VERBAL PREFIXATION in Slavic (and thus also in Polish) is closely connected with the elusive phenomenon of Slavic aspect, since the commonly recognized, primary function of verbal prefixes is to indicate perfectivity. In the chapter on the morphology of Polish verbs (Wróbel 1984) in the representative Gramatyka współczesnego języka polskiego (Grzegorczykowa et al. 1984), Wróbel states, ‘from a formal point of view, a verbal derivative which differs from the verb’s simplex form only in the presence of a native prefix (and, optionally, the postfix się) is always perfective’ (Grzegorczykowa et al. 1984:490, my translation). The perfectivizing function of the prefix za-, counteracted by the imperfectivizing action of the stem suffix -ywa-, further overridden by the addition of a second prefix (po-), is illustrated in example (1) with a series of infinitives related to the simplex verb pisać ‘write’. The layering of aspectual and semantic contrasts in the derivatives of the verb is represented by the pairs: pisać (IMP) ‘write’: zapisać (PRF) ‘write something down’; zapisać (PRF): zapisywać (IMP) ‘write things down’; zapisywać (IMP) : pozapisywać (PRF) ‘write down a concrete/limited number of things’.

(1)  
a. pisać (IMP)  : zapisać (PRF)  : zapisać się (PRF)  
‘write’  ‘write something down’  ‘write oneself down’/‘register’  
‘write something down’  ‘cover something with writing’  
‘write things down’/‘register several times/ 
be engaged in the activity of registration’

b. zapisać (PRF)  : zapisywać (się) (IMP)  
‘write something down’  ‘write things down’/‘register several times/ 
be engaged in the activity of registration’

c. pisywać (IMP)  : zapisywać (IMP)  
‘write frequently’  ‘write things down’

d. zapisywać (IMP)  : pozapisywać (się) (PRF)  
‘write things down’  ‘write down a limited number of things’/ 
‘register for a limited number of activities’

It has to be made clear that aspectual contrast in Slavic is a contrast between perfective and imperfective, the two terms being understood in their traditional sense as denoting processes that are viewed as complete and incomplete (the Polish terms are aspekt dokonany/niedokonany ‘accomplished/not accomplished’)². Unlike English and many other languages where the perfective/imperfective contrast is communicated only in the finite, tense-marked forms of the verb (usually the past tense), the

perfective/imperfective opposition in Slavic manifests itself obligatorily on all verbal forms, including the infinitive, the imperative and the participles.

As evidenced by the verb *za*pisywać (IMP) in example (1)c, which forms a contrastive semantic (but not aspectual) pair with the verb *pisywać (IMP) in (1)c, the presence of a native prefix on a verbal derivative does not guarantee the verb’s perfectivity—when the verb’s stem contains an imperfective marker such as -ywa-, the verb remains imperfective in spite of the addition of a prefix. It is possible, however, to perfectivize the verb again by adding another preverbal prefix, as in the case of the verb *poza*pisywać (PRF) in (1)d, which has two preverbal prefixes: po- and za- on top of the imperfective marker -ywa-.

Verbal prefixes convey a rich array of meanings and adding them to the verbs’ bases (‘simplex forms’) changes not only the aspect of the verb but also its semantic and syntactic characteristics. Therefore, from the point of view of the results verbal prefixation produces, the process in Slavic is both grammatical and lexical. It is grammatical because prefixation affects the grammatical category of aspect, and it is lexical because by its nature it belongs to the domain of derivational morphology (and word-formation), and as such, has obvious effects on the verb’s lexical meaning and syntactic behaviour.

1. Objective. Za- is classed among the oldest (Tabakowska 2003:157) of the sixteen non-foreign verbal prefixes in Polish (Grzegorczykowa et al. 1984:470). It is very productive, being second only to the prefix z-/s- (as in *spisać [z-write]’produce a record in writing’), with a frequency of occurrence rate comparable to that of the native prefixes po- (popisać się ’give a show’), wy- (wypisać się ’write off the list’), o- (opisać ‘describe’), u- (upić ‘drink a bit of something’), na- (napić się ‘have a drink’), przy- (przypisać ‘ascribe to’) (Grzegorczykowa et al. 1984:471). It is identical in form to the preposition za ‘behind, over, on the other side, for, instead of’, to which it is generally assumed to be related both historically and in function (Townsend & Janda 1996:134, Tabakowska 2003: 156).

The aim of the present study is to show that just as the diverse uses of the preposition za can be related to the underlying, prototypical sense of spatial location behind a barrier (Bacz 1995, Bacz 2004), so can the various meanings of the verbal prefix za- be shown to be all somehow motivated by the idea of crossing (going) over or behind some boundary (in time or in space). It is assumed, in line with the cognitivist view of meaning, that visual perception of configurations in space underlies our understanding and conceptualization of all other relations, including relations expressed by language, and that spatial images (Langackerian image schemas) provide comprehensive (and easily comprehensible) semantic models for language categories. Semantic parallelism between the preposition za and the verbal prefix za- in Polish has been argued for in a recent cognitivist article by Tabakowska (Tabakowska 2003); a cognitivist interpretation of two basic senses of the prefix za- (the sense of covering and the sense of preserving/ securing) was suggested in an earlier study on Polish perfectivizing prefixes by Dąbrowska (1996). My analysis of za- elaborates...
on the findings of these authors while keeping in focus the idea of semantic unity of this notoriously diversified prefix.

2. Analysis. The authors of the biggest recent *Słownik współczesnego języka polskiego* [Dictionary of Contemporary Polish] (Dunaj et al. 1996:1301) distinguish eight unrelated meanings for the prefix *za*--; a popular Polish grammar for foreigners (Bartnicka & Satkiewicz 2000:273), in an attempt to offer a comprehensible overview of the problem of *za*-- for learners of Polish, suggests eleven different senses for the prefix. A semantic network model proposed for *za*-- by Tabakowska (2003:172) reduces the perfectivizing uses of the prefix to five types related to two prototypical centres: a centre based on orientation of space relative to landmark as in the verb *zaskoczyć kogoś* [*za*-jump somebody (from behind)] ‘surprise somebody’, which has inherent front/back orientation (Tabakowska 2003:168) and a centre based on orientation of space relative to observer (all other perfectivizing uses with landmarks of no distinguishable inherent orientation—Tabakowska 2003:168–71). In my own preliminary analysis of *za*-- (Bacz 1995), carried out from the perspective of the Guillaumian linguistics principle of the unity of sign and meaning, I suggest that the prefix requires two potential meanings: one to capture its intensifying function (as in *zaprzestać czegoś* (PRF) [*za*-stop something:GEN] ‘abandon some activity’; *zawrócić* (PRF) [*za*-come back] ‘turn back’) and one for the different varieties of its aspectual ‘going-over-and-behind’ sense. In this paper, I argue that the usage types distinguished for the prefix are all motivated by one underlying (prototypical) spatial sense of ‘going over and behind a boundary’ which delimits (in time or in space) the activity evoked by the verb. The usage types of *za*-- discussed in this paper represent different extensions (different semantic variants) of the prefix’s prototypical meaning and are illustrated in examples (2) to (12) below. The sentence examples are my own, and they relate the uses of the prefix listed in the *Słownik współczesnego języka polskiego* [SWJP] (Dunaj 1996) and two Polish grammars, *Gramatyka współczesnego języka polskiego* (Grzegorczykowa 1984) and *Gramatyka języka polskiego. Podręcznik dla cudzoziemców* (Bartnicka & Satkiewicz 2000).

The most frequently quoted use of *za*--, listed first in the dictionaries and grammars (see Dunaj 1996:1301, Bartnicka & Satkiewicz 2000:273), concerns the purely grammatical, perfectivizing function of the prefix, illustrated by the contrastive sentences (2)a and (2)b and a series of imperfective/perfective infinitives in (2)c⁷.

(2) a. Czy tu można *parkować*?
  if here can:3SG:IMPERSONAL park
  Can one park here?

b. Czy mogę gdzieś tutaj *za*parkować/*parkować (samochód)?
  if can:1SG somewhere here *za*-park/*park (car)
  Can I park (the car)(= find a parking spot) somewhere here?

c. *palić*: *za*-palić telefonować: *za*-telefonować
  smoke *za*-smoke call *za*-call
  ‘to smoke’ ‘to have a smoke’ ‘to call’ ‘to make a call’

Reprinted from *LACUS Forum XXXI: Interconnections*, edited by Adam Makkai,
In the ‘pure perfectivity’ use of example (2), the difference between the imperfective and the perfective infinitives for the English verb to park (parkować versus za-parkować in (2)a and (2)b) can be interpreted as a difference between general and specific. In (2)a, the infinitive parkować evokes the activity of parking as a type of activity in general; in (2)b, the infinitive za-parkować calls to mind a specific instance of that activity (something like ‘to park once, on one occasion’). That’s why the imperfective, unpre-fixed form is not compatible with grammatical elements that imply specificity, such as the specific trajector (the personal pronoun subject ‘I’ rather than the impersonal ‘one’—mogę versus można in Polish) and the indication of the event’s location (‘somewhere here’—gdzieś tutaj). The perfective versus imperfective distinction in Slavic can be visualized with the help of the nominal count-versus-mass concept of boundedness applied to activities expressed by verbs (see Langacker 1991:59–100): perfective verbs are seen as evoking processes in time that are constrained by being tied down to specific details (all this is covered by the broadest sense of the term bounded), while processes that are general and totally unbounded represent the category of imperfectives⁸.

The examples in (3), (4) and (5) show that the boundedness (perfectivity) of processes expressed by za-prefixed verbs manifests itself through different syntactic means. In (3)a, illustrating the aspectual pair grać ‘play’: zagrać ‘za-play something’, the perfectivity of the za-verb is reflected on the level of a sentence in the verb’s direct object, which, in terms of a cognitivist analysis, is the primary landmark of the evoked event. The spatial boundaries of this direct-object landmark impose a boundary on the process expressed by the verb. The prefix’s over-and-behind interpretation applies to the spatial boundaries of Chopin’s mazurka (the direct object) in (3)a which, by extension from the semantics of the intransitive-to-transitive shift in the verb play, has come to denote the boundary of the process. Additional examples (zanucić, zakopać) representing the intransitive to transitive shift resulting from za-prefixation are given in (3)b. See also palić ‘to smoke’ versus zapalić (papierosa) ‘to smoke a cigarette’ in (2)d.

(3) a. Mateusz za-grał mazurka Szopena.
Matthew za-played mazurka:ACC Chopin:GEN
Matthew played a mazurka by Chopin.

b. nucić : za-nucić melodię
hum za-hum tune:ACC
‘to hum’ ‘to hum a tune’

kopać w piasku : za-kopać autko w piasku
dig in sand:LOC za-dig toy car:ACC in sand:LOC
‘dig (= play) in sand’ ‘bury a toy-car in sand’

In (4)b, the boundary of the activity expressed by the verb zajechać ‘arrive’ is provided by the spatial boundary of the adverbial nominal dom ‘home’ or miejsce ‘place, location’ (primary/secondary landmark), which overtly (the presence of the adverbial is
optional) specifies the destination (and therefore, the end limit) of the verb’s activity of going somewhere. In the process of arriving at a destination, the trajector (the event’s agent) is visualized as crossing the boundary separating ‘home’ from what is ‘non-home’.

(4) a. Powinniśmy już jechać do domu.
   Should:1pl already go to home.
   We should be going home.

     b. Nareszcie zajechaliśmy (do domu / na miejsce)
        at last za-came/went:1pl (to home / at [our] place)
        At last we have arrived home.

In (5), the activities denoted by the za-verbs are bounded by their own end limit in time. The prefix indicates that the activity expressed by the simplex verb has come to its natural end because it has produced a change of state in the trajector (the object affected by the activity), the expectation of result constituting part of the meaning of the prefixed verb. The new state the activity’s object finds itself in is a natural consequence of the activity expressed by the simplex verb; usually, it is a state of forced immobility or a state of death (real or metaphorical). The change (from action to state) the trajector undergoes (communicated by the za-perfectivization) can be represented as crossing (going over and behind) the end boundary of the activity expressed by the simplex verb. Za-verbs denoting a change of state resulting from the activity expressed by the simplex verb are characteristic of emphatic spoken style. They are often accompanied by the idiomatic expressions na śmierć ‘until death’, na amen w pacierzu ‘to the amen in a prayer’ (= for good, forever, never to be reversed) which intensify the impression of finality or ‘a maximally negative consequence’ (Grzegorczykowa et al. 1984:486, my translation).

(5) a. Ta praca bardzo go męczy.
   this job very much him:acc tires
   This job makes him extremely tired.

     b. Za-męczysz mnie tymi pytaniami na śmierć.
        will za-tire:2sg me:acc these questions:instr onto death:acc
        You’ll make me sick to death with these questions.

     c. nudzić kogoś/się : za-nudzić kogoś/się (na śmierć)
        bore somebody/oneself za-bore somebody/oneself to death
        ‘to bore/to be bored’ ‘to bore somebody stiff/to be bored stiff’

         bić (kogoś) : za-bić kogoś
         beat (somebody) za-beat somebody
         ‘to beat somebody’ ‘to kill somebody by beating them’

Many of the perfective za-verbs expressing ultimate consequences of the activity denoted by their imperfective simplex form, such as the verbs zakleć ‘glue up’ (note 10), zalać ‘flood up’ (6) a, zaszyć ‘sew up’ (6) b, zabielić ‘make white’, zagrącić ‘cover with junk’ (note 11) can also be classed with the usage type of the prefix described in the literature as representing the sense of ‘covering’ (Janda 1986:122, Dąbrowska 1996:482–83, Tabakowska 2003:170). In the covering use of za-, the primary landmark (the object affected by the action of the za-verb) is separated from view (i.e. put behind a barrier or boundary) by a secondary landmark (overtly specified or presupposed) which refers to the instrument in the activity denoted by the verb. In example (6a) Sąsiedzi na górze lali wodę na podłogę i zalali nam mieszkanie ‘Our neighbours upstairs poured water on the floor and za-poured (flooded ) our apartment’, the primary landmark ‘our apartment’ is completely covered with the activity’s instrument (secondary landmark) ‘water’, so that it cannot be seen. The secondary landmark (instrument of the verb’s activity) evokes the barrier or a boundary the object of the activity is put behind.

Contrasting with the ultimate completion sense of za-verbs (as in zabić ‘kill’, zamęczyć ‘tire out’, zanudzić ‘bore to death’, zaszyć ‘cover by sewing up’ in 5 and 6), whose activity brings about a change of state in the trajector, the za-examples in (7) evoke activities whose result could be called partial. Their effect is slight and less final, but they do bring about a change of state that can be represented as crossing a boundary, here the boundary between the activity and the resultant state. In (7)b, with the verb zaciąć się (za-cut) ‘to nick one’s chin’, the boundary defining the end of the process is the physical, spatial boundary of the trajector’s skin that was untouched and now has been gone through in the process of za-cutting.

The examples in (8) contain intransitive verbs of short duration where the time limit of the verb’s activity marks the boundary of the process on the time axis. By the very fact of coming to an end, activities of short duration imply a change (from the state of activity to the state of non-activity), which again can be represented as going over a boundary. The difference between the examples in (4) and those in (8) lies in the fact that the activities denoted by the za-verbs in (8) do not result from the activities denoted by their simplex verbs. Grammarians observe that za-verbs of short duration belong to the lexical class of verbs of perception: they usually describe phenomena that are perceived by the senses of sight, hearing, smell and taste, as evidenced by examples (8)b and (8)c.

(8) a. Telefon dzwonił dziś całe popołudnie
   Phone was ringing today all afternoon:ACC
   The phone has been ringing all afternoon today.
b. Telefon zadzwonił i zamiłó.
   Phone za-rang and za-went silent
   The phone rang once and stopped.
c. świecić : zaświecić
   shine za-shine
   ‘to shine’ ‘to shine for a moment/to start shining’
   pachnieć : zapachnieć
   smell za-smell
   ‘to smell’ ‘to smell for a short while/to begin smelling’

Za-verbs of short duration are often classed together with inchoative verbs, such as the verbs zakochać się ‘fall in love’ (9)b or zachorować ‘fall sick’ (9)c. The meaning contributed to these inchoative verbs by za- is to emphasize the beginning of the activity. The boundary that is being crossed is again the boundary between non-activity and the activity expressed by the verb. The function of za- in this use is to provide a starting-point limit to the unbounded image of the verb’s imperfective form.

(9) a. Janek kochał się w Marysi.
   John loved himself in Mary.
   John was in love with Mary.
b. Janek zakochał się w Marysi.
   John za-loved himself in Mary.
   John fell in love with Mary.
Inchoative za-verbs (9) and za-verbs of short duration (8) focus on the fleeting character of the process denoted by the verb. In contrast to the examples in (8) and (9), the verbs with za- in the usage type illustrated in (10), i.e. zaspać ‘oversleep’, zasiedzieć się ‘stay too long’, and zagapić się ‘look too long’, express excess, i.e. going beyond what’s considered the norm for the activity evoked (in either duration or in intensity). Exceeding the norm means going beyond the boundaries of what is accepted.

(10) a. Janek zaspał i spóźnił się do szkoły.
  John za-slept and came late to school.
  John overslept and was late for school.

b. zasiedzieć się  zagapić się
   za-sit oneself  za-look oneself
   ‘to stay too long’   ‘to look too intensely/to stare too long’

A semantic shift to the opposite is produced by prefixation with za- in the aspectual pairs of (11): pomnieć (IMP) ‘remember’ vs. zapomnieć (PRF) ‘forget’ and bronić (IMP) ‘defend’ vs. zabronić (PRF) ‘forbid’. These uses still follow naturally from the image of going beyond a boundary. The activity of forgetting (za-remebering) something is separated from the activity of remembering by a barrier that hides the object that’s forgotten (the trajector). The object that’s forgotten is put behind the barrier marking the end of the activity of remembering and now, access to it is blocked. The case of zabronić ‘forbid’ can be explained as a metaphorical move beyond a barrier defining the limits of defending and protection, expressed by the simplex imperfective bronić (see Dąbrowska 1996:483 for a convincing explanation of the link between blocking access-protection and securing for future use). When access to the object of the activity of defending is blocked, contact with that object can be interpreted as metaphorically forbidden. (See also Tabakowska’s 2003:170 discussion of zabronić palenia ‘to forbid smoking’.) We can note in passing that the proximity of the notions of protecting and forbidding is well illustrated in the semantics of the French verb défendre which translates as defend, protect against (Polish bronić) in uses such as défendre sa vie ‘defend one’s life’ or as forbid (Polish zabronić), in uses such as in the sentence Il est défendu de parler au conducteur ‘It is forbidden to talk to the driver’.

(11) a. ‘Pomnij com ci przykazala’ (from a poem)
   remember:2SG-IMP what:1SG you:DAT bid:3SG:FEM
   Remember what I told you to do.

b. Zapomnij co ci powiedziałam.
   Za-remember:2SG-IMP what you:DAT told:1SG:FEM
   Forget what I told you.

c. bronić : zabronić
defend za-defend
‘to defend, protect’ ‘to forbid’

In the final set of examples, (12), the function of za- can be described as intensifying. In a prevailing number of instances representing this usage, za- is added to verbs that are already perfective, so it cannot bring about their perfectivity. Its role, then, is to intensify the already perfective meaning of the verb\(^{12}\). The examples in (12)a show that the presence of za- strengthens the impression of perfectivity conveyed by the verb by imposing an additional boundary (of a different kind) on an activity that has already been bounded. In the perfective infinitive zastrzelić (PRF) ‘shoot down’, derived through za-prefixation to the perfective infinitive strzelić (PRF) ‘fire a shot’, the change-of-state/ultimate consequence perfective meaning (as illustrated in (5)) combines with the single occurrence meaning of the verb strzelić (PRF) ‘fire a shot’, which forms an aspectual pair with the imperfective -a- infinitive strzelać (IMP) ‘shoot (several times)’. Thus, the addition of a prefix to a form that is already perfective strengthens the impression of perfectivity in the lexical meaning of the verb.

In (12)b, the addition of the prefix changes the stylistic value of the verb. The prefixed forms zaprzestać ‘to stop’, zawezwać ‘to call’, zakupić ‘to purchase’ are characteristic of formal Polish. One could argue that switching to a formal register represents the activity of crossing the line between the neutral and the marked on the level of style, and thus, going beyond a boundary.

\[
(12)\hspace{1cm} \begin{array}{ll}
a. \text{strzelić (PRF)} : & \text{zastrzelić kogoś (PRF)} \hspace{1cm} \text{vs. strzelać (IMP)} \\
\text{shoot once} & \text{za-shoot somebody} \\
‘\text{to fire a shot’} & \text{‘to shoot somebody down’} \\
\text{b. przestać (PRF)} : & \text{zaprzestać (PRF)} \\
\text{stop} & \text{za-stop} \\
‘\text{to stop’} & \text{‘to stop’ (formal)} \\
\text{wezwać (PRF)} : & \text{zawezwać (PRF)} \\
\text{call} & \text{za-call} \\
‘\text{to call’} & \text{‘to call’ (formal)} \end{array}
\]

3. Conclusion. The analysis of za-prefixed Polish verbs has shown that verbal prefixation is never semantically vacuous, and that diverse uses of za-prefixed verbs can be given a unified description. Whether the addition of the prefix changes the aspect or the lexical meaning of the verb, its semantic contribution can be represented as an extension of the underlying, prototypical sense of za- to communicate the idea of going over and behind a boundary.

\footnote{The perfectivization-by-prefixation rule does not apply when a foreign prefix, such as re- or de(z)-, or the very infrequent prefix niedo- are added to the verb’s base, as illustrated by}

the following sets of infinitives: \textit{organizować} (IMP) ‘organize’ versus \textit{reorganizować} (IMP) ‘reorganize’, \textit{dezorganizować} (IMP) ‘disorganize’ but \textit{zorganizować} (PRF) ‘get organized’; \textit{słyszeć} (IMP) ‘hear’ versus \textit{niedołyszeć} (IMP) ‘not to hear well/ be hard of hearing’ but \textit{usłyszeć} (PRF) ‘to hear ( = to acknowledge having heard something, to learn something)’, \textit{zasłyszeć} (PRF) ‘to learn something that’s hearsay’ (Grzegorczykowa et al. 1984:490).

² This traditional definition of perfective/imperfective aspect does not agree with with Langacker’s (1991:85–91) understanding of perfectivity as ‘boundedness within the scope of predication’.

³ Examples of semantic and grammatical changes produced by prefixation with \textit{za-} can be furnished by the aspectual pairs: \textit{bić} (IMP) : \textit{zabić} (PRF) and \textit{sypać} (IMP) : \textit{zasypać} (PRF). When \textit{za-} is added to the imperfective infinitive \textit{bić ‘beat’}, the perfective derivative is a different lexical verb \textit{zabić ‘kill’}. In the pair \textit{sypać ‘fall (of snow)’} : \textit{zasypać ‘cover with a solid substance, such as snow’}, the imperfective \textbf{intransitive} verb \textit{sypać}, as in: Od rana dziś sypie i sypie ‘Since early morning today it’s been snowing and snowing’, changes its grammatical status and becomes the perfective \textbf{transitive} verb \textit{zasypać}, as in: Śnieg zasypał całe miasto ‘Snow has covered the whole town.’

⁴ Polish grammarians (see Grzegorczykowa et al. 1984 plus sources reviewed in Tabakowska 2003:154-58) distinguish cases of the so-called ‘empty prefixes’ in Polish, where the prefix appears to change neither the aspect nor the meaning of the verb, as in the verbs \textit{powrócić ‘return’} : \textit{wrócić ‘return’}, \textit{siąść ‘sit down’} : \textit{usiąść ‘sit down’}; all perfective (Grzegorczykowa et al. 1984:490). Tabakowska (2003:155) observes that the term ‘empty prefix’ is also used by some grammarians to refer to cases where the addition of a prefix produces a purely aspectual effect, with no changes to the lexical meaning of the verb. My own conviction (which follows from both Cognitive Linguistics and the Guillaumian Psychomechanics of Language) is that there are no semantically empty morphemes and that the meaning of the so-called ‘empty’ or ‘merely aspectual’ elements can always be identified, provided an appropriate semantic analysis is carried out.

⁵ Townsend and Janda (1996:134) observe that ‘the subordination of the analytic to the synthetic is exemplified by Slavic treatment of prepositions (an analytic item) as prefixes (a synthetic item) in treating both as components in phonetic words’ [my emphasis]; following her survey of the literature on aspect in Polish, Tabakowska (2003:156) states that ‘it is generally assumed that in Old Polish it was prepositions excerpted from adverbial prepositional phrases that were originally used as aspectual verbal prefixes’.

⁶ This view, in my opinion, agrees with the Guillaumian concept of the potential significate if we admit that graphic models of potential significates represent spatial imagery. (See Guillaume 1984 for the concept of the potential significate.)

⁷ Bartnicka and Satkiewicz (2000:273) observe that \textit{za-} has purely aspectual function when added to verbs of foreign origin with \textit{-owa-} in their stem, as in: \textit{za-obserwować ‘to notice/ observe something’}, \textit{za-gwarantować ‘to guarantee something’}, \textit{za-instalować ‘to install something’}. Tabakowska’s examples of ‘pure perfectives’ with \textit{za-} are the intransitive verbs: \textit{za-szczeptać ‘to give a bark’}, \textit{za-żartować ‘to crack a joke’}, \textit{za-salutować ‘to give a salute’} and the transitive verb \textit{za-śpiewać ‘sing (up) a song’} (Tabakowska 2003:171) (cf. my ‘verbs of short duration’).
It should be kept in mind that the opposition between the perfective and imperfective in Slavic does not parallel the difference between the progressive and simple in English.

Other za-verbs which denote activities whose boundaries are determined by the boundaries of adverbal nominals of place are: za-jść ‘to reach a destination by walking’ (versus: iść ‘to go somewhere on foot’), za-brnąć ‘to reach a destination by wading’ (versus: brnąć ‘to go somewhere by wading’), za-wędrować ‘to reach a destination after some roaming about’ (versus wędrować ‘to walk about, roam’) etc. (see Tabaksowska 2003:169 and Bartnicka & Satkiewicz 2000: 273).

Other examples of this type are jeździć ‘to drive’ vs. za-jeździć samochód (na śmierć) ‘to za-drive the car to death (to use it up)’; kleić ‘to glue’ vs. za-kleić na amen ‘to glue something up for eternity’. When the imperfective verb sypać is transitive, as in the expression sypać kwiatki-acc ‘throw flowers’, its perfective counterpart za-sypać kwiatkami-instr ‘cover up with flowers’ requires the Instrumental case-marking on the nominal kwiatki ‘flowers’. The grammatical change of case from acc to instr in this example denotes a semantic change of the role assumed by the entity ‘flowers’: from the object/patient of the activity of throwing to the participant/instrument of that activity.

Other examples of this type include cases of deadjectival and denominal derivatives, such as: bielić ‘to make white’ vs. za-bielić (zupę) śmietaną ‘to make (the soup) white by adding cream’ (from the adjective biały ‘white’), za-gracić [za-junk] ‘to cover with junk’ (from the noun graty ‘junk’). For a discussion see Dąbrowska 1996.

The intensifying function of za- has also been recognized in aspectual pairs, such as ofiarować się (imp) ‘to offer oneself’; za-ofiarować się (prf) ‘to offer oneself up’ (Bartnicka & Satkiewicz 2000:273), where the prefix is said to intensify the lexical meaning of the activity denoted by the verb on top of (or perhaps because of) its perfectivizing effect (which in the case of zaofiarować się can be described as a ‘one-time particularization’).
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