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1. Introduction

In Modern Polish (1900 - ) 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 (1971) and paraphrased as 'regret' (= żałować1):

[1] Żałuję, że tak późno zacząłem strzelać gole
żałować.1SG that so late start.1-PTCP.1SG.M shoot.INF goals
'I regret that I started scoring goals so late'
(NKJP, Express Ilustrowany, 29/4/2002)

On the other hand, it can also mean 'begrudge' (= żałować2):

[2] Żałujesz mi iść na urlop?
żałować.2SG me.DAT go.INF on vacation
'Do you begrudge me a vacation?'

żałować is an imperfective verb. Its perfective counterpart, pożałować, can also be used in the sense of żałować1 and żałować2:

[3] Pożałujesz, że mnie zatrzymałeś
pożałować.2SG that me.ACC arrest.1-PTCP.2SG
'You will regret it that you arrested me'
(NKJP, Gazeta Poznańska, 28/6/2003)

money.GEN NEG pożałować.1-PTCP.SG.M also president Pałasz
'The major Pałasz did not begrudge money either'
(NKJP, Gazeta Poznańska, 12/4/2003)

In this talk, I will focus only on żałować.

1 Following abbreviations are used in this paper: 1/2/3 - 1st/2nd/3rd person, ACC - accusative, AUX - auxiliary verb, CL - clitic, COR - correlate, DAT - dative, GEN - genitive, HAB - habitual, INF - infinitive, LOC - locative, l-PTCP - l-participle (inflected for number and gender), M - masculine, N - neuter, NEG - negation, PL - plural, PPR - present participle, PRF - perfective, REFL - reflexive, SG - singular, VIR - virile.
Leading questions

✓ To what extent does żałować1 differ from żałować2?
✓ What are the c-selectional properties of both predicates?
✓ What are the emergence conditions of żałować2?
✓ Does the development of żałować2 exemplify a grammaticalization process?
✓ What role does the opposition factive vs. non-factive play?

Outline of the talk

Section 1: Introduction
Section 2: Żałować in Modern Polish
  ✓ Argument structure
  ✓ Embedded complements
  ✓ Factivity
Section 3: Żałować in the history of Polish
  ✓ From Old Polish ( - 1500) to Modern Polish (1900 - )
  ✓ Semantic change
Section 4: Theoretical perspective: Reanalysis
Section 5: Concluding remarks

2. Żałować in Modern Polish

In this section, I will point out selected differences between żałować1 and żałować2. The main focus will be on: (i) argument structure, (ii) embedded complements and (iii) the opposition factive vs. non-factive.

2.1. Argument structure

Żałować1 is a two-place transitive predicate. Its internal argument receives Genitive case:

sometimes regret.1SG superfluous words
'Sometimes I regret my superfluous words'
(NKJP, Dziennik Zachodni, 15/4/2005)

The embedded proposition can also refer anaphorically to the matrix correlate tego:

[6] Bardzo żałuję [tego]_i [co zrobiłem]_i [żałować1]
very regret.1SG COR.GEN what do.1SG.PTCP.1SG.
'I regret very much what I did'
(NKJP, Dziennik Zachodni, 25/9/2009)
Żałować₂, in turn, is a three-place ditransitive predicate. Similar to żałować₁, it licenses a direct object checking the Genitive case. Additionally, an indirect object is generated and marked for the Dative case:

\[
[7] \ [\text{DP pro}] \ Żałować \ [\text{DP mi}]_{\text{DAT}} \ [\text{DP cukierków}]_{\text{GEN}} \ [żałować₂] \\
\begin{array}{l}
\text{begrudge}._{\text{P}}\text{TCP.3SG.M} \ \text{me} \ \text{sweets}
\end{array}
\]

'He begrudged sweets to me'

(NKJP, Talki w wielkim mieście, 2002)

If the Dative-DP is realized as an implicit argument, two readings of żałować appear to be appropriate:

\[
[8] \ [\text{pro}]i \ Żałuję \ [\_i] \ kupna \ tego \ mieszkania \\
\begin{array}{l}
\text{żałować.1SG} \ \text{purchase.\text{GEN} this flat.\text{GEN}}
\end{array}
\]

'I regret that I bought this flat' \ [żałować₁]

'I begrudge someone to buy this flat' \ [żałować₂]

However, if the Dative-DP is realized overtly, it disambiguates the reading of the verb:

\[
[8'] \ [\text{pro}]i \ Żałuję \ [\_i] \ kupna \ tego \ mieszkania \\
\begin{array}{l}
\text{żałować.1SG} \ \text{you.DAT purchase.\text{GEN this flat.\text{GEN}}}
\end{array}
\]

'*I regret that I bought this flat' \ [żałować₁]

'I begrudge you to buy this flat' \ [żałować₂]

2.2. Embedded complements

2.2.1. DPs

Both żałować₁ and żałować₂ can embed DPs marked for the Genitive case:

\[
[9] \ \text{Nie} \ \text{żaluje} \ [\text{DP swojej decyzji}] \ [żałować₁] \\
\begin{array}{l}
\text{NEG żałować.3SG his decision-\text{GEN}}
\end{array}
\]

'He doesn't regret his decision'

(NKJP, Mazowieckie To i Owo, 7/8/2008)

\[
[10] \ \text{Nie} \ \text{żalujemy} \ [\text{DP urlop-u}] \ doktorowi \ Szczypuła-e \ [żałować₂] \\
\begin{array}{l}
\text{NEG żałować.1PL vacation-\text{GEN doctor-DAT Szczypuła-DAT}}
\end{array}
\]

'We do not begrudge Doctor Szczypuła a vacation'

(NKJP, Dziennik Polski, 23/5/2002)
2.2.2. Finite CPs

As far as sentential complements are concerned, żałować can embed finite CPs headed by the complementizer że 'that'. There are no restrictions as to the aspect of the embedded verb:

[11] Žałuję, [CP że nie jem owoców] [imperfective]
żałować.1SG that NEG eat.1SG.IMPRF fruits
'I regret that I don't eat fruits'

[12] Žałuję, [CP że sprzedałyś dom] [perfective]
żałować.1SG that sell.1PL.l-PTCP.PRF house
'I regret that we sold the house'

[13] Žałuję, [CP że obiecowałem ci nowy dom] [iterative]
żałować.1SG that promise.1SG.l-PTCP.ITER you.DAT new house
'I regret that I used to promise you a new house'

The correlate tego can be used in all three cases too:

[11'] Žałuję, tego, [CP że nie jem owoców]
żałować.1SG COR.GEN that NEG eat.1SG.IMPRF fruits
'I regret it that I don't eat fruits'

[12'] Žałuję, tego, [CP że sprzedałyś dom]
żałować.1SG COR.GEN that sell.1PL.l-PTCP.PRF house
'I regret it that we sold the house'

[13'] Žałuję, tego, [CP że obiecowałem ci nowy dom]
żałować.1SG COR.GEN that promise.1SG.ITER.l-PTCP you.DAT new house
'I regret it that I used to promise you a new house'

Žałować2, on the other hand, is more restricted:

[14] Żałujesz mi [CP że idę na urlop?] [imperfective]
begrudge.2SG me.DAT that go.1SG.IMPRF on vacation
'Do you begrudge me a vacation?'

[15] *Żałujesz mi [CP że pójdę na urlop?] [perfective]
begrudge.2SG me.DAT that go.1SG.PRF on vacation
Intended: 'Do you begrudge me a vacation?'

[16] Żałujesz mi [CP że chodzę na urlop?] [iterative]
begrudge.2SG me.DAT that go.1SG.ITER on vacation
Intended: 'Do you begrudge me a vacation?'
However, if the correlate *tego* is used, the examples given in (14)-(16) sound natural:

[14'] *żałujesz* *mi* *tego* [CP *że* *idę* *na* *urlop*?]
be grudge.2SG me.DAT COR.GEN that go.1SG.IMPRF on vacation
'Do you begrudge me a vacation?'

[15'] *żałujesz* *mi* *tego* [CP *że* *pójdę* *na* *urlop*?]
be grudge.2SG me.DAT COR.GEN that go.1SG.PRF on vacation
'Do you begrudge me a vacation?'

[16'] *żałujesz* *mi* *tego* [CP *że* *chodzę* *na* *urlop*?]
be grudge.2SG me.DAT COR.GEN that go.1SG.ITER on vacation
Intended: 'Do you begrudge me a vacation?'

At this moment, I have no explanation for why this is so and where this difference comes from.

2.2.3. Infinitive CPs

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

[17] *żałuję*, [CP *nie* *potrafić* *wysoko* *śpiewać*] [żałować]
żałować.1SG NEG can.INF high sing.INF
Intended: 'I regret to be not able to sing high notes'

Even if one uses the correlate *tego*, the situation does not change:

[17'] *żałuję* *tego* [CP *nie* *potrafić* *wysoko* *śpiewać*]
żałować.1SG COR.GEN NEG can.INF high sing.INF
Intended: 'I regret to be not able to sing high notes'

On the contrary, *żałować*2 can select for CP-infinitives. It is an object control verb:

[18] *pro* *żałujesz* *mi* [CP *PRO*i,j* *iść* *na* *urlop*?] [żałować]
żałować.2SG me.DAT go.INF on vacation
'Do you begrudge me to go on vacation?'
There are no aspectual restrictions with respect to the embedded verb:

[19] Żałujesz mi [CP iść/pójść/chodzić na urlop]?  
żałować.2SG me.DAT go.INF.IMPRF/PRF/ITER on vacation  
'Do you begrudge me to go on vacation?'

Notice, however, that the correlate tego is disallowed:

[19'] *Żałujesz mi tego [CP iść/pójść/chodzić na urlop]?  
żałować.2SG me.DAT COR.GEN go.INF.IMPRF/PRF/ITER on vacation  
'Do you begrudge me to go on vacation?'

Remarkably, if żałować2 embeds a non-finite CP complement, the matrix verb and the dependent clause can be modified by two distinct temporal adverbials. I take this to be one of the diagnostics for the CP-hood of embedded complements:

[20] Jeszcze wczoraj żałował-eś mi  
yet yesterday żałować.1-PTCP.3SG.M-AUX.CL.2SG me.DAT  
[CP iść jutro na urlop]  
go.INF tomorrow on vacation  
≈'Yesterday, you begrudge me to go on vacation tomorrow'

As żałować2 does not presuppose a factive interpretation of the embedded proposition, infinitive CPs are allowed to occur.

2.2.4. Conditional clauses

As pointed out by Williams (1974), Pullum (1987) and Pesetsky (1991), conditional clauses can be realized as one of the arguments of factive predicates and preference predicates:

[21] You'll regret it [CP if you split up with him]

Żałować1 as a factive predicate allows conditional clauses as well:

[22] Później żałuję, [CP jeśli to zrobić] [żałować1]  
later żałować.3PL if this do.3PL  
'They will regret it later, if they do this'  
(NKJP, an internet forum, 2/9/2007)
On the other hand, żałować2 is not compatible with conditional clauses:

[23] *Rodzice żąują mi, [if this do.1SG] Żąłować2 parents żalować.3PL me.DAT to do.1SG to do.1SG

Based on the contrast between [22] and [23], I claim that żałować2 is neither an inherent factive predicate nor a preference predicate.

2.3. Factivity

Żałować1 is a factive predicate:

[24] Żałuję, że tak późno zacząłem strzelać gole [p=1] żalować.1SG that so late start.l-PTCP.1SG.M shoot.INF goals 'I regret that I started scoring goals so late'
(NKJP, Express Ilustrowany, 29/4/2002)

The presence of a negation marker in the matrix clause has no impact on the truth value of the embedded proposition:

[25] Nie żałuję, że tak późno zacząłem strzelać gole [p=1] NEG żalować.1SG that so late start.l-PTCP.1SG.M shoot.INF goals 'I don't regret that I started scoring goals so late'

Żałować2, in turn, is a future-oriented predicate, meaning that it remains open whether the embedded proposition is true or false. If a non-finite clause is embedded, the aspect has no impact on the interpretation:

[26] Żałujesz mi [if go.1SG.IMPRF/PRF/ITER on vacation] Żąłować2.2SG me.DAT go.INF.IMPRF/PRF/ITER on vacation 'Do you begrudge me to go on vacation?'

If żałować2 selects a finite CP with a verb marked for the present tense, only the iterative aspect gives rise to a factive interpretation:

[27] Żałujesz mi tego, że idę na urlop? [p=0 v p=1] begrudge.2SG me.DAT COR.GEN that go.1SG.IMPRF on vacation 'Do you begrudge me a vacation?'

[28] Żałujesz mi tego, że pójdę na urlop? [p=0 v p=1] begrudge.2SG me.DAT COR.GEN that go.1SG.PRF on vacation 'Do you begrudge me a vacation?'
Interestingly, if the embedded verb is marked for the past tense, it triggers a factive interpretation of the embedded proposition. The aspect value plays no role:

'Do you begrudge me a vacation?'

[31] Żałujesz mi tego, że poszedłem na urlop? \( [p=1] \)  
'Do you begrudge me a vacation?'

[32] Żałujesz mi tego, że chodziłem na urlop? \( [p=1] \)  
'Do you begrudge me a vacation?'

If żałować2 is under the scope of a negation marker, the truth value of \( p \) does not change:

[33] Nie żałujesz mi tego, że byłem na urlopie? \( [p=1] \)  
'No, do you begrudge me a vacation?'

[34] Nie żałujesz mi tego, że poszedłem na urlop? \( [p=1] \)  
'No, do you begrudge me a vacation?'

[35] Nie żałujesz mi tego, że chodziłem na urlop? \( [p=1] \)  
'No, do you begrudge me a vacation?'

2.4. Interim summary

The following table gives an overview of selected differences between żałować1 and żałować2:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>żałować1</th>
<th>żałować2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Dativ-DPs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Finite że-clauses</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Finite że-clauses with the correlate tego</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Conditional clauses</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. CP-infinitives</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. CP-infinitives with the correlate tego</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Factive interpretation of ( p )</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Selected differences between żałować1 and żałować2
3. Żałować in the history of Polish

Based on Klemensiewicz (2009) I distinguish the following four language stages in the history of Polish:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Language Stage</th>
<th>Beginning</th>
<th>Ending</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OP</td>
<td>Old Polish</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MidP</td>
<td>Middle Polish</td>
<td>1535</td>
<td>1780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
<td>New Polish</td>
<td>1780</td>
<td>1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP</td>
<td>Modern Polish</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Language periods in the history of Polish

3.1. Old Polish ( - 1535)

Żałować occurs already in Old Polish and it is associated with three different meanings. Its factive use (= żałować₁) occurs mainly with DPs and finite CPs:

[36] [DP swych g<rz>echow] (...) on był żałował
his sins.GEN he be.l-PTCP.3SG.M żałować₁.l-PTCP.3SG.M

'He regretted his sins'

(PolDi, GN, Kazanie 4; 14r: 26-27)

[37] oni tego byli barzo żałowali
they this be.l-PTCP.3PL.VIR very żałować₁.l-PTCP.3PL.VIR

[CP iżeć oni swe /[z]boże (...) byli rof/z/przeda]i
that they their crop be.l-PTCP.3PL.VIR sell.l-PTCP.3PL.VIR

'They regretted very much that they sold their crop.'

(Poldi, KG)

Remarkably, żałować can also mean 'sue', 'proceed against somebody', as shown in [38]:

[38] tedy Jan Piotra pozwał przed
then Jan.NOM Piotr.ACC sue.l-PTCP.3SG.M before

sąd żałując [CP iże ji uranil]
court żałować.PPR that him.ACC hurt.l-PTCP.3SG.M

'then Jan sued Piotr saying that he hurt him'

(PolDi, Dzial, 21:31, 22:1-2)
If \( \dot{\text{zale\'ow}} \) occurs with the preposition \( \text{na} \) 'on', it means 'tell tales about sb. to sb.':

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{[39]} & \quad <P> \dot{\text{iotr}} \dot{\text{zal\'ow}} & \quad [\text{pp na Jana}] \quad \text{przed s\'adem}, \\
& \quad \text{Piotr.NOM} \quad \dot{\text{zal\'ow}}.l-\text{PTCP.3SG.M} & \quad \text{on Jana.ACC} \quad \text{before court.LOC} \\
& \quad [\text{cp kako}] \quad \text{pzo\'ty abo dzienia jego krad\'mie} \quad & \quad \text{how bees or clothes his steal.3SG} \\
& \quad \text{'}Piotr told tales about Jan that he supposedly steals his bees and clothes' \quad & \quad \text{(PolDi, Dzial, 22:10-11)}
\end{align*}
\]

What appears to be striking about the latter two uses is that they fell into disuse. In MP \( \dot{\text{zale\'ow}} \) can only be employed either as \( \dot{\text{zale\'ow}}.1 \) or \( \dot{\text{zale\'ow}}.2 \). In this respect, MP differs from Modern Czech. As Radek Šimík pointed out to me, the Old Polish readings (except for \( \dot{\text{zale\'ow}}.1 \)) are available in Modern Czech.

I was not able to find any Old Polish examples illustrating the use of \( \dot{\text{zale\'ow}}.2 \).

3.2. Middle Polish (1535 - 1780)

First instances of \( \dot{\text{zale\'ow}}.2 \) occurs in Middle Polish. In all cases a DP is embedded:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{[40]} & \quad \text{nie zal\'ow} & \quad [\text{dp pieni\'edz}\text{y}] \quad \text{boby to by\'lo} \quad \text{nierych\'lo} \\
& \quad \text{NEG zal\'ow}.\text{INF} \quad \text{money.GEN} \quad \text{because it be} \quad l-\text{PTCP.3SG.N} \quad \text{not.soon} \\
& \quad \text{'}Don't begrudge the money; otherwise it (= a party) won't take place soon' \quad & \quad \text{(PolDi, ListyDoMarysi)}
\end{align*}
\]

Notice that \( \dot{\text{zale\'ow}}.2 \) does not license any Dative-DP in [40]. Occasionally, we can attest examples in which \( \dot{\text{zale\'ow}} \) does generate a DP checking the Dative case. But in these cases \( \dot{\text{zale\'ow}} \) is used a speech verb meaning 'complain':

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{[41]} & \quad \text{Jedna pani przysz\'\l a} & \quad \text{przed wojta i zal\'owala} \\
& \quad \text{one woman come.l-PTCP.3SG.F} \quad \text{before voyt and zal\'ow}.l-\text{PTCP.3SG.F} \\
& \quad [\text{dp mu}], \quad \text{i\'z jej czynszownik zbieda\'l} \\
& \quad \text{him.DAT that her.DAT owner deceive.l-PTCP.3SG.M} \\
& \quad \text{'}A woman came to the village head and was complaining to him that the owner of the tenement house deceives her.' \quad & \quad \text{(PolDi, OrtMac)}
\end{align*}
\]

3.3. New Polish (1780 - 1900)

In late Middle Polish/early New Polish \( \dot{\text{zale\'ow}}.2 \) starts licensing Dative-DPs:
'Would he begrudge his own piece of bread to him?'
(Poldi, Krasicki)

As I was not able to find any New Polish examples in which żałować2 would select an infinitive CP, I assume that they start to appear in Modern Polish.

4. Theoretical perspective: Reanalysis

In what follows, I analyze both żałować1 and żałować2 as lexical V-heads, indicating that none of these heads grammaticalized into a functional head associated with a functional projection:

![Diagram of base positions of żałować1 and żałować2]

Figure 1: Base positions of żałować1 and żałować2

I argue that żałować2 developed out of żałować1 in the 17th century:

![Diagram of the development of żałować2 and its complements]

Figure 2: The development of żałować2 and its complements
Following Larson (1988), I assume the indirect object receiving the Dative case to merge within vP.

The differences between żałowaćć1 and żałowaćć2, in turn, follow from the presence/absence of an [assertion] feature in ForceP of the subordinate clause (cf. Basse 2008). If żałowaćć selects for a CP, the truth-value of p can be either presupposed by the speaker (= żałowaćć1) or asserted by the matrix subject (= żałowaćć2). In the former case CPs are analyzed as defective phases lacking the feature [assertion]. Internally, there is no edge feature on the left periphery in the embedded clause and any kind of movement to the left edge is disallowed (based on Basse 2008):

Evidence for [42] comes from floating auxiliary clitics. In [45], a CP is embedded under żałowaćć1 and the auxiliary clitic cannot move from PtcpP to a higher position within the CP-field. The movement is blocked due to the absence of the [assertion] feature:

If, on the other hand, the feature [assertion] is activated, the C-Phase is not defective and the embedded C-head is an accessible goal for an Agree relation, which, in turn, is required both for PRO and secondary predicates in order to check their Case values in the embedded infinitive clause, e.g. the Dative in [46]:

In other words, although żałowaćć underwent a semantic change and although its complement types have changed, the syntactic size of its complements remained the same.
5. Conclusion

In this talk, I examined two different uses of the predicate żałować in (the history of) Polish. It has been shown that żałować can be used either as an inherent factive predicate ('regret') or as a future-oriented predicate ('begrudge').

If żałować is employed as a factive predicate, it cannot license Dative-DBPs and select for CP-infinitives. These restrictions do not hold for the non-factive use of żałować. If, on the other hand, it occurs as a future-oriented predicate meaning 'begrudge', it cannot occur with conditional clauses and finite CPs headed by the complementizer że 'that'.

Both predicates are lexical V-heads. The non-factive use developed out of the factive use of żałować in Middle Polish (1535 - 1780). This development does not instantiate any grammaticalization process. What both uses exemplify is a semantic shift of a single predicate entailing syntactic consequences.
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