The morphosyntax of Polish (un)conditionals

Barbara Tomaszewicz, University of Southern California

I provide an account of Polish **conditional** and **concessive** (or **unconditional**, Rawlins 2008) clauses as **free relatives**. I will show that treating Polish (un)conditionals as free relatives we can account for the optionality/obligatoriness of their morphological components: <u>subjunctive</u>, <u>negation</u> and the <u>*ever*</u>-like particle (see Table 1 and 1-2 below).

(1) a. Jeśli (by)   wziął (by)   tabletki, czuł(by)   się lepiej.
         If   SUBJUNCTIVE take SUBJUNCTIVE pills   feel SUBJUNCTIVE self better

     b. Gdy*(by)   wziął (*by)   tabletki, czuł*(by)   się lepiej.
         When SUBJUNCTIVE take SUBJUNCTIVE pills   feel SUBJUNCTIVE self better

     '*If he took the pills, he felt better.*' vs. '*If took the pills, he would feel better.*'

(2) Kiedy ?(kolwiek) ?(by)   ?(nie)   wziął tabletek, czuł(by)   się lepiej.
     When   EVER   SUBJUNCTIVE NEGATION take   pills   feels SUBJUNCTIVE self better

     '*Whenever he took the pills, he felt/would have felt better.*'

Polish **conditionals** come in two types: those headed by a lexical complementizer *jeśli* (*if*) (1a), and those containing a *wh*-element (1b). Assuming that conditional clauses are **free relatives** of possible worlds (Bhat and Pancheva 2006), the first type is derived by null operator movement to SpecCP, while in the second type, it is the *wh*-operator that moves. If we couple the second derivation with a requirement that the C^0 position be lexically filled (as I proposed in Tomaszewicz 2011), we can explain why the second position placement of the auxiliary is obligatory in conditionals with *wh*-words (1b), but only optional in those with the lexical *if* (1a).

Further observing that the same *wh*-word (*when*) is found in **conditional** and **temporal** adverbial clauses, and the presence of a <u>subjunctive</u> auxiliary is what distinguishes between the two [3*e,* conditional vs. 3*a,* regular temporal adjunct], we can account for the fact that *when*-based free relatives containing subjunctive require additional morphosyntactic components in order to receive a temporal interpretation [3*fgh*]. Subjunctive is frequently a component of free relatives with concessive interpretation (Izvorski 1996, 2000), and in Polish concessives it always co-occurs with <u>negation</u> or the *ever*-like particle *–kolwiek* or with both (Citko 2003). Notably, negation in this environment is the so-called "explicit negation", i.e. not interpreted as sentential negation (Citko 2003, Pietraszko 2010).

However, I observe that in temporal concessives the presence of negation (together with subjunctive) requires a non-matching mood/tense in the matrix clause [6*fgh*], otherwise negation is interpreted [3*cdgh*]. This is explained, if free relatives of times/worlds are, in fact, always instances of **correlative structures** – the matrix clause always contains a temporal or modal anaphor in the form of matching tense and mood morphology (Brasoveanu 2012). Thus, in Polish, free relative adjuncts containing the operator *when* can function as temporal adjuncts, conditionals or concessives depending on their morphological ingredients.

The support for the uniform syntax of free relatives of **times**/**worlds** comes from the fact that they all receive the same **correlative** demonstrative proform in the matrix clause *to wtedy* (lit. "then in this time") [3]. In clauses with the same internal structure functioning as **free adjuncts** (i.e. when the proform is not allowed) the negative marker functions as "explicit" negation [6*fgh*].

In those free relatives where the variable is an **individual** or a **degree** argument, we find that the morphological components also differ whether the free relative is in a **correlative** structure or in the **free adjunct** position. In correlatives negation requires subjunctive to yield the concessive interpretation [1,2,3c-d,g-h]. In free relatives it does not need subjunctive when the variable ranges over individuals [4c] in contrast to degrees [5c]. Thus, negation functions differently from the particle –kolwiek: [4,5b] vs. [4,5cd]. I argue that the two concessive readings differ: with –_kolwiek_ ('_ever_') the set of alternatives exhausts the domain, with negation the alternatives under consideration are exactly those that would not make the consequent true. Compare: (i) _Whatever Sue wears, she always looks great_, vs. (ii) _In spite of what Sue wears, she always looks great_. Only in (ii) do we interpret the adjunct and the matrix clause as polar opposites. I propose that if the _wh_-operator in the presence of negation needs to be contextually restricted wrt. to the matrix clause (Dayal 2003), we can treat negation as 'real' (contra Pietraszko 2010) and account for the difference between the individual [4c] and degree [5c] variables.

The treatment of (un)conditional clauses as correlative or free adjunct free relatives, allows us to postulate a uniform syntax where relativization results in a gap interpreted as variable abstraction (e.g. the bare bones of of (1) and (2) are _wh_i John take pills at t_i_) and account for the interaction of this meaning with additional morphosyntactic components.

Table 1.

(un)conditional interpretation			correlative FR			free adjunct FR		
			individuals [1]	degrees [2]	times [3]	individuals [4]	degrees [5]	times [6]
a	Wh	matching tense	#	#	#	*	*	-
b	Wh + -ever		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	-
c	Wh + NEG		#	#	#	✓ polarity	#	-
d	Wh + -ever + NEG		#	#	#	✓	#	-
e	Wh + SUBJUNCTIVE	non-factual	#	#	condi-tional	*	*	*
f	Wh + -ever + SUBJUNCTIVE		✓	✓	✓?	✓	✓	✓
g	Wh + NEG + SUBJUNCTIVE		✓ polarity	✓ polarity	#	✓ polarity	✓ polarity	✓ polarity
h	Wh + -ever + NEG + SUBJUNCTIVE		✓	✓	#	✓	✓	✓