

Towards an HPSG Analysis of Polish *żeby*-Clauses under Negation

Beata Trawiński
Leibniz-Institut für Deutsche Sprache
Mannheim (Germany)

In Polish, indicative finite complement clauses are typically introduced by the complementizer *że* 'that', which is compatible with affirmative and negative contexts (1). In addition to complement clauses (CPs) headed by *że*, some negated verbs can combine with CPs headed by the complementizer *żeby* (2). In this case, the negation in the matrix clause is obligatory (2c) and a negation within the complement clause is excluded (2d). Note that *sądzić* in (2) is a negative raising (NR) predicate, so that the negation in the matrix clause in (2b) is understood as negating the complement clause. This intuition holds also for (2c), where, however, no NR can be assumed given (2d).

There is yet another type of verbs in Polish, where when proceeded by the complementizer *żeby* only a negative in the complement clause is possible (3c). When used without *żeby*, those verbs allow both positive and negative finite (3a) and infinite (3b) complements (cf. also Bondaruk (2004, p. 205)).

I argue that *żeby* in (2c) is a **superstrong negative polarity item** (NPI) and *żeby* in (3c) is a **negative complementizer** (NC). I follow Zwarts (1997) and van der Wouden (1997) and assume that NPIs are superstrong if they are licensed only by antimorphic contexts (overt negation). NCs are typically licensed (overtly or covertly) by inherently negative verbs (verbs with a negative force, such as *deny* or *doubt* in English), and are attested in other languages such as Basque (cf. Laka (1992a,b)).

I implement this idea within the framework of Head-driven Phrase Structure Grammar (HPSG) in the tradition of Pollard and Sag (1994). I adopt the HPSG-approach to Negative Concord in Polish put forward by Przepiórkowski and Kupść (1997) and assume that the attribute NEGATIVE-CONCORD valued by a boolean value is responsible for Negative Concord. The value of the NEGATIVE-CONCORD attribute percolates along the head projection from a lexical item to its maximal projection and verbal projections constitute barriers. Negated verbs cancel negation percolation and NEGATIVE-CONCORD value is set up as a minus. I propose that *żeby* bears the attribute NEGATIVE-CONCORD and that the value of this attribute is underspecified in the lexicon. It is the property of verbs selecting *żeby*-CPs to determine the value of this feature, just in the same way that lexical items like *wonder* or *promise* require an interrogative or a declarative complementizer, respectively.

Verbs like the NR-predicate *sądzić* 'think' in (2) select CPs headed by *żeby* with a positive valued NEGATIVE-CONCORD feature and whose verbal complement is unnegated (4). Note that the specification NEG-CONC + defines all n-words in Polish, including *nikt* 'nobody', *nigdzie* 'nowhere' etc. By virtue of the principles responsible for Negative Concord in Polish (cf. Przepiórkowski and Kupść (1997)), the verb in the matrix clause must be negated. This correctly models cases like (2c) and (2d).

Verbs like *obawiać się* 'be afraid' in (3) select CPs headed by *żeby* with a negative valued NEGATIVE-CONCORD feature (5). This specification does not enforce the presence of a negation in the matrix clause. However, the verbal complement of *żeby* is specified as being negated, which makes *żeby* a negative complementizer on the same lines as negative complementizers addressed in Laka (1992b). This specifications correctly predict cases as in (3c).

- (1) Piotr (nie) obiecywał, że (nie) schudnie.
 Piotr NEG promised ŻE NEG lose weight
 'Piotr did not promise / promised that he will / will not lose weight.'
- (2) a. Jan sądzi, że Ewa nie wróci.
 Jan think.3.SG.PRES ŻE Ewa NEG come-back.3.SG
 'Jan thinks that Ewa will not come back.'
- b. Jan nie sądzi, że Ewa wróci.
 Jan NEG think.3.SG.PRES ŻE Ewa come-back.3.SG
 'Jan does not think that Ewa will come back.'
- c. Jan *(nie) sądzi, żeby Ewa wróciła.
 Jan NEG think.3.SG.PRES ŻEBY Ewa come-back.3.SG
 'Jan does not think that Ewa will come back.'
- d. *Jan sądzi, żeby Ewa nie wróciła.
 Jan think.3.SG.PRES ŻEBY Ewa NEG come-back.3.SG
 'Jan thinks that Ewa will not come back.' [intended]
- (3) a. Ada (nie) obawia się, że (nie) schudnie.
 Ada NEG be-afraid.3.SG REFL ŻE NEG lose weight
 'Ada is / is not afraid that she will / will not lose weight.'
- b. Ada (nie) obawia się (nie) schudnąć.
 Ada NEG be-afraid.3.SG REFL NEG lose weightINF
 'Ada is / is not afraid that she will / will not lose weight.'

- c. Ada (nie) obawia się, żeby *(nie) schudnąć.
 Ada NEG be-afraid.3.SG REFL ŻEBY NEG lose weightINF
 'Ada is / is not afraid that she will lose weight.'

- (4) Description of *żeby* as an n-word and a superstrong NPI (licensed by verbs like *sądzić* 'think')

$$\left[\begin{array}{l} \text{SYNSEM} \\ \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{LOCAL} \\ \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{CAT} \\ \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{HEAD} \left[\begin{array}{l} \textit{complementizer} \\ \text{CFORM } \textit{żeby} \end{array} \right] \\ \text{ARG-ST} \langle \text{VP: NEG } - \rangle \end{array} \right] \end{array} \right] \end{array} \right] \end{array} \right] \\ \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{NON-LOCAL} \\ \text{NEG-CONC } + \end{array} \right] \end{array} \right]$$

- (5) Description of *żeby* as a negative complementizer (licensed by verbs like *obawiać się* 'be afraid')

$$\left[\begin{array}{l} \text{SYNSEM} \\ \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{LOCAL} \\ \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{CAT} \\ \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{HEAD} \left[\begin{array}{l} \textit{complementizer} \\ \text{CFORM } \textit{żeby} \end{array} \right] \\ \text{ARG-ST} \langle \text{VP: NEG } + \rangle \end{array} \right] \end{array} \right] \end{array} \right] \\ \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{NON-LOCAL} \\ \text{NEG-CONC } - \end{array} \right] \end{array} \right]$$

References

- Bondaruk, Anna (2004). *PRO and Control in English, Irish and Polish. A Minimalist Analysis*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL.
- Laka, Itziar (1992a). *Negation in Syntax: On the Nature of Functional Categories and Projections*. Ph. D. thesis, MIT Cambridge, MA. MITWPL Dissertation series.
- Laka, Itziar (1992b). Negative Complementizers: Evidence from English, Basque and Spanish. In J. A. Lakarra and J. O. de Urbina (Eds.), *Syntactic Theory and Basque Syntax*, pp. 175–211. San Sebastián: Diputación Foral de Guipuzcoa.
- Pollard, Carl J. and Sag, Ivan A. (1994). *Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Przepiórkowski, Adam and Kupść, Anna (1997). Unbounded Negative Concord in Polish: A Lexicalist HPSG Approach. In J. Landsbergen, J. Odijk, K. van Deemter, and G. V. van Zanten (Eds.), *Computational Linguistics in the Netherlands 1996: Papers from the Seventh CLIN Meeting*, Eindhoven, pp. 129–143.

IPO, Center for Research on User-System Interaction: Technische Universiteit Eindhoven.

Wouden, Ton van der (1997). *Negative Contexts. Collocation, Polarity and Multiple Negation*. London and New York: Routledge.

Zwarts, Frans (1997). Three Types of Polarity. In F. Hamm and E. W. Hinrichs (Eds.), *Plurality and Quantification*, pp. 177–237. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.