep."
A: *Ta jo rownje wusnyła* P.
Q: "Look, she is just now falling asleep."
A: *Hladaj, wóna grode chopina* I *spać* I. (Literally: 'Look, she is just now starting to sleep.')

(c) Q: Translate "The cat is climbing up the tree."
A: *Ta kóčka lězo* I *na bom.*
Q: How about *zalězo* P?
A: That means '(she) climbed.'
Q: I thought 'climbed' was supposed to be *jo zalězła.*
A: That too.
Q: How do you say "The cat will soon climb up the tree"?
A: *Ta kóčka budźo glajch zalězć* P *na bom.*
Q: How do you say "Do you see (how) the cat (is) climbing up (the tree)?"
A: *Widźiš, kak ta kóčka (na bom) hórjej lězo* I*?*
Q: How about *zalězo* P?
A: That means '(she) will climb.'

IV

Particularly revealing about Michałk's investigation is the fact that he consciously sought out Sorbian informants whose speech, he felt, had been least influenced not by German, but by the *USo literary language.* Together with data obtained from the present author's interviews of speakers of the Bautzen and "prestige" Catholic USo dialects, this fact will serve to advance the hypothesis that the erosion of verbal aspect as a grammatical category in USo (at least to the extent witnessed by previous scholars – see above) is attributable more to the adoption of certain "Slavicizing" norms in the codification of the USo literary language than to any persistent German influence. Although the application of such norms is often termed "purism," its ultimate purpose is the closer alignment of the grammar of USo with that of the other West Slavic literary languages.[27]

Essential to the delimitation of German influence in this area of USo grammar is the following question: if the German language has had any influence on the USo verb system, then to which morphosyntactic and -semantic properties of the USo verb does that influence initially extend? Ščerba's early implication that the absence of aspect as a grammatical category in German had

resulted *directly* in the disappearance of aspect in USo cannot be accurate, for the language of Michalk's informants, all of whom were bilingual,[28] was replete with Germanisms (*glajch* 'gleich,' *grode* 'gerade,' *bom* 'Baum,' *ta* [kóčka] 'die [Katze]'), yet aspectual distinctions were consistently realized.

For the purpose of delimiting German influence on the morphosyntax and -semantics of USo verbs, we may realistically adopt as a working hypothesis the proposition that, if aspect as a grammatical category in USo has in fact eroded under the influence of German, then the erosion must occur or have occurred gradually, in stages. As occasional admonitions to USo speakers in grammars and other linguistic publications suggest (see below), the first stage is discernible at the level of Aktionsarten or "sublexical meanings." These meanings are conventionally labelled "ingressive" (or "inchoative"), "evolutive," "delimitative," "terminative," "perdurative," "finitive," "totalizing," "saturative," "attenuative," etc.[29] They are considered to be mere "modifications," primarily with respect to time or intensity, of the semantics of the basic verb stem, from which they are not considered to be *completely* distinct with respect to their *lexical* semantics. With the possible exception of semelfactivity, marked in the USo infinitive stem by the suffix *-ny (-ć)*, Aktionsarten in USo, as in other Slavic languages, are formally derived in the same way as are perfective aspectual partners to basic imperfective verbs – by prefixation. Like perfective aspectual partners, verbs denoting Aktionsarten are perfective and generally do not lend themselves to "secondary" imperfectivization by means of stem suffixation (in the USo literary language, the stem suffixes are *-owa-* and *-a-*). Such verbs are therefore *perfectiva tantum*, cf.:

(5)

	USo Aktionsart	German gloss		Synonymous imperfective USo paraphrase
Inchoative:	*wusnyć* P	einschlafen	→	*započinać* I *spać*
Attenuative:	*popjec* P	anbraten	→	*trochu/kusk pjec* I
	podźěłać P	eine Weile arbeiten	→	*chwilku dźěłać* I
Resultative:	*zešić* P	fertignähen	→	*kónčić šić* I

Example (5), above, provides a few USo *perfectiva tantum* expressing different Aktionsarten and their German glosses. The German verbs, as was seen in Michałk's interviews in which the verbs *anbraten* 'to brown (lightly fry)' and *einschlafen* 'to fall asleep' occur (examples [4a] and [4b], above), do not include aspect as one of their grammatical properties. Unlike the corresponding USo prefixed, perfective verbs, the German verbs therefore occur freely in continuous present (or past, or future) timeframes. Speakers of USo, being bilingual, are either conscious of this discrepancy or must be made aware of it. Noting, for example, that USo *wusnyć* 'einschlafen' is aspectually perfective, Šewc admonished Sorbian users of his grammar:[30]

> If a Sorb wants to express German *er, sie, es schläft ein* or *ist beim Einschlafen* ['he, she, it is falling asleep'] (i.e., in the present), then he must paraphrase: *wón, wona, wono započina spać* ['he, she, it is starting to sleep'].

In the case of the other Aktionsarten cited in (5), above – and resultative, – USo speakers may paraphrase by combining with the corresponding basic imperfective verb such adverbs as *trochu* 'ein wenig,' *kusk* 'ein bißchen,' *chwilku* 'eine Weile,' or by introducing another imperfective finite verb denoting a completion of the process (*kóńčić* 'to finish').[31]

The expression of various Aktionsarten in the imperfective aspect by means of paraphrase, as we have seen, is sanctioned by the norms of the USo literary language. For rendering in USo the meaning of three commonly used German separable prefixes, instantiation of the adverbs *wróćo* and *zaso* and the adverbialized pronoun *sobu,* illustrated in example (6), below, likewise conforms to the prescriptions of the USo literary language:

(6)	German	USo	
	*mit*nehmen	*sobu brać* i/*sobu wzać* P	'to take along'
	*zurück*geben	*wróćo dawać* i/*wróćo dać* P	'to give back'
	*wieder*schreiben	*zaso pisać* i/*zaso napisać* P	'to write again/back'

One reason, no doubt, that these verbal syntagms are incorporated into the USo literary language is that the Slavic languages in general exhibit no semantically equivalent verbal prefixes and therefore likewise have recourse to such syntagms (cf. Russian *brat'/vzjat' s soboj* 'to take along,' *da(va)t' obratno* [in addition to polysemous *otda(va)t'*] 'to give back,' etc.). Their instantiation in USo does not, therefore, run counter to the "Slavicizing" norms of the literary language (see above).

V

Although at the "first stage," delineated in the foregoing section, a degree of lexical interpretation of USo preverbs results from the German-influenced generation of imperfective "aspectual partners" by means of paraphrase, such interpretation neither prompts the lexicalization of originally "empty" preverbs nor does it have any significant temporal-aspectual ramifications for the USo verb system as a whole. In what may be viewed as the "second stage" in the gradual erosion of the USo system of tense and aspect, however, an entire class of USo imperfective verbs is relegated to obsolescence and disparities between the literary and popular languages begin to appear, cf.:

(7)	USo prefixal perfective	German	USo imperfective paraphrase	USo derived imperfective
	wuńć P	(hin/her)*aus*gehen	*won hić* i	†*wuchadźeć* i
	wuhladać P	(hin/her)*aus*blicken	*won hladać* i	†*wuhladować* i
	woteńć P	*weg*gehen	*preč hić* i	†*wotchadźeć* i
	spadać P	(hin/her)*unter*fallen	*dele padać* i	†*spadować* i
	zalězć P	(hin/her)*auf*klettern	*horje lězć* i	†*załažować* i
	zalězć P	(hin/her)*ein*kriechen	*nutř lězć* i	†*załažować* i

Despite the fact that at this stage the "old" imperfective aspectual partners are replaced by combinations of adverb + basic imperfective, the system of

perfective/imperfective aspectual distinctions remains intact. That is to say, with the disappearance of the aspectual pair *zalězć* P/*załažować* I 'to climb up; to crawl in,' new aspectual pairs developed compensatorily (in many cases, like that of polysemous *zalězć* P, with a disambiguating effect), cf. *zalězć* P/ *horje lězć* I 'to climb up,' *zalězć* P/*nutř lězć* I 'to crawl in.' This was clearly demonstrated in Michałk's interview, cited as example (4)(c), above. The Sorbian informant conveyed the action of "climbing up" in the continuous present by means of *"hórjej lězo"* (=literary USo *horje lěze*), and not by means of the secondary imperfective *załažuje,* despite the fact that in the perfective aspect the same informant used the prefixed perfective verb *zalězć*.[32] It should be borne in mind, by way of contrast, that speakers of most other Slavic languages (e.g., Russian) would, under the same circumstances, naturally switch from the prefixed perfective verb (Russian *vlezt' [na derevo]*) to the corresponding prefixed imperfective (Russian *vlezat' [na derevo]*), not to a synonymous paraphrase (which would be ungrammatical in any case, cf. Russian **lezt' vverx [na derevo]*).

Commentary elicited by the present author in 1991-92 from speakers of USo, whose years of birth ranged from 1922 to 1966, confirms the use of directional adverbs with basic imperfective verbs of motion in lieu of prefixal derivatives. The speakers who were interviewed either still lived or originally hailed from Budyšin (Bautzen), Boranecy (Bornitz, Kreis Bautzen), Chelno (Cölln, Kreis Bautzen), Stary Łusč (Lauske, Kreis Bautzen), Chanecy (Cannewitz, Kreis Bischofswerda), and Wěteńca (Dürr-Wicknitz, Kreis Kamenz). When asked how to translate into USo the German sentence *Als ich ankam, kam Jan gerade aus dem Haus heraus* 'When I arrived, Jan was just coming out of the house,' informants rejected sentence (8)(a), below, while fully accepting sentence (8)(b):

(8) (a) *Jako přińdźech, *wuchadźše* Jan runje z doma.
(b) Jako přińdźech, *dźěše* Jan runje z doma *won.*

However, with respect to verbs of motion, the same informants were just as likely to reject many of the prefixal perfectives in their concrete, directional senses (i.e., those for which the corresponding German verbs typically have the deictic adverbs *hin-* and *her-* conjoined to their separable prefix; cf. example [7], above) and thereby provided data inconsistent with the overall impression created by Michałk's earlier interviews. As even passages from contemporary USo prose works reveal, the basic, originally imperfective determinate verbs of motion – e.g., *hić* 'to go (on foot)' (German 'gehen'), *jěć* 'to go (by vehicle)' (German 'fahren'), *lećeć* 'to fly,' *běžeć* 'to run' (German 'laufen'), *ćěrić* 'to race' (German 'rennen'), *ćahnyć* 'to move' (German 'ziehen') – have by and large become aspectually neutral. They thus occur freely in syntactic environments otherwise characterized by perfective verb forms. This is clearly attested by the co-occurrence of imperfective and perfective preterite forms denoting

sequences of completed actions in the following passages from Angela Stachowa's short story "Dótknjenje" ('The Touch'; asterisked verb forms in parentheses are potential alternate formulations predicated on a strict application of the norms of the USo literary language):[33]

(9) (a) Z chwatkom *ćerjach* ^{i} wróćo do našeho hotela. Lift ani njewužiwši ^{p}, *lećach* ^{i} po schodach *horje* (**zalećach* ^{p} *po schodach*) do Hansoweje stwy. ... Bjez zaklepanja wotprasnych ^{p} durje. Hans ze swojeho wotpočowanskeho łoža *wujědźe* ^{p}, na kotrymž bě spjacy ležał.
'In haste, I raced back to our hotel. Without even using the elevator, I flew up the stairs to Hans's room. ... Without knocking, I tore open the door. Hans jumped up (German: "fuhr hoch") from his day bed (German: "Ruhebett"), on which he had been lying, asleep.'

(b) Hans *běžeše* ^{i} (**přeběža* ^{p}/**přeběhny* ^{p}) hibićiwje *nimo* mje a wotstorči ^{p} někotre wokeńcy wot woknow.
'Hans ran deftly past me and threw open several shutters ("pushed several shutters away from the windows").'

(c) Hans ... wočini ^{p} jedne z tych třoch durjow a *dźěše* ^{i} (**zańdźe* ^{p}) do přizamkowaceje so rumnosće.
'Hans opened one of the three doors and went into the adjacent room.'

(d) Wjele wsow zhubi ^{p} so w tych brunicowych jamach, ludźo *ćehnjechu* ^{i} do druhich městow a sydlišćow, a cuzy ludźo na jich městno sem *přińdźechu* ^{p} – ale z wotchadźacymi ludźimi zhubi ^{p} so też jedna rěč.
'Many villages were lost in these lignite mines, people moved to other cities and towns, and outsiders came here to take their place – but with the departing people a language was also lost.'

Thus, contrary to the previous observation that perfective/imperfective aspectual distinctions are preserved even when derived imperfectives are supplanted by combinations of adverb + basic imperfective (in imitation of German verbs with separable prefixes – see above), it must be conceded that in the case of many verbs of motion German-influenced use of directional adverbs in lieu of preverbs has in fact led to the dissolution of aspectual distinctions. Example (10)(a-c), below, summarizes the stages of this dissolution:[34]

(10) (a) *woteńć* ^{p} / *wotchadźeć* ^{i} (German 'weggehen')
(b) *woteńć* ^{p} / *preč hić* ^{i}
(c) *preč hić* $^{i/p}$

To the extent that the prefixed perfective verbs of motion are still used by contemporary USo speakers, commentary elicited from Sorbian informants reveals that the corresponding derived imperfectives are assigned iterative/distributive meaning and/or survive in their figurative (rather than concrete, directional) meanings.[35] For example, informants state that German "Die Gäste kommen schon" 'The guests are already coming' is expressed most naturally in USo as *Hosćo hižo přińdu (~přińdźeja)*, i.e., with the "formally perfective" verb *přińć;* instantiation of the corresponding imperfective derivative

přichadźeć yields a sentence (*Hosćo hižo přichadźeja*) which informants paraphrase in German as "Die Gäste kommen schon nacheinander/immer wieder" 'The guests are already coming one after the other' (if interpreted in the continuous present) or 'Already guests keep coming.' For most informants the perfective verb *wuńć* and the imperfective verb *wuchadźeć* – aspectually paired in USo grammars for all denotations – form an aspectual pair only with respect to the figurative meanings 'to take as a point of departure' (German '[von etwas] ausgehen')[36] and 'to come out, appear, be published' (German 'erscheinen'): *Nowiny wuchadźeja tydźensce* 'The newspaper comes out weekly' (German 'Die Zeitung erscheint wöchentlich'), *Časopis wuńdźe na nowy tydźeń* 'The magazine comes out next week' (German 'Die Zeitschrift erscheint nächste Woche').

As Šewc indicates, it is at this point that the prescriptive norms of the USo literary language and the grammar of the USo popular language begin to conflict:[37]

> In the USo popular language adverbial words like *won, nutř, dele, horje, preč* are, under the influence of German, often used as well to function as prefixes, e.g. *won-* (wonhladać, wonhić), *nutř* (nutř ćahnyć, nutř padnyć), *dele* (dele lězć), *horje* (horje přińć), *preč* (preč hić), *nimo* (nimo hić), etc. ... In the literary language we try to avoid them (z wokna wonhladać = z wokna hladać, nutř ćahnyć = začahnyć). ...

Insofar as speakers of USo are aware of the literary language's prescription of verbal prefixes in place of popularly used adverbs, evidence suggests that at least in formal, written contexts, speakers of USo attempt to adhere to them. Since, however, imperfective derivatives of verbs of motion and virtually all imperfectives formed by means of the stem suffix *-owa-* are so marked in the contemporary popular language for iterative/distributive meaning, there is a strong tendency, especially among younger Sorbs, to use prefixal perfectives "incorrectly," i.e., as verbs that are completely neutral with regard to aspect. The single example of the aspectual "pair" *zasadźić* P/ *zasadźeć* I ~ *zasadźować* I 'to install' (German 'einsetzen') may suffice. USo differs from most other Slavic literary languages in the frequency with which it exhibits doublets of derived imperfectives, those formed with the suffix *-owa-*, and those formed with the suffix *-a-* (which undergoes umlaut to yield *-e-* between soft consonants). Like the few examples of derived imperfective doublets in other Slavic languages (e.g., Russian *prigotovljat'* I ~ *prigotavlivat'* I from *prigotovit'* P 'to prepare'), such doublets, from the standpoint of the USo literary language, are absolutely synonymous. One informant, born in 1932, confirmed the equation of the two derived imperfectives: for him there existed no semantic difference between the sentences *Wokno zasadźam* 'I am installing a window' and *Wokno zasadźuju* 'idem.' According to this informant, both sentences could be used in response to the question *Što runje nětko činiš?* 'What are you doing right now?' – i.e., in the continuous present. For him, the sentence *Wokno zasadźu*

denoted future time, 'I will install a window.' For a younger informant, born in 1954, however, the sentence *Wokno zasadźu* denoted present time and could be used in the continuous present, in response to the question Što *runje nětko činiš?* According to this informant, the explicit expression of future time must be formulated analytically, as *Budu wokno zasadźić*. In other words, for him the verb *zasadźić* was aspectually neutral, and the derived imperfective *zasadźować* denoted iterativity or distributivity – *Wokno zasadźuju* 'I install a window' (e.g., once a year), *Wokna zasadźuju* 'I install windows' (e.g., on a regular basis) or 'I am installing the windows' (i.e., one after the other). This same informant considered the sentence *Wokno zasadźam* no more than a dialectal variant of *Wokno zasadźu* 'I am installing a window.' The younger informant's father, however, "corrected" him, indicating, like the first informant born in 1932, that *zasadźić*, being a perfective verb, could not denote present time; for him *Wokno zasadźu* likewise signified 'I will install a window.' However, this third informant also differed from the first in his interpretation of the sentences *Wokno zasadźam* and *Wokno zasadźuju:* for him the two sentences were not synonymous, inasmuch as only *Wokno zasadźam* could signify 'I am installing a window' (i.e., in response to the question "What are you doing right now?"), while *Wokno zasadźuju* signified for him, as for his son, an iterative or distributive performance of the action.

If we now label the first, third, and second informants (a), (b), and (c), resp., the following example will illustrate the gradual dissolution of aspectual distinctions and the concomitant re-interpretation of aspectual morphology in USo:

(11) (a)	*zasadźić* ^{p}	/ *zasadźeć* ^{i}	~	*zasadźować* ^{i}
(b)	*zasadźić* ^{p}	/ *zasadźeć* ^{i}	/	*zasadźować* $^{iter./dist.}$
(c)	*zasadźić* $^{i/p}$	(~*zasadźeć* $^{i/p}$)	/	*zasadźować* $^{iter./dist.}$

The biaspectualization of prefixed, "formally perfective" verbs, represented above by example (11)(c), has significant temporal ramifications for the USo verb system. In two of the four productive verb classes (classes 3 and 4 according to Trofimovič[38]), the 3rd-person singular non-past and preterite forms of perfective verbs are fully homophonous (cf. example [1], above). Thus, as was noted in reviewing Smoleŕ's arguments regarding the verb *wuńdźe* (see above), this particular verb form (like *sčini* in example [1]) is ambiguous: it may be interpreted either as a 3rd-person singular preterite-tense form, signifying 'descended, issued' (i.e., given the sentence subject *Swjaty Duch* 'Holy Ghost'), or as a 3rd-person non-past (future) tense form, signifying 'will descend, will issue.' If, in accordance with the usage followed by informant (c) above, we now add the possibility of expressing a continuous present by means of the same verb form, a three-way ambiguity arises, cf.:

(12) *Swjaty Duch wuńdźe .*
(a) 'The Holy Ghost descends.' (*wuńdźe* = *won dźe* i/*wuchadźa* i)
(b) 'The Holy Ghost descended.' (*wuńdźe* = preterite of *wuńć* P)
(c) 'The Holy Ghost will descend.' (*wuńdźe* = non-past of *wuńć* P)

Such ambiguity further contributes then, in the popular language, to the analytic formation of the future tense of perfective verbs. As observed in Michałk's interview, example (4)(b), above, the Sorbian informant rendered German *Die Katze wird gleich auf den Baum kriechen* 'The cat will soon climb up the tree' as *Ta kóčka budźo glajch zalězć na bom.* For this informant, the synthetic future tense *zalězo* (=literary USo *zaléze*) was homophonous with the preterite, hence ambiguous, and the sentence *Ta kóčka zalězo glajch na bom* could have also translated German 'Die Katze *kroch* gleich auf den Baum' ('The cat soon *climbed* up the tree').[39]

VI

In the two preceding sections (IV and V) attention was focused first on unpaired prefixed perfective verbs and secondly on aspect pairs consisting of prefixed perfective verbs and their suffixally derived imperfective aspectual partners. In this section, in what may be regarded as the "third stage" in the lexicalization of USo preverbs and its implications for the morphosemantics of tense and aspect in contemporary USo, attention must now shift to those aspect pairs consisting of basic imperfective verbs and their prefixally derived perfective counterparts. A likely source of the problem to be examined here can be found as early as 1866 in the preface to the dictionary of Křesćan Pful, who, in advancing prescriptive norms for USo grammar, made the following remarks:[40]

> Der dritte Fall, auf den ich hier aufmerksam machen wollte, betrifft zusammengesetzte Verba mit falscher Bedeutung. „Auffallen" wird nicht selten durch *horje panyć* (*padać*) ausgedrückt. Das ist falsch; denn *horje* bedeutet „nach oben, hinauf", und *horje panyć* ist nun so viel als „hinauffallen". Da aber „auf-fallen" – wie jeder des Deutschen Kundige von selbst weiß – nicht ein (an sich schon unmögliches) H i n a u f fallen bezeichnen soll, so muß man dafür ein begrifflich richtiges Compositum wählen, nämlich *nadpanyć* (*nadpadować*), das übrigens auch schon längst in der gebildeten Sprache gebräuchlich ist. Eben so falsch wird „aufschreiben" bisweilen durch *horje pisać* übersetzt, was aber „aufwärts, nach oben zu schreiben" bedeutet (z.B. in krummen Linien); „aufschreiben" heißt einfach *napisać*. Ähnlich verhält es sich mit dem Ausdrucke „ein Buch herausgeben", den man durch *knihu won dać* übersetzt hat. Letzteres besagt nämlich nicht „ein Buch herausgeben", sondern „ein Buch hinausgeben, hinausreichen" (z.B. zum Fenster hinaus); jenes muß durch *knihu wudać* ausgedrückt werden.

In rejecting the syntagm *horje pisać* i and prescribing in its place *napisać* P as the correct USo verb corresponding to German *aufschreiben* 'to write down,' Pful appears in uncharacteristic fashion to have ignored the question of aspect (cf. his proposal of *nadpanyć* P/*nadpadować* i for German *auffallen* 'to

occur, become obvious to' and of *knihu wudać* P for *knihu won dać* P 'to publish a book' [German *ein Buch herausgeben*]). While the collocation *horje pisać* consists of an imperfective verb that can convey actions in the continuous present, the verb *napisać,* being perfective, cannot convey actions in continuous timeframes. Moreover, conscious comparisons with German notwithstanding, the verb *napisać* functions within the USo verb system proper as a prefixally derived perfective aspectual partner to the basic imperfective verb *pisać* 'to write,' with which, *ipso facto,* it is lexically synonymous. In other words, the USo prefix *na-* in conjunction with the basic verb *pisać* is, as in many other Slavic languages, lexically empty and serves to form a perfective counterpart to it (cf. Russian *pisat'* I/*napisat'* P, Bulgarian *piša* I/*napiša* P, Czech *psát* I/ *napsat* P, etc.), although in conjunction with other verb stems this same prefix may carry additional lexical meaning and thereby serve to derive verbs that stand as distinct lexical items. Under German influence, however, and as commentary from USo-speaking informants confirms, the prefix *na-* has become lexicalized even in this instance, so that *napisać* has acquired, in addition to its original meaning 'to write' (German 'schreiben'), the meanings 'to write down, to note' (German 'aufschreiben') and 'to ascribe, "to chalk up," to charge (to)' (German 'an-schreiben'). The same phenomenon has occurred with a number of other prefixal perfectives, cf.:

(13) USo basic imperfective		German gloss		USo prefixal perfective		Added German meaning
čitać I	→	'lesen'	→	*přečitać* P	←	durchlesen
jěść I	→	'essen'	→	*zjěść* P	←	aufessen
pisać I	→	'schreiben'	→	*napisać* P	←	aufschreiben, anschreiben
pić I	→	'trinken'	→	*wupić* P	←	austrinken
šić I	→	'nähen'	→	*zešić* P	←	zusammennähen

While in some instances speakers of USo attempt to create by means of paraphrase imperfective counterparts to the prefixal perfectives with respect to their new German-influenced lexical meanings (e.g., *napisać* P 'aufschreiben' → *horje pisać* I, *zešić* P 'zusammennähen' → *hromadźe šić* I), such paraphrases, unlike those discussed previously (e.g., *wupadać* P 'to fall out' → *won padać* I [=†*wupadować* I]), are not sanctioned by the norms of the literary language. This is due to the fact that while the literary language tolerates the substitution of certain verbal prefixes with adverbs, it does so only with respect to their *concrete, directional* meanings (as noted previously, these are typically characterized in German by the addition of the deictic adverbs *hin-* and *her-* to the separable prefixes). Thus, while *horje pisać* is a felicitous formulation, as Pful's comments suggest (see above), in the sense of German *hinaufschreiben* 'to write upwards/towards the top,' it is an infelicitous formulation of German *aufschreiben* 'to write down, to note down,' which does not denote an action performed physically in any concrete (as opposed to figurative) direction.

An alternate solution to the formation of imperfective aspectual partners to the perfective verbs whose prefixes have been lexically reanalyzed under German influence can be seen in the suffixal derivation of some secondary imperfectives, as, for example, in the case of *twarić* i → 'bauen' → *natwarić* p ← 'aufbauen' → *natwarjeć* i.[41] However, with respect to the verbs cited in example (13), above, lexical constraints preclude the secondary derivation (however imaginable it may be in theory) of such imperfective forms as **přečitować, *zjědować, *wupiwać, *napisować,* and **zešiwać.*[42]

As a consequence of both normative constraints on the paraphrastic formation of aspectually imperfective, lexically synonymous correlates to prefixal perfective verbs and lexical constraints on the suffixal derivation of secondary imperfectives, speakers of USo have no recourse but to re-assign, so to speak, prefixal perfectives of the type illustrated in example (13), above, to the category of biaspectual or aspectually neutral verbs.[43] As far as can be determined, grammars of USo have yet to address this dilemma, although a conceivable solution would be the subsumption of these verbs under the rubric of biaspectual semantic calques (cf. *wuhladać* p 'to look out' [German 'hinaussehen, hinausblicken'] vs. *wuhladać* i/p 'to look [to have an appearance]' [German 'aussehen']), a segment of the USo verb system to which the major contemporary grammars of USo have in fact devoted some attention.[44]

VII

Underlying the foregoing examination of the temporal-aspectual ramifications of the German-influenced lexicalization of USo preverbs and, indeed, the very delimitation of that German influence itself, is the following premise, originally formulated by Hans Vogt and subsequently adopted by Uriel Weinreich:[45]

> Every enrichment or impoverishment of a system involves necessarily the reorganization of all the old distinctive oppositions of the system. To admit that a given element is simply added to the system which receives it without consequences for this system would ruin the very concept of system.

It is the conclusion of this study that, contrary to previous suggestions, the absence of verbal aspect as a grammatical category in German did not and does not lead directly to the dissolution of aspectual distinctions that is observable in the case of numerous USo verbs. The absence of verbal aspect as a grammatical category in German makes it possible, in that language, to convey as continuous certain actions which in USo are denoted by verbs formally encoded as perfective, hence non-continuous. Sorbian bilingualism generates tendencies to convey in USo, as in German, those same actions as continuous. This entails the need to create in USo imperfective verb forms, for which the necessary morphology is either absent or subject to normative or lexical constraints. Speakers of USo therefore resort to paraphrase. It has been hypothesized here that the use of paraphrase, at least to the extent that it is sanctioned

by the norms of the USo literary language, arises with the expression, in continuous timeframes, of various sublexical meanings (Aktionsarten). This then provides precedent for paraphrase in other areas of the USo verb system. Typically paraphrased are German verbs characterized by separable prefixes, which in USo find their closest syntactic parallels in directional adverbs. Normative constraints on the figurative use of directional adverbs ultimately leads to the lexicalization of originally "empty preverbs." Therefore, only the potential continuous reading of German verbs formed with separable prefixes is viewed here as constituting the extent of German influence on the USo verb system. All other factors contributing to innovations in the presumably original, "Slavic" character of the USo verb system are here considered intralinguistic. Indeed, in some instances such innovations may not be traceable to German influence at all (e.g., the analytic formation of the future tense of perfective verbs owing to the homonymy of non-past and preterite 3rd-person singular forms in two of the four productive verb classes as well as to the inherent ambiguity of non-past forms of perfective verbs with respect to future and habitually present time).

Notes

1 Some examples of West Slavic syntactic and semantic phenomena attributed to German influence are: competition in Czech between the verbs *nechat* and *dát* in constructions of the type *dát (~nechat) si ušít šaty* 'to have a dress made for oneself' (German 'sich ein Kleid machen lassen': see Bohuslav Havránek, "Die sprachlichen Beziehungen zwischen dem Tschechischen und Deutschen" in B. Havránek and R. Fischer, eds., *Deutsch-tschechische Beziehungen im Bereich der Sprache und Kultur. Abhandlungen der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig,* Philologisch-historische Klasse 57:2 [Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1965], 18); aspectually unpaired phraseological calques in Czech of the type *přijít o život* 'to die' (German 'ums Leben kommen'), *vyznat se v něčem* 'to be well-versed in something' (German 'sich in etwas auskennen': see Charles E. Townsend, *Czech through Russian* [Columbus, Ohio: Slavica, 1981], 7); the aspectual neutrality of numerous prefixed verbs in Upper Sorbian (see Hinc ãewc-Schuster, *Gramatika hornjoserbskeje rěče.* 1: *Fonologija, fonetika a morfologija* [Budyšin: Domowina, 1984], 175, and Helmut Faßke, *Grammatik der obersorbischen Schriftsprache der Gegenwart. Morphologie* [Bautzen: Domowina, 1981], 184); and the "modal passive" semantics and aspectual neutrality of the reflexive constructions *dać się, dát se, dać so* + infinitive in Polish, Czech, and Upper Sorbian, resp., corresponding to German *sich lassen* + infinitive constructions (for discussion and references, see Gary H. Toops, "Causativity in Czech: The Verbs *dá[va]t* and *nech[áv]at,*" *Canadian Slavonic Papers / Revue canadienne des slavistes,* 34:1-2 [Edmonton, 1992], 42).

2 See, for example, Toops, "Causativity in Czech ...," and Gary H. Toops, "Upper Sorbian Prefixal Derivatives and the Question of German Loan Translations," *Slavic and East European Journal,* 36:1 (Tucson, 1992), 17-35.

3 Ibid.

4 See Šewc-Schuster, 8: "Formu rěče, kotruž wužiwamy w zjawnym žiwjenju, w kotrejž su naše knihi ćišćane a w kotrejž wudawamy nowiny a časopisy, mjenujemy *spisownu* rěč. ... Spisowna rěč rozeznawa so wot rěče, kotruž wužiwamy doma, na wsy, we wšědnym žiwjenju. ... Formy tuteje rěče mjenujemy *narěče* abo *dialekty.* Druhdy trjeba so za to tež pomjenowanje

ludowa rěč." ('The form of language which we use in public life, in which our books are printed, and in which we publish newspapers and magazines, we call *literary language*.... The literary language differs from the language that we use at home, in the country, in daily life.... We call forms of this language *narěče* or *dialects*. Sometimes the appellation *popular language* is also used for this.')

5 See Faßke, 253.

6 Wherever the aspect of verbs cited here is relevant to the discussion, imperfective verbs are marked by the superscript ^{i}, perfective verbs by the superscript ^{p}, and biaspectual or aspectually neutral verbs by the superscript $^{i/p}$. The symbol † before a verb designates that verb as obsolete or obsolescent in contemporary popular usage with respect to the indicated denotation.

7 See Jurij Sergeevič Maslov, *Morfologija glagol'nogo vida v sovremennom bolgarskom jazyke* (Moscow-Leningrad: Izd-vo AN SSSR, 1963), 5. Although Maslov rejects the notion of "purely aspectual" or "empty" prefixes (as does Alexander V. Isačenko, *Die russische Sprache der Gegenwart*. 1: *Formenlehre* [Halle (Saale): Max Niemeyer, 1968], 361ff.), he concedes, loc. cit., that "in isolated cases (Russian *delat' – sdelat'* and a few others), the relationships between the prefixed and non-prefixed stem approach absolute lexical identity." One of the earliest postulations of the notion (and uses of the term) "préverbe vide" is attributable to André Mazon, *Grammaire de la langue russe* (2nd, revised ed. Paris: Librairie Droz, 1945), 216-217 and 221-222.

8 Cf. Faßke, 191: "Präfigierte Verben, die eine bestimmte Aktionsart ausdrücken, sind stets perfektiv. ... Sie können nicht suffigiert und folglich auch nicht imperfektiviert werden.... Verben, die ... das Ergebnis einer Handlung, den Stand seiner Erfüllung hervorheben (*wupić, přečitać, zrubać, wopjeć*), sind deshalb von der Suffigierung ausgeschlossen." Faßke's standpoint parallels that expressed by Isačenko, 362-363, with respect to Russian perfective verbs of the type *napisat', sdelat', svarit', postroit', sygrat'*, for which suffixally derived imperfective counterparts (**napisyvat', *sdelyvat', *svarivat', *postraivat', *sygryvat'*) do not exist. Accordingly, the specific "Aktionsart" referred to here by Faßke is the "resultative Aktionsart" put forth by Isačenko, 361ff. Cf. Note 10, below.

9 See Jouko Lindstedt, *On the Semantics of Tense and Aspect in Bulgarian* (Helsinki: University of Helskinki Press, 1985), 122-126. Exact USo correspondences to Lindstedt's notions of "continuous present," "continuous present in the past," and "continuous present in the future" were put forth years earlier by Frido Michałk, "Über den Aspekt in der obersorbischen Volkssprache," *Zeitschrift für Slawistik*, 4:2 (Berlin, 1959), 243 – "konkretes Präsens," "konkretes Präteritum," and "konkretes Futurum," resp. Although Faßke's notion of "aktuelle Gegenwart" is more narrowly circumscribed that Michałk's "konkretes Präsens" (see Faßke, 254-255), Faßke nevertheless advances the relevance of Michałk's conceptual trichotomy to the instantiation of the imperfective aspect in USo (see Faßke, 180, 261, and 267).

10 Cf. Faßke, 184. According to Lindstedt, 125, "[t]he difference between the continuous and habitual present (or imperfect, or future) is to a certain extent blurred by the existence of statives, i.e., verbs denoting states." He concludes, however, that in sentences of the type *I love you*, the verbs are "[m]ainly continuous" (Lindstedt, 126). Thus, USo provides affirmation of Lindstedt's intuitive correlation of the imperfective aspect with both the continuous present and enduring states.

11 See Viktor Vladimirovič Vinogradov, *Russkij jazyk. Grammatičeskoe učenie o slove* (Moscow-Leningrad: Nauka, 1947), 487: "[T]he basic exponent of the perfective aspect is the indication of an action limit. ... Result is a particular manifestation of an action's limit. ... The designation of result is one of the basic meanings of the perfective aspect, though not the only one" (thus cited in Gary H. Toops, *An Analysis of Prefixal Perfectivization in Contemporary Standard Russian* [M.A. thesis: University of British Columbia, 1979], 9).

12 According to Maslov, the instantiability of a given (Bulgarian or Russian) verb in response to the question *Čto èto ty delaeš'?* 'What is it that you're doing [right now]?' is one of the basic

"syntactic criteria" for identifying that verb as aspectually imperfective. See Maslov, 24-26. Note that in the case of *namakać* and other perfective verbs, the specific interpretation of the "non-past" tense form – future or habitual/frequentative present – is, in the literary language, contextually determined; cf. sentences of the type "W hornjoserbskich narěčach a w staršej spisownej rěči *namakamy* druhdy słowne dublety ..." 'In the Upper Sorbian dialects and in the older literary language we sometimes *find* [less likely: "we *will* sometimes *find*"] lexical doublets. ...' See Šewc-Schuster, 169.

13 Jan Arnošt Smoleŕ [Jan Ernst Schmaler], *Die Schmähschrift des Schmiedemeisters Stosch gegen die sprachwissenschaftlichen Wenden* (Bautzen: Schmaler + Pech, 1868).

14 Ibid., 12.

15 Ibid., 12ff. Prefixation of the determinate verb of motion *hić* (*-ńć*) 'to go (on foot)' and possibly others as well (e.g., *jěć* 'to go [by vehicle]') had apparently ceased long before to yield perfective verb forms, at least in the Bautzen dialect. Thirty-eight years earlier, Handrij Zejleŕ (Andreas Seiler), in his *Kurzgefaßte Grammatik der Sorben-Wendischen Sprache nach dem Budissiner Dialekte* (Budissin: K.A.F. Weiler, 1830), 85-86, had treated such prefixed verbs of motion ("§. 124. Die Composita von *hicź*") as imperfective verbs, cf.: "*sajndu* oder *sahdu*" 'ich vergehe,' "*budu - dźesch &c. sajncź* oder *sahcź*" 'ich werde verg[ehen].' Moreover, despite the fact that the preterite-tense forms of *zańć* ("*sajncź*") that Zejleŕ cited exhibited perfective ("aorist") desinences ("*sajndźech, sajndźe, sajndźe* ..."), he nevertheless labelled the paradigm "Imperfectum."

16 Lev Vladimirovič Ščerba, *diplomnaja rabota*, as cited by Michałk, 241.

17 Lev Vladimirovič Ščerba, *Vostočnolužickoe narěčie* (*Zapiski Istoriko-filologičeskago fakul'teta Imperatorskago Petrogradskago Universiteta*, čast' 128. Petrograd": A. È. Kollins", 1915 [Photomechanic reprint: *Der ostniedersorbische Dialekt*, with foreword by H. Schuster-Šewc (Bautzen: Domowina, 1973)]), vii-viii and XVII-XIX.

18 Ibid., 121.

19 Ibid., 121-122. Unlike USo, LSo dialects resemble Russian in exhibiting only one indicative past-tense form, consisting of the historical "*l*-participle" with or without present-tense forms of the auxiliary verb 'to be.'

20 Calques – whether they be morphological calques ("loan translations"), semantic calques, or phraseological calques – constitute the primary exception to this rule (see Toops, "Causativity in Czech ...," and Toops, "Upper Sorbian Prefixal Derivatives ...").

21 The modern USo literary equivalents to the cited verbs are *(roz)wjazał*, *(při)bił*, and *(pře)činił*, resp.

22 See Charles E. Townsend, *Russian Word Formation* (Corrected reprint. Cambridge, Mass.: Slavica, 1975), 118-122.

23 The notion of "lexico-semantic subsumption" as a factor prompting the occurrence of a particular prefix for the formation of a perfective "aspectual partner" to a basic imperfective verb is discussed in Toops, *An Analysis of Prefixal Perfectivization* ..., 6-7 and 63-66. See also N.S. Avilova, *Vid glagola i semantika glagol'nogo vida* (Moscow: Nauka, 1976), 155 and 219-226.

24 Michałk, op. cit.

25 Ibid., 242; English translation, aspect marking, and explanatory notes mine – GHT.

26 Ibid., 245-246.

27 See Hinc Šewc, *Gramatika hornjoserbskeje rěče*. 1: *Fonematika a morfologija* (Budyšin: Domowina, 1968), 3 and 263.

28 At least since the end of the World War II, no one has been aware of the existence of any unilingual Sorbian speakers. All Sorbs today are either bilingual Sorbian/German (approximately 60%) or unilingual German (in terms of active language skills). See Lea Bendias, "Domowina, organization of the Sorbs, marks 75th anniversary," *Panorama DDR: Artikel, Kommentare*, 7 VII 23/1.0:2 (Washington, D.C., 1987), 5, and H. Schuster-Šewc, "Die Förderung des Sorbischen in der DDR," *Zeitschrift für Slawistik*, 34:4 (Berlin, 1989), 571.

29 See Šewc, *Gramatika hornjoserbskeje rěče* ..., 192-195.

30 Ibid., 190; English glosses mine – GHT.

31 In example (4a), Michałk's informant initially resorts to secondary imperfectivization to render German *anbraten*. However, since the informant then suggests the basic imperfective verb *pjec*, and since **popječować* is not cited even in Filip Jakubaš's *Hornjoserbsko-němski słownik/ Obersorbisch-deutsches Wörterbuch* (Bautzen: Domowina, 1954) – which provides secondary imperfectives for virtually all prefixed perfective verbs even when such verb forms are only theoretically imaginable, – it is more than likely that **popječować* represents a spur-of-the-moment, artificial verb formation by the informant in question.

32 This phenomenon is also described by Šewc-Schuster, *Gramatika hornjoserbskeje rěče* ..., 179: "W zwisku z reimperfektiwaciju (tworjenjom sekundarnych imperfektiwnych werbow) wobkedźbujemy w hornjoserbšćinje sylny wliw němskeje rěče, kiž wobsteji w tym, zo zastupuja so wosebje w ludowej rěči sekundarne imperfektiwne werby často přez wotpowědne němske přełožki (kalki), přir. přikłady kaž *wubiwać = won bić, wustorkować = won storkać, wotpadować = preč padać* atd." ('In connection with reimperfectivization [the formation of secondary imperfective verbs] we observe in Upper Sorbian the strong influence of the German language, which consists in the fact that, particularly in the popular language, secondary imperfective verbs are often replaced by their corresponding German translations (calques), cf. examples like *won bić* for *wubiwać*, *won storkać* for *wustorkować*, *preč padać* for *wotpadować*, etc.')

33 Angela Stachowa, "Dótknjenje"/"Die Berührung," reprinted in Kito Lorenc, ed., *Serbska čitanka / Sorbisches Lesebuch* (Lipsk/Leipzig: Philipp Reclam jun., 1980), 596-618. The passages cited here appear on pp. 597, 601, 602, and 605, resp.

34 Note that, as witnessed by the passage cited as example (9)(d), the imperfective derivative *wotchadźeć* 'to leave, depart, go away' (German 'weggehen') survives, but in one of the most "literary" of verb forms, the present active participle ("z *wotchadźacymi* ludźimi").

35 Verb forms denoting iterativity/distributivity are not to be confused with the small number of frequentatives which USo, like Czech, forms from imperfective verbs by means of stem suffixation. While Šewc-Schuster, *Gramatika hornjoserbskeje rěče* ..., 192, cites five such verbs (*měwać* 'to have,' *bywać* 'to be,' *směwać so* 'to laugh,' *lěhać* 'to lie [be recumbent],' and *sydać* 'to sit'), Faßke, in contrast, states: "Zu dieser Gruppe gehören *nur drei* Verbpaare sedźeć – sydać, ležeć – lěhać, klečeć – klakać" (Faßke, 103; emphasis added; *klečeć – klakać* 'to kneel').

36 Even in this figurative meaning, the verb *wuńć* may be used biaspectually; see Šewc-Schuster, *Gramatika hornjoserbskeje rěče* ..., 195: "*Wuńdu/wuchadźam* ze slědowaceho stejišča" 'I take as my point of departure the following position' (German 'Ich gehe vom folgenden Standpunkt aus').

37 Šewc, *Gramatika hornjoserbskeje rěče* ..., 185.

38 Konstantin Konstantinovič Trofimovič [Trofimowič], *Hornjoserbsko-ruski słownik / Verxnelužicko-russkij slovar'* (Budyšin-Moscow: Domowina-Russkij jazyk, 1974), 493.

39 The homophony (or, homonymy) of perfective preterite and non-past tense forms in two of the four productive verb classes may have also contributed to the obsolescence of the preterite and its replacement by analytic perfect-tense forms in all but the southern USo dialects (see Šewc, *Gramatika hornjoserbskeje rěče* ..., 178). According to Werner Kōnig, *dtv-Atlas zur deutschen Sprache* (5th ed. Munich: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag, 1983), 163, for example, a similar development took place in Upper (southern) German dialects, where as a result of apocope present- and preterite-tense verb forms became homophonous and the preterite was supplanted by the analytic perfect tense (e.g., *er lebte* 'he lived' → *er lebt*', homophonous with *er lebt* 'he lives').

40 Křesćan Bohuwěr Pful [Christian Traugott Pfuhl], *Łužiski serbski słownik / Lausitzisch wendisches Wörterbuch* (Budissin: Schmaler + Pech, 1866 [Photomechanic reprint (Bautzen: Domowina, 1968)]), xxv.

41 Cf. Šewc-Schuster, *Gramatika hornjoserbskeje rěče* ..., 177.

42 Although Jakubaš cites secondary imperfective forms for many of these prefixal perfectives (e.g., *napisować* ^{i} [← *napisać* ^{p}], *zešiwać* ^{i} [← *zešić* ^{p}], *wupiwać* ^{i} [← *wupić* ^{p}], *zjědować* ^{i} [← *zjěść* ^{p}], etc.), it is clear from their total absence in the most recent of German-USo dictionaries that these forms are purely artificial; see Helmut Jenč [Jentsch], Frido Michałk [Siegfried Michalk], and Irena Šěrakowa [Irene Šěrak], comps., *Deutsch-obersorbisches Wörterbuch / Němsko-hornjoserbski słownik* (2 vols. Bautzen: Domowina, 1989 and 1991). While, as has been previously noted, perfective verbs with lexically "empty" prefixes do not usually lend themselves to secondary imperfectivization, some secondary imperfectives do occur nevertheless: cf. Russian *čitat'* ^{i} 'to read' → *pročitat'* ^{p} → *pročityvat'* ^{i} and *est'* ^{i} 'to eat' → s"*est'* ^{p} → *s"edat'* ^{i}. However, the salient feature of such secondary imperfectives is the fact that they cannot convey actions in the continuous present (this holds true as well of all secondary imperfectives in Bulgarian, whose derivation is subject to absolutely no lexical constraints). For USo, therefore, such imperfective verb forms would fulfill no practical function aside from possibly disambiguating verbs with respect to future and habitual present tense readings (see Note 12, above).

43 Of all the present author's USo-speaking informants, only the oldest, born in 1922, proposed *horje pisać* as a translation of German *aufschreiben* 'to write down' in the following sentence: *Twoju adresu nětko horje pisam* 'Ich schreibe deine Adresse jetzt auf' ('I am now writing down your address,' in response to the question "What are you doing right now?"). However, she quickly "corrected" herself and re-translated the German sentence as *Twoju adresu nětko napisam*. It is the present author's impression that Sorbian grammarians have concerned themselves more with preserving the distinction between concrete and figurative meanings of spatial and directional adverbs than with preserving the distinction between the perfective and imperfective aspects of verbs.

44 See Šewc, *Gramatika hornjoserbskeje rěče* ..., 185 and 191; Faßke, 176 and 184; Šewc-Schuster, *Gramatika hornjoserbskeje rěče* ..., 175. For discussion and analysis of these treatments, see Toops, "Upper Sorbian Prefixal Derivatives. ..."

45 Uriel Weinreich, *Languages in Contact. Findings and Problems* (The Hague: Mouton, 1964), 1.