

ALEXANDER ANDRASON
Stellenbosch University
aleksand@hi.is

THE SEMANTICS OF THE VILAMOVICIAN VERBAL SYSTEM (PART 1: EMPIRICAL STUDY)

Keywords: Vilamovician language, Germanic linguistics, verbal system, semantics, cognitive linguistics

Abstract

The present study – divided into two papers – provides an analysis of the semantics of the Vilamovician verbal system within a cognitive and grammaticalization framework. On the one hand, the author offers a detailed description of the entire semantic potential of all the verbal constructions available in the language and, on the other, provides an explanation for the senses conveyed by each one of these forms – more specifically, it is demonstrated that the semantic sphere of every gram can be explained and, hence, unified by making use of typologically common evolutionary scenarios, viz. paths. Consequently, the author shows that the entire Vilamovician verbal system can be modeled as a recursive process of grammaticalisation “waves” whereby older and newer forms evolve along a set of identical paths. This article constitutes the first part of the series. It includes a discussion of methodological issues and an empirical study in which the semantic potentials of all the Vilamovician verbal grams are determined.

1. The Vilamovician language and its description

Vilamovician is a Germanic language originating from and solely spoken in Wilamowice, a town in Western Galicia, which rests on the boundary with Silesia in the southern part of Poland. The English name of the tongue, i.e. Vilamovician, is derived from the Polish denomination of the municipality where it is employed, Wilamowice [vilamovifse].¹ In the vernacular itself, however, the language is called

¹ The name was coined by the author of this paper in 2008. A highly similar term, namely *Wilamovician*, was proposed by Wicherkiewicz 2003.

Wymysiöeryś [vɨmɨsø:ɾɨɕ]. This name again derives from the toponym *Wymysöu* [vɨmɨsø:y], which corresponds to the Vilamovicean designation of the town.

Presently, Vilamovicean is the smallest Germanic language in the world, being understood by approximately eighty persons, but actively and fluently spoken by less than forty. The huge majority of the speakers – with a noticeable exception of Tymoteusz Król who was born in 1983 – are more than 80 years old and, hence, according to the most probable scenario of prediction, the language, if it is understood as a real social phenomenon, will disappear within one or two decades.

1.1. Classification

Vilamovicean is usually classified as belonging – together with Standard German, Yiddish and Silesian German – to the Irminonic² group of the West-Germanic branch (Ritchie 2012: 7). According to Lewis (2009), the Vilamovicean, Standard High German, Upper Saxon and Upper Silesian languages together form the East Central German subclass of the Irminonic group (cf. Howe 1996: 51; Harbert 2007: 8). Following this view, given the historical vicinity of the tongue with other Upper Silesian vernaculars, Vilamovicean originated in an older German variety (see Kleczkowski 1920; Mojmir 1936; Lasatowicz 1992; Wicherkiewicz 2003: 5–14; Ritchie 2012: 9, 86). The most typical Irminonic feature that Vilamovicean shares with Standard German is the participation in the High German Sound Shift (for a detailed discussion, see Ritchie 2012: 86).

On the other hand, certain studies advocate for a Flemish or even Frisian origin of the tongue (cf. Wicherkiewicz 2003: 15). This view coincides with a belief that is extremely common among people in Wilamowice: it is said that their ancestors came from Low Countries (Flanders, Holland or Friesland). According to this position, the language belongs to the Istvaeonic (which likewise includes Dutch, Flemish and Afrikaans)³ or to the Ingvaeonic (which also consists of English, Scots, Low German and Frisian) group of Germanic languages (Wicherkiewicz 2003: 17, Ritchie 2012: 7–8). Among features which distinguish Vilamovicean from the Irminonic group (especially from High German) and which approach it to the Ingvaeonic group, one can quote the palatalisation of velar stops, the loss of the consonant *n* in unstressed syllables and the *h*-shape of the third person masculine singular pronoun (i.e. *har*; see Ritchie 2012: 86–87).

However, although the majority of the traits indicate that Vilamovicean is an East Central German or Irminonic language and that a genetic affiliation outside of the Irminonic branch seems less plausible, the phonetic, phonological and

² In the discussion of the genetic status of the Vilamovicean language, the author follows the study compiled by Ritchie (2012) which constitutes the most recent and the most extensive publication dedicated to this issue. Therefore, the nomenclature employed by Ritchie (2012), especially the terms Irminonic, Ingvaeonic and Istvaeonic will be preserved although they are quite problematic in the area of Germanic linguistics.

³ On the Flemish connection see Morciniec 1984 and Ryckeboer 1984.

morphological evidence fail to be conclusive with respect to the classification of Vilamovicean within the West-Germanic branch (Ritchie 2012: 87). Consequently, more research is needed in order to precisely determine the genetic and dialectal status of the tongue.

1.2. Descriptions of the Vilamovicean verbal system

Grammatical descriptions and analyses of the Vilamovicean verbal system are very scarce. The main work on the organization of the Vilamovicean verb is the short morphological and syntactical study of Kleczkowski (1920 and 1921) where the author (quite superficially) discusses various issues of the Vilamovicean grammar. An even more sketchy study is an overview composed by Młynek (1907). More recently, two other studies have been presented by Lasatowicz (1992) and Wicherkiewicz (2003). As far as the former position is considered, it must be noticed that Lasatowicz's book cannot be regarded as a trustful description of the Vilamovicean language given that her data are highly suspicious. She fails to provide the source(s) of her examples through a lack of specification of the name of the informant(s) and the Vilamovicean variety she describes presents an almost too-dominant German influence. Even more importantly, in the database developed by Król and Andrason, which has been in compilation since 2007, multiple forms that Lasatowicz proposes are lacking and/or are regarded by native speakers who were questioned on the issue as Germanisms. With respect to the latter study, Wicherkiewicz's book – besides offering a translation of Biesik's epopee – focuses on cultural and sociolinguistic issues. Conversely, the grammatical discussion is brief and shallow. It must be observed that all the afore-mentioned studies fail to offer any specific analysis of the semantics of the Vilamovicean verbal system. If they describe properties of the Vilamovicean verb at all, they limit themselves to morphology and some general statements along the essence of a given construction being a present tense, a past tense and/or a subjunctive (some positions also mention the perfect). The impression one gets from this traditional literature is that the Vilamovicean verbal system is composed of three or four categories, each one being restricted to one function or meaning (cf. Kleczkowski 1920 and 1921; Lasatowicz 1992; Wicherkiewicz 2003).

A more profound analysis of certain portions of the Vilamovicean verbal system has been proposed by the author of this paper in his earlier publications where he addressed the issue of the semantics of the Praeteritum and Perfectum (Andrason 2010a), expressions of futurity (especially, the *wada* and *zula* Futures; Andrason 2010b), and passive voice (in particular, the *zâjn*, *wada* and *blâjn* passives; Andrason 2011a). In these three, clearly descriptive articles, Andrason offered a detailed sketch of the semantic potential or senses provided by the above-mentioned constructions, without however, developing a systematic explanation for them. This paper aims at correcting the lacuna in the studies devoted to the Vilamovicean language: it provides a detailed semantic description of all the components of the Vilamovicean verbal organisation (from the most central and grammaticalized to

the most peripheral and still partially lexical) as well as a system-oriented analysis of the meaning or semantic potentials of these constructions. As a result, the article designs a model of the entire Vilamovicean verbal system, accounting both for the microscopic (wherein a description of the properties of all of its constituents is provided) and macroscopic (wherein an explanation of specific semantic traits offered by each gram and proposal of the verbal system in its totality are delivered) levels. Due to the complexity of the matter, the present study has been divided into two papers. The first one, besides dealing with methodological issues, includes the result of vast empirical research and presents a detailed review of the semantic potentials of all the verbal grams in the Vilamovicean language. The second one, which will appear in next issue of the *Studia Linguistica Universitatis Iagellonicae Cracoviensis*, will be dedicated to a systematic explanation of this empirical data and to the modeling of the entire system.

2. Our model

It should be noted that the semantic analysis of verbal systems is not an easy or straightforward enterprise, but quite the opposite: in light of recent discoveries and paradigm changes (both in linguistics and in science in general), it constitutes an epistemologically complex task. In order to properly understand the procedure adopted in the present study – and thus to appreciate its findings and conclusions – it is necessary to explain the author's attitude towards the problem of the description and analysis of verbal semantics.

2.1. Verbal semantics

Following the principles of cognitive linguistics, the meaning of a verbal construction will be understood as its entire semantic potential, i.e. as a semantic space that includes different contextually induced senses. In other words, the meaning corresponds to a set-theoretical union of all empirical and atomic senses that are available in specific contexts. A sense, in turn, is defined as a value provided by a form in a concrete place and time and hence as the compatibility of a gram with a determined (semantic, syntactic and/or pragmatic) environment. Given that such senses depend on contextual factors, the meaning of a gram is, itself, unavoidably a contextual phenomenon (Dahl 2000a: 14; Couper-Kuhlen, Selting 2001: 4–5; Croft, Cruse 2004: 258; Evans, Green 2006: 352–353, 368; Nikiforidou 2009: 16–17, 26; Helasvuo 2009: 70–72).

Furthermore, still following the cognitive view of grammar, senses are viewed as necessarily related to each other. A sense is conceptually connected to the remaining semantic potential of the gram. This property – known as the relatedness principle – states that components of a given polysemy (i.e. different values offered by a single grammatical form) are cognitively (both conceptually and diachronically) connected because they arise as mental and historical extensions from one to

another. As a result, the polysemy or semantic potential of a gram fails to be a random assembly of disparate values. The reality is quite the reverse, as it constitutes a solid and rational whole because it is based upon and propelled by universal human cognitive mechanisms, such as metonymy, metaphor or image-schema transposition. These mechanisms enable the extension of a given meaning and thus the spread of a polysemy to new semantic domains (Evans, Green 2006: 331–333; Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk 2007: 140).

In order to model the semantic potential, cognitive linguists regularly employ the concept of a map in which the gram's polysemy (and, thus, its total meaning) is figuratively pictured as a network of interconnected senses. This network graphically shows how senses – components of the map – expand one from another by following human cognitive techniques. In this manner, the map, and hence the meaning, receives a coherent structure: all senses are somehow linked and the network inter-related (Evans, Green 2006: 331–333).

However, it is important to emphasise that the connection between a given sense and its immediate extension – and thus the expansion of a polysemy – is not only conceptual (justified by the application of determined cognitive processes) but also historical. A sense that constitutes a basis for further conceptual extensions is *per vim* diachronically earlier than senses which have sprouted from it. Consequently, the chaining between elements of the network reflects not only a conceptual extension but also a diachronic progression: it leads from original (historically earlier) values to values that are gradually more advanced and distant (historically posterior). This means that polysemy and hence the semantic potential of a gram may be understood as a synchronic reflex of evolutionary processes. Consequently, the map representing a semantic potential – with all its links tracing the direction of extensions – reproduces a historical enlargement and/or contraction of a polysemous body (Tyler, Evans 2003: 344–346; Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk 2007: 140; Van der Auwera, Gast 2011: 186–188).

Moreover, since verbal constructions follow certain more or less universal principles in their evolution, known under the label of paths, these paths may be employed in order to posit an order within a given semantic map. Paths are quite regular evolutionary rules that show how aspects, tenses and moods are born, how they evolve and how they die (Bybee, Perkins, Pagliuca 1994; Dahl 2000b). More concretely, they show how the polysemy of a certain class of constructions develops by gradually incorporating new senses. In this manner, by establishing the most plausible (from a typological perspective) chaining of the senses that are prototypical for a determined class of grams, they may be employed as models of semantic potentials offered by grams. In other words, by using these common (or universal) evolutionary scenarios which primarily constitute diachronic laws, a linguist can establish an order in a given polysemy and impose a relation among all of its elements (Bybee 2010: 198–199). As a result, all senses can be connected and the semantic potential of a gram can be represented as a homogenous whole, i.e. as a portion of a path. To achieve this, one should compare the synchronic inventory of senses conveyed by a construction and organise it in a way that would allow it to correspond to stages

of a certain evolutionary scenario (Van der Auwera, Gast 2011: 186–188). Following this understanding of the meaning, the path which is used as a template for the representation of a given polysemy is treated as being both universal and realistic. It is universal because it is typologically plausible, being a common or universal developmental principle. It is realistic because it is expected to represent a realistic evolution of the gram in question. This postulate of a realistic correspondence is required to be supported by concrete diachronic proofs – the most relevant of them being the identification of the original input expression from which the gram with its entire semantic potential modeled as a path has emerged. This input form is, hence, expected to cognitively motivate the path with all of its senses (Croft, Cruse 2004: 1–3; Heine, Kuteva 2007: 58, 348; Andrason 2012: 9–10).

2.2. Paths

Linguists have identified numerous paths that specify the development of certain classes of verbal polysemies (for the most classical reviews of clines, see Nedjalkov 1988; Bybee, Perkins, Pagliuca 1994; Dahl 2000b). Given the nature of the Vilamovicean verbal system, in our study, the understanding of four types of paths will be necessary: anterior path (development towards perfects and past tenses), imperfective path (development towards imperfectives and present tenses), three subtypes of the modal path (development towards moods) and future path (development towards future tenses).

2.2.1. Anterior path⁴

The anterior path is an evolutionary model that schematises a grammatical life of resultative constructions: it specifies the order in which originally resultative proper formations incorporate new values into their semantic potential. In general terms, this trajectory proposes that resultatives first develop into perfects, acquiring successively and in a strictly determined order the following values: inclusive, resultative, experiential and indefinite.⁵ Next, present perfects develop into past tenses.

⁴ In this article, all the paths that are presented have been simplified. For a far more detailed description of these evolutionary principles consult Bybee, Perkins, Pagliuca 1994 or Dahl 2000b.

⁵ The inclusive anterior indicates that an action or state is retained without interruption from a determined point in the past to the present moment, e.g. *I have known Max since 1960* (Jónsson 1992: 129–145). The resultative anterior introduces dynamic events, portraying them as highly relevant for the present state of affairs, e.g. *I cannot come to your party – I have caught the flu* (McCawley 1971). The experiential anterior indicates that the subject has an experience of having performed (or not) a given action. This means that the activity is portrayed as an experience which occurred at least once, and which might have been repeatable, e.g. *I have never read that book or I have read 'Principia Mathematica' five times* (Jónsson 1992: 129–145). The indefinite perfect (labeled also as indefinite past) clearly indicates past events without, however, specifying its temporal location. As for the former property, the gram approximates a past tense. However, given the latter characteristic, the formation behaves as a typical present perfect.

More specifically, grams that have been functioning as present perfects become admissible in an overt past environment and, by gradually increasing their temporal distance from the enunciator's here-and-now, gain definite past senses in the following sequence. Initially, they are acceptable in contexts that correspond to a recent (immediate, hodiernal and hesternal) and discursive (colloquial or in dialogues) past. Subsequently, they spread to milieus that involve a more distant (general or remote) and narrative (narrative discourse or narration proper) past (Harris 1982; Bybee, Perkins, Pagliuca 1994: 55–57, 98, 104–105; Squartini, Bertinetto 2000: 406–407, 414–417, 422; Lindstedt 2000: 379; Heine, Kuteva 2007: 151; Mitkovska, Bužarovska 2008: 136). Additionally, in certain languages, during the acquisition of a past temporal value, it is possible to identify a stage where an upcoming past tense offers a clear aspectual perfective sense. At a posterior stage, such perfective pasts may become admissible in durative or non-perfective (or imperfective, including progressive and habitual) contexts (cf. Bybee, Perkins, Pagliuca 1994; Dahl 2000b; Andrason forthcoming).⁶ Finally, the anterior path, when located in past and future contexts (i.e. when developing from past and future resultative proper inputs), delivers past perfects (pluperfects) and future perfects, respectively. At later stages of evolution, pluperfects develop remote past senses while perfect futures acquire two types of values. One involves the increase of a temporal distance from the enunciator's here-and-now and loss of resultative and perfect nuances: the gram evolves into a simple immediate and, later on, distant future tense (either perfective or imperfective). The other corresponds to the acquisition of values of certainty, high probability, and/or inevitability.⁷ This evolutionary scenario of future resultatives has sometimes been referred to as 'future perfect cline' (cf. Andrason 2013a).

2.2.2. Imperfective path

The imperfective path outlines a model of the grammatical life of various types of imperfective constructions. Accordingly, imperfective grams originate in lexical periphrases that display a continuative sense (the gram expresses the idea of keeping on doing something on one occasion) or an iterative sense (the gram denotes events that are repeated on one occasion). At the next stage, the iterative construction acquires a habitual sense (it introduces situations which are repeated on numerous occasions) and the continuative incorporates a progressive (it denotes ongoing dynamic activities) and continuous (it also denotes ongoing situations)⁸ value. Subsequently, the two clines merge and a construction expands to durative senses

⁶ The grouping of such perfective and non-perfective values delivers the category of a simple past tense (Bertinetto, Lenci 2010: 36–38).

⁷ Various modal senses of future perfects may also have their roots in the fact that these constructions commonly derive from original modal expressions (see the section dedicated to *Future path*, below).

⁸ This means that the progressive is acceptable in contexts where a situation (and not only a process) is viewed as being in progress, consequently tolerating non-dynamic and stative predicates (cf. Bybee, Perkins, Pagliuca 1994: 317).

(it expresses activities or situations that span extended periods of time) and gnomic values. In this manner, it develops into an imperfective and later, when progressive-continuative shades of meaning are lost or weakened, into a general present tense (Bybee, Perkins, Pagliuca 1994: 125–175; Haspelmath 1998: 41–45).⁹

The model formulated by Bybee, Perkins, Pagliuca (1994: 125–75) is particularly relevant for reduplicative inputs. For other types of formations, a slightly different trajectory may be proposed. Namely, the imperfective cline may be represented as a spread from progressive-continuous domain, to iterative-habitual sphere and next to durative and gnomic values. This means that progressive-continuative grams may gradually acquire iterative-habitual uses and subsequently incorporate durative and gnomic senses (cf. Marchese 1986; Bybee, Perkins, Pagliuca 1994: 135, 140–144; Haspelmath 1998; Bertinetto, Lenci 2010: 39). Additionally, it should be noted that the imperfective path within past and future time frames can include another stage whereby an imperfective past or future develops a non-imperfective (perfective, punctual, global and bounded) value – in this manner, by being able to express both imperfective and perfect activities, an imperfective past or future becomes a simple past or future tense, respectively.¹⁰

2.2.3. Modal paths

Modal paths are evolutionary scenarios that provide a representation of the grammatical life of modal formations.¹¹ Modal grams commonly originate in four types of explicit agentive modal constructions which overtly provide nuances of ability, obligation/predestination, desire and intention. These four classes of expressions exemplify four starting points of the *genuine* modal clines, i.e. the ability,

⁹ Commonly, the notion “simple” is used in order to refer to such general present tenses (cf. *Simple Present* in English). However, in order to avoid the confusion with an identical term that is employed when referring to “simple past tenses,” (which makes reference to an entirely different phenomenon), we will prefer the label “general.” It should be noted that such general present tenses correspond to highly advanced, old imperfective grams that have lost their aspectual (progressive-continuous) load. The reduction of the original semantic potential of imperfective grams may generate further modifications in their semantic-functional nature. In particular, when new present tenses are developed, the previously prototypical function of the older formation, i.e. its present temporal value, is lost. As a result, the construction maintains values which correspond to non-invaded segments of its semantic-functional load, typically, future and subjunctive uses. Consequently, imperfective and/or present grams become restricted to non-imperfective, non-present, and even non-indicative uses. They evolve into futures and/or subjunctives (Bybee, Perkins, Pagliuca 1994: 230–236, 274–278; Haspelmath 1998: 41–45; see the section dedicated to *Modal paths*, below). The phenomenon whereby grams of distinct antiquity develop “in waves,” along the same evolutionary scenario is labeled “layering” (Hopper, Traugott 2003: 125). The older grams, whose domain is invaded by novel formations, are denominated “doughnut grams” (Dahl 2000a: 10–12).

¹⁰ See for instance, the evolution of the Icelandic progressive past that recently has been admissible in past perfective contexts: *hann var að koma* ‘he came (lit. he was coming)’ (see also Comrie 1976).

¹¹ As will be evident from the subsequent discussion, the modal path is also closely related to the formation of future tenses and future constructions.

obligation, desiderative and intentional paths (Bybee, Perkins, Pagliuca 1994: 240; Fischer 2007: 181–182). Only one of these clines – i.e. the obligation/predestination trajectory – is relevant for our study. In line with the general tendency valid for all genuine modal paths, at the beginning, an agent oriented modal sense, in this case the nuance of obligation or predestination, expands to speaker-hearer oriented uses (e.g. imperative, prohibitive or optative), epistemic values (potentiality), and to intentional contexts. Subsequently, the intentional nuance – which, together with an epistemic value, motivates the use of the gram as a modally marked future –, additionally triggers a more extensive application of the form in conditional protases, concessive contexts, and other subjunctive modal situations. Once generalised in subordinate clauses, such modal grams may survive under the label of subjunctives even though they have disappeared from principal and independent clauses (Bybee, Perkins, Pagliuca 1994: 206–241 and 258–264).¹²

Apart from agent-oriented modal sources, modal senses and thus modal grams may also arise as a sub-path departing from originally non-modal bases. One of such non-modal sources of modality is the habitual value. Namely, from the main information conveyed by habituais (i.e. the sense of a habitual performance of an activity) one may infer that the agent of this routinely repeated action knows how to execute it. This implies that he or she *is able, can* and *may possibly* realise it at any time now and in the future. In other words, a regular repetition or customary execution of an action can be viewed as a tendency, and later as a general rule, thus referring not to the actual validity of a statement but to its potential application. Hence, the formation may express predictions, suppositions and modal hypothetical situations (cf. Dahl 1975; Carlson 1977; Comrie 1985: 40; Holm 1988: 160; Fleischman 1995: 537–539; Langacker 1997: 198; Palmer 2001: 179; Danaher 2001: 16, 21–22; Helenthal 2007: 24, 31; Bittner 2008: 376–379; Boneh, Doron 2008: 321; Bertinetto, Lenci 2010: 38–39; Boneh, Doron 2010: 352–363; Andrason 2012). As a result, once the original habitual gram is employed as an expression of physical ability and mental capacity, it may subsequently undergo a regular development along one of the genuine modal paths, i.e. following the ability cline, gradually acquiring the senses of root possibility, epistemic possibility, intentionality and permission-prohibition, and later being used as a subjunctive modality, modal future and imperative (Andrason 2012: 17–20).

Furthermore, modal senses or moods in general, besides arising from the four genuine modal clines and from a habitual value developed along the imperfective path, may likewise have their roots in old indicative constructions (Bybee, Perkins, Pagliuca 1994: 230–236). According to this developmental principle, due to a frequent use of originally non-modal forms in overtly modal environments, indicative

¹² First, subordinate modal grams tend to be harmonic with introductory predicates. They are thus typically employed with verbs such as *want, desire* or *order*. However, in further evolutionary phases, they spread to contexts where non-harmonic predicates are used and which would not necessitate a modal reading (Bybee, Perkins, Pagliuca 1994: 217–218).

inputs gradually develop into grammatical moods.¹³ This developmental tendency is referred to as a modal contamination (Andrason 2011b: 6–8).¹⁴ At the beginning of this process, non-modal grams start being commonly employed in certain explicitly modal contexts (conditional protases, subordinate clauses, with modal particles, etc.). In this manner, they provide modal senses imposed by their semantic, syntactic or pragmatic environments. Because of a regular use in these modal settings, the formation gradually incorporates the value of the context as its own to the point that, when the original indicative uses have been lost, it is completely identified with this contextually induced modal value. As a result, the construction is reanalysed as a mood (Dahl 1985: 11; Hopper, Traugott 2003: 82; Bybee, Perkins, Pagliuca 1994: 25–26, 230–236).¹⁵ It shall be noted that present indicatives typically develop into (or acquire senses of) real factual modality (present subjunctives),¹⁶ past indicatives gain the value of real counterfactuality (e.g. conditionals) and pluperfects are reinterpreted as unreal counterfactuality (e.g. past conditionals or past subjunctives; Bybee, Perkins, Pagliuca 1994: 235).

Among all the paths leading to and affecting the domain of modality, it is necessary to mention the so-called optative cline. Optatives in various languages originate in non-modal (or alternatively, indicative) past and pluperfect grams which are employed in optative contexts (this modal reading may be imposed by optative morphemes, particles or a pragmatic environment).¹⁷ Following the general rule of modalisation outlined above, in a regular situation, a modalised indicative past generates a counterfactual real optative, while a pluperfect delivers a counterfactual unreal optative. Subsequently, optatives can develop into subjunctives (subordinated moods) or conditionals (main clauses), spreading to conditional protases and apodoses, respectively. Consequently, counterfactual real optatives (or optatives built from past forms) deliver counterfactual unreal subjunctive values (in protases) and counterfactual unreal conditional values (in apodoses) while counterfactual unreal optatives (or optatives built from pluperfect forms) are expanded to counterfactual unreal subjunctive and/or conditional values (cf. for instance, the use of the Latin

¹³ This process explains a progressive conversion of certain indicative imperfectives and/or presents into subjunctives, i.e. syntactically conditioned moods (see footnote 8, above). More specifically, when old presents lose their indicative uses, being preserved in subordinating clauses – especially in final or purposive clauses, conditional protases or after introductory verbs such as *want*, *wish*, *order*, etc. – they are reinterpreted as moods.

¹⁴ This is a subtype of the common process of “conventionalisation of implicature” (Dahl 2000a: 11; Bybee, Perkins, Pagliuca 1994: 25–26, 296), “context-induced reinterpretation” (Heine, Claudi, Hünnemeyer 1991: 71–72) or “semanticisation” (Hopper, Traugott 2003: 82).

¹⁵ Later, this “new” mood can be released from its original context (from which it gained the modal value) and appear in other milieus still preserving its newly acquired modal sense. For instance, contextually determined moods may be transposed to main clauses where, without being accompanied by any overt modal lexemes (except from the verbal construction itself), they will provide the modal sense they have previously acquired (Bybee, Perkins, Pagliuca 1994: 296).

¹⁶ Resultatives and present perfect usually evolve into perfect subjunctives.

¹⁷ These optative morphemes or lexemes may, in turn, derive from agent-oriented modal expressions.

subjunctive forms (original optatives) in conditional periods or the use of the English lexeme *should* in conditional periods; for a detailed discussion of the optative path, see Andrason 2013b).

2.2.4. Future path

Although one may identify various typologically plausible sources of future tenses, most future constructions originate in explicit agent-oriented modal expressions that overtly express the ideas of desire, intention, obligation/predestination and ability (Bybee, Perkins, Pagliuca 1994: 254–256, 258, 264–266). Thus, paths which lead towards future shades of meaning and towards future grams overlap with genuine modal clines (cf. previous section).¹⁸ It should be noted that the modally based future tenses are typically classified into four types that reflect four semantic ages of futurity. The first group corresponds to the initial phase of modally based futures and consists of formations that, besides being used to introduce future activities, typically convey agent oriented modal values (e.g. desire, intension, obligation/predestination or ability). The second group contains futures that also express a value of root possibility and intentionality. The third type includes grams that are most frequently employed as simple futures. Finally, the last group comprises future constructions which are typically used in subordinate clauses and which usually express epistemic and speaker-oriented senses (e.g. imperative; Bybee, Perkins, Pagliuca 1994: 279). As a result, it is evident that future grams are inherently modal and their central function is intention or prediction. Inversely, futures fail to form exclusively temporal categories. Quite the opposite, they rather “resemble[e] agent-oriented and epistemic modality, with important temporal implications” (Bybee, Perkins, Pagliuca 1994: 280). This signifies that modal nuances typically accompany future grams during their entire grammatical life, even in phases where a gram has been grammaticalised as a future tense (Bybee, Perkins, Pagliuca 1994: 280).

2.2.5. Research strategy

Complying with the cognitive understanding of the meaning, the analysis of the Vilamovicean verbal system will consist of the following. First in the remaining portion of this paper (see, section 3, below), we will provide a detailed description of the semantic potential of the verbal grams – either synthetic or analytic – that belong to the verbal organisation of the Vilamovicean language. More specifically, we will enumerate and illustrate all the senses that can be conveyed by each of the Vilamovicean constructions, providing specific contexts in which a given value is

¹⁸ Other sources of futures include: (i) periphrases built on movement verbs (especially, on predicates such as *come* and *go*; cf. Bybee, Perkins, Pagliuca 1994: 267), (ii) locutions that are formed with temporal adverbs (Bybee, Perkins, Pagliuca 1994: 270) and (iii) highly advanced original imperfectives and presents (see modal contamination above; Bybee, Perkins, Pagliuca 1994: 275–278).

activated.¹⁹ Next, in the second article of the series, in compliance with the relatedness principle, we will offer a unification of the components of each polysemy, demonstrating that the semantic sphere of every gram can be explained by making use of certain evolutionary paths. Put differently, the senses of each construction will be related and the gram viewed as a homogenous whole by using universal clines as linking templates. In order to validate all the linkages – which otherwise constitutes hypotheses derived from a synchronic variety of uses – every map will be grounded in diachronic facts. Namely, we will show that the input expression that underlines the form and thus the entire cline is cognitively compatible with the path and with all the senses arisen along it: simply, it motivates the polysemy following the meaning extensions predicted for the trajectory in question.²⁰ As a result, we will demonstrate that the entire Vilamovicean verbal system may be explained as a recursive process of creation of grams which evolve along determined paths. Thus, the clines not only will enable us to portray the semantic potential of the verbal formations but also to model the whole verbal organisation as “grammatical waves” moving along a few evolutionary trajectories.²¹

It is important to note that the aim of this paper is to provide a cognitive model of the Vilamovicean verbal system. To be exact, the article analyses – describes and explains – the semantic potential of all the Vilamovicean verbal forms and their interactions at the system’s level. Inversely, this study is not designed as a dialectological or comparative analysis and, especially, its goal is not an evaluation of similarities and differences between Vilamovicean and German or any other Germanic language. Such comparison would certainly be highly interesting, but before it is even possible, a clear description and systematic explanation of the Vilamovicean verbal organisation must be offered.

¹⁹ An extensive descriptive section is necessary because cognitive models are based on the semantic potentials of verbal forms. Given that there is no study that offers a description of the semantic potentials of the Vilamovicean verbal constructions, it is obvious that before providing an analysis of the meanings of the verbal locutions, one must first describe and illustrate the senses these formations can convey.

²⁰ As explained previously, mappings which are based on a synchronic inventory of senses and on typologically “universal” paths are nothing more than plausible hypotheses. In order to be corroborated, these hypotheses must be confirmed by concrete diachronic proofs. The best and most relevant of them is the identification of a lexical input that could motivate the entire path and, thus, all the senses which are available along it. Depending on the age of a given form (i.e. the time when it was constructed), this input may be recent (for instance, West-Germanic), older (Proto-Germanic) or very remote (Proto-Indo-European). Put differently, the question of how far back we must go in order to identify the input locution directly depends on how old a given Vilamovicean form is. Due to the “age” of some constructions, in our diachronic “verification,” it will sometimes be necessary to step back to very remote times.

²¹ Since some of the proposed paths and diachronic evidence which supports them constitute well-known facts, certain results of the mapping and/or chaining of the semantic potentials of the Vilamovicean constructions may give an impression of triviality. Put differently, some mappings may be felt as less than surprising given that identical cognitive (conceptual and diachronic) networks have been posited for other Germanic languages. This “triviality,” however, is necessary in order to design a cognitive model of the entire Vilamovicean verbal system in which every path must scientifically be demonstrated. Inversely, no path can merely be assumed.

3. Components of the Vilamovicean verbal systems

The Vilamovicean verbal system is formed by the following constructions: Praesens *yhy mah* ‘I do’ (cf. section 3.1), Praeteritum *yhy maht* ‘I did’ (section 3.2), Perfectum *yhy ho gymaht* ‘I have done’ (section 3.3), Plusquamperfectum *yhy hot gymaht* ‘I had done’ (section 3.4), Futurum I *yhy wa / wã maha* ‘I will do’ (section 3.5), Futurum I Perfectum *wa / wã hon gymaht* ‘I will have done’ (section 3.6), Futurum II *yhy zo maha* ‘I shall do’ (section 3.7), (Modum) Coniunctivum I *yhy wje* ‘(if) I were’ (section 3.8), Coniunctivum I Perfectum *yhy het gymaht* ‘(if) I had done’ (section 3.9), Coniunctivum II *yhy wje maha* ‘(if) I did (lit. if I would do)’ (section 3.10), Coniunctivus II Perfectum *yhy wje hon gymaht* ‘(if) I had done (lit. if I would have done)’ (section 3.11), Progressivum *yhy bej maha* ‘I am doing’ (3.12) and Resultativa *ej gymaht* ‘is done’, *wjyd gymaht* ‘will be done’ and *blãjt gymaht* ‘is done’ (3.13).²² In this section of the paper, the semantic potential (senses) of all of these formations will be presented.²³

²² In this study, Latin denominations will be employed with no claim of any exact correspondence between the label and the semantics of a corresponding gram. The names are thus used only as etiquettes that stand for, but do not define, a given polysemy. Additionally, in section 3.14, various means of conveying the subjunctive senses (labelled as “subiunctiva”) will be presented.

²³ During the compilation of evidence the following native speakers – ordered by the year of the birth – have been consulted: Franciszka Bilczewska fũm Frycki (born 1913), Kazimierz Grygierczyk fũm Bieruniok (1913–2010), Anna Danek fũm Pejtela (born 1916), Zofia Danek fũm Stańcu (born 1917), Franciszek Mosler fũm Mõzler (born 1918), Helena Danek fũm Kwaka (born 1919), Jan Biba fũm Tũma-Jaški (born 1920), Anna Sznajder fũm Pejter (born 1920), Elżbieta Mynarska fũm Siõeba (born 1921), Helena Biba fũm Płacnik (born 1922), Elżbieta Babiuch fũm Poũkner (1923–2010), Anna Foks fũm Prorok (born 1923), Elżbieta Kacorzyk fũm Pũtrok (born 1923), Elżbieta Sznajder fũm Pejter (born 1923), Anna Zejma fũm Lũft (1923–2010), Elżbieta Matysiak fũm Hala-Mockia (born 1924), Anna Danek fũm Kũpsela (born 1924), Helena Gasidło fũm Biõeźniok (born 1924), Waleria Brzezina fũm Cepok (born 1925), Rozalia Kowalik fũm Poũermin (born 1925), Jan Formas (born 1925), Katarzyna Balcarczyk fũm Karol (born 1925), Stanisław Foks fũm Lũft (born 1926), Elżbieta Formas fũm Mõzler (born 1926), Katarzyna Nowak fũm Tobyś (1926–2010), Rozalia Hanusz fũm Linkũs (1926–2009), Anna Korczyk fũm Kołodziej (born 1927), Elżbieta Gãsiorek fũm Anta (born 1927), Elżbieta Figwer fũm Bõba (born 1927), Anna Foks fũm Lũft (born 1927), Kazimierz Sznajder fũm Pejter (born 1927), Inga Danek (born 1928), Helena Nowak fũm Holeczkla (born 1928), Jan Balcarczyk fũm Siõeba (born 1928), Bronisława Pyka (born 1928), Helena Rozner fũm Bõba-Lojzka (born 1929), Emilia Biesik fũm Raczek (1929), Jõzef Gara fũm Tołer (born 1929), Elżbieta Merta fũm Hala-Frana-Jaška (born 1929), Katarzyna Danek fũm Pejtela (born 1929), Elżbieta Nycz fũm Słeźok (1929–2007), Helena Dobroczyńska fũm Osiecon (born 1929), Elżbieta Gandor fũm Baranła (born 1930), Zofia Kozieł fũm Šũbert (born 1930), Anna Biba fũm Kũcłik (1930–2009), Hilda Kasperczyk fũm Cũõe (1930–2005), Eugenia Foks fũm Brõda (born 1930), Rozalia Danek fũm Mira-Winca (born 1931), Elżbieta Nikiel fũm Linkũs (born 1931), Rozalia Węgrodzka fũm Gadła (born 1931), Stanisław Zejma (born 1931), Stefania Kuczmierczyk fũm Jonkla (born 1932), Anna Nowak fũm Hala-Mockia (born 1932), Emilia Danek fũm Biõeźniok (born 1933), Kazimierz Foks fũm Baranła (born 1934), Anna Kuczmierczyk fũm Zelbst (born 1934), Anna Sznajder fũm Pejter (born 1934), Barbara Tomanek (born 1935), Elżbieta Sznajder fũm Freślik (born 1938), Stanisław Merta fũm Hala-Frana-Jaška-Hala (born 1955), Janusz Brzezina fũm Urbon (born 1956). It should be noted that sections 3.1 and 3.2 are based on the evidence provided in Andrason 2010a, sections 3.4, 3.5 and 3.6 on Andrason 2010b, and section 3.12 on Andrason 2011a.

3.1. Praesens

The Praesens – a synthetic verbal construction cognate to the English Simple Present or German Present tense – commonly introduces currently ongoing, both progressive and continuous, actions and activities:

- (1) a. Wjyr **zâjn** y Wymysoü
 we are in Wilamowice
 We are in Wilamowice
- b. Vos **mahst** dü?
 what do you
 What are you doing?
- c. Yh **laz** â bihła wu dü mjyr gylejn höst
 I read a book which you me lent have
 I am reading a book which you have lent me

It also expresses iterative and habitual (customary) events (2.a–d) as well as general durative situations (2.e). A given habitual or customary activity may span from a definite moment in the past. In such instances, the gram corresponds to an inclusive present perfect (2.f). Additionally, the Praesens is typically employed to convey general truths and gnomic statements (2.g):

- (2) a. Yhy **gej** y dy süł drâjmöł y a woh
 I go in school three times in a week
 I go to school three times a week
- b. Yhy **gej** jynta möł y dy kjyh
 I go some times in the church
 I sometimes go to church
- c. Mâj tohter **wön** y Krök
 my daughter live in Wilamowice
 My daughter lives in Wilamowice
- d. Y Wymysoü **kuza** zy ind wymysiöeryś
 in Wilamowice speak they always Vilamovicean
 People always speak Vilamovicean in Wilamowice
- e. Mâj hoüz **štejt** y Wymysoü
 my house stays in Wilamowice
 My house stays in Wilamowice

- f. Yhy **wön** y Wymysoü wi'h uf dy wełd kom
 I live in Wilamowice since-I on the world came
 I have lived in Wilamowice since I was born
- g. Dy måkja y Wymysoü **zâjn** zjyr šejn
 the girls in Wilamowice are very beautiful
 The girls in Wilamowice are very beautiful

In some cases, the Praesens may offer a modal nuance of ability or dispositionality:

- (3) Yhy **kuza** wymysiöeryś
 I speak Vilamovicean
 I can speak Vilamovicean

The Praesens is likewise frequently used to express future actions and situations, both in main and subordinate clauses (4.a). In certain subordinate clauses, the formation may introduce future events that will have occurred before other future actions, thus approximating the category of a future perfect (4.b):

- (4) a. Piöer tog **fiöen** dy kyndyn **wag**
 some days go the children away
 In a few days, the children will leave
- b. Dü wyst ny roüzgejn
 you will not leave
 You will not leave
- wen dy ny **ufroüms** dy goncy hyt
 before you not clean the whole house
 Before you have cleaned the whole house

The Praesens is also used in the function of a *praesens historicum* (5.a). Furthermore, since the rule of *consecutio temporum* is not observed in the Vilamovicean language, the gram is employed in subordinate clauses that are introduced by Praeteritum or Perfectum with a past tense force. In such cases, the Praesens expresses past imperfective (progressive-continuous, iterative-habitual or durative) actions or situations (5.b):

- (5) a. Gestyn yhy **bej** dö uf dar štuw...
 yesterday I am there on that roof
 Yesterday, I was on the roof...
- b. A ziöet do å **lejzt** dos bihła
 he said that he reads this book
 He said that he was reading that book

3.2. Praeteritum

The Praeteritum typically expresses definite – accompanied by explicit past time adverbs or located in explicit past environments – past events, either near, general or remote:

- (6) a. Hoüts mügiys **koüft** yh å brut
 today morning bought I a/one bread
 Today in the morning I bought a loaf of bread
- b. Yh **go** mih öüs y 1950
 I gave myself out in 1950
 I got married in 1950
- c. Der jyšty kyng **boüt** Krök hefa jür y dom
 the first king built Cracow many years ago
 The first king [of Poland] built Cracow many years ago

As far as its aspectual force is concerned, the Praeteritum may convey both a perfective sense (as it introduces entire, unique or punctual events; cf. examples 6.a–c above) and imperfective value (as it introduces past progressive, continuous, iterative, habitual and durative activities):

- (7) a. Wi wiöeh klin **kuzt** yh myta eüdyn wymysiöeryš
 when was-I little talked I with-the parents Vilamovicean
 When I was a child, I used to talk to my parents in Vilamovicean
- b. Gestyn wi der nökwër kom
 yesterday as the neighbour came
 Yesterday when the neighbour came
- yhy **kuzt** myta eüdyn
 I talked with-the parents
 I was talking to my parents

Equally common is the use of the Praeteritum in the function of an experiential perfect and an anti-perfect:²⁴

- (8) a. Yhy **wiöe** y Krök
 I was in Cracow
 I have been to Cracow

²⁴ The anti-perfect is a label that covers several negative varieties of prototypical present perfect senses. Usually, such “anti-perfects” indicate that a given activity has not occurred yet (a negative variant of a resultative perfect), has never occurred (a negative variant of an experiential perfect), or has not been occurring (a negative variant of an inclusive perfect).

- b. Yhy **wiöe** ni kamöl hynder dy gronc
 I was not never outside the border
 I have never been abroad

Less frequent – although by no means uncommon – are cases where the Praeteritum provides the sense of a resultative perfect (9.a-b). On the other hand, the Praeteritum fails to express the value of an inclusive perfect:

- (9) a. Eta **kom** der nökwër
 just arrived the neighbour
 The neighbour has just arrived
- b. H-ho kå ślysułn boh já **felür**
 I-have no keys because-I them lost
 I do not have the keys because I have lost them

Furthermore, the Praeteritum can be employed in the function of a pluperfect, introducing past events or situations that occurred before other past actions (10.a). This usage is especially common in reported speech due to the above-mentioned fact whereby the language does not necessitate the *consecutio temporum* rule (10.b).

- (10) a. Har **štürw** śun wi der dökter kom
 he died before that the doctor came
 He had died before the doctor came
- b. Har kuzt do har śun dos **maht**
 he said that he already this did
 He said that he had already done it

It should be noted that when the Praeteritum appears in protases headed by the conjunction *wen* ‘if, as’, it regularly expresses factual activities typical for its past or perfect uses without, on the contrary, providing a counterfactual real sense as in English (*if I did* or *if I were*):

- (11) Wen har kom, å zo **rün**
 since he came he shall rest
 Since he came (has come), he shall rest

3.3. Perfectum

The Perfectum – an analytic formation that is composed by the verb *hon* ‘have’ or *zâjn* ‘be’ and the past participle that genetically corresponds to the German Perfect *ich habe gemacht* or *ich bin gekommen* – typically functions as a resultative perfect (12.a) as well as a perfect of strong current relevance (12.b). Closely related is its use

as an existential possessive resultative proper (12.c) or (rather infrequently) as an inclusive perfect (12.d):

- (12) a. Yta **ej** grod **gykuma** der nökwér
 just has already come the neighbour
 The neighbour has just arrived
- b. Yhy **ho** wiytyñ y wymysiöeryś **fergasa** cy kuza
 I have words in Vilamovicean forgotten to speak
 I have forgotten a lot of words in Vilamovicean
- c. Yhy **ho** dy kyh **ufgyroümt**
 I have the kitchen cleaned
 I get the kitchen as clean (i.e. someone else may have cleaned it)
- d. Yhy **ho** dy kyh **gymölt** diöh fir tog
 I have the kitchen painted thorough four days
 I have the kitchen (being) painted for four days

Less commonly – but not infrequently – the construction offers the sense of an experiential perfect (13.a) and the value of a definite past, either recent (e.g. hodiernal), general or remote (13.b–d). In a definite past function, the Perfectum typically introduces perfective events (13.b–c) although it may sometimes be employed with a durative or habitual sense (13.d):²⁵

- (13) a. Yhy **bej** ni kamöł hynder dy gronc **gywost**
 I was not never outside the border been
 I have never been abroad
- b. Hoüts mügies **ho** yh **gykoüft** å brut
 today in-the-morning have I bought a bread
 Today in the morning I bought a loaf of bread
- c. Der jyśty kyng **höť** **ufgyboüť** Krök hefa jür y dom
 the first king has built Cracow many years ago
 The first king of [Poland] built Cracow many years ago
- d. Wi wiöe yh klin
 when was I little
 When I was a child

²⁵ One should notice that the Praeteritum is significantly more frequent in the imperfective (durative, iterative-habitual or progressive-continuous) sense.

ho yh **gykuzt** myt mājny ɛldyn wymysiöeryś
 have I talked with my parents Vilamovicean
 I used to talk to my parents in Vilamovicean

Additionally and with a high frequency, the Perfectum is used as a pluperfect:

- (14) a. Gestyn wi ej kuma dy nökweryn
 yesterday as is come the neighbour
 Yesterday, when the neighbour came

hoh śün **ufgyroümt** dy kyh
 have-I already cleaned the kitchen
 I had already cleaned the kitchen

- b. A ziöet do ja śün **höt** dos **gymaht**
 he said that he already has this done
 He said that he had already done it

Finally, the Perfectum may express immediate (perfective) future events, approximating the category of a resultative future or future perfect:

- (15) Yhy **ho** dos **gymaht** y öügablyk
 I have this done in a while
 I will have done it in a little while!

3.4. Plusquamperfectum

The Plusquamperfectum is an analytic gram that is compounded of the auxiliary *hon* 'have' or *zājn* in the Praeteritum (e.g. *yhy hot* or *yhy wiöe*) and the past participle. It is a cognate formation of the German Pluperfect *ich hatte gemacht* or *ich ware gekommen*. The main function of the Plusquamperfectum is to express the idea of past anteriority.²⁶ More specifically, the Plusquamperfectum provides two typical past anterior uses: first, it introduces actions and situations that occurred before other past events and activities (16.a) or expresses past events in reported speech being headed by an introductory clause with a verb in the Praeteritum or Perfectum with a definite past force (16.b). Additionally, it denotes past, remote or historical (clearly detached from the current state of affairs) actions (16.c):

- (16) a. Yhy **hot** dos śün **gymaht** wi der nökwēr kom
 he had this already done as the neighbour come
 He had done it before the neighbour came

²⁶ As already explained, it is also possible to use both the Perfectum and Praeteritum in the pluperfect sense.

- b. Hor kuzt do hor ún hot dos **gymaht**
 he said that he already had this did
 He said that he had already done it
- c. Dos hot yh **gyšrejwa** 10 jür y dom
 this had I written 10 years ago
 I wrote it 10 years ago

3.5. Futurum I

The construction referred to as the Futurum I consists of the verb *wan* ‘become, be’ in the Praesens and the infinitive of a main verb, e.g. *yhy wa* (or *wā*) *maha* ‘I will do’. This formation clearly parallels the German construction *werden* + infinitive. The gram typically expresses future activities, both imperfective (progressive-continuous, iterative-habitual and durative; cf. 17.a) and perfective (punctual or vied in their integrity; cf. 17.b). As a future, it introduces events of any distance from the speaker’s here-and-now, either immediate or remote.

- (17) a. S’öwyt **wysty zon** ufa film
 the-evening will-you watch on-the movie
 In the evening, you will be watching the movie
- b. MÜN **woh krigia** å poklo
 tomorrow will-I receive a packet
 Tomorrow, I will receive a packet

Since the Vilamovicean language does not respect the laws of *consecutio temporum*, the Futurum I may appear in reported speech after an introductory verb in the Praeteritum or the Perfectum. In such cases, it introduces events that are future (i.e. prospective) from the past perspective, approximating the category of a future in the past. Frequently in such cases, modal nuances of possibility and probability are also available:

- (18) a. Å hõt gyziöet do’ å **wyt** dos **maha**
 he has said that he will this do
 He said that he would do it
- b. Å kuzt do’ å **wyt kiöefa** s’brut
 he said that he will buy the-bread
 He said that he would buy the bread

The Futurum I may likewise introduce future events and situations that will occur before other future activities, resembling the value of a prototypical future perfect.

- (19) a. Wen **wyt kuma** der nökwér
 when will come the neighbour
 When the neighbour comes
- to wo'h um ziöen dy byst ny
 then will-I him say you are not
 I will tell him that you are not here
- b. Dü **wyst ny gejn ślöfa**
 You will not go sleep
 You will not go to sleep
- wał dy dos ny **wyst enda**
 before you this not will finish
 Before you have finished this

When used in conditional protases, the Futurum I regularly offers a sense of real factuality and expresses a possible (or feasible) and/or likely event, given the accomplishment of certain conditions:

- (20) Wen yh **wa kuma**, dy **wyst mer hełfa**
 if I will come you will me help
 If I come, you will help me

Finally, the Futurum I may be employed with a modal force of certainty. In this function, the gram does not express future actions but rather indicates that a given present situation or activity is certain:

- (21) Har **wyt kuza** güť wymysiöeryś
 he will speak well Vilamovicean
 He certainly speaks a good Vilamovicean

3.6. Futurum I Perfectum

The Futurum I Perfectum equals a periphrasis formed by the verb *wada* 'be, become', the auxiliary *hon* 'have' or *zâjn* 'be' and the past participle. This construction genetically corresponds to the German locution *ich werde gekauft haben* 'I will have bought' or *ich werde gekommen sein* 'I will have come'. In its principal use, the Futurum I Perfectum conveys the idea of future anteriority and expresses future events that precede other future activities:

- (22) Wen yh s'mytagasa **wo'h hon koht**
 when I the-lunch will-I have cooked
 When I have cooked the lunch

woh abysła rün
 will-I a-little rest
 I will rest a little

In main clauses and when accompanied by temporal adverbial expressions, the formation typically indicates that, at a determined point in the future, a given state will be achieved. In this function, the gram approximates the category of a future resultative proper or future resultative perfect:

- (23) a. Ym cweľ wyt dy züp **gykoht** **zäjñ**
 in-the twelve will the soup cooked be
 At 12, the soup will be cooked
- b. Y år wäjł **wo** yhy **hon** dy kyh **ufgyroümt**
 in a while will I have the kitchen cleaned
 I will have cleaned the kitchen in a while

Furthermore, the gram is commonly used if one wishes to suggest that a given action will certainly happen in the future. This use is particularly frequent in the immediate or near future:

- (24) Mün mäj nökwer **wyt** **hon** **gykoüft** å öüta
 tomorrow my neighbour will have bought a car
 Tomorrow, my neighbour will certainly buy a car

Additionally, the gram may refer to past activities portraying them as certain or highly likely:

- (25) a. Ejs **wyt** **hon** **gyslöfa**
 she will have slept
 She certainly slept / she must have slept / I am sure, she (has) slept
- b. Har **wyt** **hon** **gykuzt** güť wymysiöeryś
 he will have spoken good Vilamovicean
 He certainly spoke a good Vilamovicean / He must have spoken a good Vilamovicean / I am sure, he spoke a good Vilamovicean

3.7. Futurum II

Future actions and situations may also be expressed through a locution which is formed by the auxiliary verb *zula* ‘shall’ and the infinitive of a meaning verb. This construction, which parallels the Dutch future *ik zal* + infinitive as well as the Scandinavian futures with *ska*, has a significantly stronger modal (optative, volitional and generally epistemic) shade of meaning than the Futurum I built on

the auxiliary *wada*. Especially evident are deontic modal tones (idea of obligation and necessity) that almost invariably accompany the Futurum II (26.a-b). Quite commonly, the sense of futurity is likewise complemented by epistemic nuances of probability (26.c). When used in the 1st person singular in affirmative sentences, the gram sometimes conveys subtle volitional senses (intention of offering oneself for something) while, in case it is directed to the 2nd person, it approximates an imperative (36.e).

- (26) a. Zy **zuła** **kiöefa** orpułn
 they shall buy potatoes
 They shall / should / let them buy potatoes
- b. Å **zo** **năjkuma**
 he shall come-in
 May he come in / let him come in!
- c. Har **zo** mih **byzihia** mün
 he shall me visit tomorrow
 He shall visit me tomorrow (It is probable, he will visit me)
- d. Yhy **zo** dir **oüzwośa!**
 I shall you help
 I will help you (I promise, I will help you)
- e. Dy **zo** dos **maha!**
 you shall this do
 You shall do it / Do it!

As is the case with the Futurum I, the locution built with the auxiliary *zuła* in the present tense may express future events introduced from a past perspective. In such cases, the formation typically expresses the idea of a prospective obligation or necessity corresponding to the English periphrasis *should do*:

- (27) a. Der dökter ziöet do yh **zo** **rün**
 the doctor said that I shall rest
 The doctor said that I should rest
- b. Yh ho gybata dy tohter do zy mir **zo** **oüzwośa**
 I have asked the daughter that she me shall help
 I have asked (I asked) my daughter to help me²⁷

²⁷ Although there are cases of the use of the Futurum I (Perfectum) and Futurum II with their respective auxiliaries in the Praeteritum, such constructions are extremely sporadic and will be omitted in this study. These types of grams are most commonly replaced by the

3.8. Coniunctivum I

The Coniunctivum I – a formation that genetically parallels German forms such as *wäre* or *hätte* (as well as the Icelandic *viðtengingaháttur* forms such as *væri* or *hefði*) – is very rarely used in the Vilamovicean language. This stems from the fact that only a few verbs (more specifically, *zâjn*, *hon*, *wada* and some modal predicates *djiyfa*, *kyna*, *zula*, *mygja*, *müsa* and *wela*) still possess forms of this category (respectively: *wje*, *het*, *wjed*, *diyft(a)*, *kynd* (*kynda*), *zeld* (*zylđ*), *myht(a)*, *müst(a)* and *wylđ* (*welđ*)). The Coniunctivum forms of the remaining predicates have been lost. As far as the meaning of this category is involved, it is possible to distinguish two main uses. First, when the Coniunctivum appears in subordinate clauses, it typically expresses a modal idea of counterfactual real condition – it introduces conditions that, although contrary to the current situation, are still able to be fulfilled, either in a real (28.a) or imaginary manner (28.b):²⁸

- (28) a. Wen yh gjeld **het**, wje'h mer dos kiöefa
 if I money had were-I for me this buy
 If I had money, I would buy this (for me)
- b. Wen yh jung **wje**, wje'h šejn zâjn
 if I young were were-I beautiful be
 If I were younger, I would be beautiful

Apart from introducing counterfactual real conditions, the formation may express counterfactual real wishes, thus approximating the category of an unlikely optative (29.a). In this manner, the gram is able to denote a less likely possibility (in conditional apodoses; 29.b) or to introduce milder orders and requests (29.c). As a result, from a typological perspective, the Coniunctivum I offers uses which are typical for “past” or imperfective subjunctives (such as *hefði* in Icelandic) or for “present” or real conditionals (such as *would have* in English; it must be noted that this use of Coniunctivum I is infrequent and it is typically Coniunctivum II that appears in conditional apodoses).

- (29) a. Wen yh å kynd **wje**
 if I a child were
 If (only) I were a child
- b. Wen yh gjeld het, **wje'h** šejn
 if I money had were-I beautiful
 If I had money, I would be beautiful

corresponding gram with the auxiliaries in the Praesens. This is most probably due to the loss of the *consecutio temporum* rule.

²⁸ Modal uses of a form in conditional protases (and in other subordinated clauses) are denominated here as “subjunctive.” Modal uses in conditional apodoses (and in other main clauses) are referred to as “conditional.”

- c. Yhy **weld** wysa
 I would-like know
 I would like to know

It should also be noted that the Coniunctivum I forms of the verb *zâjn* ‘be’ and *hon* ‘have’ are common as members (i.e. auxiliary verbs) of other modal constructions: the Coniunctivus I Perfectum (cf. section 3.9), Coniunctivum II (cf. section 3.10) and Coniunctivum II Perfectum (cf. section 3.11).

3.9. Coniunctivum I Perfectum

The Coniunctivum I Perfectum consists of the auxiliary verb *zâjn* ‘be’ or *hon* ‘have’ in the Coniunctivum I (i.e. *wje* and *het*, respectively) and the past participle of a main verb, for instance *het gymaht* ‘(if) I had done’ or *wje gykuma* ‘(if) I had come’. The Coniunctivum I Perfectum typically expresses counterfactual and unreal activities and situations. It is commonly found in conditional protases (it approximates “pluperfect” subjunctives such as *hefði haft* in Icelandic) and apodoses (it approximates past conditionals such as *would have had* in English) where it introduces the idea of counterfactuality with respect to already past events. In such a case, the event is portrayed as impossible to be changed and therefore not only counterfactual but also unreal (30.a–b). In certain instances, the formation may also express counterfactual unreal wishes, i.e. desires that concern situations that belong to the past – these situations are gone forever and impossible to alter (30.c).

- (30) a. Wen dy mer dos **hetst** **gyziöet** gestyn
 if you me this had told yesterday
 If you had told me this yesterday

het **yh** ju mytum **gykuzt**
 had I just with-him talked
 I would already have talked to him

- b. Wen dy mer **hetst** **gyhulfa** cyjür
 if you me had helped last-year
 If you had helped me last year

to **het** **yh** öü der **gyhylfa**
 then had I too you helped
 I would have helped you too

- c. Wen yh dos **het** **gywöst!**
 if I this had known
 If (only) I had known this!

3.10. Coniunctivum II

The Coniunctivum II is formed by the auxiliary *zâjn* in the Coniunctivus I (*wje*) and the infinitive of a main verb, e.g. *wje maha* ‘(if) I did’. The meaning of the formation is entirely analogical to the Coniunctivum I. It merely serves as an analytical substitute of the Coniunctivum I for verbs that lack these forms. In case of the verbs that do possess Coniunctivum I forms, the Coniunctivum II is an alternative variant with no difference in meaning. As a result, the Coniunctivum II is typically found in conditional periods, both in protases and apodoses, where it introduces counterfactual (contrary to reality) but real (still possible) conditions and hypothetical actions:

- (31) a. Wen yh jung **wje** **zâjn**,
 if I young were be
 If I were younger

wje’h šejn **zâjn**
 were-I beautiful be
 I would be beautiful

- b. Wen yh **wje** **hon** gjełd
 if I were have money
 If I had money

wje’h mer **kiöefa** å grusy hyt
 were-I for me buy a big house
 I would buy myself a big house

In certain cases, the gram also provides a real (unlikely) optative shade of meaning:

- (32) Wen yh **wje** **hon** gjełd!
 if I were have money
 If (only) I had money!

3.11. Coniunctivum II Perfectum

The Coniunctivum II Perfectum is an analytic expression formed by the Coniunctivum I of the verb *zâjn* (i.e. *wje*), the infinitive *zâjn* ‘be’ or *hon* ‘have’ and the past participle of a main verb, e.g. *wej hon gymaht* ‘(if) I had done / I would have done’ or *wje zâjn gykuma* ‘(if) I had come / I would come’. The construction semantically and functionally parallels the Coniunctivus I Perfectum. It thus expresses the idea of unreal counterfactuality in conditional protases and apodoses (33.a-b) and in optative contexts (unlikely unreal wishes; 33.c):

- (33) Wen yh **wje** **hon** **gybaka**,
 if I were have cooked
 If I had cooked (it)

wje h **śun** **ołys** **hon** **gymaht**
 were I already all have done
 I would already have it all done

The formation may also express the concept of a future perfect in the past although the Futurum I Perfectum may also be used in this function:

- (34) **Å** **ziöet** **do** **har** **wje** **dos** **hon** **gymaht**
 He said that he were this have done
 He said that he would have done this

However, contrary to the Coniunctivum I Perfectum, this construction also introduces real – possible although improbable – events that may precede other future activities, approximating the Futurum I Perfectum:

- (35) **Wen** **yh** **wje** **hon** **ym** **5** **gybaka**
 if I were have at 5 cooked
 If I cooked it by 5 (if it possibly happens that at 5 I will have it cooked)

wje h **myt** **djyr** **gejn**
 were I with you go
 I would go with you

3.12. Progressivum

The Vilamovicean also possesses a progressive periphrastic construction that consists of the predicate *zâjn* ‘be’ and the infinitive of a main verb, e.g. *yhy bej maha* ‘I am doing’. If the auxiliary verb *zâjn* stands in the Praesens, the Progressivum most frequently introduces present (and less commonly future) progressive actions and continuous situations (36.a–b). In case the auxiliary is employed in the Praeteritum, the meaning of the construction corresponds to a progressive or continuous past (36.c):

- (36) a. **Diöt** **ej** **å** **kłop** **kuza**
 there is a man talk
 There is a man talking
- b. **Diöt** **ej** **å** **głoz** **štejn**
 there is a glass stay
 A glass is standing there
- c. **Wün** **zy** **zyca** **ån** **fercyła**
 were they sit and narrate
 They were sitting and narrating

3.13. Resultativa

The Vilamovicean language is quite rich in resultative expressions that are very frequent in colloquial usage. It is possible to distinguish three types of resultativa: formation with *zâjn*, with *wada* and with *blâjn*. All of the resultativa are invariably de-transitive: they are typically derived from transitive verbs (e.g. *maha* ‘do’) but offer an intransitive patientive value (*har ej gymaht* ‘he is done’, *wjyd gymaht* ‘he will be done’ or *blâjt gymaht* ‘he is/remains done’).²⁹

3.13.1. *Zâjn* Resultativum

The *zâjn* Resultativum formally equals the *zâjn* passive (cf. Andrason 2011a). It employs the auxiliary verb *zâjn* ‘be’ in the present tense and the past participle of a main verb. Most commonly, this construction functions as a resultative stative: it introduces a present static situation viewed as resulting from a previously performed action (such as the English expression *is done*; 37.a). However, it may likewise function as a passive present perfect: it denotes dynamic anterior events currently relevant for the present state of affairs (such as the English form *has been done*; 37.b). The dynamic perfect sense is particularly visible in examples where the gram functions as an inclusive perfect passive (37.c):

- (37) a. Dos hoüz ej eta **gyboüt**
 the house is now built
 Now, the house is built (i.e. it stands as built)
- b. Der **kłop** ej **derślön**
 the man is killed
 The man has been killed
- c. Dos hoüz ej śun **gyboüt** diöh fir jür
 the house is already built through four years
 The house has been being built for four years

Furthermore, the *zâjn* Resultativum may also express definite past actions, either immediate/recent or remote:

- (38) Dy śtuw ej con jür y dom **gymöft**
 the room is ten years ago painted
 The room was painted ten years ago

²⁹ In this survey, only resultative constructions with introductory verbs in the Praesens will be discussed.

3.13.2. *Wada* Resultativum

The *wada* Resultativum is based on the auxiliary *wada* ‘be, become’ inflected in the Praesens. Contrary to the *zâjn* Resultativum, this periphrasis typically introduces future resultative situations. This stems from the fact that when the verb *wada* is employed in the Praesens, it regularly denotes future events (cf. Andrason 2011a).³⁰ By doing so, the verb *wada* (and hence the resultative periphrasis built on it) behaves like the Icelandic predicate *verða* ‘become, will be’ (compare *har wjyd ym hoüs* in Vilamovicean with *Hann verður heima* ‘He will be at home’ in Icelandic).

- (39) a. Fir drāj jür **wjyd** dy štrös **gyboüt**
 for three year becomes the street built
 The street will be built in three years
- b. Wymysiöejer špröh **wjyd** nymer ny **fergasa**
 Vilamovicean language becomes never not forgotten
 The Vilamovicean language will never be forgotten
- c. MÜN **wjyd** dy hyt **gymölt**
 tomorrow becomes the wall painted
 Tomorrow, the wall will be painted

3.13.3. *Blâjn* Resultativum

The third type of Resultativa is a periphrasis, built from the verb *blâjn* ‘remain, be’. In cases where this auxiliary stands in the Praesens, the construction regularly provides resultative stative values with no dynamic (present perfect) interpretations. Furthermore, it should be noted that, in contrast with the *zâjn* Resultativum, the *blâjt* locution fails to provide past (either dynamic or static) senses.

- (40) Dos hoüz **blâjt** šun **gyboüt**
 the house remains already built
 The house is already built (i.e. it stands ready)

3.14. “Subiunctiva”

Finally, when presenting the semantic potential of the components of the Vilamovicean verbal system, a few words should be dedicated to how a subjunctive sense is expressed in the language.³¹ The function of a subjunctive in subordinated opta-

³⁰ One should observe that the 3rd person forms of *wada* in the Resultativum (as well as in the passive voice) is *wjyd* (singular) and *wada* (plural) instead of *wyt* and *wan* that are used in cases where the verb *wada* functions as the auxiliary in the Futurum I (cf. *wyt maha* ‘he will do’ or *wyt gymaht zâjn/wada* ‘will be(come) done’).

³¹ Thus, in this section, a different technique is adopted than in sections 3.1-13, above. Instead of describing the semantic potential (variety of senses) of a given construction, various means of conveying a given value are presented.

tive, final or purpose clauses is in Vilamovicean typically fulfilled by the Praesens (41.a–b) or Futurum I (41.c–d). If the wish or goal refers to an immediate or anterior future activity (an event that should be accomplished by a given time), the Perfectum (41.e–f) or Futurum Perfectum is employed (41.g–h):

- (41) a. Yh wył do dy dos **mahst**
 I want that you this do
 I want you to do this (lit. that you do it)
- b. Yh wył do dy **kymst**
 I want that you come
 I want you to come (lit. that you come)
- c. Yh wył do dy dos **wyst maha**
 I want that you this will do
 I want you to do this (lit. that you will do it)
- d. Yh wył do dy **wyst kuma**
 I want that you will come
 I want you to come (lit. that you will come)
- e. Yh wył do dy dos **höst gymaht** ym 5
 I want that you this have done at 5
 I want you to have done it at 5 (lit. that you have done it at 5)
- f. Yh wył do dy **byst kuma** ym 5
 I want that you are come at 5
 I want you to have come at 5 (lit. that you have come)
- g. Yh wył do dy dos **wyst hon gymaht** ym 5
 I want that you this will have done at 5
 I want you to have done it at 5 (lit. that you will have done it at 5)
- h. Yh wył do dy **wyst zâjn kuma** ym 5
 I want that you will be come at 5
 I want you to have come at 5 (lit. that you will have come)

Various nuances of the subjunctive value (purpose, goal, wish after certain verbs, obligation, probability, etc.) are also commonly introduced by the infinitive of a meaning verb headed by a lexically modal verb in the Praesens or in the Coniunctivus I:

- (42) a. Der dökter ziöet do'h **mü rün**
 the doctor said that-I must rest
 The doctor told me to rest (lit. said that I should rest)

- b. Der dökter ziöet do'h **zo** **kuma**
 the doctor said that-I shall come
 The doctor told me to come (that I should come)
- c. Der dökter ziöet do'h **djyft** **kuma**
 the doctor said that-I should come
 The doctor asked me to come (said that I should come)

In this respect, one should also note that after verbs that introduce reported speech, the Futurum I and Futurum Perfectum (with *wada*) fail to offer a purposive or final sense:

- (43) Der dökter ziöet do'h **wa** **kuma**
 the doctor said that-I will come
 The doctor said that I would come

4. Interim conclusion

The present paper – which constitutes the first part of a series of two articles dedicated to the analysis of the Vilamovicean verbal system – provided a detailed description of the semantic potential of all the grams, both synthetic and analytic, that belong to the verbal organisation of the Vilamovicean language. To be exact, we enumerated all the senses (temporal, aspectual, taxis or modal) that the fifteen Vilamovicean verbal constructions may convey. As explained previously, this empirical and descriptive study constitutes a necessary step in developing a cognitive model of the semantics of a gram and, subsequently, of the entire verbal system. In the second paper of the series (“The semantics of the Vilamovicean verbal system [Part 2: Explanation and modeling]”), which will appear in next issue of *Studia Linguistica Universitatis Jagellonicae Cracoviensis*, the evidence presented in this article will enable us to develop a more systematic and synthetic analysis, and ultimately a holistic representation of the Vilamovicean verbal organisation.

References

- Andrason A. 2010a. Vilamovicean verbal system – Do the Preterite and the Perfect mean the same? – *Linguistica Copernicana* 3: 371–285.
- Andrason A. 2010b. Expressions of futurity in the Vilamovicean language. – *SPIL PLUS* 40: 1–11.
- Andrason A. 2011a. Vilamovicean passive. – *Linguistica Copernicana* 5: 221–242.
- Andrason A. 2011b. The BH *weqatal*. A homogenous form with no haphazard functions. Part 1. – *Journal of Northwest Semitic Languages* 37.2: 1–25.
- Andrason A. 2012. Cognitive foundations of the Old Babylonian *iparras*. – *Journal of Semitic Studies* 57.1: 1–24.

- Andrason A. 2013a. Future values of the *qatal* are “logical” – How to chain future senses of the *qatal* to the core of its semantic network? – *Hebrew Studies* 54: 261–292.
- Andrason A. 2013b. Against floccinaucinihilipilification of the counterfactual sense of the BH suffix conjugation – or an explanation of why the “indicative” *qatal* expresses conditions, hypotheses and wishes. – *Old Testament Essays* 26.1: 20–56.
- Andrason A. (forthcoming). A non-unidirectional movement in the verbal system? – *International Journal of Basque Linguistics*.
- Bertinetto P. M., Lenci A. 2010. Iterativity vs. habituality (and gnomic imperfectivity). – *Quaderni del Laboratorio di Linguistica* 9.1: 1–46.
- Bittner M. 2008. Aspectual universals of temporal anaphora. – Rothstein S. (ed.). *Theoretical and crosslinguistic approaches to the semantics of aspect*. Amsterdam: 349–386.
- Boneh N., Doron E. 2008. Habituality and the habitual aspect. – Rothstein S. (ed.). *Theoretical and crosslinguistic approaches to the semantics of aspect*. Amsterdam: 321–348.
- Boneh N., Doron E. 2010. Modal and temporal aspects of habituality. – Rappaport-Hovav M., Doron E., Sichel I. (eds.). *Lexical semantics, syntax, and event structure*. Oxford: 338–363.
- Bybee J. 2010. *Language, usage and cognition*. Cambridge.
- Bybee J., Perkins R., Pagliuca W. 1994. *The evolution of grammar*. Chicago.
- Carlson G. 1977. *Reference to kinds in English*. [Ph.D. dissertation, University of Massachusetts], Amherst.
- Comrie B. 1976. *Aspect*. Cambridge.
- Comrie B. 1985. *Tense*. Cambridge.
- Couper-Kuhlen E., Selting M. 2001. Introducing interactional linguistics. – Selting M., Couper-Kuhlen E. (eds.). *Studies in interactional linguistics*. Amsterdam: 1–22.
- Croft W., Cruse A. 2004. *Cognitive linguistics*. Cambridge.
- Dahl Ö. 1975. On generics. – Keenan E. (ed.). *Formal semantics of natural languages*. Cambridge: 99–112.
- Dahl Ö. 1985. *Tense and aspect systems*. Oxford.
- Dahl Ö. 2000a. The tense and aspect systems of European languages in a typological perspective. – Dahl Ö. (ed.). *Tense and aspect in the languages of Europe*. Berlin, New York: 3–25.
- Dahl Ö. (ed.). 2000b. *Tense and aspect in the languages of Europe*. Berlin, New York.
- Danaher D. 2001. Czech habitual verbs and conceptual distancing. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 9: 5–28.
- Evans V., Green M. 2006. *Cognitive linguistics: An introduction*. Edinburgh.
- Fischer O. 2007. *Morphosyntactic change*. Oxford.
- Fleischman S. 1995. Imperfective and irrealis. – Bybee J., Fleischman S. (eds.). *Modality in grammar and discourse*. Amsterdam: 519–551.
- Harbert W. 2007. *The Germanic languages*. Cambridge.
- Harris M. 1982. The ‘Past Simple’ and the ‘Resent Perfect’ in Romance. – Vincent N., Harris M. (eds.). *Studies in the Romance verb*. London: 42–70.
- Haspelmath M. 1998. The semantic development of old presents: New futures and subjunctives without grammaticalization. *Diachronica* 15.1: 29–62.
- Heine B., Claudi U., Hünnemeyer F. 1991. *Grammaticalization. A conceptual framework*. Chicago.
- Heine B., Kuteva T. 2007. *The genesis of grammar: A reconstruction*. Oxford.
- Helasvuo M-L. 2009. Emergent grammar. – Brisard F., Östman J-O., Verschuieren J. (eds.). *Grammar, meaning and pragmatics*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: 66–73.
- Hellenthal A-C. 2007. Modality properties of sentence type markers in Sheko. – Hendriks P., Rau F., Soucková K., van der Wal J. (eds.). *Leiden Papers in Linguistics* 4.2: 17–32.

- Holm J. 1988. *Pidgins and creoles. Theory and structure*. Cambridge.
- Hopper P., Traugott E. 2003. *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge.
- Howe S. 1996. *The personal pronouns in the Germanic languages*. Berlin.
- Jónsson, J.G. 1992. The two perfects of Icelandic. *Íslenskt mál* 14: 129–145.
- Kleczkowski A. 1920. *Dialekt Wilamowic w zachodniej Galicji. Fonetyka i fleksja*. Kraków.
- Kleczkowski A. 1921. *Dialekt Wilamowic w zachodniej Galicji. Składnia i szyk wyrazów*. Poznań.
- Langacker R. 1997. Generics and habitual. – Athanasiadou A., Dirven R. (eds.). *On conditionals again*. Amsterdam: 191–222.
- Lasatowicz M. 1992. *Die deutsche Mundart von Wilamowice zwischen 1920 und 1987*. Opole.
- Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk B. 2007. Polysemy, prototypes, and radical categories. – Geeraerts D., Cuyckens H. (eds.). *Handbook of cognitive linguistics*. Oxford: 139–169.
- Lewis P. (ed.). 2009. *Ethnologue: Languages of the world*. [16th ed.]. Dallas.
- Lindstedt J. 2000. The perfect – aspectual, temporal and evidential. – Dahl Ö. (ed.). *Tense and aspect in the languages of Europe*. Berlin, New York: 365–388.
- Marchese L. 1986. *Tense/aspect and the development of auxiliaries in the Kru language family*. Arlington.
- McCawley J. 1971. Tense and time reference in English. – Fillmore Ch., Langendoen T. (eds.). *Studies in linguistics and semantics*. New York: 96–113.
- Mitkovska L., Bužarovska E. 2008. On the use of the *habere*-perfect in journalistic and administrative style. – Topolińska Z., Bužarovska E. (eds.). *Language typology and universals*. Berlin: 128–138.
- Młynek L. 1907. *Narzędzie wilamowickie*. Tarnów.
- Mojmir H. 1930–1936. *Wörterbuch der deutschen Mundart von Wilamowice*. Kraków.
- Morciniec N. 1984. Die flämische Ostkolonisation und der Dialekt von Wilamowice in Südpolen. *Slavica Gandensia* 11: 7–18.
- Nedjalkov V. (ed.). 1988. *Typology of resultative constructions*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia.
- Nikiforidou K. 2009. Constructional analysis. – Brisard F., Östman J.-O., Verschueren J. (eds.). *Grammar, meaning and pragmatics*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: 16–32.
- Palmer F.R. 2001. *Mood and modality*. Cambridge.
- Ritchie C. 2012. *Some considerations on the origins of Wymysorys*. [BA thesis, University of Sydney]. Sydney.
- Ryckeboer H. 1984. Die “Flamen” von Wilamowice. Versuch zur Deutung einer Bäuerlichen Überlieferung. – *Slavica Gandensia* 11: 19–34.
- Squartini M., Bertinetto P. M. 2000. The simple and compound past in Romance languages. – Dahl Ö. (ed.). *Tense and aspect in the languages of Europe*. Berlin, New York: 385–402.
- Tyler A., Evans V. 2003. *The semantics of English prepositions: Spatial scenes, embodied meaning, and cognition*. Cambridge.
- Van der Auwera J., Gast V. 2011. Categories and prototypes. – Song J.J. (ed.). *The Oxford handbook of typology*. Oxford: 166–189.
- Wicherkiewicz T. 2003. *The making of a language*. Berlin, New York.