

Some observations on the semantic shift of the clause-embedding predicate *żałować* 'regret' in Polish

Introduction. In this talk, I will examine the semantic shift of the clause-embedding predicate *żałować* 'regret' in Polish and show to what extent this shift affected its c-selection properties. I will demonstrate that this change (i) took place in the 20th century, and (ii) enabled *żałować* to embed CP infinitives.

Phenomenon. In modern Polish *żałować* 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 (1970) and translated as 'regret' (= *żałować*₁). On the other hand, it can also mean 'begrudge' (= *żałować*₂). Both predicates differ as to what kind of sentential complements they select. *żałować*₁ is a two-place transitive predicate licensing either DP or CP complements headed by the complementizer *że* 'that':

- [1] *Nie żałuje* [DP *swojej decyzji*]
 NEG *żałować*_{1.3SG} his decision-GEN
 'He doesn't regret his decision.'
 (NKJP, *Mazowieckie To i Owo*, 7/8/2008)
- [2] *Żałuję,* [CP *że częściej tu nie występuję*]
*żałować*_{1.1SG} that more.often here NEG perform.1SG
 'I regret that I don't perform here more often.'
 (NKJP, *Nasze Miasto Kraków*, 20/6/2002)

Remarkably, *żałować*₁ cannot embed infinitive clauses (cf. also Słodowicz 2008 for a recent general overview of clause-embedding predicates in Polish disallowing infinitive clauses):

- [3] **Żałuję,* [INF *nie potrafić wysoko śpiewać*]
*żałować*_{1.1SG} NEG can.INF high sing.INF
 Intended: 'I regret to not be able to sing high.'

*żałować*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*
 NEG *żałować*_{2.1PL} vacation-GEN doctor-DAT Szczypuła-DAT
 'We do not begrudge Doctor Szczypuła a vacation.'
 (NKJP, *Dziennik Polski*, 23/5/2002)
- [5] *Żałujesz mi* [INF *iść na urlop*]?
*żałować*_{2.2SG} me.DAT go.INF on vacation
 'Do you begrudge me a vacation?'

Interestingly enough, finite CP complements headed by the complementizer *że* 'that' and having an episodic interpretation cannot be embedded under *żałować*₂:

- [6] **Żałujesz mi, [CP że pójdę na urlop]?*
żałować^{2.2SG} *me.DAT* that *go.1SG* on vacation
 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 (PolDi), and (iii) diachronic texts annotated in the National Corpus of Polish, I argue that *żałować*² developed out of *żałować*¹ in the 20th century:

- [7] [VP [_V⁰ *żałować*¹: λxλz {x:Agent; z:Theme}]] -->
 [VP [_V⁰ *żałować*²: λx(λy)λz {x:Agent; y:Experiencer; z:Theme}]]

In what follows, I analyze both *żałować*¹ and *żałować*² as lexical verbal heads. In other words, no grammaticalization process was involved in the development of *żałować*². As for sentential complements, both finite *że*-clauses of *żałować*¹ and infinitives of *żałować*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 pro_i żałował-eś mi_j*
 yet yesterday *żałować*^{2.l-PTCP.3SG.M-AUX.CL.2SG} *me.DAT*
 [CP PRO*_{i/j} *iść dzisiaj na urlop*]
 go.INF today on vacation

In other words, although *żałować* underwent a semantic change and although its complement types have changed, the syntactic size of its complements remained the same. The differences between *żałować*¹ and *żałować*², in turn, follow from the presence/absence of an [+assertion] feature in the subordinate clause (cf. Basse 2008, de Cuba 2007, Kastner 2015 for a syntactic account). If *żałować* selects for a CP, the truth-value of *p* can be either presupposed by the speaker (= *żałować*¹) or asserted by the matrix subject (= *żałować*²).

References: G. Basse (2008): Factive complements as defective phases, in: *Proceedings of the 27th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics (WCCFL 27)* ed. by N. Abner & J. Bishop, 54-62. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project. C. de Cuba (2007): On (Non)Factivity, Clausal Complementation and the CP-Field. PhD thesis, Stony Brook, NY. I. Kastner (2015): Factivity mirrors interpretation: The selectional requirements of presuppositional verbs, in: *Lingua* 164: 156-188. P. Kiparsky & C. Kiparsky (1970): Fact, in: *Progress in Linguistics* ed. by M. Bierwisch & K. E. Heidolph, 143-173. The Hague: Mouton. S. Słodowicz (2008): *Control in Polish Complement Clauses*. München: Sagner.