

Control in non-finite Polish complements

The presentation will apply a semantically motivated definition of control, as defined by Stiebels et al. (2003). This understanding of control focuses on the obligatory referential dependency between the participants of the states of affairs denoted by the matrix and complement clauses. Approaching control from the semantic perspective allows to extend the range of control relations and types of complement clauses under analysis.

I will argue in favor of assuming control in two types on non-finite complements in Polish. The case of different types of control in Polish infinitives is well documented, cf. (1) and (2). Control in nominalized complements, as demonstrated in (3) and (4), has however remained largely neglected. Apart from sporadic comments in Puzynina (1969:94,99), Rothstein (1974), Zabrocki (1981:70), Dziwirek (2000:Fn.9) and Kardela (2000) no claims for control in nominalized complements have been made.

In the course of the presentation I will show that infinitival and nominalized complements allow for similar kinds of control relations and behave similarly in contexts in which control shift can be observed in other languages.

The data suggests that the morphological processes involved in the formation of the respective forms involve argument inheritance, what is consistent with current analysis of Polish nominalizations. The issue of control turns out to be guided by the properties of the matrix verb. Matrix verbs differ however as to whether they exhibit control in both or in only one type of sentential complement. Lacking a more motivated explanation at the moment, this can be thought of as an idiosyncratic property of control verbs.

Finally, adopting a lexicalist approach, I will attempt to provide a first draft for lexical entries of the morphemes involved in the formation of infinitive and nominalized forms as well as for the selecting control verbs.

- (1) Jan_i nie znosi [_i chodzić do szkoły].
 Jan NEG stand.PRS.3SG go.INF to school.GEN
 ‘Jan hates to go to school.’
- (2) Jan_i odzwyczaił swojego psa_j [_i jeść ze stołu].
 Jan accustom.not.LPART.3SG his dog.ACC eat.INF from table.GEN
 lit: ‘Jan accustomed his dog not to eat from the table.’
 int: ‘Jan broke his dog’s habit of eating from the table.’
- (3) Rząd_i Polski zupełnie zaprzestał [_i finansowania
 government polish.GEN completely stop.LPART.MAS.3SG finance.NOML.GEN
 tych badań].
 those research.GEN
 ‘Polish government stopped completely to finance this research.’
- (4) Sytuacja_i zmusi ich_j do [_i podjęcia radykalnych
 situation force.NPST.3SG them to undertake.NOML.GEN radical
 rozwiązań].
 solutions.GEN
 ‘The situation will force them to undertake radical solutions.’

References

- Dziwirek, Katarzyna. 2000. Why Polish doesn’t like infinitives. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 8:57–82.
- Kardela, Henryk. 2000. *Dimensions and Parameters in Grammar. Studies on A/D Asymmetries and Subjectivity Relations in Polish*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Słodowskiej.
- Puzynina, Jadwiga. 1969. *Nazwy czynności we współczesnym języku polskim (słowotwórstwo, semantyka, składnia)*. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwa Naukowe.
- Rothstein, Robert A. 1974. Relevancy marking in Polish complements. In *Slavic transformational syntax*, ed. R.D. Brecht and C.J. Chvany, 54–65. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan.
- Stiebels, Barbara, Szymon Słodowicz, and Yi-Chun Yang. 2003. Questionnaire for control verbs. <http://www.zas.gwz-berlin.de/mitarb/homepage/stiebels>.
- Zabrocki, Tadeusz. 1981. *Lexical rules of semantic interpretation*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu im. A. Mickiewicza.