Mark J. ELSON (Charlottesville, Virginia)

THE EVOLUTION OF THE PERFECT IN POLISH

This paper attempts to reconstruct the evolution of the Old Polish *perfect*, a verbal formation, and thereby to clarify the historical relationship between one of its dialectal reflexes and the reflex attested in the standard literary language.

1. Old Polish attested several complex (i.e. constituted by more than a single word) verbal formations, one of which, the *perfect*, consisted of forms of the resultative participle[1] and those of the present tense of *być* 'be'.[2] The forms of the participle were accented, and comprised of a verbal stem followed first by a morpheme realized as *l/ł* expressing *taxis*, and then by a morpheme realized as *zero*, *a*, *o*, *i*, or *y* expressing *gender*, yielding five forms in all.[3] The forms of *być* were enclitic. Although it is clear they were comprised of a stem 'be' followed by a morpheme expressing person,[4] the location of the division within them is uncertain.[5] As word-level units, they were 1s. *jeśm*, 2s. *jeś*, 3s. *jest*, 1p. *jesmy*, 2p. *jeście*, and 3p. *sq*. Since they were unaccented, their syntactic position was defined with respect to the clause in which they occurred, not the participle, to which they were grammatically linked as auxiliaries qualifying the narrated event with respect to its participants.

Reinterpreted as a simple past with *l/ł* expressing tense,[6] the perfect has survived in two basic patterns: one which preserves a reflex of the personal forms of *być* as well

as a reflex of the participle,[7] and another which preserves only a reflex of the participle.[8] This paper is concerned with two manifestations of the former opposed by realizational differences in their reflex of the masculine singular participle. These differences appear in the tense marker and vocalism of the verbal stem among unsuffixed verbs (see Table 1).[9] With the exception of Decaux (1951 and 1955), Slavists have given virtually no attention to the evolution of these manifestations, although several, like Decaux, have stated or implied their opinion that one is the result of innovation (i.e. morphological or morphophonemic change) while the other is not.[10] The purpose of this paper is to argue that both manifestations are the result of innovation and, hence, that neither is an unmodified reflex of the formation which gave rise to it.

2. We will take as our point of departure Decaux's belief that the dialectal manifestation reflects no innovation. Two assumptions are implicit in this belief:

(1) *ъ* was lost word-finally preceded by a consonant (i.e. in the environment C_____#); and

(2) The environment for this sound change existed in the masculine singular participle of unsuffixed verbs with stem-final consonant (e.g. mog+[11]).

There is no reason to question the first assumption. We know that *ъ* was lost not only finally preceded by a consonant, but between consonants as well. It was therefore vulnerable to loss in the masculine singular participle of unsuffixed verbs with stem-final consonant (e.g. *pek+*, *mog+*, *vod+*) provided it was in final position. Nor is there any reason to doubt that it *was* in final position when followed by an accented word (i.e. something other than a form of *byd* or, more generally, an enclitic). The question is, was it word-final when a form of *byd* followed? Decaux apparently believes it was, undoubtedly because enclitics are traditionally construed as unaccented *words*, which means that any segment preceding the initial segment of an enclitic is word-final. But this interpretation is difficult to defend because it requires

the assumption that *ł* in standard masculine singular reflexes of *participle - być* (e.g. in 1m.s. *piekłem* and 2m.s. *piekłeś* from *piek+*) is the result of an innovation. This is the assumption Decaux makes, claiming (1951:76) that the source of *ł*, was (1) nonmasculine forms, where it was followed by a vowel *within* the participle, and therefore *not* word-final, or (2) an orthographic convention requiring its occurrence even after it was no longer pronounced, and leading eventually to its phonetic reappearance. The problem is that, with the reappearance of *ł*, masculine singular reflexes of *participle - być* among unsuffixed verbs with stem-final consonant ceased to be interpretable as *word # być* since there was no longer a string within them segmentally identical to the participle in isolation, unless we wish to assign *ł* in these forms to a unit other than the participle. Consider, for example, 1m.s. *piekłem* assuming that it is a reflex of Old Polish *piękem<piękł #* in which *pięk* is the participial reflex after loss of *ł*, and *em* is the reflex of 1s. *jeśm*. With the reappearance of the liquid, the form in question cannot be *pięk ł # em* since the string *pięk ł* is no longer a word. It can be divided *pięk # ł + em*, which yields a string with word-level status (i.e. *pięk*, the reflex of the participle in isolation), but this analysis forces us to assign *ł* to a unit following word-boundary in masculine forms, an interpretation which has never been suggested and which, in any case, is incompatible with the retention of voiced obstruents in stem-final position (e.g. in 1m.s. *mogłem* from *mog+*; *mokłem* is expected if word-boundary follows stem-final *g*). Thus in effect, Decaux must claim that masculine singular reflexes of *participle - być* were *word # być* before the loss of *ł*, a sound change which required the presence of word-boundary, but something other than *word # być* after the loss, making the reappearance of *ł* possible via analogy.

The alternative is to assume that *ł* was *not* word-final in masculine singular reflexes of *participle - być*, and was therefore *not* vulnerable to elimination. This interpretation requires motivation for (1) the *absence* of word-boundary in masculine singular reflexes of *participle - być*, and (2) the *absence* of *ł* in masculine singular reflexes of the dialectal manifestation --

motivation which is readily available if we make three assumptions:

(1) Reflexes of *być* lost their word-level status (i.e. were reinterpreted as suffixes expressing the category of person), as a result of which reflexes of *participle - być* became *continuous* (i.e. grammatical unities) as opposed to those of *być - participle*, which remained *discontinuous*.

(2) Continuous forms were assigned to paradigms on the basis of gender.

(3) In feminine, neuter, virile, and common paradigms, where the reflex of the participle in personal forms (e.g. *nieśli*, the participial reflex in *nieśliśmy* and *nieśliście*, the virile personal forms of *nios+*) was identical to its reflex in the nonpersonal, personal forms were assigned the structure *word # suffix*.[12] In the masculine paradigm, where the reflex of the participle in personal forms (e.g. *niósł*, the participial reflex in *niósłe(ś)m* and *niósłaś*, the masculine personal forms of *nios+*) was different from that in the nonpersonal, which lacked *ł*, personal forms were assigned the structure *stem + suffix*.

Within the framework of these assumptions, feminine, neuter, virile, and common paradigms were structurally uniform, each consisting of a nonpersonal form, and two personal with the structure *word # suffix*, where the nonpersaonal form (i.e. reflex of the participle) was the word-level component of personal. The masculine paradigm, however, was different. The nonpersonal form was word-level, but the personal forms, although word-level as wholes, did not contain a word-level constituent. We need only assume that the exceptional status of the masculine paradigm was eliminated via reformation according to the predominant pattern. Its result was the elimination of *ł* in masculine personal forms, and the implementation of the phonological rules regulating the opposition of voiced to voiceless in obstruents (e.g. 1m.s. *niósłem* remade on the pattern *word (= nonpersonal form) # suffix* yields

niósem/niózem) since, as a result of the innovation, stem-final consonants were word-final not only in the nonpersonal form, but the personal ones as well.[13]

It should be noted that each of the assumptions we have made is reasonable. The reinterpretation of reflexes of *byó* as grammatical morphemes can be attributed to realizational changes they underwent in auxiliary function: (1) *jest* and *sq* were eliminated; and (2) other forms were reduced by the elimination of *je* after a vowel (i.e. in feminine, neuter, virile, and common forms) and *j* after a consonant (i.e. in masculine forms).[14] As a result, the reflexes of *byó* lacked a lexical morpheme (i.e. a shared string to which the meaning 'be' could be assigned), and so lost their word-level status. Gender based paradigms can be seen as the result of a universal phenomenon: the imposition by native speakers of a formal association among word-level units with the same stem component (i.e. which are, in traditional terms, inflectionally related). The status of reflexes of *byó* as grammatical morphemes is supported by two innovations:

(1) elimination of *ś* in the first person singular reflex of *byó*, and the extension of *ś* to the first person plural, yielding *(e)m* in the former and *(e)śmy* in the latter; and

(2) interaction of the reflexes of *byó* with grammatical morphemes marking person which, historically, were restricted to the past,[15] yielding *(e)ch* in the first person singular and *(e)chmy* in the first person plural.

Changes in the distribution of *ś* tell us that it was a grammatical morpheme the meaning of which was compatible with all reflexes of the reduced forms but that of the first person singular (i.e. a grammatical morpheme expressing 'person other than the speaker'). Since no segment belonging to the reflex of *byó* preceded *ś* in feminine, neuter, virile, and common forms, we conclude that there was no longer a stem component and, accordingly, that the reflexes of *byó* could no longer be interpreted as words. This is confirmed by their interaction with strings which we are certain were grammatical morphemes, i.e. strings expressing person in the past, which included an

aorist and an imperfect. The motivation for replacement was twofold: (1) canonical similarity: a recurring consonant restricted to formation (i.e. *ś* in reflexes of *byé; ch* in grammatical morphemes expressing person in the past), which distinguished them from grammatical morphemes expressing person in the present; and (2) distribution of *ch*, which was restricted to the first person and could therefore oppose it to the second. The result was: 1s. *-(e)ch*, 2s. *-(e)ś*, 1p. *-(e)chmy*, and 2p. *-(e)ście*.

This leaves us with the problem of explaining the *absence* of word-boundary in masculine singular forms of *participle - byé*. Traditionally, a boundary has been posited within personal forms (e.g. 1m.s. *piekł # em*, 2m.s. *piekł # eś*) not only to motivate the loss of *ł* by sound change, but also because word-boundary has been assigned with respect to the terminal *segment* of word-level units. Indeed, this method of assigning word-boundary is undoubtedly responsible, in part at least, for the assumption that *ł* in the forms we are considering was vulnerable to elimination. There is no reason in principle, however, why word-boundary cannot be assigned with respect to what may be termed *terminal suffixes*, i.e. morphemes which regularly fill the final slot within word-level units. This interpretation permits the formulation of a rule which entails *two* word-boundaries in nonmasculine reflexes of *participle - byé*, but only *one* in masculine: Word-boundary follows a terminal suffix (i.e. a suffix like that expressing gender after which, normally, there is no other suffix within a word-level unit). In the absence of an *overt* terminal suffix, it follows the rightmost nonterminal. Now, within feminine, neuter, virile, and common forms of *participle - byé*, there were *two* terminal suffixes, one expressing gender immediately following *l/ł*, and another, historically the reflex of *byé*, expressing person.[16] Accordingly, all such forms were assigned two word-boundaries, one following the reflex of the participle, and another following that of *byé*. The result was *participle # byé*, which we have been writing as *word # suffix*. This was not true of masculine

forms. In the third person, without an overt terminal suffix, word-boundary was assigned after the rightmost terminal, which was *ť*. In personal forms, however, a boundary was not assigned after *ť* since the forms in question included a terminal suffix, i.e. the reflex of *być* reinterpreted as a grammatical morpheme expressing person.[17] As a result, personal forms had only a single instance of word-boundary. Since *ť* did not precede it (i.e. was technically not word-final), it was not vulnerable to elimination, and remained, even in unsuffixed verbs where it was preceded by a consonant. It is still attested in the standard manifestation of the perfect. In the dialectal, it was eliminated via *morphological* innovation regularlizing the structure of the masculine paradigm.

Thus, with respect to realizations of the tense marker, it is likely that the standard pattern is more conservative than dialectal. With respect to the stem-vocalism, however, it is undoubtedly the reverse. Historically, a reflex of length is expected in the participial component of masculine singular forms and a reflex of shortness in that of others whether the reflex of the participle precedes or follows that of *być*. We find, however, that a reflex of shortness is attested in continuous masculine personal forms of the standard pattern as well (e.g. in 1m.s. *niosłem* and 2m.s. *niosłeś* from *nios+*). This peculiarity is attributed by Decaux and others to influence of the nonmasculine forms, in which shortness is expected. But nonmasculine forms could not have been responsible as such since only two of the inherited alternations -- *ó/o* (e.g. in *mog+*, originally with *ó* in masculine forms and *o* in others) and *ó/o/e* (e.g. in *wiod+*, originally with *ó* in masculine forms, *e* in virile, and *o* in others) -- were affected although there were other alternations, i.e. *ą/ę*, and *e/Ø*, structurally identical to them (i.e. with one participant restricted to masculine forms; *ą* in the case of *ą/ę*, and *e* in that of *e/Ø*; see Table 2).[18] A useful point of departure in attempting to understand the evolution of vocalic alternations in the perfect is the observation that, whatever its nature, the innovation we are attempting to define must have been implemented within a domain which *excluded* virile forms. This follows from the parallel

evolution of *ǒ/o* and *ǒ/o/e* although they differed in the virile paradigm,[19] where *ǒ/o* attested *o* but *ǒ/o/e* attested *e*.[20] An examination of the remaining forms among verbs attesting these alternations reveals that, as a result of the innovation in question, a number of correlations existed within what may be termed the *nonvirile subsystem* (i.e. the set of forms constituted by the masculine, feminine, neuter, and common paradigms) between realizations of the stem-vocalism and phonological attributes of the forms exhibiting them:

(1) V in open syllables; V̆ in closed;

(2) V preceding an overt ending; V̆ preceding a zero;[21]

(3) V preceding two consonants; V̆ preceding one; and

(4) V if *l* is present; V̆ if it is absent.

Apparently, the reflex of shortness was associated with one of its environments. As a result, the reflex of length in masculine personal forms, which also attested this environment, was an anomaly. The irregular status of these forms (i.e. the occurrence in them of a reflex of length) was eliminated via extension to them of the rule generating the reflex of shortness. Evidence for the relevant environment is provided by nonstandard forms like 1m.s. *zapragnąłem* and 1m.s. *przyjąłem* cited by Doroszewski (1968:490-491), which reflect extension of the *ǒ/o* pattern to *ą/ę*, suggesting that the presence versus absence of an overt ending is significant since it is the only attribute which distinguishes the masculine nonpersonal form of the past from all others in verbs with *ǒ/o* and *ą/ę*. The general pattern of morphophonemic evolution in the past, then, seems to be:

(1) retention of any alternation in which one of the participants was restricted to forms marked for gender; and

(2) redistribution of participants restricted to unmarked forms.

Thus, *ą/ę* and *e/∅* -- each with one participant (i.e. *ą* of *ą/ę* and *∅* of *e/∅*) restricted to nonmasculine (i.e. marked) forms -- were stable. The same was true of *e* in *ǒ/o/e* since it was restricted to virile forms. Among nonvirile forms in

the past of verbs with *ǒ/o/e*, the nonvirile participants (i.e. *ǒ/o*, which were restricted to unmarked forms with respect to the opposition [+virile]/[-virile]) were associated with phonological attributes of the environment, and redistributed as a result. The nonstandard forms noted in Doroszewski 1968 can be attributed to a preference for phonologically defined distribution if it is available. This preference can also be used to explain the evolution of *mog+*, which inherited *ǒ/o* distributionally parallel to *ą/ę* but redistributed it, probably as part of the redistribution of *ǒ/o* in *ǒ/o/e*.

3. We have argued that, although the dialectal manifestation of the perfect is older with respect to realizations of the stem-vocalism, the standard manifestation is older with respect to those of the tense marker. Both manifestations, therefore, are the result of innovation. Two events were crucial in the evolution of the perfect: reinterpretation of *participle - być* as grammatical unities related paradigmatically on the basis of identity in gender; and analysis of personal forms as *word # suffix* if possible. As a result, the masculine paradigm was vulnerable to reformation since it was the only paradigm not interpretable as *word # suffix*. This was the impetus for generalization of the *word # suffix* structure, giving rise to the dialectical manifestation, in which the subparadigms of the past are structurally identical. In dialects which did not regularize the masculine paradigm, the unmarked participants of *ǒ/o* and *ǒ/o/e* were apparently associated with the presence versus absence of an overt terminal suffix, as a result of which *o* was extended to masculine personal forms.

In conclusion, it should be mentioned that the difference between the standard and dialectal patterns may itself be attributable to differences in the paradigmatic organization of past forms. We have assumed that forms of the past are organized on the basis of gender into three-member paradigms (e.g. masculine singular, common plural). This assumption was necessary to motivate the dialectal pattern, but not necessary in principle. The standard pattern may have evolved in dialects which organized the forms differently, opposing, perhaps, a

virile paradigm to a nonvirile, with each person of the latter exhibiting a masculine, feminine, neuter, and common form. This organization is presumably the one which led to the redistribution of participants among nonvirile forms.

Notes

1. The term *resultative participle* to denote the verbal formation in which a reflex of Common Slavic *l* follows the verbal stem is from Lunt 1974:93 et passim. For convenience, this formation is henceforth referred to with the term *participle* since we are concerned exclusively with *it* among the participial formations of Old Polish.

2. Note the following conventions: (1) The verb 'be' is cited with its standard infinitive *być*, even when the reference is to dialects or an earlier stage of the language. (2) Standard forms are cited in the orthography, yielding, in effect, a phonemic transcription except for *y* and *i*, which are contextual variants of /i/. (3) Dialectal and earlier forms are cited using the orthographic conventions of the standard language. (4) s. = *singular*, p. = *plural*, m. = *masculine*, f. = *feminine*, n. = *neuter*, v. = *virile*, c. = *common*, V = *vowel*, ´ = *long*, # = *boundary at the end of a word*, - = *unspecified boundary* (i.e. a boundary the nature of which is to be specified), and ' = *stress*.

3. Historically, there were nine participial forms, reflecting a system defined by three numbers (i.e. *singular*, *dual*, *plural*) and three genders (i.e. *masculine*, *feminine*, *neuter*). In this paper, we operate only with reflexes of the five forms preserved in the standard language: *masculine singular*, exhibiting *zero* in the gender morpheme; *feminine singular*, exhibiting *a*; *neuter singular*, exhibiting *o*; *masculine plural*, exhibiting *i*; and *feminine plural*, exhibiting *y*. We refer to these forms respectively as *masculine singular*, *feminine singular*, *neuter singular*, *virile plural*, and *common plural*, sometimes omitting the specification for number since it correlates unambiguously with the specification for gender. The term *virile* is from Schenker 1966, and denotes the referent of the reflex of the old masculine plural, which is [+human, +male]. We use the term *common* to denote the referent of the old feminine plural, which is [-human] and/or [-male]. Finally, we assume that virile is marked with respect to each of the other genders. Among the others, we assume that feminine is marked with respect to masculine and neuter, and neuter with respect to masculine.

   Forms of the participle were used to denote a narrated event specified for inception but unspecified for completion before some other event. We have labeled this *taxis*, broadening the use of this term in Jakobson 1956, where it denotes the

relationship of one narrated event to another *narrated* event. The palatal realization of the taxis marker (i.e. *l*) occured in virile forms; the nonpalatal (i.e. *ł*), in others.

4. Morphemes expressing gender and person express number as well.

5. With respect to division, the issues are: (1) the occurrence at all of a boundary within third person forms; and (2) in other forms, the morphemic affiliation of *e*, which can be assigned to either the stem or the person marker. It should be noted that we ignore dual forms of *być* in this paper since we are not concerned with dual reflexes of the participle.

6. Apparently, one of the contectual variants of 'specified for inception but not completion before another event' -- i.e. 'specified for inception *and completion* before the *speech* event' -- was assigned distinctive status, as a result of which the category expressed by the participle was *tense*.

7. The standard language preserves the personal forms of the auxiliary *być* as: 1s. *(e)m*, 2s. *(e)ś*, 1p. *(e)śmy*, and 2p. *(e)ście*, with *e* present if the reflex of *być* is preceded by a consonant, but absent if it is preceded by a vowel.

8. For brief discussion, see Nitsch 1957:55-58 and Urbańczyk 1968:51-52.For more extensive discussion, see Decaux 1955.

9. We refer to the first manifestation as *standard* since it is attested in the standard language as well as the dialects. We refer to the second manifestation as *dialectal* since it is attested exclusively in the dialects. In the table, *long* denotes a reflex of length; *short*, a reflex of shortness; *l*, a reflex of Common Slavic *l*; *Ø*, the absence of such a reflex; *participle - być*, a reflex of the subpattern of the perfect in which the participial component precedes *być*; and *być - participle* a reflex of the subpattern of the perfect in which the participial component follows *być*.

10. See Decaux 1951 and 1955. The latter is especially useful for facts, but neither is a systemic consideration of the data, nor does either provide enough data from any dialect to be of use in a more comprehensive description of the manifestations we are considering.

11. Unsuffixed verbs are cited with the verbal stem as it occurs in the first person singular present, and suffixed verbs are cited with the stem as it occurs in the infinitive. The verbs cited in this paper, listed aphabetically and glossed, are: *biednie+* 'grow poor', *bra+* 'take', *grzej+* 'heat', *id+* 'go', *mog+* 'be able', *nios+* 'carry', *piek+* 'bake', *pisa+* 'write', *przyjm+* 'accept', *przynios+* 'bring', *trząs+* 'shake', *wiod+* 'lead', *wyjd+* 'leave', and *zapragną+* 'crave'.

12. Generally, word-level units in Polish have the structure

radical - suffix, where the radical component is a stem-level unit and the suffix is a grammatical morpheme expressing inflectional categories. The reinterpretation of *participle - być* gave rise to word-level units in which the radical component was itself a unit of word-level. This type of construction is also attested in the imperative plural, which, morphologically, is the imperative singular (i.e. a word-level unit) followed by the suffix *-cie*. It should be noted that the assumption of a grammatical unity constituted by reflexes of *participle - być* is implicit in studies of the standard language which assume a generative relationship between *być - participle* and *participle - być* with the former derived from the latter. Schenker (1966:163), for example, says: "The frequency of the separation of a person suffix (i.e. a reflex of *być*; MJE) from its verb...", implying with the word *separation* the existence of a grammatical unity. Grappin (1963:184) says: "Les terminaisons personelles peuvent, en effet, se détacher du participe...", implying the same thing with *se détacher*.

Decaux and others assume that the reflexes of *być* have remained enclitic within paradigmatic units with antepenult stress in personal forms (e.g. the virile paradigm of *mog+*, with 1v.p. *mogliśmy* and 2v.p. *mogliście*). We will not speculate on the status of the reflexes of *być* as enclitics, but simply note that, if they are enclitics, the notion of enclitic must be enlarged to subsume grammatical morphemes as well as word-level units.

13. The opposition of voiced to voiceless in obstruents is neutralized in favor of the latter before word-boundary in the standard language and many of the dialects. In other dialects, it is neutralized in favor of the former. For brief discussion, see Nitsch 1957:89-90 and Urbańczyk 1968:37-38.

14. For discussion of the history of the present tense of *być*, see Elson 1977.

15. According to Decaux (1955:154ff.), the origin of *ch* in reflexes of the perfect is the *conditional* of *być*, which also attested a segment with this realization in first person forms (i.e. in 1s. *bych* and 1p. *bychom*). The origin of *ch*, however, does not affect its morphological status as *grammatical* (i.e. *nonlexical*). Decaux's opinion, therefore, need not concern us in this matter, even if its supportable.

16. The first plural reflex of *być* is *-źmy* in many of the dialects. The occurrence of *ź* in *-źmy* suggests the presence of word-boundary not only after the first terminal suffix, but each morpheme following it. Thus, in the first person plural we expect *CVC + i/y # ś # my* where CVC represents a verbal stem. This configuration yields *-źmy* in dialects which attest voiced obstruents in positions of neutralization. We should mention in this regard that Decaux's comment (1951:70) to the effect that a past form like 1v.p. *byliśmy*

is analyzed as *byliś # my* is incorrect if the implication is that there is no longer a boundary preceding *ś*. He is mistakenly assuming that past forms exhibit one and only one word-boundary internally.
We are not concerned with the question of a word-boundary in reflexes of *być - participle*. Decaux (1951:69) and others believe there is one, and cite forms like *takem* followed by a participial reflex claiming that plain velar reveals the presence of a word-boundary since, within words, the opposition of plain to palatalized in velars is neutralized in favor of the latter before *e*. In fact, however, the question needs further investigation. Several years ago on asking a native speaker to read the phrase *odkądem go poznał* 'since I met him...', provided by Grappin (1963:169), and expecting *t* before *e* in *odkądem* (i.e. devoicing before word-boundary, which, following Decaux and others, I assumed to be present), I heard *d*. When I asked if *t* was possible, the response was, "No, *kąt* means *corner*."

17. Within this framework, the stress pattern of the standard manifestation as it occurs in the literary language is not anomalous in any way. Stress is assigned with respect to the left-most word-boundary (i.e. the word-boundary closest to the initial segment of the word). This means the final, and only, such boundary in masculine forms. In other forms, however, it means the first boundary of two since there are two terminal suffixes. The result is penultimate stress in masculine forms (e.g. *przy'nioełem* from *przynios+*), but antepenultimate in others (e.g. *przy'nieśliśmy* from the same verb). In this regard, it should be noted that Decaux (1951:72-73) believes the stress pattern of masculine forms in the standard manifestation to be an innovation, implying that stress should be on the syllable preceding (e.g. *'przyniosłem* instead of *przy'niosłem* from *przynios+*) and attributing the location of the stress to the influence of feminine forms. He recognizes, however, that verbs exhibiting *e/Ø* (e.g. *wyjd+*) are a problem since the stress of masculine forms could not have been influenced by that of feminine (compare, for example, *wy'szedłem* with *'wyszła* from *wyjd+*, where the location of the stress in masculine forms is different from that in feminine). In fact, the problem is Decaux's mistaken assumption that masculine forms exhibited, and continue to exhibit, two instances of word-boundary.

18. Historically, verbs with *a/e* were not identical with respect to the distribution of participants (i.e. did not all exhibit *ą* in the masculine paradigm and *ę* in the others). The differences, which were a function of the location of the accent, were eliminated and are assumed to be irrelevant to the analysis offered in this paper. For discussion, see Bulaxovskij 1950:50-52.

19. Historically, *ó* in the masculine paradigm is expected only among unsuffixed verbs with a *voiced* consonent in stem-final

position (e.g. *wiod+*, *mog+*, but not *nios+*). Its occurrence among those with a voiceless stem-final is assumed to be the result of leveling which occurred before the innovation we are considering. For discussion, see Bulaxovskij 1950:51.

20. This interpretation is supported by the evolution of *a/e* inherited in *verbs* like *biednie+*, which attest *e* in the virile paradigm, but *a* in the others. This alternation, which marks virile forms, has been extended, in substandard speech at least (see Rothstein 1970:23), to verbs like *grzej+*, for which *grzali* is expected in the virile paradigm, but *grzeli* also occurs. It appears that *a/e* was extended to the past of verbs which, like *biednie+*, attest *a* preceded by a palatal (cf. the past of verbs like *pisa+* and *bra+* with a nonpalatal preceding *a*, which were unaffected by the extension of *a/e*).

21. Technically, this correlation is morphological in part since it is defined with respect to the realization of a unit of meaning.

22. This interpretation fits well with the evolution of the present tense of *być*, which, like the past, exhibits a continuous and a discontinuous pattern in the standard language and many dialects. Apparently, it has been remade on the model of the past. The point of departure for this innovation must have been the occurrence in both of the same set of person markers (i.e. the strings which, historically, were themselves forms of the present tense of *być*. We can assume that occurrence of both a continuous and a discontinuous pattern was taken by speakers to be an attribute concomitant to these grammatical morphemes. This interpretation meant that the present tense of *być* wa an anomaly since it exhibited the relevant morphemes, but had only a continuous pattern. The anomaly was eliminated via evolution of discontinuous personal forms made with the nonpersonal forms *jest* and *są* (e.g. *jam jest* and *myśmy są* in the first person as the respective discontinuous correlates of 1s. *je(ś)m* and 1p. *jesmy*). In certain dialects, however, the reformation went further: the discontinuous pattern was used to create a new continuous one (e.g. *jestem*, made from *jam jest*, replaced *jeśm* in the first person plural), which suggests the generation of continuous forms from discontinuous. In other dialects, where such continuous forms did not evolve, perhaps becaus continuous forms were *not* generated from discontinuous, the inherited personal forms of the continuous pattern were remade on *jest*, yielding the familiar 1s. *jestem/jezdem*, 2s. *jesteś/jezdeś*, 1p. *jesteśmy/jezdeśmy*, and 2p. *jesteście/jezdeście*. Note that penultimate stress in the personal plural forms of the standard language is expected since they contain only *one* terminal suffix.

References

BULAXOVSKIJ, L.A. (1950): *Akcentologičeskij komentarij k pol'skomu jazyku*, Kiev: Izdatel'stvo Kievskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta.

DECAUX, Étienne (1951): De l'autonomie des enclitiques en polonais, *Revue des études slaves* 28: 68-79.

DECAUX, Étienne (1955): *Morphologie des enclitiques polonais*, Paris: Institut d'études slaves (Travaux publiés par l'Institut d'études slaves, XXIII).

DOROSZEWSKI, Witold (1968): *O kulturę słowa*, II, Warszawa: PIW.

ELSON, Mark J. (1978): On the history of *byti* in West and South Slavic, *Scando-Slavica* 23:95-102.

GRAPPIN, Henri (1963): *Grammaire de la langue polonaise*, Paris: Institut d'études slaves.

JAKOBSON, Roman (1956): Shifters, Verbal Categories, and the Russian Verb, *Selected Writings* II, 130-147, The Hague: Mouton.

LUNT, Horace G. (1974) (6th, revised edition): *Old Church Slavonic Grammar*, The Hague: Mouton.

NITSCH, K. (1957): *Dialekty języka polskiego (z 3 mapami)*, Wrocław.

ROTHSTEIN, Robert A. (1970): *The Polish verb (preliminary edition)*, Cambridge: Harvard University Slavic Department.

SCHENKER, A. (1966): *Beginning Polish*, New Haven: Yale University Press.

URBAŃCZYK, S. (1968) (wydanie trzecie): *Zarys dialektologii polskiej*, Warszawa: PWN

Table 1: Reflexes of the Perfect in Unsuffixed Verbs

Manifestation 1: Standard

	byś - participle		*participle - byś*	
Stem	m.s.		m.s.	
	1/2	long	1/2	short
	3	long	3	long
	f.s.	short	f.s.	short
	n.s.	short	n.s.	short
	v.p.	short	v.p.	short
	c.p.	short	c.p.	short
Tense	m.s.		m.s.	
Marker	1/2	ø	1/2	*l*
	3	ø	3	ø
	f.s.	*l*	f.s.	*l*
	n.s.	*l*	n.s.	*l*
	v.p.	*l*	v.p.	*l*
	c.p.	*l*	c.p.	*l*

Manifestation 2: Dialectal

	byś - participle		*participle - byś*	
Stem	m.s.		m.s.	
	1/2	long	1/2	long
	3	long	3	long
	f.s.	short	f.s.	short
	n.s.	short	n.s.	short
	v.p.	short	v.p.	short
	c.p.	short	c.p.	short
Tense	m.s.		m.s.	
Marker	1/2	ø	1/2	ø
	3	ø	3	ø
	f.s.	*l*	f.s.	*l*
	n.s.	*l*	n.s.	*l*
	v.p.	*l*	v.p.	*l*
	c.p.	*l*	c.p.	*l*

Table 2: Past Conjugations with Alternation in the Stem Vocalism

1. *ó/o*

mogłem	*mogłam*	-	*mogliśmy*	*mogłyśmy*
mogłeś	*mogłaś*	-	*mogliście*	*mogłyście*
mógł	*mogła*	*mogło*	*mogli*	*mogły*

2. *ó/o/e*

niosłem	*niosłam*	-	*nieśliśmy*	*niosłyśmy*
niosłeś	*niosłaś*	-	*nieśliście*	*niosłyście*
niósł	*niosła*	*niosło*	*nieśli*	*niosły*

3. *ą/ę*

trzęsłem	*trzęsłam*	-	*trzęśliśmy*	*trzęsłyśmy*
trzęsłeś	*trzęsłaś*	-	*trzęśliście*	*trzęsłyście*
trzęsł	*trzęsła*	*trzęsło*	*trzęśli*	*trzęsły*

4. *e/ø*

szedłem	*szłam*	-	*szliśmy*	*szłyśmy*
szedłeś	*szłaś*	-	*szliście*	*szłyście*
szedł	*szła*	*szło*	*szli*	*szły*