

On the source of variation in the distribution of auxiliaries in Polish
Krzysztof Migdalski, University of Connecticut

It has been observed (cf. Mikoś & Moravcsik 1986, Rappaport 1988, Borsley & Rivero 1988, Witkoś 1998, Bański 2000) that auxiliaries corresponding to the Old Slavic form of the verb ‘be’ appear in two variants in Polish: synthetically as affixes on the *l*-participle, and analytically as clitics following the initial word (cf.1). The former option has been described as a more recent diachronic innovation of the latter, which started in the 16th century, has proceeded slowly over time, and is still far from completion. Franks & Bański (1999) argue that the process involves “Grammar Competition” (Kroch 1989) between the two forms of the auxiliary. The affixed variant enjoys a predominant position in the grammar, as it constitutes 97% compound tense formations in Modern Polish (cf. Kowalska 1976:63), so it is surprising that the clitic variant still exists and that the diachronic process has not been completed. Bański (2000:195) argues this is so because the grammar competition involves not two but three options, the third one being the present tense copula ‘be’, constructed with an old strong form of the verb ‘be’ *jest* and person-number affixes (cf.2a) that are morphologically the same as the affixes on the *l*-participle (cf.1a), but different from the ones found on finite verbs (cf.2b). It is unclear, though, why the special verbal form of the copula should hinder the reinterpretation of the auxiliary clitics as affixes.

The talk will argue that there is actually no competition between the clitic and affix auxiliary forms in Modern Polish, and that the two variants represent independent syntactic processes. The proposal is supported by diachronic facts concerning the development of cliticization in Slavic. Radanović-Kocić (1988:151) and Migdalski (2007) point out that only three clitics uniformly occupied the Wackernagel position in Old Church Slavonic: *li*, *bo* ‘because’, and the focus marker *že* (cf.3). Observe that each of them specifies the Illocutionary Force/Clause Type, in the sense of Cheng (1997). In some languages (Serbo-Croatian, Slovene, Czech), the Wackernagel law was extended to all clitics at a later stage. In Polish the main diachronic change concerned the weakening of the auxiliary clitic and its reanalysis as an affix on the *l*-participle. However, the ratio of 2nd position occurrences of the auxiliary clitic has remained roughly constant throughout the centuries (cf. Rittel 1975:91, Andersen 1987:29). Moreover, the semantic effects of the 2nd position auxiliary placement have remained similar in the history of Polish and preserve the original Old Church Slavonic pattern (cf.4). This suggests that the current instances of the auxiliary clitic placement are a continuation of the Old Slavic distribution. I propose that the auxiliary clitics target a Force-related head (Σ^0 , cf. Laka 1994) to mark the Clause Type (focus, topicalization, conditional or optative mood) or clause deviation from declarative. I will also show that a related movement occurs in other Slavic languages without Wackernagel clitics (e.g. Bulgarian), whereas in Wackernagel clitic languages the operation has different properties from the usual Wackernagel cliticization (e.g. in Serbo-Croatian Force-related clitics can only be preceded by heads, not XPs).

The hypothesis that the auxiliary cliticization on a clause-initial element is unrelated to auxiliary affixation on the *l*-participle in Polish makes two predictions. First, it should be possible to find contexts in which only the auxiliary encliticization is available. This is the case in conditional constructions, optative and subjunctive mood, (cf.5), where the verb of volition *chcieć* requires that the auxiliary be encliticized on the complementizer.

Second, it predicts cases of simultaneous auxiliary encliticization and affixation. This holds older variants of Polish, (cf. 6), where the auxiliary appears simultaneously on the *l*-participle and the clause-initial element that is interpreted as focused.

- (1) a. Kiedy przyjechali-*śmy*?
when arrive_{PART.VIR.PL}+*AUX.IPL*
“When did we arrive?”

- b. Kiedy-*śmy* przyjechali?
when^{+AUX.1PL} arrive^{PART.VIR.PL}
“When did we arrive, after all?”
- (2) a. Jest-*eśmy* zmęczeni
be^{+1PL} tired
“We are tired”
b. Jedzi-*emy* do Krakowa
go^{+1PL} to Kraków
“We are going to Kraków”
- (3) Ašte *li že ni i novōjō razderetъ*
if_Q FOC not also new tear_{FUT}
“Or else the new one will tear” (OCS, Pancheva 2007)
- (4) Ju-*że-ście* śie go dośytz namęczyli
already^{+FOC+AUX.2PL REFL} him_{ACC} enough tire^{PART.PL}
“You have tired him enough already” (PI 1522; Kowalska 1976:43)
- (5) a. Chcę, że-*by-ś* przestał mi przeszkadzać
want_{1SG} that^{+COND+AUX.2SG} stop^{PART.M.SG} me_{DAT} disturb
“I want you to stop disturbing me”
b. *Chcę, że przestał-*byś* mi przeszkadzać (cf. Borsley&Rivero 1994)
- (6) Tedy-*m* ja owszeki stracił-*em* miasto
then^{+AUX.1SG} I irretrievably lose^{PART.M.SG+AUX.1SG} city
“Then I irretrievably lost the city” (16th c.PI, Decaux 1955:34; cf. Bański 2000:125)

References

- Andersen, H. 1987. From Auxiliary to Desinence. In *Historical Development of Auxiliaries*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Bański, P. 2000. Morphological and Prosodic Analysis of Auxiliary Clitics in Polish and English. Ph.D. dissertation. Warsaw University.
- Borsley, R, and M-L.Rivero. 1994. Clitic Auxiliaries and Incorporation in Polish. *NLLT* 12:373-422.
- Cheng, L. 1997. *On the Typology of Wh-Questions*. New York: Garland.
- Decaux, É. 1955. *Morphologie des enclitiques polonaise*. Paris: l'Institut d'Études Slaves.
- Franks, S, and P. Bański. 1999. Approaches to ‘Schizophrenic’ Polish Person Agreement. In *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics: The Seattle Meeting*. Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publications.
- Kowalska, A. 1976. *Ewolucja analitycznych form czasownikowych z imiesłowem na -l w języku polskim*. Katowice: Uniwersytet Śląski.
- Kroch, A. 1989. Function and Grammar in the History of English Periphrastic *do*. In *Language Change and Variation*. Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Laka, I. 1994. *On the Syntax of Negation*. New York: Garland.
- Migdalski, K. 2007. On the emergence of the second position effect in Slavic. *FDSL-7* talk, University of Leipzig, December 2007.
- Mikoś, M.J., and E.A. Moravcsik. 1986. Moving Clitics in Polish and Some Crosslinguistic Generalizations. *Studia Slavica* 32:327-336.
- Pancheva, R., A. Łazarczyk, J. Krivokapić, and Y. Minkova. 2007. *Codex Marianus*. In *USC Parsed Corpus of Old South Slavic*.
- Radanović-Kocić, V. 1988. The Grammar of Serbo-Croatian Clitics. Ph.D. dissertation. University of Illinois.
- Rappaport, G. 1988. On the Relationship Between Prosodic and Syntactic Properties of Pronouns in the Slavic Languages. In *American Contributions to the Tenth International Congress of Slavists*. Bloomington: Slavica.
- Rittel, T. 1975. *Szyk członów w obrębie form czasu przeszłego i trybu przypuszczającego*. Wrocław: Ossolineum.
- Witkoś, J. 1998. *The Syntax of Clitics*. Poznań: Motivex.