On the origin and the development of infinitival *wh*-complements in the history of Polish

In this talk, I will examine dependent infinitive complements introduced by a *wh*-phrase in the history of Polish and investigate their emergence circumstances, individual development steps and role in the Polish complementation system in general. The main focus will be on two patterns: (i) embedded infinitival questions (= EIQs) and modal existential *wh*-constructions (= MECs). Diachronically, I will show that although both patterns emerged under similar circumstances, they developed into two different directions.

Modern Polish EIQs and MECs share two main properties: (i) they are introduced by a *wh*-phrase and (ii) they consist of an infinitive. [1] and [2] illustrate both patterns:

[1] *Człowiek*   *nie*   *wiedział*   [*gdzie*   *uciekać*]   [EIQ]
     human.being   NEG   know.3SG.M.*l*-PTCP   where   run.away.INF
     'One didn't know where to run away to.'
     (NKJP, *Express Ilustrowany*, 28/7/2001)

[2] *Nie*   *mam*   [*gdzie*   *zaparkować*]   [MEC]
     NEG   have.1SG   where   park.INF
     'There is no place where I could park (my car).'
     (NKJP, *Dziennik Zachodni*, 26/6/2001)

At first sight, [1] and [2] seem not to differ on the surface. Their matrix predicates (*wiedzieć* 'know' in [1] and *mieć* 'have' in [2]) are under the scope of the negation operator *nie* and the *wh*-clauses are headed by the *wh*-operator *gdzie* 'where' followed by infinitives (*uciekać* 'run away' in [1] and *zaparkować* 'park' in [2]). However, there are also many differences between EIQs and MECs. Firstly, Polish MECs can only be introduced by two existential predicates: *mieć* ('have') and *być* ('be'). EIQs, in turn, are embeddable under various matrix predicate classes: verbs of retaining knowledge (e.g. *wiedzieć* 'know'), decision verbs (e.g. *decydować* 'decide'), verbs of one-way communication (e.g. *wyjaśniać* 'explain'), see Bhatt (2006) for an overview. Secondly, EIQs - but very seldom MECs - can have both existential and universal force. Thirdly, according to Šimík (2011) Polish MECs cannot be headed by *kiedy* ('when'), *jak* ('how') and *dlaczego* ('why'), admitting only the *wh*-operators belonging to the first group on the *wh*-hierarchy given in [3]:

[3] {*what, who, where*} > {*when, how*} > *why*

Based on the data extracted from the National Corpus of Polish, I will illustrate that this assumption does not hold for Polish, though. I will argue that Polish MECs can be headed by all *wh*-phrases except for *dlaczego*. This makes them different from EIQs occurring with all *wh*-phrases given in [3] (cf. Jędrzejowski 2014). The major claim is

that all these differences between EIQs and MECs come from two different development paths, which they went through in the history of Polish.

I will illustrate that both EIQs and MECs emerged in the Middle Polish period and that one structural prerequisite has to be met for both patterns to arise. The matrix verb has to be under the scope of a negation operator (cf. [1] and [2]). But on the other hand, I do not claim that it was not possible in Old Polish to express similar kinds of attitude towards what is embedded. In other words, I argue that EIQs as well as MECs occurred already in Old Polish. The only difference is that Old Polish EIQs/MECs did not embed infinitival forms. Instead, they used to select for subjunctive complements. [4] illustrates such a use for MECs:

[4] *Toć   ubogi   Krolewiec   był,   iże   nie   imiał*
but   poor   King   be.M.SG.*l*-PTCP   that   NEG   have.M.SG.*l*-PTCP.AOR

[*gdzie   by   swoję   głowę   podkłonił*]
where   COND.CL   his   head.ACC   put.M.SG.*l*-PTCP

'However, the King was so poor that he did not get any place where he could have passed the night.' (Ksw IV, 6: 26-7)

As for the *wh*-hierarchy depicted in [3], I shall demonstrate that EIQs were more progressive than MECs: The former - but not the latter - started to allow in the 19th century the *wh*-phrase *dlaczego*.

As it turns out, the diachrony of EIQs and MECs provide more empirical evidence underpinning the view that both patterns cannot be brought down to a common denominator, i.e. to the *wh*-movement and the presence of infinitives.

[644 words]