Don't regret anymore! On the semantic change of the clause-embedding predicate $\dot{z}alowa\acute{c}$ 'regret' in Polish

INTRODUCTION. In this talk, we will examine the semantic change of the clause-embedding predicate $\dot{z}alowa\acute{c}$ 'regret' in Polish and show that the loss of the feature [-assertion] in ForceP affected its c-selection properties. We will demonstrate that this change (i) took place in the 19th century, and (ii) enabled $\dot{z}alowa\acute{c}$ to embed CP-infinitives.

PHENOMENON. In Modern Polish $\dot{z}alowa\acute{c}$ can be employed in two different ways. On the one hand, it can be used as a factive predicate in the sense claimed by Kiparsky & Kiparsky (1971) and translated as 'regret' (= $\dot{z}alowa\acute{c}1$). On the other hand it can also mean 'begrudge' (= $\dot{z}alowa\acute{c}2$). Both predicates differ as to what kind of sentential complements they select. $\dot{z}alowa\acute{c}1$ is a two-place transitive predicate licensing either DP- or CP-complements headed by the complementizer $\dot{z}e$ 'that':

- [1] Nie żałuje [DP swojej decyzj-i] żałować1 + DPNEG żałować1.3SG his decision-GEN
 'He doesn't regret his decision.'
 (NKJP, Mazowieckie To i Owo, 7/8/2008)
- [2] Żałuję, [CP że częściej tu nie występuje] żałować1 + CP żałować1.1SG that more.often here NEG perform.1SG (finite that-clause)

 'I regret that I don't perform here more often.'

 (NKJP, Nasze Miasto Kraków, 20/6/2002)

Remarkably, żałować1 cannot embed infinitive clauses (cf. also Słodowicz 2008 for a recent general overview of clause-embedding predicates in Polish disallowing infinitive clauses):

[3] $*\dot{Z}atuje$, $[INF\ nie\ potrafi\'e\ wysoko\ \'epiewa\'e]$ $\dot{Z}atowa\'e1 + CP$ $\dot{Z}atowa\'e1.1SG$ $NEG\ can.INF\ high\ sing.INF$ (infinitive clause) Intended: 'I regret to not be able to sing high.'

 $\dot{z}atowa\acute{c}2$, in turn, is a three-place ditransitive predicate selecting DP- as well as infinitive CP-complements:

- [4] Nie żałujemy [DP urlop-u] doktor-owi Szczypul-e żałować2 + DP NEG żałować2.1PL vacation-GEN doctor-DAT Szczypuła-DAT 'We do not begrudge Doctor Szczypuła a vacation.' (NKJP, Dziennik Polski, 23/5/2002)

Interestingly enough, finite CP-complements headed by the complementizer $\dot{z}e$ 'that' and having an episodic interpretation cannot be embedded under $\dot{z}atowa\acute{c}2$:

[6] * $\dot{Z}alujesz$ mi, [CP $\dot{z}e$ pójdę na urlop]? $\dot{z}alowa\acute{c}2 + CP$ $\dot{z}alowa\acute{c}2.2SG$ me.DAT that go.1SG on vacation (finite that-clause) Intended: 'Do you begrudge me a vacation?'

DEVELOPMENT AND ANALYSIS. Based on the empirical data extracted from: (i) Old Polish texts collected by the Polish Academy of Science, (ii) Polish Diachronic Online Corpus (Pol-

Di), and (iii) diachronic texts annotated in the National Corpus of Polish, we argue that $\dot{z}alowa\acute{c}2$ developed out of $\dot{z}alowa\acute{c}1$ in the 19th century:

In what follows, we analyze both $\dot{z}alowa\acute{c}1$ and $\dot{z}alowa\acute{c}2$ as lexical V-heads, indicating that none of these heads grammaticalized into a functional head associated with a functional projection. As for sentential complements, both finite $\dot{z}e$ -clauses of $\dot{z}alowa\acute{c}1$ and infinitives of $\dot{z}alowa\acute{c}2$ are CPs. This follows from the fact, among others, that the matrix clause and the infinitive clause can be modified by two distinct temporal adverbials:

[5']
$$Jeszcze \ wczoraj \ \operatorname{pro_i} \dot{z}ałował-eś \ mi_j$$
 yet yesterday $\dot{z}ałować2.l$ -PTCP.3SG.M-AUX.CL.2SG me.DAT
$$[\operatorname{CP}\ PRO*_{i/j}\ i\acute{s}\acute{c} \ dzisiaj \ na \ urlop]$$
 go.INF today on vacation

In other words, although $\dot{z}atowa\acute{c}$ underwent a semantic change and although its complement types have changed, the syntactic size of its complements remained the same. The differences between $\dot{z}atowa\acute{c}1$ and $\dot{z}atowa\acute{c}2$, in turn, follow from the presence/absence of an [assertion] feature in ForceP of the subordinate clause (cf. Basse 2008, de Cuba 2007). If $\dot{z}atowa\acute{c}$ selects for a CP, the truth-value of p can be either presupposed by the speaker (= $\dot{z}atowa\acute{c}1$) or asserted by the matrix subject (= $\dot{z}atowa\acute{c}2$). In the former case CPs are analyzed as defective phases lacking the feature [assertion]. Internally, there is no edge feature on the left periphery in the embedded clause and any kind of movement to the left edge is disallowed (based on Basse 2008):

Evidence for [8a] comes, among others, from floating auxiliary clitics. In [9], a CP is embedded under $\dot{z}alowa\dot{c}1$ and the auxiliary clitic cannot move from PtcpP to a higher position within the CP-field. The movement is blocked due to the absence of the [assertion] feature.

[9]
$$\dot{Z}alujesz$$
, $[CP] [C^0 \dot{z}e^{-??}\dot{s}]$ $[PtcpP] zawalilee^{OK}\dot{s}]$ $tequal sprawe \cite{A} sprawe$

If, on the hand, the feature [assertion] is activated, the C-Phase is not defective and the embedded C-head is an accessible goal for an Agree relation, which, in turn, is required both for PRO and secondary predicates in order to check their Case values in the embedded infinitive clause, e.g. the Dative in [10] (cf. Landau 2008):

[10]
$$\dot{Z}atujesz$$
 jej [CP [C PRO] $uczesa\acute{c}$ sie $samej?$] regret.2SG her.DAT comb.INF REFL alone.DAT 'Do you begrudge her to style her hair on her own?'