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Abstract. This article presents a comparative analysis of three interrelated phenomena: the use of imperfective verbs in sequences of events in Czech, Slovak, Sorbian, Slovene, and BCS; the use of po- delimitatives in sequences of events in East Slavic, Polish, and Bulgarian; the semantic nature of the prefix po- in the individual Slavic languages. The use of imperfective verbs in sequences of events in the western languages and the use of po- delimitatives in the eastern languages are two alternative ways of aspectually coding atelic predicates in narratives. The article makes two main arguments in this connection. The first is that the use of imperfective verbs in sequences of events in the western languages has been retained (and perhaps strengthened) due to German language contact, whereas the use of po- delimitatives for such atelic predicates represents an innovation in those languages that did not undergo significant amounts of such German language contact. The second is that the lack of the development of po- into an important perfectivizing prefix in the western languages is likewise due in part to German language contact, as po- was at various times used to calque German be- in its surface-contact and transitive meanings as well as ver- in its meaning of change of state; such calques contributed to the stabilization of po- as a lexical prefix in the western languages. The retarding effect of German language contact on the western languages whereby imperfective verbs remained acceptable in sequences of events, and po- did not become a major perfectivizing prefix, is analyzed as the result of a process of “replica preservation,” as opposed to the more commonly discussed process of “replica change” described by Heine and Kuteva (2005).
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1. **Background: The East–West Aspect Division, the Contextually Conditioned Imperfective Past, and Delimitative po-**

This paper discusses differences in the role that the prefix po- has played in the grammaticalization of aspect in the individual Slavic languages, and suggests that German language contact has played a role in the divergent developments. The background for this analysis is the EAST–WEST ASPECT DIVISION established by Dickey (2000), which divides Slavic aspectual systems into two types: an eastern type (Rus, Ukr, Blr, and Blg) and a western type (Cz, Slk, Sln, and Sor).\(^1\) (At the time of research and writing I had no access to Macedonian informants; however, Kamphuis 2007 demonstrates that Mac patterns with the eastern type for almost all of the parameters.) Pol and BCS are transitional zones between these two groups; they differ in that Pol patterns somewhat closer to the east, whereas BCS closer to the west. The meaning of the pf aspect in the western group is the familiar notion of TOTALITY, while the meaning of the pf in the eastern group is a concept labeled TEMPORAL DEFINITENESS (following Leinonen 1982; a similar and largely compatible account of Rus aspect is given by Zel’dovič 2002), which, in the simplest terms, adds a condition of sequentiality to the use of the pf aspect in those languages.

The current east–west aspect division is the result of innovations that have occurred in the eastern languages (and to an extent in Pol, as it tends to pattern with them), most of which have occurred or intensi-

---

\(^1\) The following abbreviations are used in this discussion:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BCS</th>
<th>Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian</th>
<th>Impf</th>
<th>Imperfective</th>
<th>Pol</th>
<th>Polish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blg</td>
<td>Bulgarian</td>
<td>Lat</td>
<td>Latin</td>
<td>Rus</td>
<td>Russian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blr</td>
<td>Belarusian</td>
<td>LSor</td>
<td>Lower Sorbian</td>
<td>Slk</td>
<td>Slovak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ComSl</td>
<td>Common Slavic</td>
<td>Mac</td>
<td>Macedonian</td>
<td>Sln</td>
<td>Slovene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cro</td>
<td>Croatian</td>
<td>OCS</td>
<td>Old Church Slavic</td>
<td>Sor</td>
<td>Sorbian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cz</td>
<td>Czech</td>
<td>OCz</td>
<td>Old Czech</td>
<td>Ukr</td>
<td>Ukrainian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ger</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>ORus</td>
<td>Old Russian</td>
<td>USor</td>
<td>Upper Sorbian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gk</td>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>Pf</td>
<td>Perfective</td>
<td>VoM</td>
<td>verb of motion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The superscripts \(^p\) and \(^l\) are used in examples to designate pf and impf verbs, respectively, and the superscripts \(^{pp}\) and \(^{il}\) designate proto-pf and proto-impf verbs, respectively, in examples from older languages in order to avoid making strong claims about the aspectual status of such verbs.
fied since the seventeenth century (cf. Dickey 2000: 282–87). These innovations in eastern Slavic aspect include the following: (i) a reduction in the ability of the pf aspect to express habitual events; (ii) the loss of the pf aspect from the narrative present and running commentaries (including stage directions); (iii) the restriction of the expression of sequences of events to the pf aspect; (iv) the development of the general-factual function of the impf; (v) the restriction of the productive derivation of verbal nouns to impf verbs. As these innovations have generally been absent or weaker in the western languages, the western languages represent a more archaic aspectual system. The reasons for the changes in the eastern group are very difficult to pin down, but two developments that appear to have had an impact may be mentioned briefly. The first is the early loss of the imperfect and aorist tenses as well as the connected early loss of the auxiliary in East Slavic, which is assumed to have resulted in a transfer of the functions expressed by the older tenses to the derivational pf–impf opposition (cf. Forsyth 1972). The loss of the old synthetic tenses occurred later in West Slavic, which appears to be one reason why aspect in the western languages never underwent many of these changes or underwent them only to a lesser degree. Note also that Blg and Mac never lost the old synthetic tenses and have retained the perfect as a functional tense; this retention corresponds to a lower degree of usage of the impf in its general-factual functions as well as in negation in these languages. The second development is the pairing of iti ‘go’ with poiti ‘PO-go’ as an aspectual pair in the languages of the eastern group and Pol by the seventeenth century, which correlates precisely with the productivity of po- delimitatives in the modern languages, and with the general restriction of the

---

2 Blg aspectual usage corresponds very closely to Russian where the non-actual present is concerned, i.e., it strongly prefers the impf aspect for habitual events, the narrative present, running instructions (e.g., stage directions), and performative utterances. It does deviate from East Slavic in that it regularly employs the pf imperfect for sequenced habitual events in the past, thus allowing the pf aspect for habitual events in the past unlike East Slavic (cf. Barentsen 2009). I do not consider this a significant difference, as the use of the pf imperfect nevertheless obeys the overall eastern principle of limiting the use of the pf aspect to contexts of sequentiality. The Blg and Mac perfect tenses are often employed with a general-factual function, regardless of the derivational aspect of the verb, so that the category of the impf general-factual is most developed in East Slavic, which accordingly represents the center of the eastern aspectual type. The aspectual differences between Rus and Blg, which I have recently addressed in an as yet unpublished paper, cannot be discussed in detail here.
pf to contexts of sequentiality. Unfortunately, the details of these two events and their precise relationship to the development of the eastern aspectual type cannot by discussed in detail here.

For the present discussion, the third innovation is of primary concern: the eastern languages (Rus is taken as representative) have increasingly required that sequences of events be expressed by pf verbs, which is shown in the Cz and Rus equivalents in ex. (1–2).

(1) a. Zvedl se tedy a šel k východu. [Cz; Ivančev (1961: 11)]
   b. Potom on vstal i pošel k východu. [Rus; = (1a)]
      ‘Then he got up and went toward the exit.’

(2) a. Sdel si a psal.
   b. On sel i *pisal/stal pisat’. [Rus; = (2a)]
      ‘He sat down and wrote/started writing.’

Ivančev (1961) terms the impf usage exemplified in (1a) and (2a) the “contextually conditioned ingressive use of the imperfective aspect” (hereinafter CCIP). In Rus equivalents of the Cz CCIP a pf verb is almost always required, either a pf phase verb (e.g., stat’ ‘start’, načat’ ‘begin’), an ingressive procedural pf verb prefixed with za- (e.g., za-igrat’ ‘start to play’), or some other kind of pf verb. (Note again that Kamphuis 2007: 31–35 demonstrates that Mac patterns with the eastern type for the CCIP.)

As this discussion is ultimately about the east–west aspect division, a slight revision of Ivančev’s and Dickey’s conclusions is necessary before proceeding. Ivančev (1961: 48) suggests that the CCIP is less frequent in Sln than in Cz and considers Sln the beginning of a transitional zone between Cz-Slk-Sor on the one hand and East Slavic and Blg on the other (and I follow his opinion). While this may be the case, it should be pointed out that the CCIP is not difficult to find in Sln. Consider the following examples from Dickey (2003: 204):

---

3 In my view, ingressivity is not itself a core semantic component of the western use of the impf in sequences of events (for details, see the remarks in Dickey 2000: 205 and the references cited there), and thus I term it the CCIP, i.e., the “contextually-conditioned imperfective past.”
(3)  a. S. K. je s prednjim delom tovornega vozila trčil\textsuperscript{p} ob deklico. Otrok je zato pada\textsuperscript{p}. Vozilo je ponosrečenko potiskalo\textsuperscript{t} še nekaj metrov. Medtem je vozilo s S. K. za volanom poškodovalo\textsuperscript{p} še tri vozila na parkirnem prostoru.  

[Sln; Novice]  

‘S. K. ran into the girl with the front end of the vehicle. The child then fell. The vehicle pushed the unfortunate victim a few more meters. While doing so the vehicle, with S. K. at the wheel, damaged three more vehicles in the parking lot.’

b. Ulegel\textsuperscript{t} sem se na tla in poslušal\textsuperscript{t} vrtenje sveta. Premišljali\textsuperscript{i} sem, ali naj vpijem: Stoj!  

[Sln; ZŽ: 105]  

‘I lay down on the ground and listened to the world turning. I wondered whether I should shout: Stop!’

Further, Ivančev (1961: 47) suggests that the CCIP occurs much more rarely in BCS than in Cz, giving no BCS examples. However, the CCIP is easy to find in contemporary Cro (and it can be found in the prose of writers from Bosnia and Serbia as well):

(4)  a. Prema izjavama očevdaca, nepoznati čovjek, za kojeg se pretpostavlja da je vlasnik psa, u srijedu ga je zakvačio\textsuperscript{p} za kuku dizalice na gradilištu, a dizaličar Slavko Šaponja zatim ga je podigao\textsuperscript{p} u zrak i mlatarao\textsuperscript{p} njegovim bespomoćnim tijelom dok ga nije usmratio\textsuperscript{p}.  

[Cro; Jutarnji list]  

‘According to the statements of witnesses, on Wednesday an unknown man, who is assumed to be the dog’s owner, hung it on the hook of a crane at a construction site, and the crane operator Slavko Šaponja then lifted it into the air and swung its helpless body about until it was dead.’

b. Sjela\textsuperscript{t} je na moj krevet i glasno jecala\textsuperscript{t}.  

[Cro; C: 88]  

‘She sat down on my bed and sobbed loudly.’

c. Na prvoj stanici izašla\textsuperscript{p} sam van. Hodala\textsuperscript{t} sam do ugla i onda skrenula\textsuperscript{p} desno.  

[Cro; C: 110]  

‘At the first stop I went outside. I walked to the corner and then turned right.’
Though Ivančev’s view that the CCIP is less common in Sln and BCS is basically correct, the CCIP is far from being foreign to these languages, and thus typologically Sln and BCS should be considered to be very close to the Cz-Slk-Sor pole with regard to this aspectual parameter. Apart from an apparent higher frequency of the CCIP in Cz than in Sln or BCS, a crucial difference lies in the fact that, as Berger (2009b) observes, telic events in Cz may be coded in the impf past with a specific “retarding” effect; such usage is absent in Sln and BCS, where the CCIP occurs almost exclusively with atelic predicates. Note that the CCIP is not characteristic of standard Pol, which in this respect patterns with the eastern group.

Regarding the lack of the CCIP in the eastern group, we may say that it correlates with the presence of certain kinds of procedural verbs in these languages, primarily ingressive verbs in za- and delimitative verbs in po-. For a discussion of ingressive in za- and the CCIP, see Dickey (2000: 222–29) and the references cited there. Dickey and Hutcheson (2003) examine the relative productivity of delimitatives in po- in the individual Slavic languages and show that po- has been much more productive as a delimitative prefix in the eastern languages and Pol than in the western languages and BCS, i.e., the languages that attest the CCIP to the highest degree. Further, I have argued (Dickey 2005) that perfectivizing po- (including delimitative “procedural” po-) has played a crucial role in determining the semantic nature of the pf aspect in Russian and the eastern languages (and to an extent in Pol), in contrast to the western languages, in which the prefix s/-z- has played an analogous role.4 According to this view, delimitatives in po- have come to perform a crucial systemic function in the aspectual systems of East Slavic (as well as Blg), as these verbs have extended the aspectual opposition to atelic predicates by allowing the regular coding of atelic activity predicates in sequences of events as pf, as in (5).

---

4 BCS, in which ComSl s9- and p0z- did not coalesce into s/-z- after the fall of the jers and which further has not developed po- as an abstract perfectivizer, is characterized as a “subsumptive” system that relies to a much greater extent on the prefixation of each individual verb with the lexically most suitable prefix and as such represents a comparatively archaic aspectual system (for details, see Dickey 2005).
(5) Gazetu vzjál', počital' i josil'.

‘He took the newspaper, read it for a while and tossed it aside.’

The relatively high degree of the productivity of po- delimitatives in Rus as well as their importance for its aspectual system is evident partly from the fact that, as discussed by Mehlig (2006), po- delimitatives are derived not only from simplex impf verbs but also from derived impf verbs when the latter are construed as homogeneous predicates (e.g., povydat’ ‘give out for a while’). In contrast, Pol, which prima facie resembles Rus based on its high number of po- delimitatives, nevertheless does not derive them from derived impf verbs to the same extent. For example, according to dictionarions Pol powydawać does not exist as a delimitative (‘give out for a while’), but only as a distributive verb (‘give out all of’). Thus, it appears that in Pol po- delimitatives are slightly more tied lexically to prototypically atelic predicates than in Rus, which allows for the derivation of a po- delimitative from almost any verb when construed as a non-stative atelic activity predicate. Farther to the west, in Cz, Slk, Sor, Sln, and BCS, po-delimitatives are not a productive class of verbs (cf. Dickey and Hutcheson 2003).5

5 It is interesting that Jungmann (1838/1989–90) gives more verbs that resemble delimitatives than do modern Cz dictionaries. However, there are problems with interpreting these attestations as evidence that in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries Cz had a productive class of po- delimitatives on a par with the eastern Slavic languages. It should be pointed out that the vast majority of such verbs are taken exclusively from Václav Rosa’s dictionary manuscript; some of these verbs seem very doubtful, e.g., poarrestowati ‘arrest for a while’. It is also possible that some of these delimitatives were artificially included in these dictionaries on the basis of Russian, which at the time served as a linguistic model in various respects for the other Slavic languages (except Polish) as they were codified during the period of national rebirth in the nineteenth century (cf. in this regard Giger’s 2008 general remarks on the topic and his discussion of the artificial extension the system of active participles in these languages). Further, it is important that only a small number of these verbs are defined as doing something ‘for a while’ (nijaký čas, eine Zeit lang), e.g., pokupčiti ‘do business for a while’ and popapanovati ‘rule for a while’, whereas most of them are defined as doing something ‘a little’ (drobet, ein wenig), e.g., popruskati ‘snap a little’ and pösiti ‘tease a little’. It is unclear whether such verbs are to be considered genuine delimitative verbs profiling the indefinite duration of an action in time as opposed to attenuative verbs that profile a small amount of action in terms of its intensity, result, or trajectory in space. Lacking convincing evidence that they were indeed delimitatives and given the
To sum up, in a given Slavic language there is a correlation between the requirement that events in sequence be coded as pf and the productivity of delimitative *po-*, on the one hand, and the presence of the CCIP and the lack of productive delimitative *po-*, on the other. In other words, in addition to the obvious inverse correlation between the existence of the CCIP and the requirement for the pf aspect in sequences of events, there is also an inverse correlation between the CCIP and productive delimitative *po-* in an individual Slavic language. These correlations can be seen in Rus and Cz versions of the same text: where Rus has a delimitative in a sequence of events performed by a single agent, Cz tends to employ the CCIP. This is shown in the following examples:

(6)  

a. Vernulsja" Mark, svežij, vynul" iz sakvojaža odekolon, 
proterjsja", leg" na divan, povoročalsja", ustraiyjas’  
poudobnee, snjal" očki i blizoruko poiskal", kuda ix položit'.  

[Ru; DA: 29]  
b. Mark se vrátil"  umyt’, svéži, vyndal" z kufru kolínskou,  
natrel’ se, lehl" si na pohovku, chvili se vrtel’, než násel"  
pohodlou polou, sundal" si brýle a krátkozrce hledal’,  
  kam by je položil.  
[Cz; = (6a); DAu: 17]  
‘Mark returned, freshly washed, took out some cologne from 
his travel bag, rubbed it in his face, lay down on the couch,  
shifted a little, getting himself into a more comfortable 
position, took off his glasses and shortsightedly looked  
around a little for somewhere to put them.’

(7)  

a. V koridore poslyšalos’ xlopanie dveri, golosa, D’jakov s  
kem-to razgovarival, potom vernulsja", neukluže stupaja v  
svoix česankax, prikryl" dver’, sel’ za stol, porylsja" v jaščike,  
vystačil’ tonen’kuju papku — v nej ležali’ listki prošlogo  
doprosa, — potom poiskal’ ešče čto-to i tak, prodolžal’  
ryt’ija v jaščike i ne gljadj na Sašu, sprosil’:  
— Tak, Pankratov, čto vy segodnja skažete?  
[Rus; DA: 145]  

productivity of non-delimitative attenuative verbs in *po-* in modern Cz, I will consider  
them attenuatives as opposed to delimitatives.
(7) b. V chodbě se ozvalo bouchání dveří, hlasy, Djakov s ně kým mluvil, pak se přišroubal a zpátky ve svých filcáčkách, zavřel dveře, sedl si ke stolu, chvili se hrabal v zásuvce, vytáhl tenké desky — ležely v nich zápisy minulého výslechu, pak ještě chvili něco hledal a při tom přehrávání v šuplíku, aniž se na Sašu podíval, řekl:
„Tak, Pankratove, copak mi povíte dneska?”
[Cz; = (7a); DAu: 148]

‘In the corridor one could hear a door slam, voices, Djakov was talking with someone, then he returned, stepping awkwardly in his felt boots, all but closed the door, sat down at the desk, rummaged a while in one of the drawers, pulled out a thin folder — it contained the transcripts of the last interrogation, looked for something else a while, and so, continuing to rummage in the drawer and not looking at Sasha, asked:
“So, Pankratov, what do you have to say today?”

(8) a. — Gitler — ěto voyna, — otevitl Budagin.
Stalin poumolčal, potom prošel:
— U nego est’ čem vovat’?
[Rus; DA: 174]
b. „Hitler znamená válku,” odpověděl Budagin.
Stalin chvili mlčel, pak se otázal:
„Má čím válčit?”
[Cz; = (8a); DAu: 180]

“Hitler means war,” answered Budagin.
Stalin was silent for a while and then asked:
“Does he have anything to fight with?”

The data in examples (6–8) are taken from a Rus original and a Cz translation, but similar pairs of examples are found in Rus translations of Cz originals, as shown in (9) and (10).
(9) a. „Tak...“ uvízlə v rozpacích, „mislím... měl! Ty pře víš...“
Mlčel, nepřijemně zaskrčen otázku. Nečekal ji. Jako by ho
polila studenou vodou. Položil se opět naznak, zadával se
utrpňě do stropu. Proč se na to ptá? Váhal, ale nakonec
přiznal prostě a nerad.
„Ne.“ [Cz; RJT: 63]
“Yes...” she said, stopping still with embarrassment, “I
think... you have! You know too much...”
He was silent, unpleasantly struck by the question. He had
not expected it. It was as if she had doused him with cold
water. He leaned on his back again, stared up bitterly at the
ceiling. Why was she asking about this?
He hesitated, but finally admitted simply and unhappily.
“No.”

b. — Da... — Èster sovsem rasterjalas'. — Ja ob èetom...
Pavel pomohl', neprijatno poražený voprosom. On ne
ožidal ego. Slovno xolodnoj vodoj obili. On uprjamo
ustavilsja v potolok. Zapinalas', priznalsja prosto i neoxotno:
— Net.' [= (9a); Rus; RDZT: 56]
“Yes...” Èster completely lost her nerve. “I [meant] about
that...”
Pavel was silent for a bit, unpleasantly caught off guard by
the question. He was not expecting it. It was as if she had
doused him with cold water. He stared up stubbornly at the
ceiling. Hemming and hawing, he admitted simply and
unwillingly: “No.”

(10) a. „No tak, no tak, holka, uklidni se,“ plácala ji pětatřicátncí
po zádech. [Cz; VNR: 15]

b. — Nu ladno, ladno, uspokojsja, devuška, — poxlopala ee
po spine tridcatiletnejá. [= (10a); Rus; VNP: 16]
“It's all right, it’s all right, girl, calm down,” the thirty-five
year old woman [said and] patted her on the back.‘

The modern Rus pattern of usage shown in exx. (6–10) differs
markedly from ORus, which allowed (proto) impf verbs (in both the
aorist and imperfect) in sequences of events like Cz (cf. (1–2) above):
(11) a. Olgá s’j synom’ Sviatoslavom’ sšbra\(^{(p)}\) voj mnogý i xrabry, 
i ide\(^{(p)}\) na Derevšskuju zemlju. [ORus; BLDR 1: 108]

‘Ol’ga with her son Sviatoslav collected soldiers many and 
brave, and went to Derevlian land.’

b. On’ že izyde\(^{(p)}\) izъ grada s’j uzdoju i xožaše\(^{(i)}\) skvozě 
pečenęgyi, glagolja: «Ne vidě li konja niktož?» 
[ORus; BLDR 1: 114]

‘He went out from the town with a bridle and walked 
through the Pecheneg camp, saying: “Has no one seen a 
horse?”’

c. I ubiša Sviatoslava, i vzjaša glavu ego, i vo lbě ego zdělaša\(^{(p)}\) 
čašju, okovavše\(^{(p)}\) lobē ego, i pyjaxu\(^{(i)}\) v nemt… 
[ORus; BLDR 1: 122]

‘And he killed Sviatoslav, and took his head, and made a 
cup out of his cranium, and having plated his skull with 
iron, and they drank from it…’

d. I pride\(^{(p)}\) Jaropolka nadv opь i plakasja\(^{(i)}\), i reče\(^{(p)}\) 
Svěngeldu: «Věž, iže ty sego xotjaše».

[ORus: BLDR 1: 122]

‘And Jaropolk came (and stood) over him and wept, and 
said to Sven’geld: “Look, for you wished this”.’

Such ORus usage generally predates the rise of productive delimitative 
po- (which began in the seventeenth century; cf. Dickey 2007) and 
the rise of productive ingessive za- (which likewise occurred in the 
seventeenth century; cf. Böttger 2004). It should be pointed out that 
such usage is attested in older stages of all Slavic languages; cf. the 
following OCS and OCz examples:

(12) a. i šděšye strjaše tšmničuji · poěše\(^{(p)}\) s[ve]taja i vedoša\(^{(i)}\) kl 
knežu. [OCS; Supr: 184]

‘And the prison guards went, took the two saints and led 
them to the prince.’
(12) b. togda ostavi ego dièvol' i se andeli pristöpiše\(^{(p)}\) i *sloužaaxö\(^{(i)}\) emou.
   ‘Then the devil left him and behold the angels came and
   served him.’

c. Jakz to král český vztvědě\(^{(p)}\), k dvoru *jide\(^{(i)}\).
   ‘As soon as the Czech king learned that, he went to the
   court.’

d. Bratr jeho jë\(^{(p)}\) së jemu zaviděti i *mysléše\(^{(i)}\), kako by mohl
   zemi obdržeti.
   ‘His brother started to envy him and thought about how he
   might get the land.’

(Koschmieder (1934/1987: 172) gives examples for Old Pol.) Thus, there
is little reason to doubt that the CCIP existed in ComSl. The verbs that
are attested in the CCIP in the older languages are VoM, *verba dicendi,*
or verbs expressing atelic activity predicates that tended not to form
aspectual pairs. Note that while the aorist is attested more frequently
in the CCIP than is the imperfect, there is no difference in meaning as
far as I can tell.

This paper argues that Ger language contact has contributed to the
development of the east–west aspect division by affecting the aspectual
coding of sequences of events in the western languages. In particular,
it is argued that extensive Ger language contact has been an
important factor both in the retention (and in some cases develop-
ment) of the archaic usage of impf verbs in sequences of events by the
western languages and also in the failure of the western languages to
develop a productive delimitative sense of *po-* . The following sections
address these issues in turn.

2. German Linguistic Interference in Slavic

A considerable, if scattered, body of literature has accumulated on the
effects of Ger linguistic interference in western Slavic languages and
dialects with regard to various lexical and grammatical phenomena
(cf., e.g., Schuchardt 1884/1971, Reiter 1953, Weiss 1987a and 1987b,
Heine and Kuteva 2005 also include German-Slavic data in their general linguistic discussions). Despite these and other studies, which can be very thorough, to my knowledge no comprehensive, organized picture of recurrent types of Ger linguistic interference in the western Slavic languages has emerged. Reindl (2005) provides a detailed overview of Sln, and Berger (2008) gives a useful discussion of some important cases claimed for Cz. Bayer (2006) has recently made an important effort in this respect, investigating various cases of Ger linguistic interference in the lexicon and grammatical subsystems of USor and LSor, Carinthian Sln, and Burgenland Cro. Bayer’s investigation is indispensable, though it does not include Cz or Slk.

Before considering the possibility of a connection between Ger linguistic interference and the western CCIP on the one hand and prefixation with po- in the eastern languages on the other, it is worthwhile to illustrate briefly a few recognized types of Ger lexical interference in western Slavic.7

(13) a. Loanwords such as Cz recht ‘right’ (< Ger Recht), USor handel ‘business’ (< Ger Handel), Slv tvořit ‘thousand’ (< Ger Tausend), and Cro cajti ‘time’ (< Ger Zeit); cf., e.g., Bielfeldt 1933, Strieder-Temps 1958 and 1963, and Newerkla 2004;

b. Calques of various kinds, such as Cz odškodnit ‘compensate’ (< Ger entschädigen), USor sobudac ‘give sth. to smb. to take along’ (< Ger mitgeben), Slv zastopiti ‘represent’ (< Ger vertreten), BCS preostati ‘remain’ (< Ger verbleiben); cf. Unbecaun 1932 and Reiter 1953;

c. Calques of Ger separable prefixes, such as USor won přině ‘come out’ (< Ger heraushommen), LSor wen pesi ‘idem’, Burgenland Cro van dojti ‘idem’, and Carinthian Sln ven pipati ‘pull out’ (< Ger herausziehen), which are also attested

---

6 For a considerable list of older sources on this topic, see Lötzsch 1970: 14–15, fn. 5.
7 I should stress that although this discussion is limited to considering Ger language contact, this is not meant to exclude the possibility of Romance interference in some of the cases mentioned, either via direct borrowing from Lat, or Romance adstrate transfer (the latter only in Sln and BCS). Note also that Lat has in many cases almost certainly exerted lexical influence on western Slavic indirectly via Ger, and that it is difficult in many cases to determine whether morphological calques are based on Ger or Lat, as Havránek (1965: 17) points out for Cz.
to a limited degree in Cz, as in *držet dohromady* ‘hold together’ (< Ger *zusammenhalten*); cf., e.g., Reiter 1953 and Bayer 2006: 171–245.

Such widespread lexical phenomena indicate a borrowing situation as opposed to a shift situation (cf. Thomason and Kaufman 1988: 37–40). In addition, various instances of structural interference such as the partial or even full development of medial demonstrative pronouns in *t*- into definite articles in Cz, Sor, Sln, and Burgenland Cro (cf., e.g., Lötzsch 1970, Berger 1993, and Bayer 2006: 95–161)\(^8\) indicate that the German interference in the western Slavic languages is at level 3 of Thomason and Kaufman’s (1988: 74–75) scale, i.e., an intense contact situation resulting in intense lexical and moderate structural borrowing.\(^9\)

The calquing of prefixed verbs, exemplified in (13b), is of potential significance for the verbal systems of these languages; in particular, the calquing of separable prefixes exemplified in (13c) indicates an

---

\(^8\) Note that Blg, Mac, and north Rus dialects have developed postposed medial demonstrative pronouns in *t*- into definite articles (Blg, Mac) or grammemes very similar to definite articles (north Rus dialects). Such similar linguistic structures are a result of the universal tendency for demonstrative pronouns to develop into definite articles, but given the morphosyntactic difference of postposition, they do not bear directly on the issue of German linguistic interference in western Slavic. It is further important to avoid an either–or approach to cases of linguistic interference. For example, it is true that it is a universal tendency for demonstrative pronouns to develop into definite articles, but this fact does not mean that German language contact did not play a role in facilitating such development in the neighboring Slavic languages (cf. Berger 2008).

\(^9\) The view that the western Slavic languages stood in an intense borrowing relationship with German makes sense given the centuries-long bilingualism that characterized the western periphery of Slavic territory (cf. Skála 1964 for Cz), cf. Thomason and Kaufman 1988: 37. However, there has been more to the contacts between Germans and western Slavs. Schuchardt (1884/1971: 40, 46) describes Cz-Ger and Ger-Sln creoles in parts of Bohemia/Moravia and Slovenia in the nineteenth century. It also appears that in Bohemia at least the Germans who had settled in the towns there as part of the Ostkolonisation (‘Settlement in the East’) in the thirteenth century were Slavicized in the fourteenth, which may have involved a shift situation (cf. Berger 2009a: 137). Otherwise the Ostkolonisation also took place in Poland, where many of those Germans also assimilated to the local population in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries (cf. Wünsch 2008: 26), and large numbers of Germans were settled in Slavonia in the eighteenth century (cf. Dragićević 2005: 86). The fate of such settlements may also have involved some substratum transfer, depending on the amount of bilingualism present in the populations, but this issue cannot be taken up here.
even greater possibility of systemic effects of Ger linguistic interference on the verbal systems of Sor, Sln, and Cz, which have relied heavily on prefixation for the expression of actional distinctions throughout their development. The tendency to develop medial demonstrative pronouns in t- into definite articles, regardless of whether the process has resulted in complete grammaticalization (as in USor) or not (as in Cz), indicates the possibility of significant effects in the system of nominal referentiality in the western Slavic languages. Another case of likely Ger linguistic interference in the verbal systems of the western group is the existence of possessive perfects (resembling fully grammaticalized have-perfects, albeit ordinarily with participle-object agreement), e.g., Cz Měl jsi otevřené okno? ‘Have you opened the window?’ and Sln Si inel okno odprto? ‘idem’. Bayer (2006: 289–91) gives examples for USor, LSor, Carinthian Sln, and Burgenland Cro. Thus, Ger linguistic interference could very well have affected the development of some grammatical subsystems of the western Slavic languages.

Given the cases of apparent Ger linguistic interference in western Slavic verbal systems, it is also possible that Ger contact has affected the development of western Slavic aspectual systems as well. The issue is to identify concrete cases of probable or possible interference. Breu (2005) discusses the unusual (for Slavic languages) usage of morphologically “pf” verbs in colloquial USor to express telic situations in process as a case of Ger interference, cf. ex. (14).

(14) a. Dyš jo so wón róčil, jo wón widžal, zo jen policist mu jen štrafctel pisa. [Colloquial USor; Breu 2005: 62]
   ‘As he was returning/When he returned, he saw that a policeman was writing him a ticket.’

b. Wón jo započal rošklasć. [Colloquial USor; Breu 2005: 62]
   ‘He began to explain.’

As Breu points out, ex. (14a) is ambiguous, and can be interpreted as expressing either a processual or a synoptic (i.e., total) construal, because the “pf” verb expresses only the telic nature of the predicate. Though Breu does not discuss in detail the mechanism of the linguistic interference involved, it basically amounts to the Sorbs adopting Ger usage of telic verbs to express telic situations in process (in these cases
zu**rückkommen** ‘return’ and **erklären** ‘explain’, respectively) with their own erstwhile pf verbs.

The spread of the functional domain of USor pf verbs to include telic situations in process examined by Breu (2005) is typical of cases of linguistic interference discussed in the literature, which involve contact-induced change, i.e., a language acquiring some new use pattern or grammatical category due to language contact. As such, the USor expansion of the functional domain of pf verbs from the synoptic construal of a telic situation to include the processual construal of a telic situation can be easily viewed as a case of replica change in terms of Heine and Kuteva (2005). Their model of replica change is a formalized representation of language change through contact, whereby in some language R in contact with another language M that has a model grammatical structure Mx, speakers of R create an equivalent structure Rx from a structure Ry that it already possesses based on similarities between Ry and Mx and eventually also grammaticalize Ry to Rx (cf. Heine and Kuteva 2005: 40–41, 81). In the case of USor creating a terminativity category from its perfectivity category, R = USor, M = Ger, Mx = terminativity, Rx = terminativity, and Ry = perfectivity. I would assume that the similarity crucial for this development in USor is basically that between USor prefixed pf verbs and Ger prefixed telic verbs.10

As most other Slavic languages are not in a situation of “complete language contact” with Ger and have not undergone such a development, it is useful to sketch a model of replica grammaticalization in a family of closely related languages. This is given in (15) on the next page. In this model a related language B², i.e., a “control” language where no contact occurs, does not undergo the changes that occur in

---

10 Heine and Kuteva consistently distinguish between the replication of use patterns, which usually involves a language developing a minor use pattern of some structure into a major one, and replica grammaticalization of a category; cf., e.g., Heine and Kuteva 2005: 74–75. It is irrelevant for this discussion how the expansion of the functional domain of pf verbs in colloquial USor actually proceeded, i.e., whether speakers were acting on a perceived grammatical category as such or merely replicating Ger use patterns, and in the latter case, if and when USor had a minor use pattern in which “pf” verbs expressed telic events in process. For the discussion of the CCIP in section 3, we will be concerned with the replication of use patterns as opposed to grammaticalization per se.
(15) Heine’s and Kuteva’s (2005) Model of Contact-Induced Grammatical Change in Closely Related Languages

B\textsuperscript{1}, and this produces a grammatical difference between the two genetically related languages. If we fill in the variables with the values given above, this model offers a picture of how aspect in USor (B\textsuperscript{1}) changed relative to aspect in Rus (B\textsuperscript{2}).\textsuperscript{11} As Heine and Kuteva (2005: 33) point out, the comparison of closely related languages is particularly useful in identifying probable cases of contact-induced transfer.

The only other discussion of which I am aware considering Ger linguistic interference in Slavic aspect usage is by Ivančev (1961: 65–70), who attributes the modern Cz CCIP to the effects of Ger language contact. However, unlike the development of the colloquial USor pf aspect into a terminativity category, there is little reason to doubt that the CCIP already existed in older stages of Slavic. Thus, it is less than clear that the current CCIP is a case of contact-induced change. The next section considers this issue in detail.

\textsuperscript{11} Note that for the sake of argument the preceding discussion implies a considerable simplification of the similarities and differences between the USor and Rus aspeclual systems, but these need not concern us here.
3. The CCIP and German Language Contact

Of interest here is the fact that Ger allows most kinds of verbs, simplex or prefixed, to occur in sequences of events in a manner resembling the Slavic CCIP. Not only does Ger not require a phase verb such as *anfangen* ‘begin’ in such contexts, it often exhibits a preference for a bare past-tense verb, as discussed by Ivančev (1961: 70, 113). Consider the following Ger equivalents of exx. (1–4, 6–8) above.12

(16) a. Er stand auf und **ging** zum Ausgang. [Ger; = (1a)]
b. Er setzte sich und **schrieb**. [Ger; = (2a)]
c. Das Fahrzeug **schleifte** das unglückliche Opfer einige Meter **mit**. [Ger; = (3a)]
d. Ich legte mich auf den Boden und **horchte**, wie sich die Welt dreht. [Ger; = (3b)]
e. Sie setzte sich auf mein Bett und **schluchzte** laut. [Ger; = (4b)]
f. Ich **ging** zur Ecke und wandte mich nach rechts. [Ger; = (4c)]
g. Mark kam zurück... legte sich aufs Sofa, **drehte** sich **mehrfach** hin und her... nahm die Brille ab und kurzsichtig **wie er jetzt war**, **suchte** er, wohin er sie legen konnte. [Ger; = (6)]
h. ... D’jakov unterhielt sich mit (irgend)jemandem, dann kam er zurück... setzte sich an den Tisch, **wühlte** in der Schublade... dann **suchte** er noch etwas... [Ger; = (7)]
i. ... antwortete Budjagin. Stalin **schwieg** eine Weile, und dann fragte... [Ger; = (8)]

The Ger equivalents given in (16) match the past-tense usage of *impf* verbs in the Cz, Sln, and BCS examples in (1–4, 6–8),13 as opposed to the Russian equivalents containing *pf* phase verbs (1–2) or *po- delimitatives* (6–8). Thus, in such sequences of events there is a clear corre-
tion between Ger verbal usage and that of the western Slavic languages, as opposed to the requirement for pf ingressive phase verbs and procedurals in Rus. The Ger usage itself is nothing remarkable, as most Indo-European languages do not have Russian-style restrictions on the linguistic coding of predicates in sequences of events (cf., in this regard, Ivančev 1961: 68–70, fn. 4). What is significant is the clear correlation between the Ger and western Slavic usage as opposed to Rus usage, given that the western Slavic languages have undergone a considerable degree of Ger linguistic interference, as discussed in the previous section.

The correspondence between western Slavic and Ger appears to be even closer if one considers the behavior of stative activity verbs in Slavic with regard to event sequencing. Both Ger and the western Slavic languages allow stative activity predicates such ‘lie’ to occur in combination with the adverb ‘suddenly’, which always entails a sequence of events, cf. the following examples:

(17) a. Jídlo, co tu měl, najednou leželo¹ na dlaždičkách, kde se smíšilo se zbytky teplého piva a sklenice se rozletěla na tisíc kousků.
   [Cz]
   
   b. Das Essen, das er hatte, lag plötzlich auf den Fliesen, wo es sich mit den Resten des warmen Biers vermischte, und das Glas zersprang in tausend Stücke.
   [Ger]
   ‘The food that he had had there was suddenly lying on the tiles, where it mixed with the remnants of warm beer and the glass had flown apart into a thousand pieces.’
   
   c. Eda, kotoraja u nego byla, vdrug okazalas” na kafeł’nom polu, gde ona smesalas’ s ostatkami teplogo piva, a stakan razbilja vdrrebezi.
   [Rus]
   ‘The food that he had had there suddenly ended up on the tiles, where it mixed with the remnants of warm beer and the glass had flown apart into a thousand pieces.’

(18) a. Nenadoma sem ležal¹ kot razmočena vreče na vlažnem pesku.
   [Sln]

   b. Odjednom sam ležao¹ poput mokre vreće na vlažnom pijesku.
   [Cro]
(18)  c.  *Plötzlich lag* ich wie ein nasser Sack im feuchten Sand.  [Ger]
‘Suddenly I was lying like a wet sack in the moist sand.’

d.  I *vdrug okazalos*, čto ja ležu kak mokryj mešok na vlažnom peske.  [Rus]
‘Suddenly it turned out that I was lying like a wet sack in the moist sand.’

As shown in (17c) and (18d), Rus does not generally allow stative activity verbs such as *ležat* ‘lie’ in this context, but requires a pf verb.\(^14\)

Given the correspondence between western Slavic languages and Ger usage as opposed to Rus usage, we are justified in hypothesizing, as Ivančev (1961) does, that Ger contact has been involved in some way. However, in my view, Ivančev’s particular account needs to be reconsidered. He considers the CCIP in Cz, Slk, and Sor (i.e., western Slavic) to be a case of contact-induced change, but such a conclusion is at the very least subject to debate, because the CCIP is attested in older stages of all Slavic languages, as pointed out in section 1. In light of this fact, Ivančev’s view that the CCIP is the product of contact-induced change may seem incomprehensible, so let us review his precise hypothesis of the development of the CCIP in Slavic (cf. Ivančev 1961: 65–70): (i) The CCIP was a ComSl phenomenon, i.e., ComSl, with only a nascent aspectual system, allowed proto-impf verbs in sequences of events. (ii) The similarity of the CCIP in OCS and OCz to the structures of the Gk and Lat originals cannot be taken to mean that they were replicating a non-ComSl structure on the basis of Gk and Lat contact; rather, such contact merely reinforced the CCIP in OCS and OCz. (iii) OCz was in the process of “aspectualizing” its determinate VoM in a manner reminiscent of ORus, i.e., by developing the use of VoM prefixed with *po-*, as specifically *ingressive* pf correlates of the simplex determinate VoM in sequences of events. (Ivančev suggests that OCz and ORus occupied some “intermediate position” in the development of aspect and the elimination of the CCIP between OCS and ComSl and the modern eastern languages.) (iv) Ger and Lat linguistic interference

\(^{14}\) I am grateful to Hans Robert Mehlig for initially making me aware of the difference between Rus and Ger with regard to stative activity verbs in sequences of events. An anonymous reviewer points out that this difference has been noted in the literature by Roganova (1961) and Andersson (1972: 64).
brought Cz/Skl/Sor back to the original ComSl state of affairs, i.e., Ger and Lat linguistic interference not only brought about the retention of the CCIP, but actually had the effect of eliminating ingressive perfectivizing po- in determinate VoM.

Thus, on the basis of examples such as those in (19), Ivančev assumes that OCz was characterized by an aspectual system that included specifically ingressive determinate VoM prefixed with po-.

(19) a. (Jidáš) přebyl moře, země, řeky, bera sē k Jerusalemiu, odňádž poďél przedpočítávání v tuže zemiu, gdež Herodeš byl čáti zbaven.  
[OCz; Ivančev 1961: 62]

‘(Judas) crossed seas, lands, rivers, taking himself to Jerusalem, whence he went off to the land where Herod had been stripped of honor.’

b. Tehdy on vstav, pogide za témi.  
[OCz; Ivančev 1961: 62]

‘Then he, having arisen, went off after them.’

In other words, he assumes that OCz pojići ‘PO-go’ was an ingressive pf VoM paired with jiti ‘go’. While this assumption may not seem problematic at first blush, I consider it unwarranted for several reasons. First, the integration of unprefixed determinate VoM into aspectual pair relationships as impf verbs (cf., e.g., the pairing of ORus iti ‘go’ with poiti ‘PO-go’) occurred relatively late in Slavic aspectual systems, as pointed out by van Wijk (1929: 246) and Bunina (1959: 32). Likewise, Strekalova (1968) compares Pol translations of the Bible and finds that unprefixed determinate VoM (e.g., gdydz ‘go’) occurring in sequences of events began to be replaced by prefixed correlates (including those prefixed with po-, e.g., pogydz ‘PO-go’) only in the sixteenth century, and by the end of that century the process was not yet complete. Ivančev (1961: 62–63), on the other hand, sees in the attested uses of OCz determinate VoM prefixed with po- in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries a more or less fully developed aspectual system, in which jiti ‘go’ and pojići ‘PO-go’ were aspectually paired (and the latter had ingressive value) in a manner approximating modern Rus idi/pojiti ‘go’. Similarly, Bondarko (1961), investigating the history of Cz impf future-tense forms of determinate VoM prefixed in po- (an issue which should be addressed in a complete analysis of the matter at hand) adduces similar examples and asserts that in the fourteenth cen-
tury OCz determinate VoM prefixed with po- were “perfective” and expressed “ingressive actions” (535). The idea that OCz developed po-as a (non-spatial) ingressive perfectivizer earlier than other Slavic languages and then subsequently lost it due to Ger linguistic interference defies belief, especially when the CCIP is frequent in the oldest OCz texts.

Second, Ivančev and Bondarko do not in my view adequately consider the exact nature of attestations of determinate VoM prefixed with po- in OCz (as well as ORus and OCS). Though examples such as those in (17) may superficially resemble Rus ingressive pošel’ ‘went’, many of the attested examples of determinate VoM prefixed with po- in ORus and OCz may be interpreted as evidence that such verbs had a primarily spatial meaning, profiling the initial path of the trajectory in space as opposed to its initial phases in time. Consider the following ORus examples with their modern Rus translations, in which modern Rus ingressive pojti’ ‘go’ is avoided.

(20) a. Ottuda poide\(^{(p)}\) vnižь и, prišedь, vzja Ljubečь, i posadi mužь svojь. [ORus; BLDR 1: 76]

b. Ottuda otravilsja\(^{p}\) vnižь, i pridja, vzjal Ljubečь, i takže posadil mužа svoego. [MRus; BLDR 1: 77]

‘From there he set off southward and, when he arrived, took Ljubeč, and installed his man there.’

(21) a. I poidosta\(^{(p)}\) po Dьнепру, iduče mimo i uzrěsta na gorě gorodokь. [ORus; BLDR 1: 76]

b. I otravilis\(^{p}\) po Dнепru, i kogda plyli mimo, to uвидели на gore nebolʹsoj gorod. [MRus; BLDR 1: 77]

‘And the two of them set off along the Dnepr, and passing by they saw on the hill a small town.’

(22) a. Ona že, vsědši v kubaru, cělovavši uniky svoě s plačemь, poide\(^{(p)}\) čresь more. [ORus; BLDR 1: 156]

\(^{15}\) Note also that the SJS includes among the definitions it gives for OCS poiti\(^{(p)}\) the specifically ablative ‘go away’.
(22) b. Ona že sela na korabl’, poproščalas’ s bližnimi svoimi s plačem i otravilas” čerrez more. [MRus; BLDR 1: 157]

‘And she, having boarded the boat, having kissed her family with tears, set off across the sea.’

In (20) the phrase ottuda ‘from there’, in contexts of physical motion, provides the context with a focus on the source of the trajectory, which motivates ORus spatial ablative/path poiti(p); note that modern Rus ingressive poiti” ‘go’ almost never cooccurs with ottuda,16 which is why the modern Rus translator chose the explicitly ablative otravit’sja ‘set off’. In (21–22) the path component in the context also focuses on the initial spatial trajectory, and the translator again chose ablative otravit’sja. It is important to note also that early ORus poiti” ‘PO-go’ occurs with goal phrases much less frequently than does iti” ‘go’.

Another particularly illustrative case is given in (23):

(23) Is togo že lėsa potečet” Volga na vjstk i vjteč sedmjisjdesjat’ žerel’ v more Xvalijskoj.

[ORus; BLDR 1: 66]

‘From that same wood the Volga flows off toward the east and flows into the Caspian Sea through seventy estuaries.’

This ORus example of what I have termed “directional perfectives” (cf. Dickey 2003) makes much more sense if we interpret the verb as being spatially ablative/path as opposed to ingressive, which would profile the beginning of the action of flowing in time. Note also the spatial source phrase is togo že lėsa ‘from that same wood’; modern Rus poteč” ‘flow [ingressive]’, like other Rus pf verbs, cannot be used in such geographic descriptions.

This analysis of the meaning of ORus determinate VoM prefixed with po- follows my earlier work on the subject (Dickey 2007), according to which these verbs had a prominent ablative sense due to the in-

---

16 Alina Israeli (p.c.) confirms this judgment and comments that source phrases occur infrequently with modern Rus poiti” ‘go’ in its VoM function, which ordinarily combines with a path or goal phrase. Similarly, modern Blg determinate VoM prefixed with po- do not ordinarily combine with source phrases, cf., e.g., Povele go (’ot kūštata) kām krāčnata ‘He led him (from the house) to the tavern’ and Toj ponese xlabu (’ot furnata) kām kūštata ‘He took the bread (from the bakery) to the house’.
herent focus of \( iti^{(i)} \) ‘go’ on the source of a motion event, as do \( go \)-verbs in general (cf. Radden 1988: 283–83), in combination with the profile of the path of the motion expressed by ORus \( po- \); the resulting profile always includes some initial portion of the path.\(^{17}\) This is why ORus \( poti^{(p)} \) ‘go, set off’ very frequently cooccurs with some explicit path reference, even when it has a sense of ‘setting out’ (cf., e.g., 19a, 20a, 21a, 22a). As I have suggested before (Dickey 2007: 338), it is important to understand that the spatial ablativity expressed by determinate VoM prefixed with \( po- \) coincides to a large extent with the temporal ingressive involved in the motion events expressed by these verbs. The essence of these verbs at a given point in time is not to be formulated in exclusive terms. Rather, it is a matter of determining what the profile base of such verbs was at a given time in history: either the domain of space or that of time. Given the ability of such verbs to combine with source phrases in early ORus, I consider ORus determinate VoM prefixed with \( po- \) to have originally been spatially ablative/path verbs, in which around the sixteenth century the prefix \( po- \) became increasingly bleached of its original spatial content to the point where these verbs became ingressive verbs and pf partner verbs of their unprefixed determinate VoM correlates. Note again that this view comports with what we know about Slavic prefixation in general—prefixes start out with spatial meanings and eventually acquire temporal and abstract ones.

To sum up, there is no clear evidence that early ORus determinative VoM in \( po- \) were pf ingressive verbs anywhere near on a par with their descendants in modern Rus, contrary to the assumptions of Ivančev (1961) and others, e.g., Růžička (1957). Rather, they profiled the path of the motion, with a natural focus on the initial portion. Thus, there is no reason to assume that ORus early on had already developed an aspectual system for its VoM resembling that of the modern language.

The same basic state of affairs is evident in OCz determinate VoM in \( po- \), contrary to the claims of Ivančev (1961) and Bondarko (1961) concerning the pairedness of \( jiti^{(i)} \) ‘go’ and \( pojiti^{(p)} \) ‘PO-go’. Consider again (19a) as well as the following examples:

\(^{17}\) Note that this is essentially a spatial version of the temporal meaning for modern Rus \( pojiš^p \) ‘go’ developed by Shull (2003).
(24) a. A **ottad pojide**\(^{(p)}\) proti vzchodu slunce k hoře Bethel [...]  
    [OCz; BD 3: 37]
    ‘And from there he went off toward the east to Mount Bethel...’

b. Item nejprve jsme **pojeli**\(^{(p)}\) **od potoka** [...]  
    [OCz; Ivančev 1961: 133]
    ‘Then we at first rode off from the stream...’

c. [lidé] **z toho domku pobiezechu**\(^{(p)}\)  
    [OCz; Ivančev 1961: 134]
    ‘[people] fled/ran away from that little house.’

In (19a) and (24) we see OCz determinate VoM prefixed with **po-** occurring with spatial source phrases, just as in ORus. Note also the variation between the Dresden Bible (14th century; 25a) and the Kořečký Bible (15th century; 25b):

(25) a. A **odjed**\(^{(p)}\) **odtud** malecko, vzrzie Yacuba [...]  
    [OCz; BD 1: 136]
    ‘And **having gone off** a little from there, he saw Jacob...’

b. A **pojed**\(^{(p)}\) **odtud** malicko vzrzie Jakuba [...]  
    [OCz; Ivančev 1961: 133]
    ‘And *having gone off* a little from there, he saw Jacob...’

In this case the context is clearly ablative, regardless of the prefix used in a given version. It is possible that the Kořečký Bible version profiles spatial attenuativity with regard to the amount of path covered (a common function of **po-** in modern Cz, cf., e.g., **pophit**\(^{(p)}\) ‘go a short distance farther’), in combination with ablativity.

It is important to point out that OCz determinate VoM in **po-** very frequently cooccur with path phrases, as in ORus, which is exemplified in (26).

(26) [...] a když [vojsko] **po mostu pojide**\(^{(p)}\), most sè s nimi propade.  
    [OCz; DC 83, 44–5]
    ‘... and when [the troops] set off on the bridge, the bridge collapsed with them.’
Note also that the main metaphorical meanings of OCz pojiti\textsuperscript{(p)} ‘PO-gō’, i.e., ‘originate’ and ‘die’, have source focus.\textsuperscript{18} These facts point to an originally ablative spatial meaning for this verb.

On the basis of evidence of the kind presented above, I conclude that, as in ORus, OCz determinate VoM prefixed with po- were not specifically ingestive but profiled the path of the motion and thereby focused on the source of the trajectory, i.e., they had prominent ablative senses.\textsuperscript{19} This is also evidenced by the metaphorical meanings of these verbs in OCz. Thus, OCz did not, as Ivančev (1961) and Bondarko (1961) suggest, dispose of an aspectualized system of VoM akin to that in modern Rus, but resembled other older Slavic languages in this regard. This in turn means that Ger language contact did not eliminate an already existing native Slavic aspectual system in OCz. The effects of Ger language contact must have been of a different nature.

In this respect, it should also be reiterated that although Ivančev (1961) includes only a few examples of the CCIP in OCz that are not VoM, the CCIP is attested in OCz with other kinds of verbs. This is shown in example (12d) repeated here as (27a), as well as in (27b–c):

\textsuperscript{18} In this respect the latter meaning is to be compared with English depart in its meaning of ‘die’; note also that while in modern Cz pojiti\textsuperscript{p} ‘die’ is used only for animals, in OCz pojiti\textsuperscript{p} ‘idem’ was used for humans as well.

\textsuperscript{19} An issue that cannot be addressed in detail here is why OCS attests so few determinate VoM prefixed with po-, and so few occurrences of pojiti\textsuperscript{p} ‘PO-gō’ in particular. Ivančev (1961: 65 and the references cited there) assumes that this is because OCS represents a stage in Slavic preceding the advent of determinate VoM prefixed in po- as ingestive pf correlates of their unprefixed source verbs. While the absence of determinate VoM prefixed in po- in OCS is puzzling, it should also be pointed out that the only aorist example of OCS pojiti\textsuperscript{p} ‘PO-gō’ cited by Dostál (1954: 283) translates Gk ἀπῆκλ ‘went’ (with the bleached ablative prefix ἀπ-) with ἀπῆρχετο ‘departed’ as a variant. Though Dostál (284) does not discuss in detail the meaning of OCS pojiti\textsuperscript{p} ‘PO-gō’, he points out that he does not consider it a post-OCS innovation, and considers the 35 attestations of pojiti\textsuperscript{p} ‘PO-gō’ in the Codex Zographensis, Psalterium Sinaiticum, Glagolita Clozianus, and Codex Suprasliensis to be an indication that pojiti\textsuperscript{p} ‘PO-gō’ was in normal use. Note also that Dostál (285) observes that OCS powsent\textsuperscript{p} occurs to translate Gk ablative ἀπάγω ‘lead away’. Thus, the meager OCS data are not necessarily at odds with the hypothesis presented here. Further investigation is necessary to determine exactly why there are relatively few attestations of these verbs in OCS.
(27) a. Bratr jeho jě(p) sě jemu záviděti i mysléš(p), jako by mohl 
zemí obdržěti. [OCz; DC 32, 14] 
‘His brother started to envy him and thought about how he 
might get the land.’

b. Protoz wzgyde(p) giezyff na horu a tu jedyeff(i) s fzymi 
vczednyki. [OCz; BD 1: 308] 
‘Jesus went up on the mountain and there he sat with his 
disciples.’

c. I poče(p) Tristram velikú žežieň jmieti i káza(i) sobě dáti pitie. 
[OCz; T: 126] 
‘And Tristan began to have great thirst and ordered that he 
be given drink.’

It is unclear what the precise restrictions were on verbs other than 
VoM in the CCIP in OCz. But inasmuch as the OCz CCIP was not 
limited to determinate VoM, the case for the contact-induced disappear-
ance from OCz of determinate VoM in po- is weakened, as the prefixed 
 pf correlates of the verbs in (27b–c) above did not disappear as well.

Let us now attempt to construct a model of linguistic interference 
that would cause Cz and the other western languages to retain the 
CCIP. The effects of language contact are usually conceptualized in 
terms of contact-induced change, as in Heine and Kuteva’s (2005) theory 
of replica change outlined above. I suggest, however, that the continued 
existence of the CCIP in western Slavic is a case of what I will 
term replica preservation: the western Slavic languages have retained 
the CCIP inasmuch as it resembled a model pattern of usage in Ger. 
This makes sense, for if there has been sufficient Ger language contact 
to motivate the creation of innovative western Slavic structures based 
on Ger models, then there must have been sufficient contact to ensure 
that existing patterns of usage that matched Ger usage patterns would 
be preserved. In the eastern languages, which were not exposed to Ger 
(and Lat) contact to any significant degree, the CCIP was largely 
eliminated in the course of the development of their aspectual systems 
(cf. again Dickey 2000: 282–87). To account for this kind of contact-in-
duced preservation, we may recast the model of contact-induced rep-
lica change among closely related languages in (15) to give a model of
contact-induced replica preservation among closely related languages, shown in (28). In this model, it is the “control” language $B^2$ that undergoes some change, whereas the related language $B^1$ retains the older use pattern and grammatical category as a result of language contact.

In my view, the importance of replica preservation cannot be overemphasized. If linguistic interference has commonly been considered only in connection with change, the reason is simply, as Brian Joseph commented at the conference presentation of this paper, that historically dialectology has been concerned with innovations in dialects that make them stand apart as opposed to those structures that remained unchanged and common to all. The result has been that scholars understandably have been far more interested in contact-induced change than contact-induced preservation. However, as far as I can tell, there is no reason to assume that the effect of linguistic interference is exclusively change; on the contrary, we should in principle expect to find
as many cases of replica preservation as we do cases of replica change.\textsuperscript{20}

As far as the CCIP in western Slavic is concerned, it is possible that some amount of “change” in the sense of the expansion of the CCIP was involved, as modern Cz appears to employ a wider variety of verbs in the CCIP than OCz (and modern Sln and BCS). But it is again difficult to ascertain whether this expansion was induced by language contact or not. It is also possible that Ger model usage patterns were influential for individual verbs. For example, proto-impf kāza ‘ordered’ occurs frequently in the Tristram epic, often where one finds hīz ‘idem’ in the Middle High Ger original. But kāza ‘ordered’ also occurs frequently in original OCz texts such as the Dalimil Chronicle, so that the evidence is not conclusive in this particular case either. It is also possible that the impression of an increase in the CCIP in Cz is the result of a lack of texts of a more colloquial nature. In view of these uncertainties, it seems reasonable to assume that the primary factor resulting in the preservation of the CCIP in Cz and the other western Slavic languages was contact-induced preservation with Ger (and Lat) serving as the model language(s).

Unsolved by the above hypothesis of replica preservation, according to which OCz poji\textsuperscript{i}(p) was a spatial ablative/path verb, is the issue of why it disappeared as an independent verb, as well as why and how its conjugated present/future-tense forms and imperative forms remained in use and eventually became the future tense and imperative of an innovative suppletive paradigm of modern Cz jiti\textsuperscript{i} (cf., e.g., Kopečný 1962: 46–50; mutatis mutandis for the other OCz determinate VoM prefixed with po-), as well as for the equivalent VoM in Sor and Slk. This question cannot be addressed in detail here, and in my view it bears only indirectly on the question of the retention of the CCIP in western Slavic. Note that according to Dostál (1954) and the entry for OCS poiti\textsuperscript{i}(p) in the SJS, the present/future-tense forms and imperative forms of poiti\textsuperscript{i}(p) fulfilled this function for iti\textsuperscript{i}(i) in OCS (and similar examples can be found in ORUs as well). Thus, determinate VoM prefixed in po- also functioned in this manner in older stages of Slavic in which they existed with full paradigms. Here I can only speculate that the disappearance of OCz determinate VoM prefixed with po-.

\textsuperscript{20} It may be constructive to explain some aspects of linguistic convergence and Sprachbund phenomena as cases of replica preservation; this issue cannot be pursued here.
occurred in a process that was largely independent of the CCIP: as the ablative/path meaning of the prefix po- in these verbs was bleached due to the ultimate redundancy of source and path in motion verbs,\textsuperscript{21} they could either take on a new, non-spatial function (e.g., ingressivity) or disappear. Because unprefixed determinate VoM, e.g., jiti\textsuperscript{0}, continued to be used in sequences of events to express whole motion events including their onset, a possible ingressive function was redundant as well; hence, these verbs as such were lost. The present/future-tense and imperative forms were retained due to the particular properties of the future tense and the imperative mood, in which as yet unrealized motion events are naturally expressed with a focus on their onset. Unfortunately, this point cannot be argued further here.

Returning to the retention of the CCIP in western Slavic and taking up its connection to the eventual grammaticalization of po- as an ingressive and delimitative perfectivizer in eastern Slavic, we may conclude that one important reason why western Slavic po- never developed these perfectivizing roles to any significant extent was that the need for explicitly pf verbs of atelic predicates was greatly reduced, precisely because the retention of the CCIP allowed atelic verbs to occur in such sequences of events in the western languages. This situation stands in contrast to the developments in the eastern languages, where the increasing restriction of sequences of events to pf verbs was involved with the rise of productive perfectivizing delimitative po- in the seventeenth century. Inasmuch as Ger language contact was involved in the retention of the CCIP in western Slavic, it was also thereby involved in producing differences in the aspect category between the western Slavic languages and the eastern Slavic languages (where no such contact took place). Here I should add that, inasmuch as the CCIP is to be considered a syntactic construction, the hypothesis of contact-induced retention of the CCIP accords with what we already know about Ger linguistic interference in western Slavic being primarily a borrowing situation. The importation of the CCIP as a new construction, i.e., true language change, would be somewhat uncharacteristic of such a borrowing situation.

As can already be seen from the preceding discussion, the relevance of the retention of the CCIP in western Slavic for the develop-

\textsuperscript{21} Note that ablative po- still exists in non-motion verbs in Cz and the western languages cf., e.g., Cz pobrať\textsuperscript{p} ‘take away’; see section 4.
ment of the prefix \emph{po-} in those languages is a highly complex issue. This section has examined the question from the point of view of the system of aspecual usage in the western Slavic languages. The following section takes up some issues involved with the development of the meaning(s) of the prefix \emph{po-} in the western Slavic languages also with regard to a possible connection to Ger language contact.

4. Western Slavic \emph{po-} and German Language Contact

We should also examine the failure of the western Slavic languages to develop productive perfectizing/delimitative \emph{po-} with regard to the nature of this prefix in western Slavic. Though \emph{po-} does occur in a great number of verbs in these languages, it does not have the status as a perfectivizer that it has in eastern languages such as Rus (cf. section 1 above and, for a cross-Slavic comparison of \emph{po-} as a perfectivizer, see Dickey 2005: 27–32, as well as Dickey and Hutcheson 2003 for delimitative verbs). For instance, Poldauf (1954: 64) observes that Cz \emph{po-} is not currently productive as a perfectivizing prefix. According to Šlosar (1981: 128), the productivity of Cz \emph{po-} as a perfectivizer has declined since the fifteenth century. In this regard it should be pointed out that \emph{po-} occurs much more frequently in impf verbs in western Slavic languages such as Cz than in eastern languages such as Rus, cf., e.g., Cz \emph{pociťovat\slash pocitiť} ‘feel’, \emph{pokřikovat} ‘call to [s.o.]’, \emph{postrádat} ‘miss’, etc. These facts indicate that \emph{po-} has remained primarily a lexical prefix in western Slavic. One reason for its primarily lexical status in these languages is that the prefix has retained its spatial meanings to a much greater extent than in the eastern languages. The endurance of its spatial meanings has likely had several causes; this section argues that Ger language contact was a contributing factor.

Let us first consider the major meanings of the prefix \emph{po-} in the Slavic languages. As I just pointed out, \emph{po-} in western Slavic and Pol has retained its original spatial meaning of surface contact. Some examples are given in Table 1. Note that many, many more could be aduced for Cz, Slk, USor, Sln, and BCS. Such verbs do not represent a productive model at all in the eastern languages. It should be pointed out that the informants to which I have had access consider \emph{po-} in verbs such as Rus \emph{pozolotit\slash pozolotit} ‘gild’ simply to be a perfectivizer, as opposed to expressing surface-contact specifically (this comports with
Table 1. Examples of Surface-Contact po- in the Western Slavic Languages, BCS, and Pol

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cz</th>
<th>Sln</th>
<th>Slk</th>
<th>BCS</th>
<th>USor</th>
<th>Pol</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>poblinkat(^p) ‘vomit all over’</td>
<td>popeč(^p) ‘bake au gratin’</td>
<td>ponastit(^p) ‘smear fat all over’</td>
<td>pobrisat(^p) ‘wipe the surface of’</td>
<td>polodze(^c) ‘plate with iron’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>popsat(^p) ‘cover with writing’</td>
<td>popisat(^p) ‘cover with writing’</td>
<td>poprisit(^p) ‘cover with writing’</td>
<td>popisati(^p) ‘put to paper’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poprásit(^p) ‘cover with powder’</td>
<td>poplavit(^p) ‘flood’</td>
<td>pochromovat(^p) ‘chrome’</td>
<td>popločat(^p) ‘pave with cobbles’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pochromovat(^p) ‘chrome’</td>
<td>pokromat(^p) ‘chrome’</td>
<td>pochromovat(^p) ‘chrome’</td>
<td>poniklat(^p) ‘nickel’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

the views of linguists such as Voloxina and Popova (1997: 37–39) and Camus (1998: 101) that Rus po- currently has no spatial meaning.

The relative productivity of surface-contact po- in the western and eastern languages can be seen in modern terms such as ‘galvanize’: USor pocinkowač\(^\circ\)\(^p\), Sln pocinkat\(^p\)\(^p\), and BCS pocinkovati\(^p\) versus Pol ocynkowač\(^\circ\)\(^p\)/pocinkowač\(^\circ\)\(^p\), Rus ocinkovat\(^p\)\(^p\) and Ukr ocynkovaty\(^p\); note that Cz and Slk borrowed galvanisovat\(^p\)\(^p\), and galvanizovat\(^p\)\(^p\), respectively, but attest other such verbs, e.g., Cz pocinovat, Slk pocinovat, both ‘tin’, as well as Cz pochromovat\(^p\), Slk pochromovat\(^p\), both ‘chrome’. For its part, BCS has only Cro kromirati\(^p\)\(^p\) and Srb hromirati\(^p\)\(^p\), but attests other loans with surface-contact po- as in the preceding examples. In Pol, po- appears to have retained the meaning of surface contact but has also developed a productive delimitative meaning. It should be pointed out that in Pol some loan verbs expressing surface contact occur much more fre-

---

\(^22\) According to Ivanova (1966: 124), Blg po- has no spatial meaning. Šerex (1951: 292) observes that po- has no spatial meanings in Ukrainian.

\(^23\) Blg does attest pocinkovati\(^p\)\(^p\) ‘galvanize’, but given the paucity of other such surface-contact verbs, I assume that this verb was borrowed from another South Slavic language.
quent with or than po#: cf., e.g., common ocynkować ‘galvanize’ versus rarer pocynkować ‘idem’, and common ocynować ‘tin’ versus rarer pocynować ‘idem’; on the other hand, pochromować ‘chrome’ occurs much more frequently than ochromować ‘idem’. Here the transitional status of Pol between the western and eastern groups is evident.

In addition to surface-contact po-, the western Slavic languages attest various relics of po- with literal or metaphorical ablative meanings (recall section 3), as shown in Table 2.

Table 2. Remnants of Ablative po- in the Western Slavic Languages, BCS, and Pol

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Ablative po-</th>
<th>Czech</th>
<th>Sln</th>
<th>Slk</th>
<th>USor</th>
<th>BCS</th>
<th>Pol</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pocházel/pojít ‘originate, stem from’</td>
<td>poňatí/poňt ‘disappear’</td>
<td>pochadzat/pochodit ‘originate, stem from’</td>
<td>pochážet ‘originate, stem from’</td>
<td>polazití/počít ‘depart’</td>
<td>pochodzíć ‘originate’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pojít ‘die (of animals)’</td>
<td>poňatí ‘confiscate, seize’</td>
<td>pochadzat ‘originate, stem from’</td>
<td>počít ‘take away’</td>
<td>polazití ‘depart’</td>
<td>pochodzíć ‘originate’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pokrast ‘steal’ (= Ger wegstehlen)</td>
<td>pokupit ‘sa/pokupat’ sa ‘leave’</td>
<td>počít ‘take away’</td>
<td>pokupit ‘sa/pokupat’ sa ‘leave’</td>
<td>pokupit ‘sa/pokupat’ sa ‘leave’</td>
<td>pokupit ‘sa/pokupat’ sa ‘leave’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pomíný “so ‘disappear’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The retention of verbs prefixed with ablative po-, despite the loss of ComSl *poiti ‘PO-go’ as an independent VoM (in all of western Slavic except BCS, in which počít is the perfective of polazití ‘depart’), is an indication of the continued spatial nature of the prefix. The surface-contact and ablative meanings of po- can also be unified to a fair extent (a full account requires a network approach, which cannot be attempted here). Recall that, as pointed out in section 3, the

---

24 Recent internet searches produced 482,000 hits for ocynkować and 29,000 hits for ocynować, but only 197 hits for pocynkować and 2,690 hits for pocynować; pochromować yielded 32,000 hits versus only 180 for ochromować.

25 And the loss of poiti as a VoM in the western Slavic languages in the face of the retention of ablative po- in other verbs likewise indicates that the loss of ablative poiti in these languages has something to do with the combination of ablative po- and a go-verb; cf. the brief discussion in section 3.
ablative meaning of determinate VoM prefixed with po- stems from the path meaning of the prefix. The aforementioned surface-contact meaning of po- is in fact the source of the path meaning of the prefix, which is simply an application of the notion of surface-contact to a motion event. Thus, we may conclude that the meanings of the prefix po- in western Slavic are centered around a spatial meaning of surface-contact. This view is supported by the fact that distributive verbs in po-, which are highly productive in BCS, Sln, and Pol, and somewhat productive in Cz and Slk, can also be related to the surface-contact meaning of the prefix (cf. Dickey 2002: 112–13).

Parallel to the case of the CCIP discussed in section 3, there is a noticeable correlation between western Slavic (Cz is taken as representative) surface-contact po- and Ger surface-contact be-,26 as shown in Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predicate</th>
<th>Czech</th>
<th>German</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘cover with paint’</td>
<td>pomazat³</td>
<td>bestreichen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘cover with sand’</td>
<td>popískovati⁶</td>
<td>besanden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘cover with powder’</td>
<td>poprásit⁶</td>
<td>bestäuben</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘cover with dew’</td>
<td>porosit⁶</td>
<td>betauen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘cover with spray’</td>
<td>postřikat⁶</td>
<td>bespritzen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ComSl po- had this spatial meaning, as did Old High Ger be-, so that examples of equivalents can be quite old, cf., e.g., OCS pokropiti and Middle High Ger besprengen ‘sprinkle on’. It is unlikely that Ger language contact was relevant in older stages of Slavic, or that it has produced systemic change in western Slavic in this regard. Its main effect would be to reinforce the surface-contact meaning of western Slavic po-, thereby facilitating its preservation.

26 As far as I am aware, treatments of Ger be- do not single out a purely surface-contact meaning of the prefix, but refer to ornative Verben (cf., e.g., Günther 1974), i.e., verbs that express an action of equipping or furnishing an object with some substance or property. Many, if not most “ornative” verbs prefixed with be- involve the application of the substance or property to the surface of the object in question.
There is evidence of various impulses to calque Ger be- as western Slavic po- in historical times. Apart from brief comments by Werner (2003) concerning USor, this calquing as a tendency appears to have gone unnoticed. However, it has resulted in a degree of lexical equivalence between Ger be- and western Slavic (primarily Cz, Slk, and Sor, as well as Sloven and Cro) po-\(^{27}\) At least three convergent factors/ processes have resulted in this development: (1) the aforementioned original semantic overlap between Slavic surface-contact po- and Ger surface-contact be-, which facilitated (2) calquing German be- with western Slavic po- as a perfectivizing prefix for verbs involving surface contact (cf., e.g., Ger betäfeln ‘panel’ and Cz potaflowati\(^{28}\) ‘idem’), which in turn led to (3) the use of po- to calque be- in its transitive meaning (cf., e.g., Ger beschreiben ‘describe’ and Cz popisovat/popsat ‘idem’), as well as a change-of-state prefix in calques involving German ver- (cf., e.g., Ger verstaatlichen ‘nationalize’ and Cz postáttnit ‘idem’).

Before discussing points (2) and (3), a few remarks on morphological calques are in order. As Reindl (2005: 130) observes, it is much more difficult to identify calqued prefixes than ordinary loanwords. This difficulty is aggravated because central European languages rely so heavily on prefixes in (verbal) word formation (cf. Décsy 1973: 218). Reindl (2005: 129) also points out that prefixed verbs which look suspiciously like calques could “simply be chance coincidences based on semantically equivalent metaphors.” A case in point is that of Sloven po-

\(^{27}\) Werner (2003: 127–28) observes that USor po- occurs in verbs calqued from Ger, e.g., poradžovati/poradžiti ‘advise’ (< Ger beraten) and postrowjati/postrowiti ‘greet’ (< Ger begrüßen). Werner (2003: 153) also points out that wo- (< ComSl o(b)-) has been employed to calque Ger be-, e.g., woprinmyati ‘comprehend’ (< Ger begrüßen). Dictionary searches reveal that the LSor cognate prefix wob- has been particularly productive in calquing Ger be-, cf., e.g., wobstarovati/wobstaraš ‘provide, take care of’ (< Ger besorgen). According to data given by Reiter (1953), Cz o- has also occurred commonly in calques of Ger be-, cf., e.g., olněšetí ‘amount to’ (< Ger betragen) and ollstátí ‘exist’ (< Ger bestehen). A detailed investigation of the relative prominence of po- vs. o(b)- in the western languages lies beyond the scope of this discussion. However, it may be safely said that Cz po- has been used mostly to calque Ger be- in its surface-contact meaning, whereas Cz o(b)- has been used more frequently to calque Ger be- in its more directly transitive meanings (cf. in this regard the comments on calques with the respective USor prefixes by Werner, 127–28 and 153).

\(^{28}\) Items taken from Jungmann (1838/1989–90) are spelled as given in the dictionary. Likewise, I follow the various individual sources for the spelling of infinitives (-ti vs. -t). None of these variations has any bearing on the points argued here.
dati\textsuperscript{r} se 'go', which Reindl following Janko (1993: 353) accepts as a probable calque from Ger, because the metaphor involved is "stretched," or tenuous. It is nevertheless difficult to determine definitively whether Sln podati\textsuperscript{r} se is indeed a calque from Ger, as Rus attests podat\textsuperscript{sja} in more or less the same meaning. On the other hand, the existence of Rus podat\textsuperscript{sja} does not mean that Sln podati\textsuperscript{r} se (or Slk podat\textsuperscript{r} sa or USor poda\textsuperscript{r} so 'idem') is not a calque.

There are many such words in Cz that appear to contain calqued po-, but that could be "native" formations as well. Cz popadnout\textsuperscript{r} 'be-fall' could be a calque of Ger befallen 'idem' but is also certainly a very old verb which could have developed this meaning based on an original transitivizing function of po- in Slavic. A non-verbal example is pohotový 'ready', which might be a calque on Ger bereit; it apparently did not exist in OCz (which had unprefixed hotový). However, it is not impossible that the adjective was prefixed with elative po- and eventually became the word for 'ready'. And finally, the calquing of be- as po-may have led to an elative pohotový becoming entrenched as 'ready' (Ger bereit) alongside unprefixed hotový 'ready' (Ger fertig). As in the case of Sln podati\textsuperscript{r} se, an adequate investigation of even a single possible case requires a great deal of information and lies far beyond the scope of this discussion. For this reason, in what follows I limit myself to cases that have either been previously discussed in the literature or that otherwise appear to be certain cases of calques. In this regard, I consider the occurrence of po- corresponding to Ger be- in impf verbs (either imperfectiva tantum or impf members of aspect pairs) that do not express surface contact as an important indicator of the likelihood of a calque, as this indicates an unmotivated lexical (as opposed to perfectivizing) function of the prefix. I have also been guided by comparisons with Rus, Ukr, and Blg.

Let us now examine calques of Ger be- with po- in the western group. The case of Cz popisovat\textsuperscript{r}/popsat\textsuperscript{r} and Slk popiso\textsuperscript{r}at/popisat\textsuperscript{r} 'describe' (< Ger beschreiben) is particularly striking. It is semantically removed from the shared surface-contact meaning of Ger be- and Cz/Slk po-, which underlies a related meaning of Cz popiso\textsuperscript{r}at/popsat\textsuperscript{r} and Slk popiso\textsuperscript{r}at/popisat\textsuperscript{r}, i.e., 'put to paper' (< Ger beschreiben; cf. also USor popisowa\textsuperscript{r}/popisa\textsuperscript{r} and LSor popisowa\textsuperscript{r}/popisa\textsuperscript{r} 'idem'). I assume that the meaning of 'put to paper' was the original point of contact that allowed for a calque meaning 'describe'. Regardless, such semantically unmotivated calques indicate a relatively low degree of grammatical-
zation of the prefix *po*- in Cz/Slk/Sor as a perfectivizer. And inasmuch as such a calque was the *consequence* of a low degree of grammaticalization of *po*- as a perfectivizer, it must have in some way reinforced its status as a lexical rather than an aspectual prefix.

Reiter (1953) notes the following cases in which Cz *po*- is used to calque Ger *be*- with verbs and verbal nouns:

**Table 4. Czech Calques in which *po*- calques German *be*- in Reiter (1953)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Czech Calque</th>
<th>German Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>podělati</em> ‘soil’</td>
<td><em>bemachen</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>posluhovatí</em> se čeho ‘make use of sth.’</td>
<td><em>sich einer Sache bedienen</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>potahovatí</em> co na něco ‘relate sth. to sth.’</td>
<td><em>etwas auf etwas beziehen</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>potahování</em> ‘relationship’</td>
<td><em>Beziehung</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>povolání</em> ‘profession’</td>
<td><em>Beruf</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A similar case is that of *pobíratí* ‘draw [pay]’ (< Ger *beziehen*), condemned in anonymous commentaries in *Naše řeč* 7: 75 and 10: 15 (cf. also Slk *pobírat* ‘idem’). Kampelik (1864: 82–3) condemns as Germanisms *potřebující* and *potřebující* ‘person concerned’ (< Ger *der Betreffende*). Apart from *podělati* ‘soil’, all these cases are semantically unmotivated, i.e., they are not based on the shared surface-contact meaning, and seem to calque the transitive function of *be*. Note that some of the Cz items cited above have equivalents in Sor or Slk, cf., e.g., USor *počahovati*/*počahovat* — *počahovat* — *poščogovati*/*poščogovati* ‘cover, relate’ (< Ger *beziehen*), USor, LSor *povoljano* and Slk *povoljeni* ‘profession’ (< Ger *Beruf*), etc. The ipf participial calques correspond to calques of the prefix in Sor as well: USor *potrjeheti* and LSor *potrjeheti* ‘concern’ (< Ger *betreffen*).

Let us consider some very probable cases not mentioned by Unbegau (1932) or Reiter (1953), which are given in Table 5 on the next page. Cz *pokřízovatí* se and USor *pokřízovat* so ‘cross oneself’ (as well as Sln *pokřízovatí* se ‘idem’ — see Table 6) are probably based on the shared surface-contact meaning (i.e., forming or applying the pattern
Table 5. Other Likely Czech, Slovak and Sorbian Calques in which po- calques German be-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Czech, Slovak, Sorbian Calque</th>
<th>German Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cz pokřižovati se, USor pokřižować so</strong> ‘cross oneself’</td>
<td>&lt; sich bekreuzigen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>USor pokładżeny całty ‘sandwiches’</strong></td>
<td>&lt; belegte Brötchen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cz pochopiti, Slk pochopiti</strong> ‘comprehend’</td>
<td>&lt; begreifen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cz poraditi, Slk poraditi</strong></td>
<td>&lt; beraten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>USor poradżować/poradźiś, Lsor porażowaś/porażiś</strong> ‘advise’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cz pověřovati/ pověřiti koho úkolem</strong></td>
<td>&lt; jemanden mit einer Aufgabe betrauen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Slk poverovat/ poveriti koho úlouho</strong> ‘entrust someone with a task’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. Sln, BCS, and Pol Calques in which po- Calques Ger be-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sln, BCS, Pol Calque</th>
<th>German Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sln pokrižati se</strong> ‘cross oneself’</td>
<td>&lt; sich bekreuzigen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sln, BCS ponašati</strong> se ‘conduct oneself’</td>
<td>&lt; sich betragen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BCS pogodovati</strong> ‘favor’</td>
<td>&lt; begünstigen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sln posluževati se/poslužiti se česa</strong></td>
<td>&lt; sich einer Sache bedienen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BCS posluživati se/poslužiti se čega</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pol posługiwać/posłużyć się czymś</strong> ‘make use of sth.’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BCS postojati</strong> ‘exist’</td>
<td>&lt; bestehen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BCS posvjeđući/posvjediti</strong> ‘testify’</td>
<td>&lt; bezeugen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sln poverjati/ poveriti komu nalogu</strong></td>
<td>&lt; jemanden mit einer Aufgabe betrauen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BCS povjeravati/povjeriti kome zadatak</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pol powierzać/powierzyć komuś funkcję</strong> ‘entrust someone with a task’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sln pobrigati se, BCS pobriniati se</strong> ‘get, procure’</td>
<td>&lt; sich besorgen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of the cross to the combined frontal surface of one’s brow and body), as is USor pokláženy calty ‘sandwiches’. In the other cases, po- appears to calque Ger be- as a transitive verb. In the case of ‘advise’, in Cz and Slk it is only the pf verb that is prefixed with po-, and the prefixation could well be the result of native perfectivization models. However, the borrowing (-rad- ‘advise’ < Ger -rat-) as well as the calquing (-chop- ‘grab’ < Ger -gereif-) of the roots suggests that the prefix likewise calques Ger be-, which is highly likely in USor and LSoR, as the impf verb is prefixed with po- as well. Another probable example from USor is počesáváči počesáči ‘honor’ (< Ger beehren).

Such calques are also found in SlN and BCS, though they are fewer in number; PoL seems to attest fewer still. Examples are given in Table 6 on the previous page. SlN and BCS ponašati se ‘behave, conduct oneself’ are identified as calques of Ger sich betragen by Unbegaun (1932: 28). As in Cz, Slk, and PoL, Ger sich einer Sache bedienen has been calqued in SlN, BCS, and PoL, though only SlN posluživati se/poluživati se česa with a genitive object matches the Ger valence, whereas BCS posluživati se/poluživati se čine and PoL posluživatiči/poluživatiči se čymš take the instrumental.

Likewise, Ger jemanden mit einer Aufgabe betrauen ‘entrust someone with a task’ has also been calqued into SlN, BCS, and PoL, though unlike Cz and Slk (see Table 5) these languages do not preserve the accusative case assignment of the Ger original. It is interesting that SlN pobrigati se and BCS pobrinići se mean ‘get, procure’ like Ger sich besorgen, whereas the unprefixed Ger sich sorgen, SlN brigaći se and BCS brinići se all mean primarily ‘worry’.

SlN loan verbs also reveal occurrences of the calquing of be- with po-. Examples are pomerkati ‘notice’ (< Ger bemeren) and ponukati ‘use’ (< Ger benutzen), attested by Schuchardt (1884/1971: 185), as well as pogerovati ‘request’ (< Ger begehren) and poštrafati ‘punish’ (< Ger bestrafen), attested by Golec (2005: 305). Care must be taken when considering the possibility of prefixational calques with SlN loan verbs, however, as some attested loan verbs in po- follow native models of

---

29 Though probably not the result of a calquing process per se, it appears that an equivalency was created between Ger bedienen ‘serve food, wait a table’ and Cz posluhowat/poslužit, Slk posluhowat/poslužit, USor poslužovat/posluží, SlN poslužiti, BCS posluživati/poslužiti, PoL posluživati/poslužyć. Note that all these Slavic verbs take the accusative in this meaning, like Ger bedienen. I assume that Uk posluhyvati/poslužiti and Bg posluhovac/posluži, given the lack of consonant mutation in the impf, are denominals derived according to the PoL model.
prefixation and do not calque *be-*; cf., e.g., Sln distributive *poribati* ‘scrub [all/several]’ (cf. Ger *reiben* ‘rub’). An interesting case is Sln *porihtati* ‘repair’, which is not a calque of modern Ger *berichten* ‘report’, but of Middle High Ger *berihten* ‘put in order’, which indicates that such calquing of *be-* with *po-* in loan verbs is quite old.

Similar loans are given for Burgenland Cro by Neweklovsaky (1989) and Tornow (1989), cf., e.g., *poribati* ‘be s.o.’s heir’ (< Ger *beherben*), *pomerkati* ‘notice’ (< Ger *bemerken*), and *pošvindlati* ‘swindle’ (< Ger *beschwindeln*). Note that Burgenland Cro attests other calques that do not exist in standard Cro, e.g., *počorstiti* ‘make firm’ (< Ger *befestigen*), *poiskati* ‘visit’ (< Ger *besuchen*), attested by Tornow (1989).

To sum up, prefixed verbs in which *po-* appears to calque Ger *be-* either in its surface-contact meaning or in its transitive meaning are found in all of western Slavic (Cz, Slk, Sor, Sln, BCS); there are fewer of them in Pol. It is difficult to determine how many such calques exist in the individual western Slavic languages or the exact time periods and circumstances when such calquing was productive. Nevertheless, these calques should be taken into account in a contrastive analysis of the development of *po-* in the western and eastern Slavic languages. Whereas in eastern Slavic *po-* has developed into a highly productive aspectual (perfectivizing) prefix, western Slavic *po-* has remained a much more lexical prefix centered around a meaning of surface-contact. As suggested above, it would be a mistake to assume that such calquing has effected any drastic change in western Slavic. Rather, the nature of the calques is probably best considered in terms of a factor reinforcing the non-aspectual meanings of the prefix and thus stabilizing its lexical status, which consequently made it an unlikely candidate for grammaticalization as a perfectivizer. In this respect, it should be pointed out that eastern Slavic *po-* lost its ComSl spatial meanings before/as it developed into an abstract perfectivizing (and delimitative) prefix (for detailed discussion see Dickey 2005, 2007). Moreover, in the western languages (except BCS) jer-fall produced a new prefix *s/-z-* that began shortly thereafter to develop into an abstract perfectivizing prefix, thus obviating the need for western Slavic *po-* to develop in that direction (see Dickey 2005).

Western Slavic *po-* has been involved in one more kind of verbal calque that is relevant to this discussion. In this case, Ger *ver-* in denominal verbs (most of which are factitive) was calqued by *po-* as a prefix expressing change of state. This occurred to varying degrees in
Cz, Slk, Sln, and BCS, less so in Sor and Pol (which makes one wonder if this was connected with Habsburg authority). Representative examples are given in Table 7.

Table 7. Slavic Calques in which po- calques
German ver- ‘change of state’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slavic Calque</th>
<th>German Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cz poněmčovat’/poněmčiti,</td>
<td>&lt; verdeutschen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slk ponemčovat’/ponemčiti,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USor poněmčowa’t/poněmčiti,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sln ponemčevati/ponemčiti,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCS ponjemčivati/ponijemčiti,</td>
<td>‘Germanize’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cz postáňovat’/postátniti,</td>
<td>&lt; verstaatlichen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slk poštáňovat’/poštátniti,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sln podržavljati/podržaviti,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCS podržavljivati/podržaviti,</td>
<td>‘nationalize’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cz pojišťovat’/pojistiti,</td>
<td>&lt; versichern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slk poistovat’/poistiti, ‘insure’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sln poenostavljati/poenostaviti,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCS pojednostavljivati/pojednostaviti,</td>
<td>‘simplify’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These calques are aspectually interesting in that here the basic function of po- is to calque the change of state expressed by Ger ver-, but in all the western Slavic languages, and especially in Cz, Slk and Sor, suffixation with -i- expresses the factitive meaning of the Ger source verbs (in which factitivity is not morphologically expressed).30 The only inchoative example in Cz of which I am aware, ponešťastněti ‘have an accident/suffer misfortune’ (< Ger verunglücken), is given by Reiter (1953); however, it appears to have been an artificial journalistic

---

30 In BCS, where the opposition between factitive -i- and inchoative/stative -č- has largely broken down, po- in such verbs has arguably become more of a real factitive prefix, given that the majority of such verbs are factitive and BCS po- otherwise has a prominent transitive sense. This issue cannot be pursued here.
word.\textsuperscript{31} Change of state would seem to be closely linked to the pf aspect, yet the vast majority of these calques occur in prefixed aspect pairs, so that the change of state expressed by po- in these calques appears to have been treated as a lexical and not a perfective meaning in their aspectual systems. Thus, these calques have not served as an impetus to grammaticalize po- as a perfectivizer. On the contrary, they appear to have helped to solidify its status as a lexical prefix.

There are also apparently semantically unmotivated calques in which Slavic po- calques Ger ver-. Examples are given in Table 8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slavic Calque</th>
<th>German Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cz porovnávat\textsuperscript{i}/porovnat\textsuperscript{e},\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>&lt; vergleichen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skl porovnávat\textsuperscript{i}/porovnat\textsuperscript{e},\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pol porównywac\textsuperscript{i}/porównać\textsuperscript{e},\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>'compare'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sln poskušati\textsuperscript{i}/poskusiti\textsuperscript{e},\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>&lt; versuchen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCS pokušavati\textsuperscript{i}/pokušati\textsuperscript{e}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'try, attempt'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cz pokoušet\textsuperscript{i} se/pokusit\textsuperscript{e} se,</td>
<td>&lt; sich versuchen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skl pokušat\textsuperscript{e} sa/pokusiti\textsuperscript{e} sa,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USor pospytać\textsuperscript{o} so,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pol pokuśić\textsuperscript{e} się</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'give sth. a try'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Such semantically unmotivated calques must also have contributed to the stabilization of po- as a lexical prefix in the western group.

Another set of issues involves the calquing of deverbal nouns and occasionally adjectives.\textsuperscript{32} Western Slavic po- has calqued be- in various deverbal nouns and adjectives, as shown in Table 9. Cz archaic poplata

\textsuperscript{31}See the commentary in Naše řeč 2(6), available online at: http://nase-rec.ujc.cas.cz/ archiv.php?art=1404.

\textsuperscript{32}Note that verbal nouns, which are generally paradigmatically related to past passive participles, are not considered here; some examples were given above.
Table 9. Calqued Deverbal Nouns and Adjectives in Which po- calques German be-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slavic calque</th>
<th>German Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cz, Slk posáďka, Sln posadka, BCS posada</td>
<td>&lt; Besatzung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘garrison/crew’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cz posłuha, Sln postrežba, BCS posługa, Pol posługa&lt;sup&gt;33&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>&lt; Bedienung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘service’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cz, Slk porada</td>
<td>&lt; Beratung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘consultation’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cz, Slk posádkový, Sln posadni</td>
<td>&lt; Besatzungs-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCS posadni</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘crew/garrison (adj.)’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cz, Slk poradenský, Slk poradný</td>
<td>&lt; Beratungs-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘consultational’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘payment’ (< Ger Bezahlung), attested by Jungmann (1838/1989–90), also belongs here; note that Cz poplatit ‘pay all of’ is specifically distributive, both currently and according to Jungmann, and would not as such be a source for poplata ‘payment’). Another archaic Cz example is potaha ‘relationship’ (< Ger Beziehung), attested by Jungmann (1838/1989–90). It seems that such nominal calques are most common in Cz and Slk, and that there was at some point a limited tendency to calque Ger Be-...-ung as po-...-a (occasionally po-...-ka), preserving the gender of the source noun. As for adjectives, Reiter (1953) gives Cz posádková armáda ‘occupying army’ (< Ger Besatzungsarmee) as a clear case of an adjectival calque, and the corresponding adjectives in the other languages can express this sense of Besatzungs-, i.e., ‘occupying’, as well.

<sup>33</sup>I assume Ukr posluha and Blr posluha are loans from Polish as opposed to calques from German.
It is important to point out that the inclusion of _po_- in nominal (and some adjectival) calques only reinforce its status as a lexical prefix, as opposed to a perfectivizing prefix, as in the eastern languages.

Such calques are part of a larger pattern, particularly noticeable in Cz and Slk, of deriving deverbal nouns prefixed with _po_- that have no counterparts in Rus and Blg. Examples are Cz, Slk _pochyba_ ‘doubt’, Cz _poléčka_, Slk _polievka_ ‘soup’, Cz, Slk _pomlěčka_ ‘(typographical) dash’, Cz, Slk _pomluva_ ‘slander’, Cz, Slk _poprava_ ‘execution’, Cz, Slk _posila_ ‘strengthening, reinforcement’, and Cz, Slk _potucha_ ‘presentiment’. Such nouns are also common in BCS, Sln, and Pol. Representative examples are BCS _pobuna_ ‘rebellion’ and _pohvala_ ‘praise’, Cro _pohrana_ ‘storage’, and BCS _povrda_ ‘certificate’; Sln _pomota_ ‘error’, _poroka_ ‘marriage’, and _pótrata_ ‘waste’, and Pol _pochwała_ ‘praise’, _polewa_ ‘enamel’, and _pozoga_ ‘blaze’. In the eastern languages, where _po_- has become an important perfectivizing prefix, there are relatively few such deverbal nouns, especially with the structure _po-...-a_ (there are more with the structure _po-...-ka_; an example is Rus _pokupka_ ‘purchase’).  

The last issue concerning deverbal nouns is not so much a matter of calquing a specific prefix with _po_-, but rather the consequences of the adoption of a model of zero-suffixed deverbal nouns, i.e., prefix-root-Ø, e.g., OCS _otoko_ ‘island’. This model appears to have originally been fairly limited in Slavic but has become extremely productive in the western Slavic languages (regarding Cz, cf. Berger 2008). The lack of an overt suffix in such deverbal nouns indicates that the prefix-root combination is felt to be an independent lexical entity. Note also that such deverbal nouns have a tendency to undergo hypostasis and otherwise develop meanings removed from those of their source verbs, which likewise suggests that these prefix-root combinations function as independent lexical entities, which have little or no verbal dynamicty. In terms of Heine and Kuteva (2005), we may say that the Žer deverbal derivational model prefix-root-Ø has been a model on which an

34 Here are numbers for these types of deverbal nouns, taken intentionally from smaller contemporary dictionaries containing around 40,000 words (in particular, the LTWD, LTWPD, LTWKD, LTWRD, and GSAS), in order to give an idea of the words that actually get used:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cz</th>
<th>Pol</th>
<th>Sln</th>
<th>Cro</th>
<th>Rus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>po-...-a</em></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>po-...-ka</em></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
originally relatively minor Slavic derivation pattern has become a major one in western Slavic. Many western Slavic deverbal nouns of the model prefix-root-∅ are easily recognizable as calques; cf. the examples shown in Table 10.35

Table 10. Slavic Deverbal Nouns of the Model
PREFIX-ROOT-∅ Calqued from German

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slavic Calque</th>
<th>German Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cz, Slk vílet, USor, L Sor wulět, Sln, BCS izlet ‘excursion’</td>
<td>&lt; Ausflug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cz, Slk oblek, USor woblek, L Sor woblak, Sln obleka, Pol oblek ‘suit’</td>
<td>&lt; Anzug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cz, Slk odpad, USor wonpad, Sln odpad, BCS otpad, ‘garbage’</td>
<td>&lt; Abfall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cz obnos, Sln, BCS iznos ‘sum’</td>
<td>&lt; Betrag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sln obisk ‘visit’</td>
<td>&lt; Besuch</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The relatively high productivity of this model of deverbal nouns in western Slavic as opposed to eastern Slavic is in my view connected with the more lexical nature of verbal prefixation in the western languages: in a language where prefixes have a high functional load in terms of aspect, it would be unexpected for them to occur productively in unsuffixed deverbal nouns that express independent lexical notions and as such have very little or no verbal dynamicity to them.

This line of thinking follows Shull’s (2003) comparative analysis of prefixation in Rus and Cz. Based on the greater number of secondary impf verbs that are synonymous with their simplex impf counterparts

in Cz, Shull concludes that “the prefix has fused with the verbal root in Czech, such that the prefix is losing its status as an independent morpheme” (2003: 230). The behavior of Cz prefixes as contrasted with those in Rus also leads Shull to the conclusion that verbal prefixation is relatively more spatial in Cz than in Rus and that Cz prefixation is less important for aspectual distinctions than suffixation, whereas prefixation in Rus is more abstract and relatively more important for perfectivization (2003: 228). The importance of suffixation for aspectual distinctions in Cz is evident from triads such as vytrhnout‘ tear out’—vytrhát‘ tear out [several]”—vytrhávat‘ tear out’, which are also characteristic of Slk and Sor (cf. Dickey 2001). The idea that Cz prefixes behave as lexical elements “fused” with verbal roots to a higher degree than in Rus can help explain the higher productivity of prefixed deverbal nouns with a zero suffix in western Slavic.36

Western Slavic po- has been drawn into this derivational model as well. Compare Cz, Slk posit ‘feeling’, Cz, Slk pohovor ‘talk’, Cz pokřik, Slk pokřik ‘shout’, Cz, Slk popud ‘stimulation’, and Cz pozved’ch, Slk povzdych ‘sigh’. Such nouns are common in USor (cf., e.g., pochád ‘origin’). They are also productive in Pol, cf., e.g., pociśk ‘projectile’, pojazd ‘vehicle’, and popyt ‘inquiry’. In Sln and BCS such nouns occur, but are not as common as in Cz; cf., e.g., Sln poljub ‘kiss’, popust ‘discount’, posmeh ‘mockery’, potek ‘expiration’, and BCS pomak ‘shift’, popust ‘discount’, porast ‘increase’, (Cro) posjet ‘visit’. Farther to the east, in Rus and Blg, such nouns are relatively few in number, and apart from isolated recent items such as Rus poezd ‘train’, they occur largely as relics of older surface-contact po-; cf., e.g., Blg, Rus posev ‘crops’, pokrov ‘roof’, etc.37 It should be noted that some instances of po- in this derivational model in western Slavic also appear to be calques: Slk pochop ‘concept’ (< Ger Begriff; nonexistent in modern Cz but attested by Jungmann 1838/1989–90), Cz podil, Slk podiel ‘share’ (< Ger Anteil), Cz, Slk pokrok

36 Based on verbal derivation patterns in the eastern and western groups, I assume that Shull’s conclusions also apply to some degree to the east–west division in general, i.e., that prefixation in western Slavic is more spatial, and that prefixation in eastern Slavic is more important for aspectual distinctions.

37 Numbers for this type of deverbal noun, taken from the dictionaries mentioned in fn. 33, are given in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cz</th>
<th>Pol</th>
<th>Sln</th>
<th>Cro</th>
<th>Rus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>po-</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
‘progress’ (< Ger Fortschritt), Cz, Slk pokus ‘attempt’ (< Ger Versuch), Cz povyk ‘shouting’ (< Ger Geschrei), Sln posest, BCS posjed ‘property’ (< Ger Besitz), Pol pościąg ‘train’ (cf. Unbegaus 1932: 37), etc.

Though all Slavic languages attest a number of prefixed deverbal nouns with a zero suffix, they appear to be most common in Cz/Slk/Sor. Sln, BCS, and Pol also attest a considerable number. The eastern languages attest the fewest, as noted above. This distribution correlates with the degree of Ger language contact in the individual Slavic languages, and it is thus reasonable to assume that the higher number of such nouns in western Slavic must be a consequence of Ger language contact. The fact that some western Slavic deverbal nouns of this type appear to be directly calqued provides circumstantial evidence for this assumption. Inasmuch as western Slavic po- occurs in such deverbal nouns, I suggest that it has been both a consequence of its primarily lexical status in these languages as well as a factor in the failure of po- to develop into an abstract perfectivizer, as it did in the eastern languages.

To conclude this section, it has been shown that po- in the western Slavic languages has participated in calques of Ger prefixes, primarily be-. The point of semantic contact that formed the basis for such calquing was the meaning of surface contact shared by western Slavic po- and Ger be-. In addition, western Slavic po- has also calqued be- in its transitive meaning, and occasionally in semantically unmotivated calques. Likewise, there has been a limited tendency to calque Ger ver- with po- in (mostly factitive) verbs expressing a change of state. It should be noted that it is also possible that po- has calqued Ger hin- on the basis of its ablative meaning; cf., e.g., Cz poukazovat’/poukazat’ ‘point out’ (< Ger hinweisen) and poprava ‘execution’ (< Ger Hinrichtung). Naturally, most of the calques discussed above have involved the calquing of prefixes in verbs. However, po- has also occurred in calques of prefixed deverbal nouns as well. Two kinds of deverbal nouns have been examined: those in which po- calques be- in a deverbal noun suffixed with -a or -ka (in which case the suffix corresponds to Ger -ung), and zero-suffix deverbal nouns, in which western Slavic po- calques either be-, ver-, or some other prefix. It has also been suggested that overall the adoption of the derivational model of prefixed deverbal nouns with a zero suffix has been significant in that it allowed po- in its lexical senses to occur in the most morphologically simple type of deverbal noun. The fact that po- occurs in such deverbal
nouns is a strong indicator of its lexical status in western Slavic. As a comparison, it should be pointed out that Rus, Ukr, and Blg perfectivizing po- rarely occurs in such deverbal nouns. Rus has even lost at least one ComSI deverbal noun of this type, *pogledь ‘glance’, presumably because of the incompatibility of its perfectivizing po- with the lack of verbal dynamism and temporality in such deverbal nouns. Note also that eastern delimitative po- never occurs in deverbal nouns. Finally, inasmuch as the derivational patterns produced by calquing Ger verbs and deverbal nouns played a role in reinforcing the lexical nature of western Slavic po- and surface-contact as its central meaning, they also contributed to its failure to develop into a major perfectivizing prefix and in particular into a productive delimitative prefix. Thus, Ger linguistic interference has arguably played a role in the development of western Slavic po- into a primarily spatial lexical prefix as opposed to a delimitative aspectual prefix.

In terms of the model of language contact outlined in section 3, we may characterize the failure of po- in the western languages to develop into a dominant perfectivizing prefix as in part the result of Ger linguistic interference. The lexical meanings of the prefix were reinforced by a process of replica preservation in which the primary, initial model was the surface-contact meaning of Ger be-. The model pattern(s) involved here are the derivational models including be- employed by Ger. This case of replica preservation on the level of word formation complements the case of replica preservation on the level of a syntactic construction (the CCIP), discussed in section 3.

5. Conclusions

This article has drawn attention to the high productivity of po- delimitatives in an eastern macro-group of Slavic languages (Rus, Ukr, Blr, Blg, and Pol) in contrast with their low productivity in a western macro-group (Cz, Slk, Sor, Sln, and BCS), and the inversely proportional high frequency of the CCIP in western Slavic as opposed to its virtual absence in eastern Slavic. Po- delimitatives and the CCIP are interrelated in that po- delimitatives allow the coding of aletic predicates as pf in sequences of events in eastern Slavic. It is aletic predicates that most often occur in the CCIP in the western languages.

ComSI was characterized by the CCIP as well as by a low number of po- delimitatives. This article has attempted to shed light on why the
CCIP was retained only in the western languages, and why the western languages did not develop productive delimitative po- in a manner like the eastern languages. In doing so, it has considered the possibility that language contact with Ger played a role in the western Slavic developments. It has been argued that Ger linguistic interference played a role in the retention of the CCIP in western Slavic by providing a model usage pattern in which any verb can occur in a sequence of events. Ger verb usage in sequences of events, which matches the western Slavic CCIP, served as the model in a process that I have labeled *replica preservation*, in which the model structure serves not as a catalyst for change but as a factor facilitating the retention of features shared by the model language (Ger) and the replica languages (western Slavic). In other words, western Slavic languages imitated Ger verb usage in sequences of events, reinforcing the status of the CCIP in their grammatical systems. As the CCIP was retained in western Slavic, there was no systemic need for the development of po- delimitatives, which have remained a minor part of the western Slavic verbal system. In this way, Ger linguistic interference affected the development of aspect usage in western Slavic.

It has also been argued that the failure of the western Slavic prefix po- to develop into an important delimitative prefix was largely caused by its retention of its original lexical meanings, most importantly its spatial meaning of surface contact. One reason po- did not develop a more abstract perfectivizing role was because OCz began early to develop innovative s/-z- as its abstract perfectivizing prefix. Another contributing factor was, again, Ger linguistic interference. Based on probable calques it has been suggested that western Slavic po- was used to calque Ger be- on the basis of their shared meaning of surface-contact, which led in turn to tendencies for western Slavic po- to calque Ger be- in its transitive meaning. Western Slavic po- also calqued Ger *ver-* in its (factive) change-of-state meaning. In addition, the imitation of a Ger pattern of deverbal noun derivation (prefix-root-ø) by the western Slavic languages also resulted in western Slavic lexical po- occurring in zero-suffixed deverbal nouns in which its lexical status was further solidified. Thus, the particular development of western Slavic po- can also be attributed in part at least to language contact with Ger.

The involvement of Ger linguistic interference in the western Slavic retention of impf verbs in sequences of events and the retention by the western Slavic prefix po- of its older surface-contact meaning and
the strengthening of its change-of-state and other lexical meanings in the western Slavic languages helped to create a situation where, on the one hand, there was no increasing pressure to code atelic predicates in sequence as pf and, on the other, po- did not lose its lexical meanings and develop purely aspectual functions such as delimitativity (which is what occurred in the eastern Slavic languages). In this manner, Ger linguistic interference has played an important role in the development of the east–west aspect division in Slavic. With the possible exception of the increase in the productivity of prefixed deverbal nouns with a zero suffix, none of the instances of Ger linguistic interference in Slavic aspectual phenomena examined here are canonical cases of contact-induced change; rather, they amount to Ger language contact on the whole helping to preserve western Slavic linguistic structures at times when the eastern Slavic languages underwent important changes in their aspectual systems (beginning or intensifying in the seventeenth century). From these developments one can see that in some cases language contact causes linguistic structures to be preserved and that such replica preservation can be an important factor in the creation of differences between closely related languages.
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