

Keiko Mitani
The University of Tokyo
Hongo 7-3-1 Bunkyo, 113-0033 Tokyo, Japan
tridoli3@l.u-tokyo.ac.jp

UZ-PREFIXATION AND DEPENDENT FUTURE IN CROATIAN¹

This paper deals with a special verb form prefixed with *uz-* in Croatian. *Uz-*prefixed present forms from imperfective verbs, known as a functional equivalent to the second future, are rarely used in contemporary Croatian, despite the inclusion of this phenomenon in standard grammars. Based on dialectal as well as diachronic evidence, this paper defines the use of the *uz-*prefixed present as a remnant of old Štokavian features. Further, connecting this form to the old Czech *vz-* future, the author argues that it originated from a particular usage of the prefix **vbz-* in old Slavic dialects, which originally marked the perfective aspect but became by reanalysis a future marker. The Czech prefix *po-* used to form the future tense of motion verbs is considered as indicative; similar to the Czech *po-*, the *uz-*prefixed present is characterized as a synthetic future imperfective form, but one that is only available in the subordinate clause whose matrix has future reference.

1. *Uz-*prefixed form in Croatian

The prefix *uz-* (<**vbz*>²) in Croatian is used to derive nouns, adjectives, adverbs, and verbs (Babić 2002: 396, 493, Barić et al. 1997: 369, 379ff): e.g., *uzdah* 'sigh', *uzmak* 'retreat'; *uzlazni* 'ascending'; *uzgred* 'in passing'; *uzrasti*

¹ This article is a fully revised and expanded version of Mitani (2015). In accordance with the newly added materials and modified analysis, the result has also been altered.

² *Uz-* has the allomorphs *uza-/us-/uš-/u-*, depending on the phonological environment. *Uz* is also used as a preposition governing the accusative case; it expresses such meanings as 'beside', 'along', and 'with (accompanied by)'.

‘to grow up’, *uznemiriti* ‘to upset’. As a verb prefix, it adds a variety of meanings to derived verbs, such as upward motion (*uzaći/uzići* ‘to ascend’, *uspeti se* ‘to climb up’), movement in the opposite direction (*uzmicati* ‘to retreat, withdraw’), ingressive meaning (*uzviknuti* ‘to begin to cry’, *uskipjeti* ‘to begin to boil’), intensity (*uzburkati* ‘to agitate’), and completion (*uzorati* ‘to dig up’) (Babić 2002: 553, Barić et al. 1997: 384). Along with these, another function has been ascribed to *uz-*, that of forming a functional equivalent of the so-called „second future” (further, FII)³ with the present form of an imperfective verb (Maretić 1899: 596, Stevanović 1986: 447–448, Katičić 2002: 202, 262, 298). For example:

(1) Čovjek koji bude tako pisao pročit će se.

‘A man who writes (will be writing) like that will gain fame.’

(2) Čovjek koji tako uspiše pročit će se.

=(1)

(Katičić 2002: 202)

In contemporary Croatian, *uz*-prefixation of the imperfective present stem expressing the meaning of FII (further, *uz*-VPR) is regarded quite marginal; only a few verb forms, such as *ustreba* (< *trebati* ‘to need’), *ushtjedne* (< *htjeti* ‘to want’), and *uzmogne* (< *moći* ‘to be able to’), are recognized as such (Katičić 2002: 202). Probably because of this, *uz*-VPR has not been seriously treated in Croatian linguistics.⁴ However, as I argue below, the emergence of this form brings to light a special aspect of verb prefixation in Croatian, and it is worthy of deeper consideration. In the following, I first briefly outline the syntactic features of FII and the perfective present (PPR) in contemporary Croatian. Next, I describe the *uz*-VPR phenomenon as it has appeared in dialects and old grammars and writings. After that, I give an account of why this form has emerged in the tense-aspect system in Croatian, referring also to the use of the *vz*- prefix in Old Czech.

2. FII and its functional alternatives

FII in Croatian is formed from the perfective present of *biti* ‘to be’ with the *l*-participle (Barić et al. 1997: 241): 1SG *budem pitao/pitala* ‘I will have asked’, 2SG *budeš pitao/pitala* ‘you will have asked’, etc. This is diachronically a Slavo-
nomic future perfect, *bōdō+*l*-participle (Schenker 1995: 148). In Old Chur-

³ In Croatian grammar, it is usually referred to as *futur drugi* or *futur egzakt*.

⁴ Some studies, such as Milošević (1970), have treated this form, but not as an independent issue.

ch Slavonic (OCS), the future perfect denoted an event „viewed as completed before some future moment and whose results are important for that moment” (Lunt 2001: 114):

- (3) Прѣклонитъ са и падеть егда оудоблѣль
crouch-PRS.3SG REFL CONJ fall-PRS.3SG when overcome-PTPL.M.SG
бѣдетъ убогимъ
AUX.3SG poor-DAT.PL
‘He croucheth, and humbleth himself, that the poor may fall by his strong ones.’⁵
(Ps. IX.31, Jagić 1907: 41)

The same form was used in other old Slavonic languages, such as Old Russian (4) and Old Czech (5):

- (4) аще и грѣхы будеть кто сътвориль, азъ имамъ
if PTCL sin-ACC.PL aux-3SG who-NOM make-PTPL.M.SG 1SG.NOM have-PRS.1SG
о томъ прѣдъ Богъмъ отвѣщати⁶
PREP that-LOC.SG PREP God-INS answer-IPF.INF
‘Whoever commits sin, all the same it is me who shall answer in front of God.’
(5) uposlúchá-li teb zísal budeš bratra tvéh⁷
listen-PRS.3SG PTCL 2SG.ACC gain-PF.PTPL.M.SG AUX.2SG brother-ACC.SG
(Gebauer 2007: 555)
‘If he will listen to you, you have found your brother.’

It should be noted that an event „viewed as completed before some future moment”, expressed in this form, could occur before the speech moment. The next example from Old Ukrainian illustrates this:

- (6) нехай теперь нам скажуть у которого будеть Вильневца
let now we-DAT say-PRS.3SG PREP who-GEN AUX.3SG citizen_of_Villinus-GEN.SG
купиль а мы тому Вильнивицу велимъ ему
buy-PTPL.M.SG CONJ 1PL.NOM that-DAT.SG DAT.SG tell-PRS.1PL 3SG.DAT

⁵ The English translation is quoted from the King James Version (Ps. X.10).

⁶ Житие Феодосия печерского. Библиотека Литературы Дервней Руси. Т. 1. [<http://lib2.pushkinskijdom.ru/tabid-4872>] (accessed 11/30/15)

⁷ The original text is in *Čtenie zimnieho času* (dated to the 14th century).

серебро заплатити.⁸

silver-ACC.SG pay-PF.INF [Акты С.155]

‘Let him tell us now from which Villinus citizen he bought the silver, and we shall tell that man to pay for the silver.’

The context in which this passage appears indicates that the event expressed by the form in question (*будеть купилъ*) has already been completed at the time of speaking.

Consequently, it can be stated that the future perfect in OCS marked an event completed before some other event that has a future reference, but did not define the temporal relationship between the event expressed by this form and the speech moment.

In some modern Slavic languages, such as Polish, Slovene, and the Kajkavian dialect of Croatian, the cognate form developed into a future tense marker. In standard Croatian, however, this form maintained its original function of what we call here „dependent future”: it occurs exclusively in subordinate clauses of time and condition, as well as in relative clauses whose matrix predicate depicts an event that will, or is expected to, take place sometime after the speech moment. Embedded in this matrix, the dependent future denotes a preceding or background event, with reference to which the event in the matrix clause occurs (Katičić 2002: 202). Compare (7) and (8), which are ungrammatical, and (9) and (1), which are grammatically correct sentences.

- (7) *Ti budeš pročitala/čitala ovu knjigu.
*‘You will have read this book.’
- (8) *Mislio je da budeš pročitala/čitala ovu knjigu.
*‘He thought that you will have read this book.’
- (9) Kad budeš imala vremena, piši mi!
‘When you have time, write to me!’

The apparent commonality of morphological features and the syntactic condition in FII and the Old Slavonic future perfect, as seen above, may lead us to conclude that FII is a direct descendant of the Old Slavonic future perfect. However, a considerable functional divergence is observed between FII and the Old Slavonic future perfect.

⁸ Акты относящейся къ исторіи западной Россіи, собранные и изданные археографическою коммиссіею. Т. 1. 1340-1506. СПб., 1846. С. 155.

As the OCS example (3) above illustrates, Old Slavonic verbs used in this form were in the perfective aspect and expressed a perfect-resultative meaning.⁹ In contrast, FII favors imperfective verbs and represents an event as occurring concurrently with the event expressed in the matrix:

(10) Kupi mi novine kad se budeš vraćao.

‘Buy me a newspaper (when you will be) on your way home.’

Truly, the formation of FII from perfective verbs is not excluded, as illustrated by (11):

(11) Kad budeš došao, kupi cigarete.

‘When you arrive, buy cigarettes.’

Nonetheless, the perfective FII is rare in contemporary Croatian (Barić et al. 1997: 242); if a speaker needs to express the anteriority or resultant state of a particular event in relation to another that has future reference, the perfective present (PPR) is favored:¹⁰

(12) Kad dođeš, kupi cigarete.

‘When you come, buy cigarettes.’

Therefore, FII has two functional equivalents: PPR, when a future anterior or a future perfect meaning is intended, and *uz*-VPR, when the event in the subordinate clause and the matrix event are concurrent in the future reference structure. The table below summarizes the relationship of FII to other related forms:

Uz-VPR AND RELATED FORMS [Katičić 2002: 202]

	FII	Present form	
Perfective future perfect	<i>budeš napisao</i>	<i>napišeš</i>	‘you will have written’
Imperfective future perfect	<i>budeš pisao</i>	<i>uspišeš</i>	‘you will be writing’

⁹ Lunt remarks that only 7 examples of the future perfect are observed in OCS texts (Lunt 2001: 114). The other six are presumably: *бждеть покааль (сѧ)*, *бждеть съльгалъ, родил бждеть*, *бждеть съгнило, подражали бждѣмъ*, *бждеть створилъ* (Křížková 1960: 163).

¹⁰ The perfective present in Croatian, unlike in East and West Slavic languages, does not independently denote the future tense. It does occur in the main clause, for example, as a narrative present, or in negative interrogatives (Barić et al. 1997, Bulatovic 2008). However, its primary function consists in serving as a „futate” (Binnick 1991: 65) in certain modal structures, such as in a complement clause headed by *da* (e.g. *U koliko sati da dođem?* ‘What time shall I come?’), and in subordinate clauses, as illustrated in (9).

As is already stated above, *uz*-VPR is not active in contemporary Croatian. Despite the description of the Croatian Academy dictionary (RHJ 1961–71, 1971–72), which presents numerous examples of *uz*-VPR, such as *uzgovori* (< *govoriti* ‘to speak’), *uzvidi* (< *vidjeti* ‘to see’), *uzdolazi* (< *dolaziti* ‘to come’), and *uzbudu* (< *biti* ‘to be’),¹¹ a search of the contemporary Croatian corpus returns only a limited number of examples of *uz*-VPR, such as *uzmogne* (< *moći* ‘can’) and *ustreba* (< *trebati* ‘to need’).¹² There are, however, other sources in which the *uz*-VPR phenomenon can be detected: dialectal materials and pre-19th-century grammars and writings.

3. *Uz*-VPR in dialectal and diachronic varieties of Croatian

3.1. Contemporary standard Croatian is based on the Štokavian dialect, on which standard Serbian, Bosnian, and Montenegrin are also based. Two other Croatian dialects, Čakavian and Kajkavian, are regional today, although both played a significant role in the formation of the Croatian literary tradition. We examine in this paper the Štokavian situation.

In the Štokavian dialectal continuum, extending geographically within as well as outside the territory of Croatia, the use of *uz*-VPR has been reported by some dialectologists, such as Pešikan (1965: 202) and Peco (2007: 329–330). For example, Pešikan’s research, focused on a variety of Štokavian spoken in Montenegro, finds that „доста често, нарочито од старијих особа, може се чути префикс уз-: кад успрашимо, ак-успише” ‘we often hear, particularly from old people, (the use of the) *uz*- prefix: when we *uz*-ask (will have asked), if he/she *uz*-writes (will have written)’. Noteworthy is Pešikan’s observation that FII was rarely used, and that users of this form belonged to the younger generations (Pešikan 1965: 202). Peco’s description also provided a few examples, such as *uščuvaš* (< *čuva*) ‘you *uz*-keep (will have kept)’.

It is notable that the same phenomenon is described in Vuk Karadžić’s grammar, *Pismenica* (1814: 59ff). In this work, imperfective present forms prefixed with *uz*- are noted as the future tense of „наклонење сослагателно” (‘the conditional mood’): „ако ја узбивам, ако ти узбиваш” ‘if I *uz*-am (will be), if you *uz*-are’. For as much as Vuk’s grammatical description was founded on Štokavian variants (Belić 1998: 55ff; on the appearance of the *uz*-prefixed

¹¹ In the dictionary of Matica srpska as well, the function of FII is assigned to *uz*-prefixed verbs, such as *uzjesti* (‘to eat’), *uzlagati* (‘to tell a lie’), *uzmoći* (‘to be able’), and *uspitati* (‘to ask’) (Rečnik 1976).

¹² The consulted corpus is: hrWaC 2.0 (http://nl.ijs.si/noske/all.cgi/corp_info?corpname=hrwac) (accessed 12/20/16).

form, see, for example, Oczkova 2010: 28), the mentioning of *uz*-VPR in his grammatical description can be naturally regarded as pertaining to features of Štokavian.

From the evidence presented above, it can be concluded that, in Štokavian, and particularly in its southern varieties, *uz*-VPR was used more than occasionally at least up to the second half of the 20th century as a verb form denoting the dependent future.

3.2. The treatment of *uz*-VPR as a part of the verb conjugation is found in other grammatical descriptions written in 19th-century Croatia. For instance, P. Budmani, in his *Grammatica della lingua Serbo-Croata*, presented forms such as *kad uzljubim* (*uz*-ljubim < ljubiti) and *ustijem* (*uz*-htijem < htjeti) as „future in the subordinate clause” (Budmani 1867: 105). Budmani’s inclusion of *uz*-VPR in the verb conjugation may be regarded as an influence from Vuk’s grammar, given the author’s pro-Vukovian orientation for the Croatian standardization.¹³ However, the form in question also appears in grammars composed by those who belonged to the so-called Zagreb school.

For example, in *Slovnica Hervatska za gimnazije i relane škole*, A. Mažuranić treats *uz*-prefixed verb forms occurring in the temporal and conditional subordinate clauses as „futura I za neizvesnost” (‘the future I of uncertainty’), e.g., *kad uzbudem* (Mažuranić 1869: 79). Another grammarian of the Zagreb school, V. Babukić, mentions forms such as *ustrebam* (*uz*-treba), *uzvidim*, *uzoram*, *uzopijem*, and *uzradim*, in his *Ilirska Slovnica*; here the form in question is regarded as the future of „pogodbeni način” (‘conditional mood’) available in subordinate clauses led by the conjunctions *ako*, *kad*, and *dok* (Babukić 1854: 274, 286ff). It is notable that these grammarians treat *uz*-VPR and FII separately; the former is a simple „future conditional” that expresses a future event concurrent with another future event, whereas the latter is meant to express the proper future perfect.¹⁴

The grammatical understanding of *uz*-VPR as a verb form can be further detected in pre-19th-century writings. The prime example from the 18th century is M. Relković’s *Nova slavonska, i nimačka grammatika*.¹⁵ Relković considered *uz*-prefixed forms as part of the conjunctive mood, in the same way Vuk

¹³ Ham 2006: 67ff.

¹⁴ According to Babukić, for example, *uz*-VPR forms are „oblik trajući” of the conditional future, whereas FII is „futura exactum” (Babukić 1854: 286). Mažuranić distinguishes between these two, labelling *uz*-VPR as „buduće II za neizvjestnost”, and FII as „buduće II za neizvjestnost”.

¹⁵ Matija Relković (1732 – 1798) was a military officer; after leaving the army, he began to write under the influence of Enlightenment writers. His grammar was aimed at enlightening the Croatian people (Ham 2006: 33–38).

and his successors did more than century later: „Ako ja budem, ili uz budem kod kuće” ‘if I will be at home’, „Ako ja ne mogu, ili uzmogu doći, nemojte mi zamiriti” ‘If I will not be able to come, nevertheless don’t be angry with me’. (Relković 1767: 342–343).

Relković presents, along with the *uz*-prefixed forms, PPR („Ako pojdete u Bečs” ‘if you go to Vienna’) and the imperfective present („Kad čujete dvanajest satih udarati” ‘when you hear the clock strike 12’) as forms available in the same syntactic condition as *uz*-VPR, giving the impression that his description of *uz*-VPR is not entirely coherent. However, this lack of consistency should be interpreted as mirroring the actual language situation in which the *uz*-prefixed form was not an isolated resource, but one of the available forms for expressing the dependent future. In any case, Relković’s recognition of the *uz*-prefixed form as a verb form expressing the dependent future merits attention, as it hints at the existence of an older source on the basis of which he composed his grammar.

In fact, exploring the history of Croatian grammar, we find a description of the *uz*-prefixed form by J. Mikalja (1601 – 1654) in *Gramatika talijanska u kratko ili Kratak nauk za naučiti latinski jezik*. Here, Mikalja presents forms like „kad ja uzvidim”, along with „kad budem video”, as verb forms of ‘modus expressing the coming time’.¹⁶ His distinction between these two consists in the former being the future, and the latter expressing the future perfect (Mikalja 2011: 91), which is basically the same treatment as what we find in the grammars of Budmani, Mažuranić, and Babukić. In this reference, Mikalja’s grammar can be seen as a precursor of later grammars composed by Croatian grammarians.

3.3. Our observation of old Croatian grammar shows that *uz*-VPR was historically recognized as a verb form denoting the dependent future, competing sometimes with other present tense forms, and sometimes with FII. Let us now shift our attention to how *uz*-VPR was used by writers in past centuries.

Uz-prefixed present forms in old Croatian writings is witnessed from the earliest records, for example, възлюбиши, appearing in a practical document dated to the 13th century: „и колико възлюбиши прѣбыти у насъ, да си прѣбудеши” ‘As much as you like to stay here, so you may stay’ (Miklosich 1858: 22). What might be questionable with this case is that, although *възлюбиши* does represent an event accompanying another event expressed in the matrix clause with a future reference and looks to be an early example of *uz*-VPR, it could simply be a use of the present form of the already lexicalized verb *възлюбити*. The latter interpretation might be supported by the following OCS example „възлюби дѣша моѣ възделѣти: сждобѣ твоихъ” [Пс.СХ-

¹⁶ In Mikalja’s *Gramatika*, the forms presented here correspond to *Quando vedrò, hauerò veduto*.

VIII.20] (Sever'janov 1922: 155) ‘My soul breaketh for the longing that it hath unto thy judgments at all times’.¹⁷ Here the verb *възлюбѣ* is aorist, corresponding to the Greek *ἐπεπόθησεν*, the 3-rd person singular aorist of *ἐπιποθέω* (‘to long for’). A valid inference here is that the prefixed verb *възлюбѣти* as a lexical item existed, and if the existence of such a verb is witnessed in OCS, it is quite likely that in old Štokavian existed the cognate verb as well. Nevertheless, we like to consider the *uz*-prefixed form *възлюбѣши* in the above-quoted example represents the early case of *uz*-VPR because of the accordance of the syntactic condition in which this form occurs with the one in which *uz*-VPR as a dependent future is expected to occur.

It is indeed difficult to make clear demarcation between *uz*-VPR and the present form of a lexicalized verb with the prefix *uz*-. Yet, relying on the 19th century descriptions, such as Miklosich (1868: 200) and Zima (1887: 256), we like to state that *uz*-VPR in Štokavian writings can be witnessed since the late 14th century, and the following examples coming from writings composed from the end of the 15th to the 17th century fall under this case: (13) and (14) from practical documents, (15) in a translated text, and (16) – (18) found in literary works:

- (13) *щоцо годѣ узговоре одъ наше стране*
 whatever *uz*=speak.PRS.3PL PREP OUR-GEN.F.SG side-GEN.SG
вашои милости (Miklosich 1858: 536)
 your-DAT.F.SG grace-DAT.SG
 ‘Whatever shall be said from our side to your Majesty’
- (14) *ако ли узимаю кою прѹ саси*
 if PTCL *uz*=have.PRS.3PL INDEF.PRN.ACC.SG. quarrel-ACC.SG Saxons-NOM.PL
з дубровчани
 PREP Dubrovnik _citizens-INS.PL (Miklosich 1858: 205)
 ‘If Saxons begin to quarrel with the Dubrovnik citizens. . .’
- (15) *немои-се бояти немои сумнити ако тии добро*
 ADV REF be_afraid_of-INF ADV doubt-INF if 2SG.NOM well
узвѣриуешь истинога бога (Rešetar 1926: 67)
uz=believe-PRS.2SG true-GEN.M.SG God-GEN
 ‘Do not be afraid, do not doubt, if you believe in the True God.’

¹⁷ According to the King James Version: Ps. CXIX.20.

- (16) I ako ne uzbude stvar [. . .], za to ne imam
CONJ if NEG uz=be-FUT.3SG thing.NOM.SG PREP that-ACC NEG have-PRS.1SG
bit ja kriv nego vi
be-INF 1SG.NOM guilty-M.SG.NOM CONJ 2SG.NOM (Držić, *Pjesni razlike*)
'If a thing would not be (like that), it is not me who should be guilty, but you.'
- (17) ali, ako ga ona ušćeka, nastaće se
CONJ if him-GEN.SG 3SG.F uz-wait.IPF.PRS.3SG become-IPF.INF-AUX.3SG REFL
mrazna i naga
cold-F.SG CONJ bare-F.SG (Gundlić, *Osman*)
'But if she waits for him, she shall be in cold and misery.'
- (18) Koji ovako uzčini biti će s Isusom u kraljstvu
who-PL this uz=do-IPF.PRS.3PL be-INF AUX.3SG PREP Jesus-INS PREP kingdom-LOC.SG
nebeskom (RHJ XX: 60)
heavenly-LOC.SG
'Those who behave like this shall reside in the Kingdom of Heaven with Jesus.'

These examples indicate that the treatment of *uz*-VPR observed in past Croatian grammars was in accordance with Štokavian writers' use of this form. Further, taking into account that Croatian writers after the 15th century opted to use Štokavian vernacular idiom rather than Church Slavonic or the Čakavian literary language, we can conclude that the *uz*-VPR found in the old writings arose from an old dialectal trait of Štokavian.

4. *Uz*-VPR and the Old Czech *vz*-prefixed future; the provenance of the forms

4.1. In the previous section we observed that *uz*-VPR was a linguistic feature in old Štokavian. Here arise the following questions: how did this present form prefixed with *uz*- emerge, and what is the aspectual nature of this form? From the viewpoint that prefixation in Slavic is essentially a matter of word-formation but not a means to form inflectional categories, the *uz*-VPR evidenced in old Štokavian looks an unusual phenomenon. Moreover, a conventional understanding on Slavic verbs is that prefixed verbs derived from imperfective base verbs are perfective, if not particularly marked morphologically as imperfective. In this reference, *uz*-VPR is likely to be featured as perfective. Contrary to

this, however, the grammatical descriptions we observed in the previous section often suggest that its aspectual attribute is imperfective. Thus, it looks that we are dealing with an especially exceptional problem. However, it is not so idiosyncratic in fact, since a similar phenomenon is witnessed in Old Czech.

As is well known, in contemporary Czech the prefix *po-* expresses the future meaning when added to imperfective directed motion verbs: *poletím* < *letím* (‘I will fly’), *poběžim* < *běžim* (‘I will run’). The point here is that the form attached by *po-* is not a perfective present used as a suppletion of the analytic future with the auxiliary *být* ‘to be’, but it is a part of the conjugation, thus: *šel jsem* (‘I went’, the imperfective past tense of *jíti*, ‘to go’) — *jdu* (‘I go’, the imperfective present of *jíti*) — *půjdu* (the future form of *jíti*) (Kopečný 1962b: 46–50, Němec 1962: 33). Similar to this „synthetic imperfective future-tense form” (Kopečný *ibid.*), in Old Czech the prefix *vz-*, cognate to the Croatian *uz-*, was used to denote an event that takes place after the speech time (Lamprecht, Šlosar, Bauer 1986: 195, Kopečný 1962a:177, Šlosar 1974/75: 37–42). Compare (19) and (20), which are Old Czech translations of the Psalms, with (19b) and (20b), the corresponding verses in the *Kralice Bible*.

(19) Hospodine ktož vzbydlí v stanu tvém
 Lord-VOC who-NOM *vz=live*.IPF.PRS.3SG PREP tabernacle-LOC.SG your-LOC.SG
 (Ps. XIV.1[15.1], Vinter 1986: 67)

(19b) Hospodine, kdo bude přebývati v stánku tvém?
 ‘Lord, who shall abide in thy tabernacle?’

(20) Vzvýši tě bože můj král’u i
vz=exalt-IPF.PRS.1SG 2SG.ACC God-VOC my king-VOC CONJ
 vzblahaju imén tvém na věky
vz=eulogize.PRS.1SG name-DAT.SG your-DAT.N.SG PREP eternities-ACC.PL
 (Ps. CXLIV.1-2[CXLV.1], Vinter 1986: 262)

(20b) Vyvyšovati tě budu, Bože můj králi, a dobrořečiti jménu tvému na věky věků.
 ‘I will extol thee, my God, O king; and I will bless thy name for ever and ever.’

In these sentences *vz*-prefixed forms like *vzbydlí*, *vzvýši*, and *vzblahaju* (<*vz* + *blaha-* ‘praise’) depict events that will, or are supposed to, take place after the speech moment (Kopečný 1962a: 177).

The usage of *vz-* in this function was lost in the early stage of Czech language history, which can be confirmed by the forms witnessed in the *Kralice*

Bible, where the analytic future form replaces the old Czech *vz*-future: *bude přebývati* in (19b), and *vyvyšovati budu* in (20b); *vzblahaju* in (20) is also replaced by an analytic future form of the verb *dobrořečiti*. Therefore, it was indeed a short term phenomenon. Still, the significance of this curious form in connection with the Croatian *uz*-VPR phenomenon is clear; given the identical composition consisting of the prefix derived from the Proto-Slavic **vъz-* and the imperfective present form, as well as the similarity of grammatical function to stand for the futurate, it is natural to consider these two forms as originating from the same provenance.

Prefixes and prefixation in Slavic have long been one of the most discussed problems in Slavic linguistics. A series of works has been devoted to explaining the process by which the prefixation that is basically a word-formation means in Slavic was grammaticalized as to form the abstract category of aspect, and the extent to which semantic functions of particular prefixes were relevant to the process of aspectual formation (ex. van Wijk 1929, Maslov 1958, Vaillant 1966, Bermel 1997; the main studies on historical development of the Slavic aspect are overviewed in Bermel, chapter 3).

Concerning the prefix **vъz-*, scholars have regarded its primary function as being to express spatial relations; above all, to add to the base verb a meaning of upward movement, ex. OCS *въздѣти* ‘to lift up’, *възгладати* ‘to look up’, *възйти* ‘to go up’, *вълетѣти* ‘to fly up’ (Miklosich 1968: 199, Vaillant 1966: 469), but also a meaning of movement in the opposite direction: *въздаму* ‘return’ (Khaburgaev 1974: 330). In either case, **vъz-* was a „path” component in the configuration of motion event (Talmy 2000: 49ff). Retaining this path function, the prefix **vъz-* apparently obtained a more abstract meaning in accordance with the development of the Slavic aspectual system. The abstraction process of this prefix is understood, for example by Khaburgaev, as having moved from the spatial meanings to the ingressive, or inchoative, Aktionsart meaning that marks the onset of event or a rise of some situation (*въздродоватисѧ* ‘rejoice’, *възплакати* ‘start crying’, *възалъкати* ‘find to feel hungry’) before it became a so-called „empty” prefix (Khaburgaev 1967: 330). But how can we verify that this verb prefix became semantically „empty”?

An answer to this question may be found in the following example noted by Birnbaum (1958: 19): *вълюбиши подруга своего. і възненавидиши врагы своя* [Zog. Mt. V.43, Jagić 1879: 4] (‘You shall love your neighbor and hate your enemy’). Here, the original Greek verse reads: ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου καὶ μισήσεις τὸν ἐχθρόν σου, in which the verbs ἀγαπήσεις and μισήσεις are in the 2nd person singular of the future tense: ἀγαπάω ‘I love’ and μισέω

‘I hate’. Assuming that the OCS text was a literal translation of the Greek Gospel, the simple indication here is that the verbs with *ъзз-* were used as an equivalent of the Greek future verbs. Given that the Greek verbs occurring here (‘love’, ‘hate’) are atelic activity verbs, the effect of prefixation in OCS translation can be understood as nothing but to add to the base verb (*любити* ‘love’, *ненавидети* ‘hate’) a future reference meaning. Accordingly, the prefix used here is semantically empty.

For the standard view on the Slavic aspect, the prefixed verbs used here may be simply interpreted as a case of the perfective present verb form that has future reference. However, another way of interpreting these forms with the empty *ъзз-* may be possible: for those who used the old Slavonic language more than a thousand years ago when the grammaticalized form for the future reference was not yet established,¹⁸ the situation was probably such that the prefix *ъзз-* was one of the best available means to obtain a future-equivalent form from an underived atelic, thus imperfective, verb. If we take this option of interpretation, it is not difficult to connect the use of the „empty” prefix *ъзз-* in OCS with Czech *vz*-future as well as Croatian *uz*-VPR. More clearly, the two types of Slavic futurate with *vz-/uz-* we are treating here have as their common provenance the use of **vъz-* as an empty prefix. And a factor connecting them is presumably reanalysis.

4.2. Suppose that in some old Slavic dialects, such as Czech and Croatian-Štokavian, the prefixes derived from **vъz-*, primarily used as an empty prefix to form perfective verbs, were reanalyzed at some point in the history as to mark the future reference. We would then find that we are dealing with a phenomenon similar to the contemporary Czech *po*-future as mentioned earlier; namely, the synthetic imperfective future-tense form. In this respect, the aspectual attribute of forms with *vz-/uz-* can be regarded as imperfective, in spite of their formal resemblance to the perfective present.

The early loss of the Czech *vz*-future may be motivated by several reasons that resulted in a total decrease of occurrence for the *vz*-prefixed verb forms: phonological reduction of *vz-* to *z* (Miklosich 1868: 200), replacement of *vz-* with *raz-/roz-* as well as *za-* in verbs with the ingressive meaning (Šlosar 1974/1975: 40), and the development of the analytic future form (Kopečný 1962a: 177). In contrast to the Czech *vz*-future, Croatian *uz*-VPR survived, but only in the subordinate clause.

¹⁸ It is well known that, having lost the Indo-European *s*-future, the early stage of Slavic languages did not have a particular morphological marker in the verb conjugation to indicate futurity, and several analytic forms for the future tense were developed inside the Slavic; see ex. Fortson 2004: 368, 372.

Conditions under which this form was retained should be studied in reference to the process where the occurrence of this form was limited to the predicate position of subordinate clauses, and also to the expansion of this form in space and time in the Croatian-Štokavian dialectal continuum. The former question needs further examination, which is out of the range of this study, but the latter question may be explained by analogy. The *uz*-VPR phenomenon probably started with a small group of atelic activity verbs, but once the formation was accepted in the language system it could spread to a broad range of undelivered imperfective verbs. In relation to this hypothesis, a remark by Kopečný (1962b: 48–49) on the Czech *po*- future is quite suggestive. As Dickey (2007: 352) paraphrases, in colloquial language the form with *po*- „has spread from the narrow class of determinate motion verbs to various other verbs that do not express motion in its prototypical sense”, and this spread of *po*- to non-motion verbs is „the result of analogy”.

Thus, embedded in the subordinate clause whose matrix has future reference, *uz*-VPR gained the same syntactic status as FII. It is not to be forgotten that *uz*-VPR is different from the future perfect in that the latter in its original function implies the perfect-resultative meaning (as observed in section 2) that the event should take place anterior to the event of the matrix predicate, which has future reference though the form itself does not mark any temporal relationship with the speech time, whereas the former retained its function to mark the future tense. In this regard, interestingly, we can say that *uz*-VPR and FII became more alike as FII in Croatian gained the tendency to be formed from imperfective verbs, and, by this, has begun to express an event that concurrently occurs with the matrix event. Thus, the usage shift of FII has resulted in the equivalency of *uz*-VPR and FII to function as a dependent imperfective futurate.

The reasons for the decline of *uz*-VPR in contemporary Croatian may be complex, too. In part it may be due to the progress of language standardization in Croatian, including the stabilization of the use of FII. We may recall Pešikan’s remark that it was the „younger generation” who used FII at the time of his research. Furthermore, the decline in the productivity of the prefix *uz*-, like *vz*- in Czech, could be another contributing factor. A final decisive element could be the disharmony of this form and the nature of the language whereby the prefixation in Slavic is not normally a component of the verb conjugation.

5. Conclusion

The *uz*-prefixed present tense form, as an alternative to the second future, is in the two-fold sense a minor phenomenon in contemporary Croatian. It is

minor at the usage level in that only a limited group of verbs are used in this form, and it is minor in its morphological status, since prefixation in the Slavic verb system is not a means for conjugation. However, our examination of this form uncovered that the use of the *uz*-prefix was a linguistic phenomenon going back to the use of Old Slavonic empty prefix **vъz-*. Taking into account as evidence the Old Czech *vz*-future as well as the contemporary Czech *po*-future, we concluded that the empty prefix **vъz-* was reanalyzed as a future marker and spread in the language system by analogy to form a synthetic imperfect future form in Croatian-Štokavian dialect. Embedded in the subordinate clause whose matrix sentence has a future reference, the *uz*-prefix present became the functional equivalent to FII.

The specific feature of verb prefixation in Slavic is that it developed in such a way as to contribute to the formation of the grammatical category of aspect; particularly the formation of perfective aspect. *Uz*-VPR is indeed a marginal phenomenon; still, it suggests morphological as well as grammatical variability of prefixation in Slavic languages.

References:

- BABIĆ, STJEPAN. 2002. *Tvorba riječi u hrvatskom književnom jeziku*. HAZU – Globus. Zagreb.
- BABUKIĆ, VJEKOSLAV. 1854. *Ilirska Slovnica*. Tiskarnica Ljudevita Gaja. Zagreb.
- BARIĆ, EUGENIJA ET AL. 1997. *Hrvatska gramatika. II. promijenjeno izdanje*. Školska knjiga. Zagreb.
- BELIĆ 1998 = БЕЛИЋ, АЛЕКСАНДАР. 1998. Вукова борба за народни и књижевни језик. Расправе и предавања. Изабрана дела Александра Белића, т.6. Ур. Младеновић, Александар. *О великим ствараоцима*. Завод за уџбенике и наставна средства. Београд. 7–178.
- BERMEL, NEIL. 1997. *Context and the Lexicon in the Development of Russian Aspect*. University of California Publications in Linguistics. Berkeley.
- BINNICK, ROBERT. 1991. *Time and the Verb. A Guide to Tense and Aspect*. Oxford University Press. New York – Oxford.
- BIRNBAUM, HENRIK. 1958. *Untersuchungen zu den Zukunftsumschreibungen mit dem Infinitiv im Altkirchenslavischen*. Almqvist. Stockholm.
- BUDMANI, PIETRO. 1867. *Grammatica della lingua Serbo-Croata (Illirica)*. Vienna.
- BULATOVIĆ, ANDJELKA. 2008. *Modality, Futurity and Dependent Tense: The Semantics of the Serbian Perfective Nonpast and Future 2*. Doctoral dissertation. University of Chicago. Chicago.

- DICKEY, STEPHEN. 2007. A prototype account of the development of delimitative *po-* in Russian. *Cognitive Paths into the Slavic Domain*. Eds. Divjak, Dagmar; Kochanska, Agata. Mouton de Gruyter. Berlin – New York. 329–374.
- FORTSON IV, BENJAMIN W. 2004. *Indo-European Language and Culture: An Introduction*. Blackwell Publishing. Malden, MA.
- GEBAUER, JAN. 2007. *Historická mluvnice jazyka českého. Díl IV Skladba*. Academia. Prague.
- HAM, SANDA. 2006. *Povijest hrvatskih gramatika*. Globus. Zagreb.
- JAGIĆ, VATROSLAV. 1879. *Quattuor evangeliorum Codex glagoliticus olim Zographensis*. Leningrad.
- JAGIĆ, VATROSLAV. 1907. *Psalterium Bononiense. Interpretationem veterem slavica cum aliis codicibus collatam, adnotationibus ornatam, appendicibus auctam*. Gerold & Soc. Vienna.
- KARADŽIĆ 1814 = Караџић, Вук Стефановић. 1814. *Писменица сербскога језика по говору простог народа*. Веч.
- KAŠIĆ, BARTOL. 1604. *Institutiones linguae Illyricae*. Rome [Bartol Kašić. 2002. *Osnove ilirskoga jezika u dvije knjige*. Ed. Znika, Marija. Institut za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje. Zagreb.]
- KATIČIĆ, RADOSLAV. 2002. *Sintaksa hrvatskoga književnog jezika*. HAZU – Globus. Zagreb.
- KOPEČNÝ, FRANTIŠEK. 1962a. *Slovesný vid v češtině*. Nakladatelství Československé akademie věd. Prague.
- KOPEČNÝ, FRANTIŠEK. 1962b. Zur Entstehung der Futurbedeutung beim perfektiven Präsens im Slavischen. *Scando slavica* 8. 171–181.
- KHABURGAJEV 1974 = Хабургаев, Г. А. 1974. *Старославянский язык*. Просвещение. Москва.
- KŘÍŽKOVÁ, HELENA. 1960. *Vývoj opisného futura v jazycích slovanských, zvláště v ruštině*. Státní pedagogické nakladatelství. Prague.
- LAMPRECHT, ARNOŠT; ŠLOSAR, DUŠAN; BAUER, JAROSLAV. 1986. *Historická mluvnice češtiny*. Staětní pedagogické nakl. Prague.
- LUNT, HORACE. 2001. *Old Church Slavonic Grammar*. Mouton de Gruyter. Berlin – New York.
- MARETIĆ, TOMISLAV. 1899. *Gramatika i stilistika hrvatskoga ili srpskoga književnog jezika*. L. Hartman. Zagreb.
- MASLOV 1958 = Маслов, Ю.С. 1958. Роль так называемой перфективации и имперфективации в процессе возникновения славянского глагольного вида. Маслов Ю. С. 2004. *Избранные труды. Аспектология. Общее языкознание*. Ур. Бондарко Ю.С. и др. Языки славянской культуры. 445–476.

- MAŽURANIĆ, ANTUN. 1869. *Slovnica Hèrvatska za gimnazije i realne škole. Dio I. Rečoslovje*. Četvrto izdanje. Fr. Župan. Zagreb.
- MIKALJA, JAKOV. 2011. *Gramatika talijanska u kratko ili Kratak nauk za naučiti latinski jezik*. In *Blago jezika slovinskoga (1649/1651). Transkripcija i leksikologija interpretacija*. Institut za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovje. Zagreb.
- MIKLOSICH, FRANZ. 1858. *Monumenta Serbica spectantia historiam Serbiae, Bosnae, Ragusii*. Braumüller. Vienna.
- MIKLOSICH, FRANZ. 1868. *Vergleichende Grammatik der slavischen Sprachen. V.4. Syntax*. Braumüller. Vienna.
- MILOŠEVIĆ, KSENJA. 1970. *Futur II i sinonimski oblici u savremenom srpskohrvatskom književnom jeziku*. ANUBiH. Sarajevo.
- MITANI, KEIKO. 2015. *Uz*-prefixation and the Second Future in Croatian. *Аспектуальная семантическая зона: топология систем и сценарии диахронического развития. Сборник статей V Международной конференции Комиссии по аспектологии Международного комитета славистов*. Ed. Kitajo, Mitsushi. Tanaka Print. Kyoto. 167–173.
- NĚMEC, IGOR. 1962. Staročeské futurum typu pójdu, ponesu v poměru k préteritu. *Slavia* 31. 27–33.
- OCZKOWA, BARBARA. 2010. *Hrvati i njihov jezik. Iz povijesti kodificiranja književnojezične norme*. Školska knjiga. Zagreb.
- PECO, ASIM. 2007. *Govori zapadne Hercegovine. Izabrana djela I-IV*. Knjiga II. Bosansko filološko društvo. Sarajevo.
- PEŠIKAN 1965 = Пешикан, Митар. 1965. *Староцрногорски средњокатунски и љешански говори*. Институт за српскохрватски језик. Београд.
- RELKOVIĆ, MATIJA. 1767. *Nova slavonska, i nimacska grammatika. Neue slavonische und deutsche Grammatik*. Anton Jandera p. t. Factorn. Zagreb.
- Rečnik = Речник српскохрватскога књижевног језика. Књига шеста. 1976. Матица српска. Нови сад.
- REŠETAR 1962 = Решетар, Милан. 1962. *Либро од мнозијех разлога. Дубровачки ћирилицки зборник од г. 1520*. Српска манастирска штампарија. Сремски Карловци.
- RHJ XIX, XX = *Rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika*. Dio XIX. 1967–1971; Dio XX. 1971–1972. Eds. Musulin, Stjepan; Pavešić, Slavko. JAZU. Zagreb.
- SCHENKER, ALEXANDER. 1995. *The Dawn of Slavic. An Introduction to Slavic Philology*. Yale University Press. New Haven.
- SEVER'JANOV 1922 = Северьянов.С.Н. 1922. *Синайская псалтырь. Глаголический памятник XI в.:* Отделение русского языка и словесности Российской акад. наук. Петроград.

- STEVANOVIĆ 1986 = Стевановић, Михаило. 1986. *Савремени српскохрватски језик. I. Увод. Фонетика. Морфологија*. Научна књига. Београд
- ŠLOSAR, DUŠAN. 1974./1975. Vývoj funkcí slovesného prefixu *vz-* v češtině. *Sborník prací filozofické fakulty brněnské university* A22/23. 37–42.
- TALMY, LEONARD. 2000. *Toward a Cognitive Semantics. v.2: Typology and Process in Concept Structuring*. MIT Press. Cambridge, MA.
- VAN WIJK, NICOLAAS. 1929. Sur l'origine des aspect du verb slave. *Revue des Etudes Slaves* 9. 237–252.
- VAILLANT, ANDRÉ. 1966. *Grammaire comparee des langues slaves. v. III. Le Verbe*. Klincksieck. Paris.
- VINTR, JOSEF. 1986. *Die älteste tschechische Psalterübersetzung*. Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften. Vienna.
- WEBER, ADOLF. 1862. *Skladnja ilirskoga jezika za niže gimnazije*. Vienna.
- ZIMA, LUKA. 1877. *Ñekoje, većinom sintaktične razlike između čakavštine, kaj-kavštine i štokavštine*. JAZU. Zagreb.

Abbreviations

1	1st person	GEN	genitive	PF	perfective
2	2nd person	IMPR	imperative	PL	plural
3	3rd person	INDEF	indefinite	PREP	preposition
ACC	accusative	INF	infinitive	PRN	personal pronoun
AUX	auxiliary	INS	instrumental	PRS	present
CONJ	conjunction	IPF	imperfective	PTCL	particle
COMP	complementizer	LOC	locative	PTPL	participle
DAT	dative	M	masculine	REF	reflexive
F	feminine	NEG	negative	SG	singular
FUT	future	NOM	nominative	VOC	vocative

Prefiks *uz-* i zavisni futur u hrvatskom jeziku

Sažetak

Rad je posvećen posebnom glagolskom obliku s prefiksom *uz-* u hrvatskom jeziku. Riječ je o prezentskom obliku glagola s prefiksanim morfemom *uz-* koji se smatra funkcionalnim ekvivalentom futura drugog, no rijetko se upotrebljava u suvremenom jeziku. Na osnovi dijalektnih i povijesnih podataka, utvr-

đuje se da je ovaj oblik ostatak stare štokavske jezične osobine. Razmatrajući analogni prezentski oblik s prefiksalmim elementom *vz-* u staročeškom jeziku, nastanak toga oblika autorica povezuje s funkcijom prefiksa *uz-* koji se prvobitno upotrebljavao u tvorbi svršenih glagola, ali je bio reanaliziran kao oznaka budućega vremena. Raspravlja se i o morfološkom statusu toga oblika kao o sintetičkom obliku futura glagola nesvršenoga vida, analogna obliku budućega vremena nesvršenih glagola kretanja koji se u suvremenome češkom jeziku tvore s prefiksom *po-*.

Key words: prefix *uz-*, the second future, prefixation, future in subordinate clauses, the synthetic future form

Ključne riječi: prefiks *uz-*, futur drugi, prefiksacija, futur u zavisnim rečenicama, sintetički oblik futura

