

Subjunctive mood in Polish and the Clause Typing Hypothesis

1. INTRODUCTION – THE POLISH DATA

Polish grammar books (e.g. Bąk, 1999) provide lists of so-called subordinating conjunctions such as *żeby*, *izby*, *ażeby*, *aby*, *by*, *coby* (all standardly translated as 'in order to', 'so that' – stylistic difference), *gdyby* ('if' as in "If I were..."), *choćby*, *choćażby*, ('even if'), but they fail to mention that (nor explain why) the verbal inflection, instead of on the verb, has to occur on such conjunctions, and that it has to be past morphology.

In (1) *żeby* introduces a complement to a volitional verb 'want' (incompatible with *że* 'that'). (2, 3, 4) show that no other tense/mood verbal form is possible.

- (1) Chce, *żebyś* (ty) pożyczył mu książkę. 'He wants you to lend him a book'
 want.3Sg *żeby*.2Sg you lend.Prt him book Lit. 'He wants that you lend...'
- (2) a) *Chce, *żeby/że* (ty) pożyczysz mu książkę. --> PRESENT PERFECT (= FUTURE)
 want.3Sg *żeby/that* you lend.2Sg.Pres. him book
- b) Mówi, że (ty) pożyczysz mu książkę. 'He says that you will lend him a book'
 say.3Sg that you lend.2Sg.Pres. him book (--> INDICATIVE)
- (3) a) *Chce, *żeby/że* (ty) pożyczyleś mu książkę. --> PAST (--> INDICATIVE)
 want.3Sg *żeby/that* you lend.Prt+Aux.2Sg him book
- b) Mówi, że (ty) pożyczyleś mu książkę. 'He says that you lent him a book'
 say.3Sg that you lend.Prt+Aux.2Sg him book
- c) Mówi, żeś (ty) pożyczyl mu książkę. (colloquial/dialectal variation / focus)
 say.3Sg that+Aux.2Sg you lend.Prt him book
- (4) a) *Chce, *żeby/że* (ty) pożyczylbyś mu książkę. --> 'CONDITIONAL' MOOD
 want.3Sg *żeby/that* you lend.Prt .BY.2Sg him book
- b) Mówi, że (ty) pożyczylbyś mu książkę. 'He says that you would lend him a book'
 say.3Sg that you lend.Prt+BY+Aux.2Sg him book
- c) Mówi, że (ty) BYŚ pożyczyl mu książkę. 'He says that you WOULD lend him a book'
 say.3Sg that you BY+Aux.2Sg lend.Prt him book

Since *żeby* is incompatible with the so-called conditional mood (cf. 4) whose form consists in the participle + *by* + (affixal) auxiliaries, we can suspect that it is the same "by element".

Crucially: no other complementizer in Polish requires affixation of verbal inflection. The case in (3c) is 'accidental' – generally, the past auxiliary can optionally be affixed to any clause initial element (5).

- (5) Tyś pożyczyl mu książkę?! 'You have lent him a book?!'
 you+Aux.2Sg lend.Prt him book old-fashioned

Interestingly, the fronting of *by+aux* in *żeby* clauses does not introduce any special effect, like focus (cf. 3c' & 5) so it should not have anything to do with the phenomenon observed in 16th. c. Polish (6), although it has been claimed to be related (Bański, 2000). What is more, already in Old Church Slavonic some complementizers seemed to somehow attract *by'* (7).

- (6) a) *Tedym JA owszeki stracił_{em} miasto* 'Then I irretrievably lost the city'
 then+Aux.1Sg I irretrievably lose.Prt+Aux.1Sg city (Decaux 1955: 34; from Bański 2000: 125)
- b) *Iżęś TY pobięś wszystkie sprzeciwiające się mnie*
 that+Aux.2Sg you beat.Prt+Aux.2Sg all opposing REFL me
 'That you defeated all those who opposed me'
- (7) a) *... da byxŭ pokajaľŭ sę kŭ bogu.* '[...wanted] that I repent before God.'
 that BY.Aux.2Sg repent.Prt self to God (Suprasliensis 167.2, from Willis 2000: 333)
- b) *A by był_ę prorokъ.* 'If he was a prophet.'
 if BY.Aux.3Sg² was.Prt prophet (Vaillant 1977: 219, from Migdalski 2006: 160)

2. CONDITIONAL AND SUBJUNCTIVE MOODS IN POLISH

BY is usually called a **mood particle** because it is a hallmark of the so-called “conditional” and “subjunctive” moods in many Slavic languages (*by* or *bi*).

When *by* is immediately after a complementizer it is assumed to introduce the **subjunctive mood**³, in contrast to the **conditional** where it does not necessarily have to appear in a designated position (cf. contrasts in 8 & 9), although the default is PRT-*by*-AUX (9b).

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>(8) a) <i>Chcę, żebyś (ty) to zrobił.</i>
 I want <i>że+by</i>SUB+Aux.2Sg (you) it doPRT
 'I want you to do it'
 'I want that you do it'</p> <p>b)*<i>Chcę, że (ty) zrobiłbyś to.</i>
 I want <i>że</i> (you) do+<i>by</i>COND+Aux.2Sg it</p> <p>c)*<i>Chcę, że to byś zrobił.</i></p> | <p>(9) a) <i>Nie sędzę, żebyś (ty) to zrobił.</i>
 I don't think <i>że+by</i>SUB+Aux.2Sg (you) it doPRT
 'I don't think that you would do it'</p> <p>b) <i>Nie sędzę, że (ty) zrobiłbyś to.</i>
 I don't think <i>że</i> (you) do+<i>by</i>COND+Aux.2Sg it</p> <p>c) <i>Nie sędzę, że TO byś zrobił.</i></p> <p>d) <i>Nie sędzę, że BYŚ to zrobił.</i></p> |
|---|--|

↓

Complements to e.g. volitional verbs are required to be in subjunctive.

↓

Sometimes, subjunctive seems to be interchangeable with conditional.

Since early generative accounts it has been postulated that *żeby*, is a complex complementizer, but no satisfactory solution has been proposed as to the nature of the particle *BY*. E.g. Bondaruk, 2004, concludes on the basis of examples like (8a) and (9b and d) that there are two different kinds *żeby*, one complex and one inseparable, where *by* has different roles, which she calls “conditional” and “subjunctive”, but does not explain what those labels mean. Bondaruk has to assume that the inseparable *żeby* which appears with past verbal inflectional morphology is a sort of inflecting complementizer.

1 Rather BY based auxiliary.

2 Notice that 3 Per. Sg. has a null ending.

3 eg. Czech and Slovak *aby*, Russian *чтобы*. There are different strategies in South Slavic languages.

I believe that (9a and 9b, c, d) cannot be always used interchangeably. All examples in (9) refer to a hypothetical situation, BUT only (9a) can refer to a situation that presumably has already happened, i.e. 'I don't think that you did it' (whereas (9 b, c, d) rather express potential). This seems to be an instance of polarity subjunctive – as in e.g. Romance languages, the speaker stresses his doubt using subjunctive instead of a that-clause.

Migdalski, 2006 is the first to show that it is the same *by* element in both cases. Moreover, he shows that the “**conditional**” is composed of *by* + **past tense auxiliary clitics**, which is not surprising, though, if we look at the paradigms in (10):

(10)

	(a) Conditional auxiliaries:		(b) Past auxiliary affixes:	
	SG	PL	SG	PL
1	by-m	by-śmy	1	-(e)m
2	by-ś	by-ście	2	-(e)ś
3	by	by	3	-

By, which originates in Mood₀ immediately below T₀ hosting auxiliary clitics, may target two different syntactic positions, depending on its semantics.

(11) [CP [ModP *by*_{SUBJ} [TP [MoodP *by*_{COND}]]]] (97) in Migdalski, 2006: 240

In conditional *by* left-adjoins to the auxiliary in T₀ (12b), in subjunctive the *by*+auxiliary complex moves higher attracted by a modal feature in the functional head of ModP above TP (12c).

- (12) a) [CP *że* [ModP [TP *Auxiliaries* [MoodP *by* (COND) [VP *Participle*]]]]]
* *że-ś by zrobił*
- b) [CP *że* [ModP [TP *by*_i (COND)+*Aux* [MoodP t_i [VP *Participle*]]]]]
że by-ś zrobił
- c) [CP *że* [ModP *by*_i (SUBJ)+*Aux*_j [TP <t_i+t_j> [MoodP t_i [VP *Participle*]]]]]
że-by-ś zrobił
- d) [CP *że* [ModP [TP *Part*_k+*by*_i (COND)+*Aux* [MoodP t_i [VP t_k]]]]]
że zrobił-by-ś
- e) [CP *że* [ModP *Part*_k+*by*_i (SUBJ)+*Aux*_j [TP <t_k+t_i+t_j> [MoodP t_i [VP t_k]]]]]
* (chce) *że-zrobił-by-ś*

However, there is a problem concerning the l-participle. In his structure the default position of the participle is inside the VP (The subject and the l-participle phrase are in a Small Clause configuration – overtly manifested through gender agreement on the l-participle.⁴) It optionally moves as a head and incorporates into the auxiliary in T (12d). But the the default order is PRT-*by*-

4 Cf. Romance languages where there is agreement only in unaccusative and passive structures, (unergatives take the 'to have' auxiliary). Migdalski postulates a different syntactic composition of compound tenses in Slavic vs Germanic and Romance:

...[be [vp DPagent v [VP/PartP VPART DPtheme]]]	Slavic
...[vp DPagent v [VP have [VP VPART DPtheme]]]	Romance and Germanic

Only 'have' is able to introduce an agent and assign accusative case. 'Be' is an unaccusative auxiliary. Instead the l-participle introduces the external argument and assigns accusative.

AUX. AND why cannot the participle be raised to ModP within the *by*+Aux complex (12e) if it is the element *by* that expresses modality and the whole word *zrobilby* is modal (= *he would do*)? Plus we still have no clue, though, why *by* has to raise only in some cases. What kind of semantics do the two different positions of *by* encode if *by* itself is an irrealis/counterfactual morpheme?

3. ŻEBY IN CROSSLINGUISTIC PERSPECTIVE

Subjunctive vs Conditional opposition in **Polish** reflects the **crosslinguistic generalization** proposed by **Iatridou, 2000**:

- (13) **If M1 then M2**
want-M2 that M1
- (14) O Kostas θa i θ ele (M2) na o δ i γ use (M1) kokino aftokinito.
 Kostas MOD want/PST/IMP PART drive/PST/IMP red car
 'Kostas wishes he drove a red car.'
- (15) An eperne afto (M1) to siropi θa γ inotan (M2) kala.
 if take/PST/IMP this syrup FUT become/PST/IMP well
 'If he took this syrup, he would get better.'

Crosslinguistically 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+PST) is the same as as the morphology of the verb expressing a wish.⁵

Crosslinguistic generalization (Iatridou, 2000, p.242):

"If M1 is subjunctive in a conditional clause than there is also subjunctive in the complement to a verb expressing a wish."⁶ \leftrightarrow If a language uses subjunctive M1 in complements to the verbs of wishing (16a) then it also uses M1 in the antecedent of a counterfactual conditional (16b).

It is can't be a coincidence then that Polish hypothetical 'if' (16b) contains the same counterfactual particle! (cf. the OCS example (7b))

- (16) (a) Chciał**by**m(M2), **żeby**ś (M1) się nie spóźnił.
 want.Prt+BY+Aux.2Sg żeby+Aux.2Sg self not late.Prt
 'I'd like you not to be late.'
- (b) Gdy**by**ś (M1) wyszedł wcześniej, nie spóźnił**by**ś(M2) się.
 when+BY+Aux.2Sg leave.Prt earlier, not late.Prt+BY+Aux.2.Sg self
 'If you had left earlier, you wouldn't be late.'

However, in Polish it is **not the actual morphemes** that distinguish between M1 and M2 (in both cases there is the *by* particle, an l-participle and an auxiliary), **but their ordering** with respect to the verb and the complementizer.

4. OTHER CASES OF SUBJUNCTIVE IN POLISH

It cannot be a mere coincidence that *by* appears in *żeby* (and its variants) in complements to volitional predicates⁷, in *gdyby* and in (at least) two other cases.

5 Not seen in English - a lexicalized item *wish* instead of something like 'would want'.

6 Also seen in the English register that contains subjunctive *were*: *If he were here, . . .* and *I wish he were here*)

7 And also to other verbs, such as *desideratives*, and adjunct purpose clauses.

I. The so called “optative mood” expressing wishes without the matrix verb (*oby*), which is reminiscent of the archaic English conditional inversion (i.e. M1) in wishes:

- (17) a) Would that he were my president.
b) *Would that John is here.

- (18) Oby nie padało!
o+BY not rain.Prt
'I wish it wouldn't rain!' / 'Let's wish it wouldn't rain!'

II. The special (clause initial) interrogative particle *czyżby*, translatable as “really? / indeed?” (cf. the neutral interrogative particle *czy*, also clause initial, that has no additional meaning component) can be said to express subjunctive mood.

- | | | |
|------|------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| (19) | a) Czyżby padało? | b) Czy pada? |
| | 'whether'+BY rain.Prt | 'whether' rains.3Sg.Pres |
| | 'Does it seem like it's raining?!' | 'Is it raining?' |

5. WHAT IS SUBJUNCTIVE?

So far we have established that **it is the fronting of the counterfactual particle *by* that expresses subjunctive**, and not the complementizers themselves (*o* is not a complementizer). Now, the question is: What is subjunctive? What does it mean in all those Polish cases (16, 18, 19)? What meaning is associated with morphology **M1**???

- **Iatridou, 2000**, observes that crosslinguistically M1 is most often PST:

- (20) “past tense morpheme” = **exclusion morpheme** expressing exclusion feature (*ExclF*)

- when it ranges over times, we get past tense, i.e. the topic time (the topic that we are talking about) excludes the utterance time.
- when it ranges over worlds, we get conditionals and wishes, i.e. the topic worlds exclude the actual world, (i.e. **fake past** - past tense morphology does not receive a past interpretation - an unfulfilled desire about the present)

Therefore, Iatridou claims that it is “the past tense morphology that appears in MG and so many other languages in CFs is the main element responsible for the meaning of counterfactuality.”

If Pst = counterfactual, what is the additional feature that *by* expresses?

Iatridou argues: “**there is no longer evidence that there is such a thing as a separate conditional mood**”. “There is no need to look for the contribution of a conditional mood” – [In Romance subjunctive] we have all the elements we need anyway, or at least all the elements we found in MG and English – future and past morphology. This seems to be right for Polish as well, because conditional is not a distinct paradigm (it is “composed” of *by*, 1-participle and past tense auxiliary clitics) while imperative is. Additionally, *by* is historically related to the verb *być* (*to be*), just as the modern future auxiliary *będzie* (perfective *to be*) is.

However, we find the same *by* in Polish subjunctive which in Iatridou's survey is expressed mainly through past and imperfective morphology. Iatridou, 2000, proposes: “The answer may be simple: in certain languages the **subjunctive** appears when the proposition talked about is marked by something as **not true** in the set of worlds that as far as the speaker knows is the actual world.”

This seems to be true for the Polish polarity subjunctive (cf.9 and 21 below), but not so much for e.g. subjunctive complements to volitional verbs... or, maybe, we could analyze them as “**not yet true**”?!

- (21) a) Nie s \acute{a} dzę, żeby był trzeźwy, gdyby/jeśli tyle wypił.
I don't think SubjC.by.3Sg be sober if / since so much drank
I don't think he was/is/would be sober, if/since he had drunk so much.
- b) Nie s \acute{a} dzę, że byłby trzeźwy, gdyby/*jeśli tyle wypił.
I don't think that be.by.3Sg sober if / since so much drank
I don't think he would be/*was sober, if/*since he drank so much.
- c) Nie s \acute{a} dzę, że był trzeźwy, *gdyby/jeśli tyle wypił.
I don't think that he was sober if / since so much drank
I don't think he was/*would be sober, *if/since he drank so much.

The predicate “I don't think” allows both subjunctive and conditional but the interpretation is different. The conditional does not allow the readings that subjunctive allows: a factual past tense reading, i.e. what has occurred, and, more interestingly, a present tense reading “I don't think he is sober (now) since..”

However, the morphological make-up of **both subjunctive and conditional in Polish consists in exactly the same morphemes** – the crucial difference is syntactic ordering. It seems that distribution of the Polish counterfactual morphology in subjunctive vs conditional has its source in the syntax and cannot be explained purely in terms of the presence of Excl morpheme.

6. PROPERTIES OF *ŻEBY* CLAUSES

Why should the BY+aux complex be **obligatorily adjacent** to the complementizer in subjunctive?

Since, as we have seen, it is not morphological “ingredients” that characterize Polish subjunctive but a special requirement on the structure of the clause, it seems plausible to propose that **by raises for scope reasons** (from scope over the verb to scope over the whole event?) or maybe its source of modality/counterfactuality comes from the “outside” not from *by*...

- **Grohmann, 2000 - Clause typing mechanism** (a modification of Cheng, 1991⁸):

“An abstract (complex operator-like) **feature that goes with each clause type**” sits in the left-peripheral position. It is supposedly “**part of C**”, which expresses “clause-outwards” information.

- (22) [CP [C [CLAUSE-TYPING FEATURE] ... [TP...]]]

An **appropriate element has to move** to check the C-T feature:

- obligatory overt movement when the C-T feature is “strong” (i.e. additionally expresses “clause-inwards information”, e.g. requires special verbal forms), e.g. imperatives and exclamatives.
- non-obligatory movement in declaratives and interrogatives (clause-type can be expressed below CP by checking of other features).

8 “**Clause Typing Hypothesis** (CTH): Every clause needs to be typed. In the case of typing a wh-question, either a wh-particle in C^o is used or else fronting of a wh-word to the Spec of C^o is used, thereby typing a clause through C^o by Spec-head agreement.” (Cheng, 1991: 30)

“Modality of the clause is satisfied by the **modal morpheme in C**, resulting in an **irrealis** reading”

Grohmann, 2000, presents arguments for a phonetically unrealized modal morpheme in Germanic and Romance Infinitival Exclamatives.

(23) Peter kiss Mary?! I will never believe it!

(24) [CP Ø [Modi-C⁰[E]] [ModP SU_j ti [VP t_j V_{inf}OB]]]

Interestingly, an exclamative of this sort is expressed with a *żeby*-clause in Polish! And, unlike English, Polish has an **overt modal morpheme** in such contexts (which probably originates in ModP, since like English (and unlike German) modals it does not have an infinitival verb-like form).

(25) *Żeby* Piotr pocałował Marię?! Nigdy w to nie uwierzę!
żeby +Aux.3Sg Piotr kiss.Prt Maria Never in it not believe.Pres.Perf.1Sg

Moreover, other facts from Polish seem to support (22 a, b) i.e. the proposal that movement for clause typing purposes is not always obligatory:

i) Conditional inversion (I-to-C movement, Iatridou, 1993) in Polish counterfactual conditionals precludes the use of a complementizer (26a vs 26c), which shows that it is the syntactic position of *by*+Aux that is relevant.

- (26) a) *Wzięłoby* dziecko tabletkę, to poczułoby się lepiej.
 take.Prt+BY+Aux.3Sg child pill then would.3Sg feel better
 b) *Gdyby* dziecko wzięło tabletkę, to poczułoby się lepiej.
 when+.BY+Aux.2Sg child take.Prt pill then would.3SG feel better
 c) **Gdy* wzięłoby dziecko tabletkę, to poczułoby się lepiej.

ii) There is an opposition between (27a,b) where *gdy* (*when*) and *by*+Aux have to be adjacent, and (22c,d) where *jeśli* (*if*) attracts *by*+aux optionally. It looks like it is only when a given complementizer has **no counterfactual meaning by itself**, that the *by*+Aux complex has to contribute this meaning component and raise to a high position.

- (27) a) *Wpadnij*, *gdybyś* miał czas. c) *Wpadnij*, *jeśli*byś miał czas.
 Drop in, when+BY+Aux.2Sg have.Prt time Drop in, if+BY+Aux.2Sg have.Prt time
 'Drop in if you have time'
 b) **Wpadnij*, *gdy* miałbyś czas. d) *Wpadnij*, *jeśli* miałbyś czas.
 Drop in, if have..Prt+BY+Aux.2Sg time
 'Drop in if you have time'

Grohmann, 2000, also postulates a **deficient T** in infinitival exclamatives, and, following others, assumes that a deficient T lacks a specifier – this would, in turn, explain why subjects can not precede *by* in subjunctive.

Support for a deficient T come the fact that *żeby*-clauses can also be **infinitival**:

- (28) *Bardzo* chciał, *żeby* już wyjechać.
 very want.Pst.3Sg *żeby* already leave.Inf
 'He really wanted to leave now'

Essentially, the infinitives in *żeby*-clauses most often express (obligatory) **partial control**, i.e. the PRO referent has to include the controller but does not have to be identical to it as in the case of exhaustive control.

- (29) a) Odłożyliśmy (nasz) wyjazd, choć syn_i bardzo chciał, żeby PRO_{i+/*i} już wyjechać.
 postpone.Pst.3Pl. our departure although son very want.Pst.3Sg żeby already leave
 'We postponed our departure although our son really wanted to leave now'
- b) Odłożyliśmy (jego) wyjazd, choć syn_i bardzo chciał PRO_{i/i+} już wyjechać.
 postpone.Pst.3Pl. his departure although son very want.Pst.3Sg already leave
 'We postponed his departure although our son really wanted to leave now'

A hypothesis that **partial control infinitives are somehow tensed** has been often expressed, e.g. Landau, 2000, 2004, 2006 and Bianchi, 2003. They allow a tense mismatch between the matrix and the embedded events. Landau, 2006 specifies the tense of partial control infinitives as irrealis.

Bianchi, 2003 argues that tenseness/finiteness is related to “logophoric anchoring” (i.e. disambiguating reference), i.e. finite indicative clauses are directly anchored to the speech event (=external logophoric center), while infinitival (partial) control clauses are anchored to a speech or mental event that is reported in (or recoverable from) the context (=internal logophoric center)⁹. The participants of the internal LC are the participants of the matrix clause. The participants of the external LC can be distinct.

The *żeby*-clauses, then, seem to be “**in between**” **finite and non-finite clauses**. They require non-identical referents (but implied in the context) and signal two distinct events (but the embedded event follows the matrix one¹⁰), and even though they can be finite and license a lexical subject, they **do not have independent tense as indicatives do**, which accounts for the following properties:

I. **Subjunctive clauses exhibit obviation** – Tense-dependency is standardly given as its cause, e.g. Landau's, 2004, [+T] on C. (However, it is cancellable... (30c)).

- (30) a) pro_i chce PRO_i śpiewać. He wants to sing.
 want.Pres.2Sg sing.Inf
- b) pro_i chce, żeby pro_{*i/j} śpiewał. He want him to sing.
 want.Pres.2Sg żeby+Aux.3Sg sing.Prt.
- c) pro_i chce, żeby to ON_i (sam) śpiewał. He wants himself to sing.
 want.Pres.2Sg żeby+Aux.3Sg Foc.Prt he self sing.Prt.

II. **Subjunctive complement clauses are not opaque for extraction** (whereas indicative complements are). Polish does not allow freely long distance *wh*-movement out of a tensed indicative complement, as in (28a). However, long distance extraction is possible out of a bare infinitival complement like (28b) and out of subjunctive clauses like (28c) (Lubańska, 2005). This can be taken to indicate that CP in subjunctives is permeable although it does freeze pronouns as they are dependent on person agreement (p.c. Maria Polinsky).

- (31) a) ^{*/?}Co_i Jan był przekonany, że Maria kupiła t_i?
 what Jan was convinced that Maria buy.Pst.3Sg
 'What was John convinced that Mary had bought?'
- b) Co_i Jan chciał kupić t_i?
 what Jan want.Pst.3Sg buy.Inf
 'What did John want to buy?'

9 Exhaustive control infinitives lack a Logophoric Center = lack a potential anchoring event.

10 Otherwise, a past perfect form in the *żeby*-clause is needed.

- c) Co_i chcesz, żeby Jan przeczytał t_i?
 what want.Pres.2Sg żeby+Aux.3Sg Jan read.Prt
 ‘What do you want John to read?’

Personal pronouns, in contrast, cannot be extracted from subjunctive clauses, since they are frozen by person agreement features in T.

- (29) a) Co mu chcesz dać?
 what him want.Pres.2Sg give.Inf
 b) Co (*^{/?}mu) chcesz, żebym dał?
 what him want.Pres.2Sg żeby+Aux.1Sg give.Prt

Also, genitive of negation is not licensed in *żeby* complements to a negated matrix verb:

- (30) a) Nie chcesz mu kupić roweru.
 not want.Pres.2Sg him buy.Inf bike.GEN
 b) Nie chcesz, żeby mu kupić rower/*roweru.
 not want.Pres.2Sg żeby him buy.Inf bike.ACC/*GEN

III. **Subjunctive complement are dependent on the internal Logophoric center** anaphoric to the matrix event, which explains **why they can refer to past (9a) and present** situations (21a) - their temporal properties are dependent on the context (expressed or pragmatically inferred). The temporal specification of the event in the “conditional mood”, on the other hand, cannot be dependent on the matrix event, i.e. they can only refer to hypothetical, unrealized situations.

Lack of independent tense and proposal of a deficient T can be perhaps implemented along the lines of **Khomitsevich, 2007** who argues that although TP is not a phase (because T gets its temporal and ϕ -features from C (cf. English *for/that* & finiteness)), in Russian, the complementizer *čto* can take infinitival clauses. Proposal: Russian CP is a phase, but the phase head is T, not C. In *čto*-complements a wh-phrase is attracted to Spec,T (not Spec,C) and cannot reach the phase edge = gets trapped. In *čto*-complements T is moved to C, “because” a verbal particle *by* is merged into the complementizer = a wh-phrase attracted by T ends up in Spec,C (the phase edge) and can move on further.

8. SUMMARY

The aim of the talk was to present the relation between conditional and subjunctive moods in Polish. Interestingly, both moods contain the same mood particle, but with a different distribution, and though sometimes they seem to be used interchangeably, crucially it is not always possible. It is very difficult to determine any differences in their meaning intuitively, therefore the issue has not received much attention in grammars and 'traditional' linguistics. My analysis intended to show the intricacies of the two structures and point to the direction of the syntactic analysis of complement clause structure in Polish. However, all the relevant facts (ExclF, defective T, permeable CP, etc.) have yet to be combined for a real syntactic analysis . . .

References:

- Bąk, P. 1999. Gramatyka języka polskiego. Zarys popularny. [Polish Language Grammar: Popular Edition]. Wiedza Powszechna. Warszawa.
- Bański, P. 2000. Morphological and Prosodic Analysis of Auxiliary Clitics in Polish and English, Institute of English. Ph.D. dissertation. Warsaw University.
- Bianchi V. 2003. On finiteness as logophoric anchoring. In Temps et Point de Vue/Tense and Point of View, edited by J. Guéron e L. Tasmovski, 213-246. Parigi, Université Paris X Nanterre
- Bondaruk, A. 2004. *PRO and Control in English, Irish and Polish. A Minimalist Analysis*. Lublin: KUL
- Cheng, L. 1991. On the Typology of Wh-questions. Cambridge, Mass.: PhD Dissertation MIT.
- Iatridou, S., Embick. D. 1993. Conditional Inversion. In Proceedings of NELS 24
- Iatridou, S. 2000. The Grammatical Ingredients of Counterfactuality. In Linguistic Inquiry 31.2
- Khomitsevich, O. 2007. A Phase Theory approach to locality of movement in Russian. Paper presented at 2nd Congress of the Slavic Linguistic Society, Berlin, August 22nd-26th, 2007
- Landau, I. 2000. Elements of Control: Structure and Meaning in Infinitival Constructions. Studies in Natural Language and Linguistic Theory, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht.
- Landau, I. 2004. The Scale of Finiteness and the Calculus of Control. Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 22, 811-877.
- Landau, I. 2006. Severing the Distribution of PRO from Case. Syntax 9, 153-170.
- Lubańska, M. 2005. Focus On Wh-questions. Peter Lang Pub Inc
- Migdalski, K. 2006. *The Syntax of Compound Tenses in Slavic*. Utrecht: LOT
- Willis, D. 2000. Verb Movement in Slavonic Conditionals. In Diachronic Syntax: Models and mechanisms, 322-348. Oxford: Oxford University Press.