

Subjunctive complementizers in Polish

Barbara Tomaszewicz (Universität Frankfurt am Main/Wrocław University)

Since early generative accounts it has been postulated that *żeby*, is a complex complementizer (some more recent analyses are Borsley & Rivero, 1994; Szczegielniak, 1999; Bondaruk, 2004) but no satisfactory solution has been proposed as to the nature of the particle *by* until the analysis of Migdalski, 2006. *By* is usually called a mood particle because it is a hallmark of the so-called conditional mood in many Slavic languages (*by* or *bi*). When immediately after a complementizer, it is assumed to introduce the subjunctive mood, in contrast to the conditional where it does not necessarily have to appear in a designated position (cf. contrasts in 2 & 3). Migdalski, 2006 shows that it is the same *by* element in both cases that originates in Mood⁰ immediately below T⁰, which hosts past auxiliary clitics. In conditional *by* left-adjoins to the auxiliary in T⁰, in subjunctive the *by*+auxiliary complex moves higher attracted by a modal feature in the functional head of ModP above TP. However, Migdalski, 2006 does not explain why the *l*-participle (the form of the lexical verb in conditional and subjunctive moods, as well as past and future II tenses) which originates in VP and can adjoin to the *by*+auxiliary complex in T in conditional, cannot be raised to Mod⁰ within the complex in subjunctive.

I would like to propose that the striking property of the subjunctive mood follows from the Clause Typing Hypothesis (Cheng, 1991, Koster, 2003, Moscati, 2006). The hypothesis basically assumes that there are formal means in grammar that indicate the semantic status of all clauses. Following Moscati, 2006, I suggest that an appropriate valued and interpretable typing feature is inserted in the root of a clause which results in the movement of *by*+auxiliary. The feature can be specified in terms of an exclusion function as in Iatridou, 2000 or non-veridicality as in Giannakidou, 2007. Why then there is no movement of *by* in conditional? My analysis of the subjunctive/conditional asymmetry in Polish will show that, in fact, there is no opposition between conditional and indicative mood, which is in line with the conclusion in Iatridou, 2000, that there is “no such a thing as a separate conditional mood”.

My account also predicts that the adjacency of *że* (that) and *by* in subjunctive is to be expected and follows a cross-linguistic pattern observed in Iatridou, 2000. Counterfactual conditionals and counterfactual wishes seem to use the same morphology in complimentary distribution. The morphology on the counterfactual antecedent M1 (Past/Imperf) is the same as the morphology on the complement to the verb of wishing. The morphology of the consequent M2 (Fut+Past) is the same as as the morphology of the verb expressing a wish (1). What follows is that the Polish hypothetical “if”, *gdyby*, is also a complex complementizer – *gdy* “when” + *by*, which means it is in an instance of subjunctive mood (2).

- (1) (a) If M1 then M2
 (b) want-M2 that M1
- (2) (a) *Gdybyś wyszedł(M1) wcześniej, nie spóźniłbyś się(M2).*
 ‘If you had left earlier, you wouldn’t be late.’
 (b) *Chciałbym(M2), żebyś się nie spóźnił(M1).*
 ‘I’d like you not be late.’

Selected references

- Bondaruk, A. 2004. *PRO and Control in English, Irish and Polish. A Minimalist Analysis*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL
- Borsley, R. and M.L. Rivero. 1994. Clitic Auxiliaries and Incorporation in Polish. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 12:373-422.
- Cheng, L. 1991. On the Typology of Wh-questions. Cambridge, Mass.: PhD Dissertation MIT.

- Migdalski, K. 2005. *The Syntax of Compound Tenses in Slavic*. Utrecht: LOT
- Moscato, V. 2006, The Scope of Negation, semanticsarchive.net.
- Koster, J. 2003. All Languages are Tense Second. In: Jan Koster and Henk van Riemsdijk, eds., *Germania et Alia: A Linguistic Webschrift for Hans den Besten*.
- Szczegielniak, A. 1997. 'That-t effects' cross-linguistically and successive cyclic movement. In *MIT working papers in linguistics*, vol. 33. ed. Arregi et al. 369-393. MIT.