

Marek Łaziński
University of Warsaw



Goals and Results of DiAsPol Project.
Aspect triples. Aspect in Corpora.
Aspect in Legal Texts

The Slavic Verb – a Multi-faceted Approach,
Bamberg.23.5.2023

DiAsPol: diaspol.uw.edu.pl

Development of the Polish Aspect System in the Last 250 Years

- Polish German Project granted by Beethoven 2018-2021.
- University of Warsaw: Marek Łaziński and a team,
- Johannes Gutenberg University Mainz: Bjorn Wiemer and a team

Content of the presentation

1. Objectives and results of the project
2. Database of aspect triples
3. Corpora
 - 3.1. Polish-German Corpus. Tagging aspect pairs
 - 3.2. Corpus of XIX century Polish
 - 3.3. Corpus of Legal Texts
- 4. Verbal aspect in codices and legal texts (a sub-project)**

1. Development of verbal aspect

1. Root verbs, e.g. *robić* ('to do') take a prefix specifying the type of action (not yet the grammatical aspect) - *zrobić*, *dorobić* ('to finish, do/add extra').

2. The prefixed verbs acquires regular suffixes (aspect opposition): *zrobić* – *zrabiać*, *dorobić* – *dorabiać*

3. Triples change to pairs:

PV-IPV2 if the meaning of IPV2 was different from IPV1:
dorobić – *dorabiać*

IPV1-PV if IPV1 was synonymous to IPV2 which is therefore extinct: *robić* – *zrobić* (no more *zrabiać* – still present in 19th C. dictionaries).

2. Database of aspect triples

We focused on triples as a milestone in the development of aspect system in terms of over the past 250 years based on dictionaries and corpora.

We have built a table of almost 1.800 Polish triples with Russian and Czech tables as a background. It is designed as a **tool to formulate or test hypotheses** about the aspect system and its development.

As support tools, we built three corpora and introduced special rules of tagging aspect oppositions.

A special sub-project researched on aspect in legal texts.

Triplets in 3 languages

	Triplets	IPV1	PV	IPV2 (variants)
Polish	1754	1386		1781
Czech	709	634	709	740
Russian	1280	837	1280	1494

How it was built?

A provisional set of aspect triples was based on lists of aspect pairs in Polish WordNet, contemporary dictionaries. This list was supplemented by checking ipfv. simplex stems in the dictionaries and assigning to them pfv. partners and secondary ipfv. stems. The relation between members of potential triplets was checked in contemporary and historical corpora starting from the 18th century.

A list of Czech ipfv. stems was derived from Esvan (2007), for Russian from the Emptiness Database: in Tromso: (emptyprefixes.uit.no/triplets_eng.htm).

How it was checked?

Joining verbs in triplets, we applied tests on trivial pairedness between PF and IPF1 and IPF2. We checked on the narrative present, with unlimited iteration in real contexts in contemporary and historical corpora. In every triple, the IPV2 was attested at least in one dictionary or occurs in one of written corpora and the IPV1 still exists at the same period.

The frequency refers to transitive verbs and their counterparts with *się*, which can be separated from the verb (in Polish and Czech, but not in Russian). The true reflexives, reflexiva tantum and reciprocal uses of transitive verbs are merged with the verbs without *się*. Thus the frequency of the triplet based on *adaptować* refers to *adaptować się* as well. (*Zadaptowywać się* is attested in one dictionary).

Persistence

There are less triplets now than it used to be before, but still 30 per cent of suffixed verbs are parts of triples in Polish.

IPV1-s are usually more frequent than IPV2-s, even if they are fully interchangeable. IPV2 as *przeczytywać*, *napisywać* (?*napisovat*, ?*napisyvat*) tends to disappear since they are synonymous to IPV1 *pisać* (*psat*, *pisat*).

In some triplets the frequency of the IPV1 decreases, as Czech *konat* - *vykonat* - *vykonávat*. or Pol. *mrzeć* - *umrzeć* - *umierać* (Polish *konać* means 'to die' today and forms a triplet *konać* – *skonać* - *skonywać*).

Arguments and meaning

Members of a triplet should have the same argument structure. In Polish and Czech IPFV1-IPFV2 pairs *dělit* : *rozdělovat* and *dzielić* : *rozdzielać* ‘divide, separate’, a prepositional phrase is added more often to the IPV1 *dělit/dzielić na*, the IPV1 has usually has a statual function, whereas the IPV2 has a processual function.

Svůj život dělí na život před dítětem a po něm. ‘He **divides** his life into a period before and after the baby.’ (ČNC)

*(...) **sprawiedliwie dzielącym** ich łóżko na dwie połowy.* ‘(...) fairly **dividing** their bed into two halves.’ (NKJP)

Future research

Triplets do not constitute a homogeneous class, but divide into “better” and “worse” representatives, or into core and periphery. Apart from that, the “survival rate” of triplets varies a lot, e.g. if IPFV1 and IPFV2 remain synonyms, but develop preferences for different subsets of functions associated with imperfective aspect.

Our database is a tool for future research.

3. Corpora

In order to examine Polish verbal aspect against the background of non-aspect languages, we collected a Polish-German and German-Polish parallel corpus of 10 million words, covering texts from the 18th century, including a sub-corpus of legal and administrative documents. The corpus offers a search for aspect pairs (triples), not only for aspect value of a verb.

<http://diaspol.uw.edu.pl/polniem/#!>

As we found not enough contexts for triples before the 20th century, we also collected a 10 million word monolingual corpus of Polish texts 19th century:

<http://diaspol.uw.edu.pl/XIX/#!>

Aspect tags in the Polish-German Corpus

– applied in the search syntax

Aspect value:

- Pf partner, ipf partner, bi-aspectual,
- Verbs not tagged are per default pf or ipf tantum

Aspect determiner:

- Not-affixal (simplex): aspect marked by root, eg. ipf *pisać*, pf *przepisać* (*prze-*, repeated in ipf. *przepisywać*)
- Prefix (pf): *na-pisa-ć*
- Suffix: ipf *przepis-ywa-ć*, pf *stuk-ną-ć*
- Suppletive: *brać* – *wziąć*

Every aspect partner is assigned to a superlemma consisting of ipf and pf, eg. *pisać* – *napisać*.

- It is enough to put one verb to find the superlemma.

Search for pf corpus partners beginning with u- in simple future form)

The screenshot shows the Parallel Corpus search interface. The browser tabs include "Beata Fudalej - Szukaj w Google", "Gielda - GPW - WIG - Notowania", and "Corpus Query interface". The address bar shows "parasolcorpus.org/Teesthoven/#!". The page header features logos for "UNIVERSITÄT MAINZ" and "WARSAWSKI" and the title "Parallel Corpus".

Navigation tabs include "Search", "Frequency", "Collocations", and "N-grams". A settings gear icon is in the top right.

Two search panels are visible:

- Query for Polish:** Under "Basic search", the query "u" is entered in the "Token:" field and "fin" in the "Lexeme:" field. The "Superlemma" field is empty. The "perf patne" dropdown is set to "perf" and "patne". The "prefix" dropdown is set to "patne". The "begins with" checkbox is checked, while "ends with" and "case sensitive" are unchecked. Below the search fields are "+" and "-" buttons. Under "Search only in:", the buttons "Fiction", "Non-fiction", "Press texts", and "Law texts" are visible. A "Filters" section with a "+" button is at the bottom.
- Query for German:** The "exclude (find everything except query match)" checkbox is unchecked. The "Token:", "Lexeme:", and "Gram. tag:" fields are empty. The "begins with", "ends with", and "case sensitive" checkboxes are all unchecked. "+" and "-" buttons are present.

Alternative automatic assignment to aspect pairs (some disambiguated)

1. State – imperfectivum tantum:

- Te papugi charakteryzuje piękne ubarwienie.
- ‘These parrots are characterised for their beautiful colouring’

2. Accomplishment (telic action) ,to describe’:

- (S)Charakteryzował kolegę krótkimi słowami.
- ‘He described his friend in short words.’

3. Accomplishment (telic action) ‘make up oneself’:

- Aktor (u)charakteryzował się przed występem.
- The actor made himself up before the performance.

Every form of the ipf *charakteryzować* must be potentially referred in the corpus to two different pfs or left as an IMPT. Only a small sub-corpus is disambiguated by hand.

3. Aspect in legal texts.

„You shall not kill” in Slavic codices

- Kto **zabija** (ipf) człowieka [...] podlega karze... (Kodeks karny RP 1997, art. 148.1).
- Kdo jiného úmyslně **usmrtí** (pf), bude potrestán... (Trestní zákoník ČR 2009, art. 140.1).
- Kto iného úmyselne **usmrtí** (pf) s vopred uváženou pohnútkou, potrestá sa... (Trestný zákon Sr, 2005, art. 144 § 1)
- Kojto umišleno **umàrtvi** (pf) drugigo, se nakazva za ubijstvo... (Nakazatelen Kodeks na BR 2006, art.115)
- Ko drugog **liši** (pf) života, kazniće se zatvorom... (Krivičny zakon RS 2006, art. 47.1).

Why does Polish and only Polish use the ipf in codices?

- The ipf is not pure iterative (not only repeated murder is punishable). It brings a factor of generality, the same which builds a general hypothesis (everybody, always).
- A perfective: *kto zabije* would present the omnitemporal rule as a predictable event, i.e. that somebody will really kill another person (future meaning of a the pf present).
- Speakers of other Slavic languages interpret the Polish ipf *kto zabije*, opposed to *kto usmrtí, umàrtvi* or *liši života* (pf) as a repeated reading or an attempt.
- Of course, it does not a meaning of attempt. An attempt to kill is not punishable equally with the real deed.

„You shall not kill” in Slavic codices – nominal framing

- Vbivstvo, tobto umisne protipravne zapodijannja smerti inšij ljudini, – karajet’sja pozbavlennjam voli na strok vid semi do p’jatnadcjati rokiv (Kriminal’nij kodeks Ukraïni, 2001, art. 115.1).
- Ubijstvo, to est umyšlennoe pričinenie smerti drugomu čeloveku, nakazyvaetsja... (Ugolovnyj kodeks Rossijskoj Federacii 1996, art. 105.1)
- Ubijstvo **soveršennoe** (pf) s osoboj žestokostju ‚murdr committed with a special cruelty’ nakazyvaetsja... (Uk RF, art.105.2).
- Planirovanie, podgotovka ili razvjazyvanie agressivnoj vojny - nakazyvajutsja lisheniem svobody na srok ot semi do pjatnadcati let. (UkRF, art.353.1).

Three elements of a legal norm and its grammatical framing

- The **hypothesis** of a legal norm specifies the addressee and the context: kto/whoever is a general hypothesis
- The **disposition** describes the behaviour (prohibition, injunction or permission): in this case – not killing
- The **sanction** sets consequences prescribed by law for acting contrary to the disposition.
- The verbal model, as in English, West- and South Slavic, tracing back to the book of Leviticus or the Code of Hammurabi, contains an elaborate disposition: whoever kills, but only the subject is shared with the hypothesis.
- The nominal model, as in French and East Slavic tradition, conceals the hypothesis, and limits the disposition.

Polish uses ipf and Russian uses pf in proverbs, rules and other legal-like texts.

- Pl. Kto późno przychodzi (ipf), sam sobie szkodzi.
- Rus. Pozdno prišel (pf), tomu mosol.
'Latecomers lose out; first come, first served'
- Pl. Kto pod kim dołki kopie, ten sam w nie wpada.
- Rus. Ne roj drugomu jamu, sam v nee popadeš.
'Who digs a pit for sb., falls there themselves = the biter bit'
- Pl. Kto sieje wiatr, zbiera burzę.
- Rus. Kto seet/poseet vixer, požnet burju.
'Sow the wind and reap the whirlwind (Bibel)'

Attempt

Some verbs can raise doubts about whether the committing a crime is completed or merely attempted:

- Odpowiada za podżeganie, kto chcąc, aby inna osoba dokonała czynu zabronionego, nakłania ją do tego. (Kk, art. 18.2)

'Whoever, wanting another person to commit a prohibited act, persuades this person to do so, is liable for incitement.'

Polish lawyers have disagreed about this, despite the default interpretation of an ipf as a trivial equivalent of the pf.

Does nakłania 'incite' mean here 'tries to incite' or 'has incited successfully' (if the incited person has shown his/her will to commit crime). An „incitement to hatred” is even less verifiable.

Vague interpretation of the Polish Supreme Court (2003)

- ...słowo „nakłania” [...] należy rozumieć jako zawierające wymóg wywołania skutku, w postaci wzbudzenia u podżeganego zamiaru popełnienia czynu zabronionego, mimo że przepis posługuje się czasownikową formą niedokonaną. Formą taką posługuje się przecież kodeks również w innych przepisach, a mimo to nie budzi wątpliwości, że przepisy te dotyczą przestępstw skutkowych.
- ...the word *nakłania* should be understood as requiring to trigger a consequence – causing in the induced person an intention to commit a prohibited act, although the legal provision uses an imperfective form of the verb. The same form is used in other provisions of the code which, without a doubt, refer to consequence crimes

Verbal aspect and stages in commission of crime

- It is not the semantics of aspect that determines the interpretation of an attempt or an accomplished action, but a lexically expressed separate provision included in the general part of the code, applicable to every offence typified in the special part.
- Penal codes use a specific construction to encompass the situation of a crime intended, but not consumed. Every time the culprit is involved in an intended criminal action, but does not succeed in finishing it, the concept of attempt applies.
- The penalty is imposed on the basis of both the according provision of special part of the code and Art. 13 in the general part of the Polish penal code.

Accomplishment verbs in Polish Penal code

- Killing (*kto zabije*) is an achievement verb and always denotes a fact. Enciteing (*kto nakłania*) is an accomplishment verb and rises doubts.
- Imperfective accomplishment verbs in PC are usually contextually disambiguated as accomplished events:
- *gromadzić* ‘to amass/accumulate’, *nakłaniać* ‘to persuade/induce’, *niszczyć* ‘to destroy’, *organizować* ‘to organise’, *przerabiać* ‘to alter (a document)’, *przewozić* ‘to transport/carry’, *splacać* ‘to repay’, *werbować* ‘to recruit’, *wykonywać* ‘to perform/execute’, *wypełniać* (blankiet) ‘to fill in (a form)’, *wytwarzać* ‘to manufacture’

Perfectives in the Polish Code

While imperfectives in the present tense denote all kinds of offences and their circumstances, the perfectives are generally used to specify extenuating and exempting circumstances:

naprawić ‘to repair’, *zapobiec* ‘to prevent’, *osiągnąć* ‘to achieve’, *odstąpić od/poniechać/zaniechać*, ‘withdraw/ give up’, *odpowiedzieć* ‘to answer/respond’, *podjąć starania* ‘to make efforts’, *powrócić* ‘to return / come back’, *zawiadomić* ‘to inform’, *przekazać* ‘to hand over / transmit’, *zwolnić* ‘to release’, *sprostować* ‘to put right’, *uchylić niebezpieczeństwo* ‘to avert danger’, *zaspokoić roszczenia* ‘to compensate a claim’, *zrezygnować* ‘to resign’, *zwrócić* ‘to return / give back’

Extenuating circumstances

Kto **bierze** lub **przetrzymuje** zakładnika... podlega karze [...]
Nie podlega karze za przestępstwo [...], kto **odstąpił** (past pf)
od zamiaru wymuszenia i **zwolnił** (past pf) zakładnika.

‘Whoever takes or holds a hostage..., is subject to the penalty... [...]

Whoever has abandoned the intention of extortion and released the hostage
is not subject to the penalty for the crime... (art. 252 §§ 1, 4)

The event denoted by a perfective *zwolnił zakładnika* becomes
temporally definite against the background of the macrosituation
expressed by imperfectives *bierze zakładnika*. The causal relation
between the release of a hostage and renouncing the imposition of
penalty constitutes a short narrative story and makes the perfective
zwolnił 'released' temporally definite.

Conclusions

- Grammatical structure of the penal code depends on the legal tradition and typical functions of grammatical categories (aspect, tense, verbal noun) and determines the actional interpretation of allowed or prohibited human conduct.
- The actional interpretation of a verb can even influence the pragmatic legal interpretation of a norm applied to individual situations.