When do secondary predicates not agree? Polish case study

In Polish, secondary predication can be expressed in two ways, either with a bare predicate (1)-(2), i.e. an adjective that should agree with the controlling event participant or a prepositional predicate (3), i.e. a combination of a preposition and invariant form of an adjective. There are restrictions as to what types of event participants can control bare and prepositional secondary predicates, based on their morphosyntactic marking and syntactic function. In general, prepositional secondary predicates, as the non-agreeing ones, can be controlled by any arguments of the matrix predicate. This is not surprising because the major syntactic issue here is agreement of an often syntactically distant secondary predicate with its controller. That agreement depends directly on the controller's ability to c-command the secondary predicate. Once c-command is interrupted or non-existent, agreement fails, and it must be replaced by the emergency instrumental or a prepositional secondary predicate. Still, the acceptability is not binary (good vs. bad), but it rather spreads on a scale, from good, through acceptable, awkward down to unacceptable. This is an important observation because purely syntactic treatments of secondary predication have tendency to work on binary values rather than scale, and to mark all less acceptable instances as ungrammatical. The goal of this paper is to show that there is a downgrade in acceptability of bare secondary predicates depending on how much the controller diverges from being a canonical representative of its kind: a nominative subject or an accusative object. This downgrade does not necessarily result in the unavailability of secondary predication in general but rather in growing frequency of replacing agreeing bare secondary predicates with non-agreeing ones. The acceptability scale is based on syntactic function and morphosyntactic marking, including so far: nominative subject, accusative object, non-accusative object, impersonal (no subject), dative subject, PP object. The further the controller is on the scale, the more difficult it is to agree with the secondary predicate, and the more likely it is that the secondary predicate will be a non-agreeing one. Importantly, however, then major tendency is to agree with the controller if possible. This is in contrast with Russian, where according to Landau (2008) and Bailyn (2012), non-agreeing instrumental is always available and even preferred in secondary predication, both with the subject and object control. This preference is not found in Polish, but rather lack of agreement is a substitute. Subject controlled secondary predicates must agree in nominative with the controlling NP (1). Direct object control allows both, accusative agreement and non-agreeing instrumental (2), but the agreeing form is preferred. Hence, case transmission in Polish secondary predicates patterns in many respects with Russian quantifiers *sam* 'himself' and *odin* 'alone', but not with Russian adjectives. Therefore, although Landau (2008) and Bailyn (2012) convincingly account for the dichotomy between agreeing and non-agreeing predicates in Russian in their respective framework, their analyses cannot be directly applied to Polish.

(1)   Jan.NOM_i wrócił pijany.NOM_i
       'Jan returned drunk'
(2)   Spotkałem go.ACC_i pijanego.ACC_i / pijanym.INS_i
       'I met him drunk'
(3)   Źle mi.DAT_i się spało po pijanemu$_i$
       'I slept badly drunk'

                                                                    (2972 characters)

Selected references:

Bailyn, J. 2012. *The Syntax of Russian*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press.

Bondaruk, A. 2004. *Pro and Control in English, Irish, and Polish. A Minimalist Analisis*. Lublin: Wyd. KUL.

Hentschel, G. 1993. "Zur Kasus Variation des Prädikativen Substantivs. Syntaktischer Wandel im Polnischen des 16. und 17. Jahrhunderts." In *Studies in Polish Morphology and Syntax*, eds. G. Hentschel and R. Laskowski. München: Verlag Otto Sagner. 259-292.

Hentschel, G., Ch. Schroeder, and W. Boeder. 2008. *Secondary Predicates in Eastern European Languages and Beyond*. Oldenburg: BIS-Verlag.

Landau, I. 2008. Two routes of control: Evidence of case transmission in Russian. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 26: 877-924.

Szajbel-Keck, M. 2014. "Prepositional Secondary Predication in Polish: Adjectives in complex constructions." In *Formal Approaches to Slavic Lingustics 22*, eds. C. Chapoman, O. Kit and I. Kučerová. Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publications. 361-379

Witkoś, J., P. Cegłowski, A. Snarska, and S. Żychliński. 2011. *Wybrane aspekty derywacji i interpretacji wyrażeń bezokolicznikowych. Minimalistyczne studium porównawcze polsko-angielskie*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM.