

Björn Wiemer
JGU, Mainz
wiemerb@uni-mainz.de
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6466-2060>

PREFIXING NON-PAST FORMS OF SIMPLEX STEMS AND THEIR VICISSITUDES IN SLAVIC

This article provides an outline of the current state of research on an exceptional kind of tense marking: certain groups of simplex verb stems tend to mark their future tense by prefixing *po-* to their present tense forms (either exclusively or, more often, alternatively to an “analytic” marking with an auxiliary deriving from **bǫd-*). This behavior is restricted to, or at least clearly biased toward, lexical meanings related to directed motion; in case of polysemy, it does not apply to other meanings of the relevant stems. Moreover, this behavior appears to ensue from a reduced paradigm structure of *po*-prefixed stems, which get integrated into the paradigms of the simplex stems. Consequently, one may ask to which aspect these stems belong: are they *imperfectiva tantum*, perfective, or biaspectual?

All languages affected by this phenomenon are spoken at the western peripheries of the Slavic landscape. Czech is the most prominent one, whereas Polish (in contrast to Kashubian) does not show any traces of this phenomenon.

The article only deals with the contemporary stage (20th–21st centuries), but aims at a comprehensive treatment of all factors relevant for this phenomenon on the background of the tense-aspect systems in West and South Slavic languages. Together with these factors, it can be shown that future tense marked by *po*-prefixation of simplex stems is a gradable phenomenon in several respects, such as, e. g., (i) possibility of alternative future marking, (ii) proportions of frequency between these alternatives, (iii) number of stems involved (at least occasionally). The core group of the relevant stems all denote directed motion; among these, ‘go’, then ‘drive, ride’, are the central units. They seem to be kind of last “refugium” of this phenomenon in (almost) all relevant languages. As for the West Slavic languages, these two simplex stems almost preclude alternative future tense marking with an auxiliary, definitely in Czech, less so in the Sorbian languages and Kashubian. In turn, Slovene *iti* ‘go’ does mark its future in the usual way (with an auxiliary), but its *po*-prefixed derivative does not. As a result, its paradigm is most idiosyncratic and difficult to interpret on the background of the non-past system of this South Slavic language.

Keywords: Slavic, future tense, aspect, paradigm structure.

„Využívanie týchto tvarov nie je ešte ustálené.”

(Dvonč 1984: 104, concerning Slovak)

1. The phenomenon

In the western peripheries of Slavic, we observe a phenomenon which is peculiar not only from the perspective of slavists, but also for general linguists or typologists interested in tense-aspect systems, more specifically: in non-past systems. Before dwelling on this phenomenon, I provide the general background.

The aspect opposition of all Slavic languages divides verb stems into two classes, a perfective (pfv.) and an imperfective (ipfv.) one, and since this division is based on stem derivation it heavily interferes with all other verbal categories and grammatical distinctions on clause, sometimes even discourse level (cf. Wiemer 2022a). This interference becomes particularly evident with non-past forms in North Slavic (= West+East Slavic): almost exceptionless, pfv. stems mark future tense without any additional morphology, instead future reference has become the default interpretation of their present tense forms¹ (see 1a). A non-future interpretation is possible (see 1b), but there is no contrast in form. In turn, ipfv. stems mark the future with the aid of auxiliaries, and the only or predominant future auxiliary in North Slavic languages derives from the root **bqd-*, which originated in a probably inchoative copular and existential verb. For this reason, I will refer to it as BECOME-auxiliary; see (2).² That is, in North Slavic, almost without exception the membership of a stem to pfv. or ipfv. aspect determines the way in which it marks future tense, or otherwise: aspect membership conditions the complementary distribution of verb stems with regard to future marking.³

Russian

- (1a) *Zavtra ona nemnožečko očnetsja* ^{pfv.prs}, *navestit* ^{pfv.prs} ee sledovatel' (...).

‘Tomorrow she **will wake up** a little, the investigator **will visit** her.’

(RNC; O. A. Slavnikova: Pryžok v dlinu. 2014–2016)

- (1b) *Is ego točki zrenija, novyj den' — éto novoe čudo. On ne speša prosnetsja* ^{pfv.prs},
plavno primet ^{pfv.prs} vannu, vdumčivo *vyp'et* ^{pfv.prs} kofe i proguločnym šagom
otpravitsja ^{pfv.prs} na rabotu.

‘And from his point of view, a new day is a new miracle. He slowly **wakes up**, **takes** a gentle bath, thoughtfully **drinks** (a cup of) coffee and in a leisurely manner **walks off** to work.’

(RNC; Domovoj. 4.01.2002)

¹ Known exceptions to this strict rule are varieties of Sorbian, where pfv. stems (infinitives) with *bud-* (see below) have been attested. For Lower Sorbian cf. Mucke (1891: 604–606), for Upper Sorbian cf. Schuster-Šewc (1996: 169), Scholze (2008: 253).

² For further details cf. Wiemer (forthcoming-1: §3.2.1).

³ Full glossing will be provided only for some “critical” examples. Otherwise, the relevant categories of verb forms in question will receive superscripts or be introduced by a heading to the example.

- (2) *Posle toga kak ustroitsja^{pfv.prs}, ona **budet**^{fut.3sg} nas **navešćat**^{ipfv.inf} i **proverjat**^{ipfv.inf}, pravil'no li my otdyxaem.*
 'Once she gets settled, she **will visit** us and **check** if we are resting properly.'
 (RNC; A. A. Taxo-Godi: Žizn'i sud'ba. 2009)

By contrast, South Slavic languages do not show any complementary split of future marking conditioned by the aspect membership of the stem. Both ipfv. and pfv. stems mark future tense with the same auxiliary⁴ (see 3a vs 4), i. e. the auxiliary is not sensitive to aspect. In turn, the present-tense forms of pfv. stems (henceforth PFV.PRS), thus distinguished from the future morphologically by lack of an auxiliary, usually mark some function or other from a broader irrealis-domain (cf. Wiemer 2022b: 70, 74; forthcoming-1: §3.1.2; forthcoming-2); see (3b). These functions, first of all, include habitual and “gnomic” functions (often called ‘inactual present’ by slavists) and correlated functions in the domain of non-deontic modality. They are basically the same as with the pfv. non-past forms in North Slavic (see above).

Slovene

- (3a) pfv. future

*Minister za kmetijstvo, gozdarstvo in prehrano Dejan Židan **bo obiskal** tri kmetije in **se srečal** s koroško kmetijsko svetovalno službo.*

‘Minister of Agriculture, Forestry and Food Dejan Židan **will visit** three farms and **meet** with the Carinthian Agricultural Advisory Service.’

(Gigafida 2.0; online press, 2015)

- (3b) pfv. present

*Na strokovnih ekskurzijah v spomladanskem času članice društva odkrivajo življenje in delo v drugih krajih, kar jim **porodi** marsikatero koristno idejo za svoje delo. **Obiščejo** tudi kulturne spomenike, cerkve, samostane, domače obrtnike in tako spoznavajo kulturno dediščino naših prednikov.*

‘On professional excursions in the spring, members of the association discover life and work in other places, which **gives** them many useful ideas for their work. They also **visit** cultural monuments, churches, monasteries, local craftsmen, and thus learn about the cultural heritage of our ancestors.’

(Gigafida 2.0; online press, 1999)

- (4) ipfv. future

*Pri popotnikih, ki **bodo obiskovali** velike nacionalne parke, je priporočljiva uporaba odvrča (repellentov) in ustreznih oblačil.*

‘For travelers who **will visit** large national parks, it is recommended to use repellent and appropriate clothing.’

(Gigafida 2.0; online press, 2006)

For short, the processes that underlie these different ways of marking future tense will here be called grammaticalization (if auxiliaries are involved) and hypoanalysis (in case of PFV.PRS marking future by default). Following Croft

⁴ Most future auxiliaries in South Slavic behave like clitics. Some of them show signs of affix status. However, these details are irrelevant for the topic of this article.

(2000: 126f.), the latter term means the conventionalized shift of a form (or a whole paradigm) toward a new default meaning, without changes in the expression. In the case of the PFV.PRS, this shift can be specified as narrowing within an initially vaguer function range: a subrange (namely, future) becomes the prominent, or default, meaning, while the remainder, e. g., non-deontic modal or habitual readings, may still be “activated” (as shown in ex. 1b above).

Furthermore, in order to avoid misunderstandings, I will abide by a strict concept of future tense. Namely,

[FUT] A predicative construction (marker, gram) can be considered a sufficiently conventionalized future if among its core, or default, functions, we find reference to a single (episodic) situation that is posterior to a reference interval. In the prototypical case, this reference interval is the current moment of speech (‘deictic future’).

This definition delimits future reference from other uses of non-past forms, namely irrealis functions (Wiemer, forthcoming-1).

These general premises supply the backdrop for the topic of this article. For most West Slavic languages (actually, for all West Slavic languages except Polish and largely also Kashubian) we observe that unprefixed (= simplex) ipfv. stems of certain verb groups display an alternative way of forming their future: not with the commonplace BECOME-auxiliary (+ infinitive), but with prefixes (usually *po-*, seldomly *s-/z-*) attached to the present tense of simplex stems; compare (5a) and (5b):

Czech

- (5a) *po* *dvacet-i* *let-ech* *bud-e* *věs-t*
 after twenty-LOC year-LOC.PL FUT-3SG lead.IPFV-INF
naše hlavní město jiná strana (...).
 ‘after twenty years another party **will lead** our capital’
 (CzNC)

- (5b) *potřebují někoho,*
k-do *je* *po-ved-e* *dál.*
 who-NOM 3PL.ACC PFX-lead.IPFV-PRS.3SG further
 ‘they need someone to lead them on.’ [lit. ‘who **will lead** them on’]
 (CzNC)

With few exceptions, prefixation of simplex stems (most of which belong to ipfv. aspect) yields pfv. stems; usually this also causes a modification or a more serious change of lexical meaning (see 6), but in many cases the prefix does not change the lexical meaning so that the ipfv. simplex stem and its prefixed pfv. derivative can be considered an aspect pair⁵ (see 7).

⁵ For this notion and related issues cf. Janda et al. (2013), Wiemer et al. (2020).

Czech

- (6) *psát*.IPFV ‘write’ → *po-psat*.PFV ‘describe’
no aspect pair, grammatical and lexical derivation
- (7) *psát*.IPFV → *na-psat*.PFV ‘write’
aspect pair, only grammatical derivation

As for forms like *povede* ‘will lead’ in (5b), without further context supplying actionality characteristics of the utterance, and without an account of the paradigm structure of the verb lexeme, it would be difficult, if not impossible, to determine whether *povede* should really be considered an ipfv. stem with a prefix added “on top” of a form already inflected for present tense, or rather as a pfv. stem whose present tense form gets standardly interpreted as pfv. future. That is, we must clarify whether the prefix in cases like *povede* takes scope over the entire present tense form (see 5b’) or narrowly scopes just over the stem, or root, before tense (+ person/number) marking applies (see 5b’). In the former case, *po-* marks future tense by being attached to the present tense of an ipfv. stem, while in the latter case this prefix changes the aspect of the stem as such, before any other categories apply and, and for the present tense form a future reading ensues via hypoanalysis (as, e. g., in ex. 1a). In other terminology, when *po-* marks future by attaching to the present tense of an ipfv. simplex stem, it behaves as an external prefix, while *po-* as prefix to derive pfv. stems from ipfv. ones has to be considered an internal prefix.⁶

		scope of prefix	prefix marks
(5b’)	<i>po-</i> [<i>ved-e</i>]	wide: tense (IPFV) > prefix	future tense
(5b’)	[<i>po- ved</i>]- <i>e</i>	narrow: prefix (PFV) > tense	pfv. aspect
	PFX-ROOT-PRS.3SG		
	‘(she/he/it) will lead’		

In this article, I focus on the wide scope reading. Future marking of ipfv. stems via prefixation of their present tense has been observed for Czech (Šmilauer 1947: 152, Бондарко 1961, Machek 1962: 439, Mrhačová 1993: 65–67, among many others), Slovak (e. g., Horecký 1957, Ružička/Dvonč 1966: 41), and in Upper and Lower Sorbian (e. g., Michalk 1963, Scholze 2008: 194f., 269f., 279f.). The same phenomenon has been noticed also in Slovene, although to a lesser and more arguable extent (see §3.4), and it applies to Kashubian to a very limited extent, as basically it seems restricted to one verb (see §3.3). Bláha (2008: ch. 2) supplies an extensive survey on all these languages, except Kashubian; the approach taken here makes prominent additional aspects which, in my view, de-

⁶ Cf. Biskup (2019: ch. 5; 2022), who also discusses the possible diachronic connection between the involved processes and links them to language contact. For reasons of space, these two aspects of the “story” will here largely be left aside, as will in general a due account of Biskup’s analysis.

serve more attention. For brevity, ipfv. stems marking their future with *po-* will henceforth be called ‘IpoFut-stems’.

I will first survey and discuss the arguments that have been provided in favor or against the treatment of forms like *povede* as future tense of ipfv. stems. This discussion potentially concerns all languages on the western peripheries of the Slavic speaking landscape, including minority languages in islands like Resian, Molise or, Croatian in the Austrian *Burgenland*, but for space reasons they will not be treated here. I will concentrate on Czech and use it as basis of comparison, first of all with Slovene, since, as for this issue, Czech has been studied most thoroughly. A comparison with Slovene promises to disclose crucial moments, first of all concerning the question which aspect the relevant prefixed forms belong to or whether they are best characterized as biaspectual.

I continue first with an evaluation of the findings for Czech (§2), before I turn to data and observations on other languages of the western peripheries of Slavic (§3), with Czech as a kind of blueprint. The last section formulates conclusions and desiderata for further research (§4). The article does not dwell upon the diachronic background, which — as far as possible by now — has been dealt with in Wiemer (forthcoming-1: §4.2); see also fn. 6.

2. Czech

This section largely relies on the survey in Wiemer (forthcoming-1: §4).

2.1. Outline

In modern Czech, only the prefix *po-* has been attested to mark future tense of ipfv. stems (based of their present tense forms). The lexical core group of ipfv. simplex stems betraying this behavior is related to directed motion (e. g., *pojedu* ‘I will go/drive’, *popluji* ‘I will swim’); less salient are verbs of other lexical groups, like causative equivalents of directed motion verbs (e. g., *potáhnu* ‘I will pull’, *povezu* ‘I will bring (by driving)’), some inchoative verbs (e. g., *poroste* ‘s/he will grow’, *pokvete* ‘it will bloom’), but also some verbs denoting duration (e. g., *trvat* ‘last’, *vát* ‘blow’), at least in a wide sense (e. g., *vládnout* ‘rule’). Notably, the absolute majority of these verbs imply parametric changes, i. e. they are not strictly telic (as there is no absolute right boundary of action), but nonetheless dynamic.

Moreover, almost all IpoFut-stems also mark their future with the usual future auxiliary *bud-*; with most of them this marking predominates. The exceptions are two stems which only mark their future with *po-*, namely: *jít* ‘go’ (*půjde* ~ **bude jít*) and *jet* ‘ride, drive’ (*pojede* ~ **bude jet*); cf. Ševčíková — Pánevová (2018: 181). For these two stems, exclusive marking of future by *po-* may be considered their lexicalized feature, which represents the extreme end of a distributional pattern (concerning the alternation with *bud-*) across the relevant part of the verbal lexicon (see below).

Table 1 demonstrates crucial slots of the paradigm structure of relevant *IpoFut*-stems. We see that these stems have an infinitive and past tense without *po-*; infinitives and past tense forms with *po-* either do not exist or they belong to another lexeme (see below). That is, *po-* only occurs with present tense forms. The verbs ‘go’ (*jít*) and ‘ride’ (*jet*) also occur with *po-*-prefixed imperatives, and this applies to other intransitive verbs of directed motion, too (e. g., *poběž* ‘run!’, *polet* ‘fly!’, *popluj* ‘swim!’). With their transitive counterparts, however, *po-*-prefixed imperatives seem to be obsolete; compare, e. g., *?pones* ‘bring, carry!’, *?povez* ‘drive (by car)!’ (J. Kocková, p.c.).

Table 1: Slots of paradigm structure for *po*-marked ipfv. future (modern Czech)

infinitive	past (1SG)	present (1SG)	future (1SG)	imperative (SG)
<i>jít</i> -t ‘go’	<i>še-l jsem</i>	<i>jd-u</i>	<i>pů-jd-u</i>	<i>jdi, pojd’</i>
<i>nést</i> -t ‘carry’	<i>nes-l jsem</i>	<i>nes-u</i>	<i>po-nes-u</i> (<i>bud-u nést</i> -t)	<i>nes</i> (?† <i>po-nes</i>)

Counts of lexemes involved into the group of *IpoFut*-stems vary largely; they range from 11 to 115 or even more lexical units (e. g., Kopečný 1962: 49f., Osolobě 2014: 137, Ševčíková–Panevová 2018: 179f., VAGSČ 2021: 156, Saicová Římalová 2023). The counts seem to depend much on the type of data used. Thus, in large corpora one finds considerably more cases in which *po-* as future marker of ipfv. simplex stems occurs at least occasionally. Such hapax-like phenomena are indicative of *po-*’s productivity as future marker, whereas the token frequencies of different *IpoFut*-stems vary enormously. For the majority of stems allowing for either kind of future marking (*po*-prefix ~ *bud*-auxiliary) this is also reflected in huge differences concerning the proportions between these alternatives. For some of the most frequent ones, VAGSČ (2021: 156) adduces the following figures (the verbs are represented by their 3SG-forms):

(8)	<i>povede</i>	2,744	<i>bude vést</i>	25	‘lead’
	<i>ponese</i>	439	<i>bude nést</i>	5	‘carry, bring’
	<i>poletí</i>	203	<i>bude letět</i>	3	‘fly’
	<i>pokvete</i>	29	<i>bude kvést</i>	1	‘bloom’
	<i>poveze</i>	61	<i>bude vézt</i>	0	‘carry (on vehicle)’

2.2. Criteria for determining the aspect of *po*-prefixed forms

Now, why should the *po*-prefixed present-tense forms be considered ipfv. and not just PFV.PRS? There are two answers to this question, one simple and one more complex one. The simple answer lies in the compatibility of the *po*-prefixed forms with time adverb(ial)s that denote open-ended duration (cf. Kopečný 1962: 47–50, Galton 1976: 45); these can only occur with ipfv. stems. Thus, examples like (9–10) are indicative of the ipfv. status of the respective forms:

- (9) *ty to po-nes-eš stále*
 2SG.NOM DEM.N.ACC PFX-carry.IPFV-PRS.2SG permanently
 ‘you(sg) will **carry** this permanently’
 (Kopečný 1962: 48)

Ševčíková–Panevová (2018: 182) draw attention to the equivalence of such *po*-prefixed forms with the past tense of the same verb, which does not have (and cannot have) a prefix; see (10). The equivalence of these forms follows from their lexical identity.

- (10) *Kůň po-vleč-e / vleč-l kaskadér-a*
 horse-(NOM.SG) PFX-drag.IPFV-PRS.3SG / -PST-(SG.M) stuntman-ACC.SG
za sebou dlouh-ě minut-y.
 after REFL.INS long-ACC.PL minute-ACC.PL
 ‘The horse **will drag** / **dragged** the stuntman after itself for many minutes.’
 (Ševčíková–Panevová 2018: 182, slightly adapted)

As we see, this equivalence can be exploited for a substitution test. We thus get two tests: a syntagmatic one (collocatability with adverb(ial)s of open duration) and a paradigmatic one (equivalence relation with the past tense), based on lexical identity.

Straightforward as the syntagmatic test is, it has a disadvantage: relevant adverbials rarely occur in corpus examples, and not always are intuitions of informed native speakers reliable. A more specific factor that may cause troubles with this test consists in lexically conditioned actionality features of a particular verb (which otherwise counts as ipfv.) which make it incompatible with a durative adverbial, regardless of tense. For instance, Ševčíková — Panevová (2018: 184) point out that *mazat* (original meaning ‘smear’) in the figurative sense of directed motion defies a combination with such an adverbial (see 11). As they assume, „the semantic feature of duration in the temporal determination is partly in conflict with the feature of rapid realization in the meaning of the verb“ (my translation).⁷

- (11) *A on za všechny svoje hříchy mazal ipfv.pst do pekla ?několik minut.*
 ‘And he **went** to hell for all his sins ?for/during a couple of minutes.’

As Ševčíková–Panevová (2018: 181–187) show, the test with durative adverb(ial)s and the equivalence criterion with non-prefixed past tense forms often need to be applied jointly. In addition, they account for corpus attestations and their interpretation. Even then, however, the results obtained suggest a cline between clear cases of *po*- used only for marking future of ipfv. stems (e. g., if there are no infinitives: **poběžet* ‘run’, **pokvést* ‘blossom’, **poklapat* ‘work out, function’) and cases not leaving doubt that *po*- marks a pfv. counterpart to a simple stem (e. g., *potočit se* ‘rotate, swirl’, *potrénovat* ‘train, exercise’). Between these

⁷ „(...) významový rys trvání v časovém určení je zčásti v rozporu s rysem rychlé realizace ve významu slovesa.“

poles we are forced to admit intermediate cases, either because tests are inconclusive (e. g., *posunout se* ‘move’, *postěhovat se* ‘move’ — ipfv. or pfv.?), or because their *po*-prefixed derivatives only rarely occur in the past tense or as infinitives. See also §2.3.

In certain cases, the syntagmatic and the paradigmatic test even appear to work against each other, so that their strength must be weighed. Ipfv. verbs denoting duration usually have *po*-prefixed pfv. counterparts which combine the lexically conditioned meaning of duration with the boundedness feature of pfv. aspect, but may combine with the same durational adverb(ial)s. Consequently, such pfv. and ipfv. stems do not differ in their actionality, but the *po*-prefix of the pfv. stem adds a limitation to the duration,⁸ and this applies regardless of the specific tense or finiteness. Compare (12a) with pfv. *potrvat* ‘last’ in present (or non-past) tense, (12b) with the same lexeme in the infinitive, and (12c) with *potrvat* in the past tense (from Ševčíková–Panevová 2018: 187).

- (12a) *Ozdravěn-í* *les-ů* *po-trvá* *desítk-y let.*
 recovery-NOM.SG forest-GEN.PL PFX-last.PFV-(PRS.3SG) decade-ACC.PL
 ‘The recovery of forests **will take** decades.’

- (12b) *Větrn-é* *počas-í* *se* *sněžen-ím*
 windy-NOM.SG.N weather.N-NOM.SG with snowfall-INS
mě-l-o *po-trva-t* *cel-ou* *noc.*
 have.IPFV-PST-N.SG PFX-last.PFV-INF whole-acc.sg night-(ACC.SG)
 ‘Windy weather with snowfall was expected **to last** all night.’

- (12c) *Byl to požehnaný večer a zároveň počátek přátelství,*
kter-é *po-trva-l-o* *desítk-y let.*
 REL-NOM.SG.N PFX-last.PFV-PST-SG.N decade-ACC.PL
až do *Bedřich-ov-y* *smrt-i.*
 until PN-RELADJ-GEN.SG.F death.F-GEN.SG
 ‘It was a blessed evening and at the same time the beginning of a friendship that **lasted** for decades, until Bedřich’s death.’

(12c) is remarkable in that the last adverbial (*až do...* ‘until’) explicitly indicates an absolute boundary, which seems to support pfv. aspect anyway. However, the proper point is that adverb(ial)s of open duration may not serve as litmus tests of aspect membership exactly when pfv. stems derived from ipfv. simplex stems only add their boundedness feature. Therefore, the equivalence test is probably more reliable; for this reason, its results should be given preference.

Approaching the more complex answer to the question posed above, we should emphasize what actually has already become evident with the equivalence test. All observations and tests concerning the behavior of *po*-prefixed stems w.r.t. future tense are valid only for *lexemes*, i. e. for verb stems in one particular meaning. They usually do not obtain for other meanings of the same

⁸ This does not mean that the duration must be short (see ex. 12a-c), only that the process is conceived of as limited by boundaries on both ends of duration. Compare ‘t-boundedness’ in Croft (2012: 77–80).

stems. Compare, for instance, (10) with (13), in which the same verb (*vléct*) occurs in another meaning ('cover', not 'drag').

- (13) *Po-vleč-e* / *po-vlěk-l-a* *postel*
 PFX-COVER.PFV-PRS.3SG / -PST-SG.F bed-(ACC.SG)
*(čerstv-ým prádl-em) *dlouh-é minut-y.*
 fresh-INS.SG.N linen.N-INS.SG long-ACC.PL minute-ACC.PL
 'She **will cover** / **covered** the bed (with fresh linen) *for many [lit. long] minutes.'

In this case, the meaning shift is accompanied by valency increase, and the *po*-prefixed forms represent a pfv. stem. Accordingly, *povleče* is PFV.PRS "hy-poanalyzed" to future, and it has a "regular" *po*-prefixed past tense equivalent (Ševčíková–Panevová 2018: 182–184).

Similar lexical splits (i. e. polysemy) have been noticed for concrete (physical) vs figurative (non-physical) meaning alternations. As a rule of thumb, if for the simplex stems there is a choice for future marking, *po*- appears to be rather associated with physical activities (14a), while *bud*- prefers figurative meanings (14b).

- (14a) *Pokud se přetěžujeme čistě fyzicky, dopad je samozřejmě mechanický.*
Když po-lež-u dvacet let po kolen-ou,
 if PFX-climb.IPFV-PRS.1SG twenty year-(GEN.PL) on knee-LOC.PL
bud-u na nich mí-t degenerativn-í změn-y (...).
 FUT-3SG on 3PL.LOC have.IPFV-INF degenerative-ACC.PL change-ACC.PL
 'If we overexert ourselves purely physically, the impact is of course mechanical. If I **crawl** on my knees for twenty years, I will have degenerative changes on them (...).'

(CzNC syn2020; Moje zdraví 2017)

- (14b) *já mu bud-u léz-t do zadk-u?!*
 1SG.NOM 3SG.M.DAT FUT-1SG climb.IPFV-INF to ass-GEN.SG
 'Me and **crawl** into his ass?!' (lit. 'I **will climb** him to the ass?!')

(Galton 1976: 45, referring to Poldauf 1948)

However, these are tendencies at best; see, for instance, (5a–b). Native speakers' judgments on this regard diverge considerably, and corpus studies do not reveal any reasonably clear distribution (cf. Ševčíková–Panevová 2018: 181, Saticová Římalová 2023). Moreover, not always is it easy to draw a line between substantial meaning shifts and shifts from physical to figurative use; compare (15a–b), adapted from Ševčíková–Panevová (2018: 181), with (10, 13, 14a–b):

- (15a) *Požene (hnal) stádo na pastvu hodinu.* IPFV (simplex *hnat*),
 'He **will drive** (drove) the herd to pasture for an hour.' causation
 of physical motion
- (15b) *Požene (pohnal) Nováka před soud *hodinu.* PFV (*po-hnat*),
 'He **will take** (took) someone to court *for an hour.' causation
 of figurative motion

Now, the more complex answer to the question formulated above emerges from an account of the paradigmatic structure of the relevant verb lexemes.

The *po*-prefix marking future attaches only to the present tense forms and occurs in the imperative of the same lexemes, but it does not occur with any other paradigmatic form of the ipfv. simplex stem. Concomitantly, imperatives of these ipfv. lexemes with *po*- indicate that the action be performed towards and/or jointly with the speaker. See examples from syn2020 (CzNC):

- (16) *Pojď!* vs *Jestli musíš, tak jdi!*
 ‘Come (with me, to me)!’ ‘If you must, just **go** (away)!’
 (17) *Polez!* vs *Kristežežíši, fajn. Lez a já tu počkám.*
 ‘Climb (here, to my place)!’ ‘Christ Jesus, ok. **Climb** (there) and I’ll wait here.’

Let us summarize so far. *Po*-prefixed future tense of ipfv. stems is a gradable phenomenon (with core and peripheries), in more than one respect. First, with respect to types of lexical meaning: the core is undoubtedly made up of verbs denoting directed motion (in a physical or a figurative sense), but there is much fluctuation beyond that core. This fluctuation hinges on what may be reinterpreted (at least occasionally) as directed motion and on the question whether the *po*-derivative of the simplex stem occurs (with identical meaning) in the past tense and/or the infinitive. Here, second, frequencies vary a lot. Within the lexical core *jít* ‘go’ and *jet* ‘drive, ride’ are the central lexemes which do not at all occur with *bud*- to mark their future, neither do they have *po*-derivatives.⁹ Third, almost all *IpoFut*-stems also appear with the *bud*-auxiliary; however, again, in terms of token frequency these options are distributed very unevenly among these stems.

Jointly with this, and fourth, the choice between *po*-prefix and *bud*-auxiliary to mark future tense reveals an unstable distribution w.r.t. regular semantic alternations between physical and figurative motion, i. e. perspicuous correspondences between meaning and options of future marking are lacking. A clear-cut distribution of *po*-prefix vs *bud*-auxiliary obtains only for more far-reaching lexical splits (causing polysemy) that are accompanied by valency increases, but in these cases the function of *po*- itself and the status of the verb stem change radically as well: for ipfv. simplex stems in their original meaning of intransitive motion the *po*-prefix is the normal (or more widespread) way of marking future tense, but when these stems undergo a meaning shift connected with valency increase, *po*- makes the stem pfv., i. e. it changes the aspect membership. Correspondingly, this stem acquires an entirely different meaning and marks its future just with the morphological present/non-past tense as a consequence of hyponanalysis (and it cannot combine with *bud*-).

As a consequence of the properties just summarized, *IpoFut*-stems are paradigmatically defective, as *po*- does not occur with any other form of the ipfv. stem (Table 1), except the imperative (which deictically specifies movement toward the speaker). At least the core units of these stems can be considered *imperfectiva tantum*. In turn, if *po*- serves to perfectivize an ipfv. simplex, these

⁹ Thus, *pojít.INF* is pfv., means ‘die’ and can occur in the past tense.

stems are defective as well, but just as are all other pfv. stems in Czech (and other North Slavic languages): their form does not distinguish between present and future, in contrast to their ipfv. counterparts. Compare their basic paradigm structure (without imperatives) in Tables 2a–2b.

Table 2a: Paradigmatic structure of Czech **vléct₁** ‘drag’ (ipfv tantum)

	infinitive	past tense (1SG)	present tense (1SG)	future tense (1SG)
simplex	<i>vléct</i>	<i>jsem vlékla/vlékl</i> (F/M)	<i>vléku</i>	<i>budu vléct</i>
prefixed	* <i>povléct</i>	—	—	<i>povleku</i>

Table 2b: Paradigmatic structure of Czech **vléct₂** ‘cover’ (aspect pair)

	infinitive	past tense (1SG)	present tense (1SG)	future tense (1SG)
simplex, IPFV	<i>vléct</i>	<i>jsem vlékla/vlékl</i> (F/M)	<i>vléku</i>	<i>budu vléct</i>
prefixed, PFV	<i>povléct</i>	<i>jsem povlékla/povlékl</i> (F/M)		<i>povléku</i>

The example of *vléct* can be extended to the majority of polysemous *IpoFut*-stems, including the two options for marking future tense. Only the stems at the very core, *jít* ‘go’ and *jet* ‘drive, ride’, exclusively have *po-* in their physical motion meanings (see above); of course, in other meanings their paradigms may differ (see fn. 9).

Still, there remain questions whether *IpoFut*-stems are really to be considered ipfv. tantum, with *po-*forms “supplementing” their paradigms. We now turn to this issue.

2.3. Contextually conditioned ingressive use (CCIP)

The decision to regard *IpoFut*-stems (at least their core) as *imperfectiva tantum* seems to be challenged by past tense contexts, in which these stems never occur with the prefix *po-*. They may, however, be used in chains of predicates depicting a sequence of events (see 18). This function is typically associated with pfv. past tense and supports an ingressive interpretation.

- (18) *Začala^{pfv.pst} jsem ustupovat (...). Otec mi vzal^{pfv.pst} kufr a šel za mnou.*
 ‘I started to back away (...). My father took my suitcase and followed me.’
 (CzNC, syn2020)

Dickey (2011) has dubbed this usage type “contextually conditioned ingressive use of ipfv. verbs” (CCIP).¹⁰ This use is prominent in Czech, but has been

¹⁰ Its discovery is assigned to Иванчев (1961), cf. also Berger (2013) for a survey.

noted also for Slovak, Sorbian and, to a lesser degree, Slovene and SerBoCroatian (Dickey 2011: 178–180; 2020).¹¹ Importantly, the CCIP is by no means specific for motion verbs, but a general feature of ipfv. verbs, also for those which have pfv. counterparts, like Cz. *dívat se* ‘look’ (pfv. *podívat se*) in (19).

- (19) *Nedíval jsem se na ni. Ona se dál smála, pak přestala^{pfv.pst} a dívala^{ipfv.pst} se na mě lesklýma, vlhkýma očima.*
 ‘I didn’t look at her. She continued to laugh, then stopped and **looked** at me with shiny, wet eyes.’
 (Berger 2013: 39)

The generality of this property in Czech, irrespective of aspectual pairedness, is a fairly strong argument in favor of the ipfv. status of *jít* ‘go’ and other simplex stems denoting directed motion. However, it does not entirely rule out their biaspectual treatment, either.

From a diachronic viewpoint, the lack of past tense (as well as of infinitive) forms of *po*-prefixed derivatives of simplex stems denoting directed motion resulted from a retreat of these forms after the Old Czech period (i. e. since the 15th century). The actionality features of such forms have been disputed as well as their significance for the aspect system. Regardless, prefixes used just to profile phases of activities (ingressive or delimitative modification) were but weakly developed; only since the 17th century did they start gaining prominence, but only in the eastern parts of Slavic, including Polish. Simultaneously, the BECOME-auxiliary (*bud-*) acquired more and more prominence to mark future tense with ipfv. stems in North Slavic. As a consequence, *po*- attaching to non-past forms of simplex stems to mark future tense ended up in paradigmatic isolation, and it remained as a niche-phenomenon to mark future for a limited group of ipfv. stems in the western part of Slavic (cf. Wiemer, forthcoming-1: §4.4–5).

Moreover, since Old Czech times there have been quite a few contexts in which *po*-prefixed non-past forms of simplex stems denoting directed motion could be interpreted not only as future (often with ingressive flavor), but also as habitual or gnomic present, i. e. in a function that is associated to the present tense of pfv. stems. This problem has obviously persisted into our times, as the next subsection will demonstrate.

2.4. Problems with functions in the non-past domain

There is a major problem with the assessment of examples even when they occur in broader contexts: in many instances, *po*-prefixed simplex stems can be read as pfv. stems with ingressive or non-deontic modal meanings, or they refer to single events, which are then read as future, in the sense corresponding to [FUT] in §1. Non-deontic and habitual readings belong to the irrealis domain and are closely associated to the functional domain of PFV.PRS (cf. Wiemer, forthcoming-1: §3.1.2; forthcoming-2).

¹¹ Again, this phenomenon appears to be gradable. As Dickey (2020: 14) remarks, secondary imperfective verbs of motion do not occur in this context in Slovene and SerBoCroatian.

Consider examples chosen *ad libitum* from the CzNC: *polezete* and *polezu* in (20) can be read as ingressive and posterior w.r.t. to a reference interval, i. e. future. In (21), *polezu* clearly marks a goal-directed activity posterior to the reference interval, but its interpretation as ingressive, resultative ('goal reached') or just durative is vague.

- (20) *A polezete tentokrát zase jako jediná žena? Bude to úplně poprvé, co polezu na tak velký kopec s další ženskou — Američankou.*
 'And **will you climb** this time again as the only woman? It will be the very first time **I climb** such a big hill with another female — an American.'
 (syn2020; Lidé a země. 2018)
- (21) *Podívala jsem se na plot. Pak na něj. „Ty čekáš, že na to polezu?“*
 'I looked at the fence. Then on him. "You expect me to climb on it?"'
 [lit. '... that **I (will) climb** on this']
 (syn2020; C. Hoover: Bez naděje. 2014)

Consider further two examples adduced by Ševčíková — Panevová (2018). In (22), *pochvátám* 'I hurry' occurs in the apodosis of a conditional sentence; this brings it closer to a dispositional (or circumstantial) than to a future reading. In (23), the temporal reference of *poklíčí* 'germinate' alternates between future reference (again together with an ingressive nuance) and a dispositional meaning specifying what happens at any time when the seeds are exposed to light; the latter interpretation can be called gnomic, i. e. timeless.

- (22) *Kdyby ode mne potřeboval pomoc, pochvátám k němu milovými kroky.*
 'If he needs help from me, **I (will) hurry** to him by leaps and bounds.'
 (CzNC, SYNv5)
- (23) *Semena poklíčí lépe na světle, pouze je přitlače k substrátu a pravidelně zalévajte.*
 'The seeds **will germinate / germinates** better in the light, just press them to the substrate and water them regularly.'
 (from the internet)

Therefore, the problem is that PFV.PRS is well-suited for the denotation of unlimited repetition or for lawlike events, provided the type of situation can be conceived of as bounded. In turn, unlimited repetition (i. e. habituality) is closely associated to non-deontic modality (cf. Wiemer, forthcoming-2). In addition, PFV.PRS is perfectly compatible with ingressive or other phasal restrictions of activities. See (24), which lends itself actually for all just mentioned functions of PFV.PRS.

- (24) *Kulturnost lidí se ovšem neomylně pozná* ^{pfv.prs}.
 'However, one **recognizes** people's cultural level without mistake.'
 (Seidel 1939–1940: 18)

These usage domains of PFV.PRS create a large field of potential intersection with ipfv. verbs, in particular with respect to events that are, or may be, thought of as posterior to a contextually given reference interval (= future). While the interpretation of *po*-prefixed present tense stems as ingressive has

been taken into account in the discussion about the aspect membership of these forms, habitual and non-deontic modal meanings have largely remained out of consideration.¹²

Finally, there is another usage type of PFV.PRS well known for Czech (and the Slavic “western periphery” *in toto*): the narrative present. However, *po*-prefixed ipfv. stems are apparently not used in the narrative present; I am unaware of any suitable example, also in the other languages discussed below (see fn. 24).

3. Comparison with other Slavic languages

In general, research into ipfv. future marked with *po*- (or other prefixes) in languages other than Czech has been much less systematic. In the following, I make an attempt at summarizing the bits of information to be found, concerning the contemporary stage. This synthesis adds to the critical survey provided by Bláha (2008), who in general finds that outside of Czech and Slovak the lexical basis of *IpoFut*-stems is considerably reduced to a narrow group of simplex stems denoting directed motion. Moreover, Bláha provides a thorough review on the history of the question whether the incriminated *po*-prefixed forms are to be considered representatives of PFV.PRS (undergoing hypoanalysis to future) or as special future formations of ipfv. stems (2008: 64–70). My comments on this issue will thus be reduced to a minimum. Suffice it to say that after World War II these forms have been treated predominantly as ipfv. future, at least in Czech and Slovak, while for varieties of Sorbian and Kashubian views diverge to a larger extent; as for Slovene, these forms are mostly considered pfv. present. As will become obvious below, these different treatments are only partly grounded in real differences in the matter.

3.1. Slovak

Slovak is most similar to Czech in all respects discussed in §2, including the uniqueness of ‘go’, Slk. *ísť* (see below). However, grammars provide much less information concerning the range of *IpoFut*-stems and their usage. Dvonč (1984: 104) notes that there is only a limited number of motion verbs (plus a few more “affiliated” ones like *cestovať* ‘travel’, *rásť* ‘grow’) and claims that this kind of future marking does not show any increase in productivity (cf., however, Bláha 2008: 43). Most of these verbs have “doublets” (auxiliary *bud-* ~ prefix *po-*), whose functions do not seem to differ (Ružička 1966: 479). An exception is *ísť* ‘go’: no **budem ísť* exists as an alternative to *pôjdem* ‘I’ll go’ (Ružička 1966: 421). Otherwise, the formation with *bud*-auxiliary is claimed to be slightly more widespread than in Czech (Bláha 2008: 78f.).

¹² For instance, Bláha (2008: 65) remarks that *po*-prefixed forms with the relevant verbs are to be considered ipfv. also for the reason that they do not refer to repeated action (in this case only the future with *bud*-auxiliary is appropriate) — unless there is some lexical support, as in the following example: *Nesčetnokrát ponesu [= budu nést] ten kufr na nádraží a zase zpátky. ‘I will carry that suitcase to the station and back countless times.’* However, exactly such contexts do not preclude an interpretation of *ponesu* as PFV.PRS.

In general, the analysis of relevant *po*-forms in Slovak is fraught with the analytical shortcomings which I pointed out in §2.4: contexts in which these forms occur do not exclude commonplace functions of pfv. stems, i. e. of PFV. PRS, and one wonders on which basis informed linguists (even if they are native speakers) determine the ipfv. nature if, as usual, supporting durative adverbials are lacking. See examples from Ružička (1966: 421):

- (25) *Ešte si spolu posedíme^{pfv.prs}, porozprávame^{pfv.prs} sa, potom pekne spolu poletíme.*
 ‘We’ll sit together, talk, and then **we’ll fly** (= run) together.’
 (Tatarka)
- (26) *Pozrite sa mi, prosím, do očí. Z tých záhonov už svetlo **neporastie**.*
 ‘Please look me in the eyes. Light **will no longer grow** from these flower beds.’
 (Rázus)

In (25), *poletíme* ‘we’ll fly (= run)’ even occurs after two undoubtedly pfv. verbs, and all three verb forms acquire a hortative flavor. In (26), a proper future reading alternates with a circumstantial one (‘the conditions are such that flowers cannot grow there’). Admittedly, Ružička provides the ipfv. *bud*-future (*budeme letieť* and *nebude rásť*, respectively) as possible replacements, but such contextual equivalents do not really disprove a possible pfv. interpretation of the inflected *po*-forms. They only show that the contexts, which may remain vague, are compatible with the future marked by either aspect, and nuances that possibly accompany pfv. or ipfv. future are as though swept under the carpet.

Moreover, some assertions about the future tense of the relevant ipfv. stems raise surprise. For instance, Ružička (1966: 421) points out two future forms for *vidieť* ‘see’: *budem vidieť* and *uvidím*. This is misleading inasmuch as we are to infer that the prefix *u-* forms the future tense of ipfv. *vidieť*. This would mean that no infinitive *uvidieť* of a pfv. equivalent to *vidieť* exists. However, this form is attested, although probably rarely; see a corpus example:

- (27) *Stasi múzeum na Normannenstrasse je plné návštevníkov. **Uvidieť** tu môžu napravené dvere trabanta (...).*
 ‘The Stasi Museum on Normannenstrasse is full of visitors. Here, they can **see** the repaired doors of a Trabant (...).’
 (SME, May, 22, 2008; SNK, prim-6.0-public-all)

In turn, the regular form of the ipfv. future, *budem vidieť*, looks somewhat strange, and the reason seems to be the same as for the Czech cognate: Cz. *budu vidět* only refers to the ability of seeing, i. e. it can only mean ‘I will be able to see’, while the nonpast forms of *uvidět* can relate to concrete events with a metonymical shift to social behavior.¹³

¹³ For instance, Cz. *Uvidím tě na příští bohoslužbě?* ‘**Will I see** you at the next service?’ (J. Saul: Trest pro hříšné. 2012; CzNC, syn2020). See also *Seznam odpovědí*: https://dotazy.ujc.cas.cz/odpovedi/?id_odpoved=8095&filter=1.

3.2. Sorbian

The Sorbian languages are described in a similar manner, but often important pieces of information are lacking, primarily those concerning the functional distribution of forms. From a strictly formal point of view, there is one argument for older Lower Sorbian and standard Upper Sorbian which justifies why the relevant simplex stems denoting directed motion should be aligned with ipfv. aspect: only an imperfect can, or could, be used with these verbs, while aorist forms are attested only with prefixed forms.¹⁴ By contrast, genuinely bi-aspectual stems allow for both imperfect and aorist forms (e. g., standard Upper Sorbian *prajić* ‘say, tell’ has *praj-eše*.IMPF.2/3SG and *praj-i*.AOR.2/3SG).¹⁵ However, since this argument is based on the past tense, it is of limited help w.r.t. *po*-prefixed stems that only occur with non-past forms. In turn, for colloquial Upper Sorbian this argument does not apply since no aorist or imperfect forms are used anymore. This leaves us with “orphanized” non-past *po*-prefixed forms, whose paradigmatic integration and, thus, the aspect assignment of the respective simplex stems are still in question.

3.2.1. Lower Sorbian

According to Janaš (1984: 303), *z-* is used with *měš* ‘have’ and *po-* with *hys* ‘go’ to mark future tense. As for the other ipfv. stems denoting directed motion, the prefix *po-* either marks future tense or some kind of delimitative or attenuative mode of action (*Aktionsart*); the interpretation depends on the context. Which of these two “modes of action” applies is difficult to decide from the few examples given. It anyway may not be clear whether *po-* does not simply mark the ipfv. future, which is naturally compatible with the aforementioned modes of action; see (28). However, the same stems occur with *po*-prefix in the past tense (see 29); of course, in these cases the prefix can only be considered a marker of the aforementioned modes of action, which simultaneously shifts the stems into pfv. aspect.

(28) *Ja šī kofēr (chylku) **ponjasu**.*

‘I (will) **carry** the suitcase (a while).’

(29) *Ako som snědal, jo won te gusy (chylku) **pogonił**.*

‘When I ate breakfast, I **chased** those geese (for a while).’

(Janaš 1984: 303)

A similar point has been made for Upper Sorbian (Bláha 2008: 45), but in Lower Sorbian the parallelism as marker of ipfv. future and of mode of action (to yield pfv. stems) appears to be more systematic (cf. Bláha 2008: 69, 80, who speaks of “homonymy”). As a consequence, the distinction between ipfv. future and “diminutive” modes of action (with a shift to pfv. aspect) becomes very subtle, and deciding on either even in broader contexts becomes difficult or im-

¹⁴ For Lower Sorbian *hys* ‘go’ cf. Mucke 1966 [1911–1915/1925], *sub verbo*), for standard Upper Sorbian *hić* ‘go’ and *jěć* ‘drive, ride’ cf. Kral (1986 [1927], *sub verbis*).

¹⁵ I am obliged to Walter Breu for drawing my attention to this important detail.

possible. On the one hand, if the *po*-prefixed forms also occur in the past tense, a mere tense-marking function of *po*- is rather implausible, since the paradigm structure of *po*-marked forms does not seem reduced. On the other hand, we might ask whether *po*-prefixed forms belong to two different (“homonymic”) lexemes — with future-marking *po*- only filling one paradigmatic slot of the ipfv. simplex and “another” *po*- deriving its pfv. counterpart — or whether the “diminutive” and the future tense function of *po*- are related to the same lexeme, since their temporal features can be connected via implicatures.

After all, it is not entirely clear whether *po*-forms like the following ones might not be considered just PFV.PRS, since *po*- can, again, be interpreted as marking the ingressive moment (compare with the Czech examples 20–22):

- (30a) *Za tyžėń **pojěžomy** do Polskeje.*
 ‘In a week, we (will) go to Poland.’
 (30b) ***Polešiš** ty z lětađłom abo **powježo** tebję wujk z awtom?*
 ‘**Will you fly** by plane, or **will they drive** you with the car?’
 (Janaš 1984: 303)

Notably, in his description from the end of the 19th century, Mucke (1891: 604f.) explicitly excludes “synthetic” future with *po*- or *z*- for ipfv. stems. Instead, he treats forms like *pójžeš* ‘you(sg) will go’, *póšignješe* ‘you(pl) will drag’ as pfv., on a par with pfv. non-motion verbs, e. g. *powstanu* ‘I will stand up’. He comments on this as follows: „In Sorbian, the perfective present tense still appears most regularly as the future tense in the verbs of motion“ (Mucke 1891: 604; my translation).¹⁶

In addition, information on whether the relevant stems with *po*- have (or had) an infinitive, or whether the *bud*-auxiliary may be used alternatively, is scarce and contradictory. While Janaš (in the 1976 edition of his grammar) is said to have excluded future with the auxiliary only for *hyś* ‘go’, *jěś* ‘ride’ and *lězc* ‘crawl’, Mucke is claimed to have admitted both *pójžom* and *bužom hyś* ‘I’ll go’ for *hyś* (Bláha 2008: 46). We cannot exclude that these contradictory claims reflect real change in preferences for *po*- (“synthetic”) or *bud*- (“analytic”) in the language over some three generations.

3.2.2. Upper Sorbian

For Upper Sorbian we should distinguish between the (conservative) standard and the colloquial variety. Concerning the former, Schuster-Šewc (1996: 169) specifies that the following ipfv. verbs mark their future tense exclusively with *po*- (“synthetic” future):

- (31)¹⁷ *hić* ‘go’, *njesć* ‘carry’, *wjesć* ‘lead’, *wjezc* ‘take, drive’, *lećeć* ‘fly’,
lězc ‘crawl’, *jěć* ‘go (by vehicle)’, *ćěrić* ‘chase’, *ćahnyc* ‘move’.

¹⁶ See the original (spelling retained): „Am regelmässigsten erscheint im Sorbischen das perfective Praesens als Tempus futurum noch bei den verben der Bewegung.“

¹⁷ This list is almost identical with the list in Ермакова (1973: 278–280), who additionally includes *běžeć* and *hnać* ‘run’ (both). Cf. Bláha (2008: 79) for a survey.

Concerning their aspect membership, these “*po*-prefixed forms specify no completion of future action and are therefore grammatically analogous to the periphrastic future formed with *budu*”. The same applies to *z-* for *měć*, i. e. *z-měju* ‘I will have’, etc. (1996: 169); cf. also Werner (1996: 62f.; 2003: 128).

However, again, we face the problem that *po*-prefixed forms of these stems may occur in contexts in which they combine with present tense forms of pfv. verbs as parts of sequences of (episodic?) events posterior to the reference interval. In such environment, they acquire ingressive meaning and thereby refer to completed action. Consider an example from Faßke (1981: 267):

- (32) *Jednogo dnja wulke awta wosrjedź wsy zastanu^{pfv.prs} a wjesnjanjow ze wsy powjezu.*
 ‘One day, large cars will stop in the middle of the village and **drive** the villagers out of the village.’

In principle, all these findings apply to the colloquial variety as well. See Scholze (2008: 194), who adds an interesting detail: the exclusive use of *po*- as future tense of ipfv. stems denoting directed motion “leaks” in one particular case. Namely, if future meaning is accompanied by some nuance, the *bud*-auxiliary (+ infinitive) may be used. Judging from Scholze’s example (32), this nuance may consist in an illocutionary effect of resistant consent (which Scholze dubs “modal”):

- (32) *Da **budžem** ja em tón korb **nesć!***
 ‘Then **I’ll** just **carry** the basket!’
 (compare Germ. ‘Dann **werde** ich eben den Korb **tragen!**’)

Notably, at face value, the examples adduced by Scholze (2008: 269, 279f.) do not show unambiguous ipfv. uses, either; all of them can be referred to the beginning or the endpoint of the directed motion event. The corresponding simplex stems do not have infinitive or past tense forms. Their imperatives (*pój.sg*, *pójće.pl* ‘come here’), in turn, reveal the same deictic orientation toward the speaker as their Czech cognates (Scholze 2008: 268, 277f.).

In addition, Werner (2003: 82) admits the rare occurrence of the “analytic” future (*budu hić* ‘I will go’, etc.) outside the standard language. He furthermore remarks that *po*-prefixation with ipfv. simplex stems sometimes occurs with verbs which acquire a meaning of directed motion only via context, as in the following example from auditory evidence:

- (33) *Póndžeš ty pěši abo posmjerdžiš ty tam?*
 ‘**Will you walk** or **will you “stink”** there?’
 (compare Germ. ‘**Gehst** du zu Fuß oder **stinkst** du dorthin?’)

3.3. Kashubian

Some grammars and dictionaries of Kashubian point toward a unique behavior of *jic* ‘go’. Sychta (1968: 103) adduces forms like *pudq.1sg*, *puze.3sg* as future tense of *jic*, which he treats as ipfv., alongside with imperative forms (*poj*, *poj3*, *pu3*), but no infinitive (**pojic*). So does Gółąbk (2005) in the entry for *jic*.

He does not specify the aspect, but his short examples are compatible with pfv. aspect (e. g., *Mě pùdzemě razã* ‘We’ll go together’, *Ōn zarô pùdze* ‘He’ll go immediately’), just as do Sorbian examples (see §3.2). Makùrôt (2016: 51) presents a full paradigm of the irregular future of *jic* marked with *pù-*. She thus seems to align these prefixed forms with ipfv. aspect. So do Breza — Treder (1981: 133).¹⁸

No other simplex stem seems to behave this way. Even the infinitive *pò-jachac* derived from *jachac* ‘ride, drive’ exists (P. Bartelik and H. Makùrôt-Snuzěk, p.c.), but it should probably be considered pfv.; at least, this is what examples with past tense (34) and non-past forms (35) provided by Sychta (1970: 247) suggest:

- (34) *Mòji starkòwie pòjachelě na grzëbitwã pód Pieleszewò.*
‘My parents **went** for (collecting) mushrooms to Pieleszewo.’
- (35) *Jak pòjedziesz wedlq piekla, to nie gadòj pùrtce jinaczi jak „ùja”.*
‘When **you go** on the road to hell, don’t say to the devil in another way than “ùja”.’

Regardless, according to Hana Makùrôt-Snuzěk (p.c.), the future tense of *jic* can alternatively be formed with the *bud*-auxiliary and the *l*-participle of the suppletive root *š-* (e. g., *bãdã szla/szedl* ‘I will go [F/M]’). These forms are judged quite acceptable in belles-lêttres, under negation they sound natural even in speech (e. g., *jô tam nie mdã*¹⁹ *szedl* ‘I won’t go there’). Remarkably, with the infinitive, the same auxiliary (*?bãdã jic*) seems excluded, at least in speech.

Lorentz (1919: 44; 1958: 316; 1962: 979) offers a slightly different treatment. He classifies *jic* as ipfv., but *p^uudq*.1SG, *p^uuzeš*.2SG, etc., as pfv. The latter forms do not have an infinitive counterpart, either, but Lorentz supplies a prefixed past tense form (*p^oosed*), apart from the imperative (1958: 317). As Nomachi (2015: 274) remarks, prefixed past tense “does exist in Kashubian, and indeed it is not rare, but this form is often regarded as an ‘incorrect’ Polonized form”. Otherwise, past tense is expressed with unprefix forms (*szedl*, etc.), and these behave like their Czech equivalents, i. e. can be interpreted ingressively in narrative sequences. This conforms to Dickey’s CCIP usage (see §2.3); cf. Nomachi (2015: 273f.).

Summarizing these not always unambiguous pieces of information on *jic*, its paradigm appears to be based on the forms given in Table 3.

At present, we may only speculate why **bãdã jic*.INF is not used (as an alternative to *bãdã szla/szedl* ‘I’ll go [F/M]’), in contrast to the bulk of ipfv. verbs, which allow for both realizations. The exclusive use of *bãdã szla/szedl* might possibly be explained as a diachronic remnant: in Common Slavic, the future (originally a future perfect) with the *bud*-auxiliary was formed with the *l*-participle, while the infinitive was a Bohemian and Polish innovation (following, or accompanying, the functional shift to an “ordinary” future of ipfv. stems).

¹⁸ “Od czasownika *jic* ‘iść’ czas przyszły brzmi *pudę, pudziesz, pudze, pudzemě* lub *pudze-ma, pudzeta* lub *pudzece* (forma grzecznościowa), *pudq*.” Cf. also JKPE (2006: 42).

¹⁹ Forms with *m* (*mdã*.1SG, etc.) are regular alternatives of this auxiliary.

Table 3: Paradigmatic structure of Kashubian *jic* ‘go’

	infinitive	past tense (1sg)	present tense (1sg)	future tense (1sg)
simplex	<i>jic</i>	(jo) <i>žem szła / szedł</i>	<i>jidã</i>	? <i>bãdã</i> , ? <i>mdã szła / szedł</i> (F/M)
prefixed	* <i>pojic</i>	? (jo) <i>žem poszła / poszedł</i> (F/M)	—	<i>pùdã</i>

However, this innovation goes back to the 13th–14th century, while the *l*-participle reappeared in Polish in the late 15th century via secular texts and subsequently acquired equal status with the infinitival pattern (cf. Wiemer, forthcoming-1: §3.2.1.2, for a summary of the relevant research). Under this assumption it would appear like a miracle why over the centuries Kashubian should not have been affected by intense Polish contact, which possibly has also supported the parallel options for marking ipfv. future tense (with *l*-participle or infinitive).²⁰ For this reason, an alternative explanation of the deviant behavior of *jic* sounds more plausible: for Pol. *iść*, the future tense with the participle is much more frequent in colloquial speech than with the infinitive.²¹ This predominance of the participial realization of the lexical verb could have been copied, or PAT-borrowed,²² possibly with the Polish pattern supporting a tendency in Kashubian itself. However, at present either attempt to explain the observations amounts to mere assumptions that should be scrutinized on a larger background and more solid facts.

Moreover, it is unclear whether there have been other verbs which marked their future in this way. Anyway, even if the restriction of *jic* to the *po*-prefix and the participle (with *bãd-*) turns out as an idiosyncratic lexicalized case, this raises the question whether it might be an archaic remnant of an earlier layer more widespread not only in the Bohemian-Moravian, but even in the Lekhitic area of West Slavic.

3.4. Slovene

Again, treatments of the simplex *iti* ‘go’ in contemporary Slovene do not yield any clear picture about its aspect membership, in particular on account of the present tense forms of its *po*-prefixed derivative (*pojdem*.1sg, etc.). Usually, *iti* seems to be treated as a biaspectual verb, e. g. in the SSKJ (1970–1991,

²⁰ Andersen (2006: 14) points out that, generally, the variant with the infinitive is attested only in the southern dialects of Kashubian, and he explains this as an adaptation to Polish (2006: 18).

²¹ A superficial check in the PNC revealed that the ratio of token frequency for *będ-* + *szedł/szła*, etc., vs *będ-* + *iść* is approximately 3.7 (267 vs 71 tokens), showing a clear dominance of the participle. By comparison, the same ratio for *pisać* ‘write’ is 0.96 (296 vs 308 tokens). For these figures, I am obliged to Marek Łaziński.

²² For these processes cf. Sakel (2007).

sub verbo). However, the prefixed present tense forms and the imperative (*po-jd-i(te)*) are included in the paradigm of *iti*, and these are obviously regarded as pfv. (Derganc 2015: 70). In the meaning ‘go’, the *po*-derivative of *iti* has neither infinitive nor past tense forms (Derganc 2014: 348). Infinitive and past tense forms do exist for this stem, but only in the meaning ‘be wasted, be no longer available, have become spent/exhausted’; see (36) from SSKJ (entry *poiti*) and (37) by courtesy of Mladen Uhlik:

- (36) *Prihranjen-i denar mu je hitro po-še-l.*
 saved-NOM.SG money-NOM.SG 3SG.DAT AUX.PRS.3SG quickly PFX-go.PFV-LP-(SG.M)
 ‘The money he saved **went** (= **was spent**) quickly.’
 (<https://fran.si/iskanje?FilteredDictionaryIds=130&View=1&Query=poiti>)
- (37) *Vs-e bo po-š-l-o.*
 everything-NOM.SG.N FUT-(3SG) PFX-go.PFV-PST-SG.N
 ‘All will be gone (= It will never return.).’

This perfectly corresponds to the Czech cognate *pojít* ‘die’ (see fn. 9). However, in contrast to Czech, no imperative forms of the simplex stem *iti* are used, at least in the standard language.²³

Moreover, *iti*’s future tense is marked with an auxiliary (*bôm*.1SG, *bôš*.2SG, etc.) only for the stem without *po*-prefix (*bom šel/šla* ‘I will go (M/F)’), not with it (**bom pošel/pošla*) in the meaning ‘go’ (Ramovš 1952: 129). Instead, the present tense forms of the *po*-prefixed stem (*pojdem*.1SG, etc.) are regarded as another future of *iti*. These two future formations of *iti* do not show any apparent differences in function (M. Uhlik, p.c.). Bláha (2008: 47) argues that *po*-prefixed present tense forms may be interpreted as ipfv., however the two examples he adduces are not convincing: one shows hortative usage (*čez vode pojdemo v južne kraje* ‘**let’s cross** [lit. *we (will) go across*] the waters to the southern lands’), the other takes part in a conditional sentence implying a sequence (*Kadar pojdemo na Posavje, se lahko napijete in napojite do site volje* ‘When **we go** to Posavje, you can get drunk and drink to your heart’s content’). After all, the paradigm of *iti* looks highly unusual: the forms *pojdem* etc. take the place of the regular future formation with the BECOME-auxiliary, and this adds to the morphological uniqueness of this verb lexeme. In the standard language, *iti* is highly suppletive anyway, as its paradigm is made up of three roots: *i(d)*-, *gre*-, and *š*- (see Table 4). In addition, the *po*-prefixed stem deviates from the regular pattern of Slovene pfv. stems, which morphologically distinguish present and future tense.

The *po*-derivative of *iti* ‘go’ is thus defective as it only has imperative and non-past forms without any morphologically distinguished future. Simultaneously, the simplex *iti* is assigned two future forms, the usual one with auxiliary (+ *l*-participle), and one with present tense morphology of its *po*-prefixed derivative. This raises the question whether the latter should be regarded ipfv. as well

²³ Such imperatives (*idi*.SG, *idite*.PL) are only attested in Carinthian and Prekmurje Slovene (M. Uhlik, p.c.). In the latter, imperatives from the simplex stem even seem to predominate, and the paradigm of *i-ti* does not show suppletion with *gre*- for the present tense (M. Greenberg, p.c.).

Table 4: Paradigmatic structure of Slovene *iti* ‘go’

	infinitive	past tense (1SG)	present tense (1SG)	future tense (1SG)	imperative
simplex	<i>i-ti</i>	<i>š-e-l / š-l-a sem</i> [M/F]	<i>gre-m</i>	<i>š-e-l / š-l-a bo-m</i> [M/F]	—
prefixed	—	—	—	<i>po-jd-em</i>	<i>po-jd-i(te)</i>

or, alternatively, as pfv. with an entirely defective paradigm, i. e. with “orphanized” present tense and imperative forms. The prefixed imperative may be understood as filling a gap for lack of an imperative of the ipfv. simplex (in the standard language; see fn. 23), but what, then, about the “doubly filled” future tense slot? However we turn around the form: function relations and the paradigm slots of this lexeme meaning ‘go’, its paradigm *in toto*, and for the *po*-prefixed forms in particular, do not fit into any coherent paradigm structure of Slovene verbs.

Moreover, the *po*-prefixed non-past tense forms (*pojdem* etc.) and their employment as future tense also look strange on a South Slavic background: provided these forms take the paradigmatic place of the pfv. future, this levels out the functional distinction between pfv. present and pfv. future: in Slovene (as in other South Slavic languages) the pfv. present is otherwise employed for irrealis functions, while a genuinely temporal use (marking posteriority, in accordance with [FUT] in §1) is typical of the pfv. future.

Correspondingly, one wonders whether *pojdem* etc. is used in irrealis functions and, above that, whether it may partake in narrative chains related in present tense.²⁴ Definitely, forms like *pojdem* are not used in progressive function (i. e. as denotation of ongoing or future activities), and this contrasts with their Czech cognates (see §2.2).

What about other verbs of motion (*nesti* ‘carry’, *vesti* ‘lead’, *jahati* ‘ride’, *peljati* ‘drive’, *leteti* ‘fly’, etc.), i. e. forms like *ponesem*, *povedem*, *popeljem*, *pojezdim*, *poletim*? According to Derganc (2022: 147), their use with future meaning is typical rather of literary or poetic style (“v pomenu futura sodijo predvsem v knjižni in poetični jezik”). While this does not say anything about their non-future use, these *po*-prefixed forms, with identical lexical meaning, do correspond to the usual future tense (*bom popeljal*, *bom poletel*, *bom ponesel*, etc.), although presumably these forms are infrequent (M. Uhlik, p.c.). Nonetheless, one wonders whether the functions of the present and the future tense forms (*ponesem* ~ *bom ponesel*, etc.) differ. In addition, practically all these stems are

²⁴ Miklosich (1874 [1926]: 773) denied narrative usage with these verbs, and this would correspond to its Czech cognate (see §2.4). However, Miklosich’s notion of narrative (or “historical”) present was rather vague (1868: 768).

attested with their infinitives in SSKJ in meanings of directed motion (apart from figurative meanings),²⁵ and Miklosich (1874 [1926]: 773) mentions the infinitives of all these verbs, including *pojti* ‘go’. Today, *pojti* seems to have entirely disappeared, which makes *iti* unique even within the narrow group of directed motion verbs.

After all, the scarce findings about *po*-derivatives of a narrow group of simplex stems denoting directed motion in Slovene rather clearly suggest that these *po*-prefixed stems are most adequately characterized as pfv. However, at least the *po*-derivative of *iti* (*pojdem* etc.) seems to “overfill” the paradigm of *iti* for its future, unless the contrast between *pojdem* and *bom šel* ‘I will go’, etc., boils down to one of aspect (see Table 4). Moreover, it is not clear whether the simplex *iti* is biaspectual or ipfv. At least, the contrast *pojdem* (→ pfv.) vs *bom šel* (→ ipfv.), together with the suppletion of *i*- with *gre-* for ipfv. present tense, suggests that *iti* should be regarded as ipfv.

In sum, we are left with a conundrum, in particular when we add other puzzling information. Thus, Derganc (2022: 146) reports that the infinitive *iti* occurs, although very rarely, after the phasal verb *začeti* ‘begin’:²⁶

- (38) *Bela ovca se je prestopila*^{pfv.pst} *in začela iti vzdolž laza.*
 ‘The white sheep crossed over and **began to walk** along the path.’
 (Nova beseda)

This speaks in favor of *iti*’s ipfv. status. So does, on first sight, the observation that its past tense (*šel, šla*) is not easily compatible with inclusive time intervals. At least, occasional examples from authentic use do not yield unequivocal interpretations. Consider, for instance, (39):

- (39) „Kaj bi storil, če bi dobil sporočilo o gorski nesreči?“
 „Vzel bi hribovske čevlje in opremo, rezervni akumulator in *šel, v petih minutah.*“
 “‘What would you do if you got a message about a mountain accident?’“
 “I’d grab my mountain shoes and gear, spare battery and **go, within five minutes.**””
 (Derganc 2022: 146; from the internet)

The adverbial *v petih minutah* ‘in five minutes’ can be understood to refer to the time that elapsed until the speaker got ready and went out, i. e. until the movement started. It seems that tests based on inclusive time adverbials sometimes fail to show what they are supposed to.²⁷ If anything, a “pfv. reading” feels more natural, but the left boundary of directed motion is not what such

²⁵ *Poletéti* ‘fly’, *pojáhati* ‘ride’, *pojézditi* ‘drive, ride’ are given with an ingressive meaning (usually for their past tense), whereas the phasal, or deictic, characteristics of *popeljati* ‘drive’, *povesti* ‘lead’ and *ponesti* ‘carry’ seem to be more diffuse.

²⁶ An analogous observation holds true for Czech simplex stems denoting directed motion: combinations of *začít* ‘begin’ with these verbs are extremely rare, but attested (J. Kocková, p.c.).

²⁷ Tests based on inclusive time intervals are usually designed for accomplishments; they often do not fit when the focus is on ingression of action (cf. Dickey 2022: 10f.).

adverbials actually focus on; instead, an additional inferential step is needed to link the “punctual” ingressive moment with a closed time interval of some extension.

In addition, past tense forms of *iti* easily combine with adverbials denoting the precise time (see 40); the same applies to past tense forms of other simplex motion verbs (see 41).

- (40) *Točno ob petih sem šel v kino.* ‘Exactly at five o’clock I went to the cinema.’
 (41) *Ob petih je nesel pismo na pošto.* ‘At five o’clock he took the letter to the post office.’

(Derganc 2022: 146)

However, these forms do not unambiguously refer to either the start or the endpoint of movement, and the time indicated by these adverbials may also serve as reference interval for an ongoing process. Thus, for instance, if (41) is slightly modified, *je nesel* acquires progressive function (M. Uhlik, p.c.):

- (41’) *Ob petih, ko so ga klicali, je nesel pismo na pošto.*
 ‘At five o’clock, when they shouted for him, he **was carrying** the letter to the post office.’

We may thus infer that the actionality potential of *nesti*, at least of its past tense, is diffuse and rather shaped by the context. This, of course, does not contradict an assignment of *nesti* (and other simplex motion verbs) as ipfv. (cf. Krviná 2016: 211). However, when digging further, we notice that past tense forms of these verbs are hardly compatible with adverbials denoting open intervals (Derganc 2022: 145f.); see (42a). This stands in clear contrast to their Czech cognates (see 42b); cf. also Dickey (2020: 12, referring to Součková 2004: 55 for Czech).

- (42a) Slovene *Šel je v mesto *eno uro.*
 (42b) Czech *Šel do města hodinu.*
 ‘He went to the city for an hour.’

This perfectly fits with the different behavior of the non-past forms Sln. *pojdem* vs Cz. *půjdu*. Thus, provided the simplex past tense forms and the prefixed non-past forms belong to the same lexeme, and the same paradigm, the Czech forms differ in a crucial section of their “behavioral profile”: even though this happens rarely, Cz. *půjdu*, etc., does occur in progressive contexts, or can be collocated with corresponding adverbials (see §2.2), whereas for Sln. *pojdem*, etc., a progressive function does not seem to be available under any means.

3.5. Comparison of Cz. *jít* (*půjdu*) and Sln. *iti* (*pojdem*)

To compare the most prominent “protagonists” of our survey, Cz. *jít* and Sln. *iti* ‘go’, in the contemporary standard languages, see Table 5, which summarizes the functional distribution of their forms.

Table 5: Cz. *jít* and Sln. *iti* ‘go’ in comparison (*standard languages*)

	does <i>po</i> -derivative have			<i>po</i> - nonpast	past	simplex with	simplex past
	infinitive	past tense	imperative	progressive function?		phasal verb?	CCIP ?
Cz. <i>jít</i>	—	—	+	+	+	(+)	+
Sln. <i>iti</i>	—	—	+ *	—	—	(+)	+

* Usual in the standard language, other varieties prefer imperative of simplex stem (*idi(te)*).

Cz. *jít* is slightly less defective as for its morphological forms, also on account of the imperative (deictic contrast: *jdi* — *pojď*). More importantly, both Cz. *jít* and its *po*-derivative are compatible with progressive contexts (and corresponding time adverbials), in contrast to their Slovene cognates. In the first place, this supports the treatment of Cz. *jít* as ipfv., including its *po*-forms, which are thereby integrated into the paradigm of ipfv. *jít* (as its future forms), and this justifies declaring *jít* an *imperfectivum tantum*. This verb does not use the *bud*-auxiliary as a parallel device of future formation. The same applies to *jet* ‘drive, ride’, but all other verbs for which *po*- has been claimed to mark future tense, do have a parallel formation with *bud*-. Correspondingly, these ipfv. simplex stems display two future tense options, i. e. a kind of overabundance.

As for Sln. *iti*, at first sight the situation looks very similar, but it gets fundamentally different when we account for the following points. First, its collocational behavior does not fit the behavior of ipfv. verbs: in past tense, it is compatible with temporally bounded events, only rarely does it collocate with a phasal verb; the latter however also applies to its Czech cognate. Second, there is an open issue whether *pojdem* and *bom šel* differ in terms of boundedness, i. e. whether *bom šel* can mark a progressive function for the future (in contrast to *pojdem*, which clearly cannot). Altogether, *pojdem* behaves like a pfv. verb (in contrast to Cz. *půjdu*). Nonetheless *pojdem* has usually been included into the paradigm of *iti*, but, again, the non-prefixed forms of *iti* rather show a pfv. behavior themselves — except their present tense, which, however, is suppletive (*gre*-). This suppletion may be for a reason, namely: to “recompensate” the inability of *i-ti* (and the other suppletive root *š-*) to mark unbounded situations. After all, only *gre*- makes this verb lexeme with its highly suppletive paradigm a possible candidate of a biaspectual verb; without *gre*- we would rather not hesitate to align it with pfv. aspect.

Provided these insights and conclusions as for the grammatical status of the Czech and the Slovene cases are correct, a further difference “beneath the surface” ensues. It concerns the interpretation of the past tense forms of Cz. *jít* and Sln. *iti* in narrative contexts. As mentioned above, these forms have been considered as demonstrating “contextually conditioned ingressive use of ipfv. verbs” (CCIP). Provided Sln. *šel/šla* is pfv. (or at least biaspectual), then this behavior

results automatically and there is nothing peculiar about it, except that this verb is not prefixed: no contextually conditioned coercion occurs with these forms in Slovene, since their ingressive function conforms to their aspect membership. For Cz. *šel/šla* the case is different: here all considerations concerning CCIP apply.

Finally, we may ask how the facts assembled about Cz. *jít* and Sln. *iti* relate to aspectual pairedness. Clearly, the *po*-prefixed present tense forms cannot be regarded as a full-fledged pfv. counterpart of the simplex stems in either case, although for different reasons pointed out above. However, the unique behavior and paradigmatic structure of these two cognate simplex stems (with meaning ‘go’) may be taken as an extreme pole at which the *po*-prefixed forms are integrated into their paradigms. From this pole, a gradient stretches toward another pole at which we may safely speak of aspect pairs. This is depicted in Figure 1.

The vertical axis is meant to show the gradient from an entirely idiosyncratic behavior of *jít/iti* ‘go’ and its prefixed forms at the top toward doubtless aspect pairs at the bottom. The cognate stems in Czech and Slovene may differ in their aspect assignment, but in addition the tense-aspect systems of Czech and Slovene differ in general: Slovene (as all South Slavic languages) morphologically distinguishes present and future tense regardless of the aspect of the stems, whereas in Czech (as North Slavic practically all over) pfv. stems cannot make this distinction. Thus, the options of indicating future tense for Sln. *iti* have to be judged differently than the options for Cz. *jít*, also on the backdrop of other stems denoting directed motion. Cz. *jít* (together with *jet* ‘drive’) only has one option, namely with *po*-, while the other simplex stems denoting directed motion have two: *po*-prefix and *bud*-auxiliary, whereas the future tense of all other ipfv. stems is only marked with *bud*-auxiliary. In turn, Sln. *iti* marks its future in the normal way (with BECOME-auxiliary + *l*-participle), but its *po*-derivative does not; instead, the non-past form of the latter is interpreted as another, exceptional future form of *iti*. From these paradigmatic idiosyncrasies we get to other simplex stems denoting directed motion (and associated meanings), which have two options of marking future tense in Czech, but either of them behaves like ipfv. future and should probably be treated as *imperfectiva tantum*. By contrast, their Slovene cognates distinguish present and future tense forms, although these are rarely used and it is not clear whether, and how, they differ in function; concomitantly, the *po*-prefixed forms might probably be treated as pfv. counterparts of ipfv. simplex stems, but this remains to be established. Thus, for Slovene, the gradient toward aspectual pairedness can possibly be described in terms of the functional relations between simplex and *po*-prefixed derivatives for all parts of the paradigm (and as for whether all their “slots” are filled for both stems). In Czech, in turn, this gradient is determined by the problems discussed in §2.2.

In Figure 1, aspect is indicated (by small caps in superscripts) only for forms with tense morphology in Czech; otherwise, the *po*-prefixed forms count as pfv., the non-prefixed ones as ipfv. (also in Slovene). The mark ‘?’ indicates the arguable aspect membership of the given form, ‘*’ indicates lack of attestation.

PREFIXING NON-PAST FORMS OF SIMPLEX STEMS
AND THEIR VICISSITUDES IN SLAVIC

Figure 1: Gradient between paradigmatic idiosyncrasy and aspectual pairedness

Czech:	PFV.PRS ⊃ PFV.FUT (or rather: PFV non-past), 3SG	INFINITIVE	PAST	PRESENT	FUTURE	
‘go’		(*po)jit	(*po)šel	jde	pojde ^{PFV} / *bude jit	↑ ipfv. tantum, most of them like <i>letět</i>, i.e. with two future forms? ↓
‘fly’		(*po)letět	(*po)letěl	letí	poletí ^{PFV} / (bude letět)	
‘work out’		(?po)klapat	(?po)klapal	klape	(?poklape) / bude klapat	
...		...	...	...	...	
‘rain’		(po)pršet	(po)pršelo	prší	poprší ^{PFV?} / bude pršet ^{PFV}	??
...		...	...	...	...	
‘watch’		(po)hledět	(po)hleděl	hledí ^{PFV}	pohlédí ^{PFV} / bude hledět ^{PFV}	aspect pair

Slovene:	PFV.PRS ≠ PFV.FUT – bo (3SG) + l-form (SG.M) as dedicated FUT (for either aspect)	INFINITIVE	PAST	PRESENT	FUTURE	
‘go’		(*po)iti	(*po)šel	gre	bo šel / (pojde), *bo pošel	↑ biaspectual, or pfv.? – regardless, two parallel FUT forms: <i>pojdem...</i> does not behave like PFV.PRS ↓
‘carry’		(po)nesti	(?po)nesel	nese	bo (po)nesel / (ponese)	
...		...	...	...	...	
‘watch’		(po)gledati	(po)gledal	(po)gleda	bo (po)gledal (vs PRS (po)gleda)	aspect pair

Figure 1: Gradient between paradigmatic idiosyncrasy and aspectual pairedness

4. Conclusions

The present article has dealt with the peculiar way in which certain verbs of languages in the western peripheries of the Slavic speaking territory mark their future tense, namely: with the prefix *po-* (only in rare cases *z/s-*) attached to present tense forms. Concomitantly, these verbs also (tend to) lack other paradigmatic forms of the verb except the imperative. The core group has always consisted in simplex stems denoting some kind of directed motion (e. g., Cz. *popluji* 'I will swim', Slk. *poletíme* 'we'll fly', USorb. *powjezu* 'I'll drive (sb.)', Sln. *popeljem* 'I'll go, ride'), in either a physical or a figurative sense. From this core we observe various extensions into associated lexical fields to other simplex stems. With barely any exception, this usage affects meanings of parametric change with either transitive or intransitive syntax.

Moreover, future marking by *po-* attached to present tense forms of simplex stems may involve ipfv. stems which occasionally acquire meanings of directed motion (e. g., Cz. *fičet* 'whiz'). Conversely, if simplex stems of directed motion develop other meanings (with or without changes in valency), they only have the usual ipfv. future with an auxiliary, but also an infinitive and past tense forms. In these cases, *po-* only serves to transform an ipfv. stem into a pfv. one (e. g., Cz. $vléct_1^{ipfv}$ 'drag' > $vléct_2^{ipfv} \Rightarrow po-vléct_2^{pfv}$ 'cover (sth. with sth.)'). This demonstrates that the whole issue concerns lexemes, i. e. verb stems in particular meanings, not just stems of some morphological shape; moreover, the status of *po-* (marker of ipfv. future or of pfv. stem derived from an ipfv. simplex?) changes radically in accordance with the paradigm structure of the stem. Jointly with this, issues arise as for the aspect of the simplex stem: ipfv., biaspectual, or even pfv.? While for the relevant West Slavic languages most arguments speak in favor of their status as ipfv. stems, even as *imperfectiva tantum*, the core verb of this group in Slovene, *iti* 'go', can better be characterized as pfv., at least on account of its extremely idiosyncratic paradigm structure (however construed).

The discussion was restricted to the (more or less) contemporary stage of Czech, Slovak, varieties of Sorbian, Kashubian, and Slovene. We have seen that stems with this behavior form a loose group with fuzzy extensions. Several gradients could be figured out:

(a) The largest extensions from the lexical core group of directed motion can be observed in Czech, while, obviously, in Kashubian there is only one verb with an irregular future (*jic* 'go'). Probably, Slovene comes close to this. Between these extremes we find Slovak and the Sorbian varieties.

(b) Crosslinguistically, the very core is formed by the cognate simplex stem meaning 'go', then comes 'drive, ride'. This is evident from the observation that, in almost all aforementioned languages, only 'go' (Cz. *jít*, Slk. *ísť*, USorb. *hić*, LSorb. *hyś*, Kash. *jic*) virtually lacks an alternative to mark future tense with the usual way known in all these languages, namely with a BECOME-auxiliary (Cz./Slk./Sorb. *bud-*, Kash. *bãd-* or *md-*). The exception is Slovene (*iti*), where *bo šel / šla* 's/he will go' is a regular formation: however, in Slovene the interaction

of future marking with aspect differs anyway. Occasional use of the BECOME-auxiliary with 'go' is known only for Kashubian and, with a specific nuance, in Upper Sorbian. Simultaneously, these stems consistently lack an infinitive and past tense forms. Simplex stems with the meaning 'ride' follow up closely: Kashubians sometimes use *po-jachac* (probably under Polish influence). Slovene has *po-jahati* and *po-peljati*, but these forms are extremely rare, and they are lacking in the other languages. Realizations with the auxiliary are virtually unknown.

(c) As for the remaining relevant simplex stems in Czech, the two options of future marking (*po*-prefix vs auxiliary) are realized in very different proportions of frequency. As for Slovene, due to its different aspect-tense system in the non-past domain, the relation between *po*-prefixation of present tense forms and auxiliary used for future marking (*bô-*) must be assessed more systematically in terms of aspectual pairedness: are both simplex and *po*-prefixed stems used in present and future tense? And, if yes, how do their functions relate to each other?

After all, the status of *po*-prefixed present tense forms of simplex motion verbs should be decided upon language per language, and not all relevant simplex stems may behave in an identical manner even in the same language. A prominent case to illustrate this is, again, the central verb of the core group, 'go', in a comparison of Slovene (*iti*) with Czech (*jít*), partly also with Upper Sorbian (*hić*). In contrast to the West Slavic cognates, the *po*-prefixed present tense forms (Sln. *pojdem*.1SG, etc.) cannot be used in progressive contexts (or with adverbials denoting open intervals), nor can the unprefixed past tense forms.

As concerns the aspect membership of the simplex stems with *po*-prefixed future tense, basically two complementary kinds of evidence, or tests, prove useful. Decisive evidence comes from the compatibility of these forms with adverb(ial)s of open-ended duration; such contextual elements are indicative of a progressive function, which only associates with ipfv. aspect. The problem with this evidence is that it only rarely occurs in authentic utterances, and not always are intuitions on elicited examples with such adverb(ial)s reliable.

The other kind of evidence is related to paradigm structure: if the *po*-prefixed present tense form marks ipfv. future, it should be comparable with an unprefixed past tense form of the same stem in the same lexical meaning. This equivalence relation is probably more robust in terms of testing; however, it does not entirely rule out a biaspectual treatment of the relevant simplex stems, since these stems consistently lack past tense forms with *po*- (with identical lexical meaning). Only these forms may unambiguously be treated as pfv., and this would more convincingly restrict the unprefixed past tense forms to ipfv. aspect.

Concomitantly, for Slavic languages of the western periphery "contextually conditioned ingressive use of ipfv. verbs" (CCIP) has been considered a characteristic feature, and unprefixed past tense forms of stems denoting directed motion apparently behave according to this use. Alternatively, one may argue that

this behavior justifies treating these stems as biaspectual, since, after all, one cannot deny their use in progressive function in the non-past domain. However, this argument loses its strength in view of the fact that the CCIP also holds for ipfv. verbs that do have pfv. counterparts (see §2.3).

Finally, a hitherto underestimated problem in determining the aspect membership of simplex stems denoting directed motion is that ingressive readings are often supported also by their *po*-marked forms that are based on present tense morphology. In addition, *po*-marked forms may also admit an interpretation as delimitation of action or they allow for habitual or non-deontic modal (dispositional, circumstantial) readings (see §2.4). All these functions are strongly associated to pfv. present tense, and they may heavily interfere with a future reading (conforming to [FUT] in §1).

Acknowledgments

For consultations and data I am very much obliged to Piotr Bartelik, Motoki Nomachi and Hana Makūrôt-Snuzěk (Hanna Makurat-Snuzik) concerning Kashubian, Malinka Pila as well as Mladen Uhlik and Domen Krvina concerning Slovene, Marc Greenberg concerning Prekmurje Slovene, Jana Kocková concerning Czech and Markus Giger for additional insights concerning Slovak, Leńka Šolčić (Lenka Scholze) for information on Upper Sorbian, Marek Łaziński for corpus checks on Polish, and Walter Breu for a more general discussion on Slavic minority languages. I also thank two anonymous reviewers for a couple of useful minor remarks. Of course, all remaining errors or misinterpretations are exclusively my responsibility.

REFERENCES

- Andersen, Henning. “Periphrastic futures in Slavic. Divergence and convergence”. Kerstin Eksell & Thora Vinther (eds.), *Change in verbal systems. Issues in explanation*, Bern, etc.: Lang, 2006: 9–45.
- Berger, Tilman. “Eine ungewöhnliche Verwendung des Aspekts im Tschechischen — der imperfektive Aspekt in Handlungssequenzen”. *Zeitschrift für Slawistik* 58/1 (2013): 31–42.
- Biskup, Petr. *Prepositions, case and verbal prefixes: The case of Slavic*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 2019.
- Biskup, Petr. “Grammaticalization of Slavic Prefixes and Language Contact”. *Zeitschrift für Slawistik* 67/2 (2022): 322–339.
- Bláha, Ondřej. *Vyjadřování budoucnosti v současné češtině (se žretelem k ostatním slovanským jazykům)* [The expression of futurity in contemporary Czech (with an account of the other Slavic languages)]. Olomouc: Univerzita Palackého, 2008.
- Breza, Edward & Jerzy Treder. *Gramatyka kaszubska (Zarys popularny)* [Kashubian grammar (A popular sketch)]. Gdańsk: Zrzeszenie Kaszubsko-Pomorskie, 1981.
- Croft, William. *Explaining Language Change. An Evolutionary Approach*. London: Longman, 2000.
- Croft, William. *Verbs: Aspect and causal structure*. Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Derganc, Aleksandra. 2014. “Še o glagolih premikanja v ruščini in slovenščini [Once more about motion verbs in Russian and Slovene]”. Vidovič Muha, A. & A. Žele (eds.). *Prostor v jeziku*

- in jezik v prostoru [Space in language and language in space]. *Slavistična revija* 62/3 (2014): 345–351.
- Derganc, Aleksandra. “Glagol determinirovanogo dviženija ‘iti’ v slovenskom jazyke [The verb of determined motion ‘iti’ in Slovene]”. Kitadzě, Micusi (ed.). *Aspektual’naja semantičeskaja zona: tipologija sistem i scenarii diachroničeskogo razvitija: sbornik statej V Meždunarodnoj konferencii Komisii po aspektologii Meždunarodnogo komiteta slavistov, Kioto, 13–15 nojabrja 2015 g.* [The semantic zone of actionality: typology of systems and scenarios of diachronic development: collection of articles of the Aspectological Commission at the International Congress of Slavists, Kyoto, November, 13–15, 2015]. Kioto: Universitet Kioto Sangě, 2015: 70–73.
- Derganc, Aleksandra. “Ali je slovenski *iti* vendarle biaspektiv? [Is Slovene *iti* biaspectual, after all?]”. Panovska-Dimkova, Iskra & Marko Jesenšek (eds.). *Zbornik vo čest na prof. dr Ljudmil Spasov — po povod 70 godini od negovoto rağanje* [Collection of papers to honor prof. dr Ljudmil Spasov on the occasion of his 70th birthday]. Skopje, 2022: 143–150.
- Dickey, Stephen M. “The Varying Role of *po-* in the Grammaticalization of Slavic Aspectual Systems: Sequences of Events, Delimitatives, and German Language Contact”. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 19/2 (2011): 175–230.
- Dickey, Stephen M. “On a putative case of native Slavic biaspectuality: Czech *jít*, Slovene *iti* and BCMS *ići*”. *Language: Codification - Competence - Communication* 2–3 (2020): 7–24.
- Dvonč, Ladislav. *Dynamika slovenskej morfológie* [The dynamics of Slovak morphology]. Bratislava: Veda, 1984.
- Faßke, Helmut. *Grammatik der obersorbischen Schriftsprache der Gegenwart*. Bautzen: Domowina, 1981.
- Galton, Herbert. *The main functions of the Slavic verbal aspect*. Skopje: MANU, 1976.
- Gółąbk, Eugeniusz. *Kaszëbsczi słowôrz normatiwny* [Kashubian normative dictionary]. Gdańsk: Oficyna Czeć, 2005.
- Horecký, Jan. “O tvorení slovies predponami [On the derivation of verbs with prefixes]”. *Slovenská reč* 3 (1957): 141–155.
- Janaš, Pětr. *Niedersorbische Grammatik (für den Schulgebrauch)*. 2nd ed. Bautzen: Domowina, 1984.
- Janda, Laura A., Anna Endresen, Julia Kuznetsova, Olga Lyashevskaya, Anastasija Makarova, Tore Nessel & Svetlana Sokolova. *Why Russian aspectual prefixes aren’t empty: Prefixes as verb classifiers*. Slavica Publ., 2013.
- JKPE: Treder, Jerzy (ed.) *Język kaszubski. Poradnik encyklopedyczny* [Kashubian. An encyclopaedic guide]. 2nd ed. Gdańsk: Wydawnictwo uniwersytetu gdańskiego, 2006.
- Kopečný, František. *Slovesný vid v češtině* [Verbal aspect in Czech]. Praha: Nakl-ví ČAV, 2, 1962.
- Kral, Georg. *Wendisch-deutsches Wörterbuch der oberlausitzer Sprache*. Bautzen: Maćica Serbska. [Reprint of the original: Bautzen 1927.], 1986.
- Krvina, Domen. “Toporišičevo razumevanje in opis kategorije glagolskega vida v luči nekaterih novejših spoznanj [Toporišič’s understanding and description of the verbal category of aspect in view of recent insights]”. Kržišnik, Erika & Miran Hladnik (eds.). *Toporišičeva obdobja (Obdobja 35)*. Ljubljana: Znanstvena založba Filozofske fakultete, 2016: 209–215.
- Lorentz, Friedrich. *Kaschubische Grammatik*. Danzig: Gedania, 1919.
- Lorentz, Friedrich. *Pomoranisches Wörterbuch, Bd. I: A-P*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1958.
- Lorentz, Friedrich. *Gramatyka pomorska, t. III* [Pomorian grammar, vol. III]. Wrocław: Wydwo PAN, 1962.
- Makùrôt, Hana. *Gramatika kaszëbsczégò jãzëka* [A grammar of Kashubian]. Gdańsk: Zrzeszenie Kaszubsko-Pomorskie, 2016.
- Michałk, Frido. “Dwójne słowjesa pohibu w serbšćinje [Double verbs of movement in Sorbian]”. *Serbska šula* 16/11 (1963): 698–704.
- Miklosich, Franz. *Vergleichende Syntax der slavischen Sprachen*, vol. 4: *Syntax*. Wien: Braumüller. [Reprint from 1926, Heidelberg: Winter.], 1874.
- Mrhačová, Eva. *Korelativní slovesa pohybu ve slovanských jazycích, zvláště v ruštině* [Correlative verbs of motion in Slavic languages, in particular in Russian]. Ostrava: Sfinga, 1993.

- Mucke, Karl Ernst. *Historische und vergleichende Laut- und Formenlehre der niedersorbischen (niederlausitzisch-wendischen) Sprache (mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Grenzdialecte und des Obersorbischen)*. Leipzig: Hirzel, 1891.
- Mucke, Ernst. *Wörterbuch der nieder-wendischen Sprache und ihrer Dialekte*. Bautzen: domowina. [Reprint of the original edition: St. Petersburg 1911–1915 / Prag 1926.], 1966.
- Nomachi, Motoki. “On the Second *Be* Periphrasis (BE-2) in Kashubian: Its Grammatical Status and Historical Development”. *Slavia* 84/3 (2015): 268–283.
- Osolobě, Klára. *Česká morfologie a korpusy* [Czech morphology and corpora]. Praha: Karolinum, 2014.
- Poldauf, Ivan. “Atemporálnost jako gramatická kategorie českého slovesa? [Atemporality as a grammatical category of the Czech verb?]”. *Slovo a slovesnost* XI (1948): 121–132.
- Ramovš, Fr. *Morfologija slovenskega jezika* [The morphology of Slovene]. Ljubljana: Univerzitetna študijska komisija, 1952.
- Ružička, Jozef (ed.). *Morfológia slovenského jazyka* [The morphology of Slovak]. Bratislava: Vydavateľstvo Slovenskej akadémie vied, 1966.
- Saicová, Rímalová, Lucie. *Two paradigms for imperfective future tense in contemporary Czech*. Talk given at the 56th Annual Meeting of the Societas Linguistica Europaea (Athens, 29 August — 1 September 2023), 2023.
- Sakel, Jeanette. “Types of loans: Matter and pattern”. Matras, Yaron & Jeanette Sakel (eds.). *Grammatical Borrowing in Cross-linguistic Perspective*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 2007: 15–31.
- Seidel, E. “Zur Futurbedeutung des Praesens perfectivum im Slavischen”. *Slavia* XVII (1939–1940): 1–32.
- Scholze, Lenka. *Das grammatische System der obersorbischen Umgangssprache im Sprachkontakt*. Bautzen: Domowina, 2008.
- Schuster-Šewc, Heinz. *Grammar of the Upper Sorbian Language (Phonology and Morphology)*. Translated by Gary H. Toops. München: Lincom Europa. 1996.
- Součková, Kateřina. *Measure Prefixes in Czech: Cumulative na- and Delimitative po-*. Tromsø: University of Tromsø (PhD thesis), 2004.
- SSKJ: *Slovar slovenskega knjižnega jezika*, I–IV [A dictionary of the Slovene standard language, I–IV] (1970–1991). Ljubljana: SAZU in DZS; <http://www.fran.si/130/sskj-slovar-slovenskega-knjiznega-jezika>.
- Sychta, Bernhard. *Ślownik gwar kaszubskich na tle kultury ludowej*, t. II: H-L / t. IV: P-Ř [Dictionary of Kashubian dialects on the background of folk culture, vol. II: H-L / vol. IV: P-Ř]. Wrocław etc.: Zakład Narodowy im. Ossolińskich, 1968–1970.
- Ševčíková, Magda & Jarmila Panevová. “Hranice flektivní a derivační morfologie: Příklad předpony *po-* u českých sloves [Borders of inflectional and derivational morphology: The case of the prefix *po-* in Czech verbs]”. *Slovo a slovesnost* 79 (2018): 171–198.
- Šmilauer, Vladimír. “Slovesný čas [Verbal tense]”. *Druhé hovory o českém jazyce* [The second talks about Czech]. Praha: Mikuta, 1947: 149–165.
- VAGSČ Štícha, František et al. *Velká akademická gramatika společné češtiny, II: Morfologie — morfologické kategorie, flexe* [Big academy grammar of common Czech, II: Morphology — morphological categories, inflection]. Praha: Academia, 2021.
- Werner, Eduard. *Studien zum sorbischen Verbum*. Bautzen: Domowina, 1996.
- Werner, Eduard. *Die Verbalaffigierung im Obersorbischen*. Bautzen: Domowina, 2003.
- Wiemer, Björn. “No paradigms without classification: how stem-derivation develops into grammatical aspect”. Diewald, Gabriele & Katja Politt (eds.). *Paradigms regained: Theoretical and empirical arguments for the reassessment of the notion of paradigm*. Berlin: Language Science Press, 2022a: 67–125.
- Wiemer, Björn. “Delimitation problems in the non-past domain”. *Slavistika* XXVI/1 (2022b): 63–89.
- Wiemer, Björn (forthcoming-1). “The entanglement of grammaticalization and hypanalysis in the rise of futures in Slavic languages”. Hartmann, Stefan & Lena Schnee (eds.). *Futures of the Past*. Berlin: Language Science Press.

- Wiemer, Björn (forthcoming-2). "Unity behind diversity: What explains the distribution of perfective present in Slavic languages?". Dekker, Simeon, Egbert Fortuin & Jaap Kamphuis (eds.). *The Slavic Verb: Comparative, Diachronic and Typological Perspectives*. Leiden: Brill.
- Wiemer, Björn, Joanna Wrzesień-Kwiatkowska & Piotr Wyroślak. "How morphologically related synonyms come to make up a paradigm". *Russian Linguistics* 44/3 (2020): 231–266.
- Бондарко, Александр В. «К вопросу о глаголах движения в чешском языке [On verbs of motion in Czech]». *Slavia* 30 (1961): 527–547.
- (Bondarko, Aleksandr V. „K voprosu o glagolah dvizheniya v cheshskom yazyke [On verbs of motion in Czech]“. *Slavia* 30 (1961): 527–547).
- Ермакова, Майя И. *Очерк грамматики верхнелужицкого литературного языка* [Outlines of a grammar of Standard Upper Sorbian]. Москва: Наука, 1973.
- (Ermakova, Majya I. *Ocherk grammatiki verhnjeluzhickogo literaturnogo yazyka* [Outlines of a grammar of Standard Upper Sorbian]. Moskva: Nauka, 1973).
- Иванчев, Светомир. «Контекстово обусловлена ингресивна употреба на глаголите от не-свършен вид в чешкия език [Contextually conditioned ingressive use of imperfective verbs in Czech]». *Годишник на Софийския университет, Филологически факултет* [Yearbook of the University of Sofia, Department of Philology] 65/3 (1961): 1–152.
- (Ivanchev, Svetomir. „Kontekstvovo обусловлена ingresivna upotreba na glagolite ot nesv'rshen vid v cheskiya ezik [Contextually conditioned ingressive use of imperfective verbs in Czech]“. *Godishnik na Sofijskiya universitet, Filologicheski fakultet* [Yearbook of the University of Sofia, Department of Philology] 65/3 (1961): 1–152).

CORPORA

- CzNC: <https://korpus.cz/clarin>
- Gigafida: <https://www.cjvt.si/en/research/cjvt-projects/gigafida-corpus/>
- Nova beseda: http://bos.zrc-sazu.si/a_about_si.html
- PNC: <https://nkjp.pl/>
- RNC: [https://ruscorpора.ru/en](https://ruscorpورا.ru/en)

Бјорн Вимер

ПРЕФИКСАЦИЈА НЕ-ПРОШЛИХ ОБЛИКА ПРОСТИХ ГЛАГОЛСКИХ ОСНОВА И ЊИХОВЕ ПРОМЕНЕ У СЛОВЕНСКИМ ЈЕЗИЦИМА

Резиме

Овај чланак даје преглед досадашњих истраживања о јединственом начину глаголског обележавања времена: одређене групе простих глаголских основа имају тенденцију да своје будуће време обележавају префиксом по-, који се додаје на њихове садашње облике (или као изузетак, или чешће као алтернативу „аналитичком“ обележавању помоћу помоћног глагола изведеног од *бод-). Такво је понашање ограничено, или барем јасно усмерено, на лексичка значења повезана с кретањем у одређеном правцу; у случају вишезначности, оно се не примењује на друга значења истих основа. Штавише, чини се да ово понашање произлази из редуциране парадигматске структуре глагола с префиксом по-, који се интегришу у парадигме простих основа. Као последица тога, поставља се питање којем аспект ови глаголи припадају: да ли су imperfectiva tantum, перфективни или биаспектуални?

Сви језици захваћени оваквом појавом говоре се на западним периферијама словенског језичког простора. Најистакнутији међу њима је чешки, док пољски (за разлику од кашупског) не показује никакве трагове ове појаве.

Чланак се бави искључиво савременим степеном развоја појаве (XX–XXI век), али има за циљ свеобухватну обраду свих фактора релевантних за ову појаву на позадини система времена и аспекта у западнословенским и јужнословенским језицима. Узимајући у обзир ове факторе, може се показати да будуће време обележено префиксацијом по- простих основа представља градацијску појаву у више аспеката, као што су, на пример: (i) могућност алтернативног обележавања будућег времена, (ii) пропорције учесталости између ових алтернатива, (iii) број укључених основа (повремено). Основна група релевантних основа све означавају кретање у одређеном правцу; међу њима су централне јединице „ићи/go“ и „возити/drive, ride“. Чини се да оне представљају последње „склониште“ ове појаве у (готово) свим релевантним језицима. Што се тиче западнословенских језика, ове две просте основе скоро у потпуности искључују алтернативно обележавање будућег времена помоћу помоћног глагола, најчешће у чешком, а ређе у сорошком и кашупском. С друге стране, словеначки глагол *iti* „ићи/go“ обележава своје будуће време на уобичајен начин (помоћу помоћног глагола), док његова по-префиксна изведеница то не чини. Као резултат тога, његова парадигма се најтеже интерпретира на позадини система не-прошлог времена овог јужнословенског језика.

Кључне речи: словенски језици, будуће време, аспект, парадигматска структура.