

On Complements and Adjuncts in Polish

Adam Przepiórkowski

Universität Tübingen & Polish Academy of Sciences

November 21, 1997

The **aim** of the talk: to examine the complement vs. adjunct dichotomy in Polish, in particular, to question the configurational status of this distinction.

1 Introduction

What the linguist means when (s)he says *complement* or *adjunct*?

1.1 Functional Criterion

A dependent which cannot be eliminated (which is obligatory) is a complement.

Sometimes a weaker version of this criterion is given (dating back to Tesnière (1959)): **Complements, unlike adjuncts, are indispensable to complete the meaning of the verb** (Vater, 1978a,b).

This is the single most accepted criterion (both cross-linguistically and cross-theoretically). It is given as the first or the only criterion in textbooks (e.g., Lyons (1976), Radford (1988), Bütting (1989), Borsley (1991), Haegeman (1994)), in linguistic dictionaries (e.g., Bußmann (1990), Polański (1993), Crystal (1997)), and in newer Polish grammars (e.g., Bąk (1984), Saloni and Świdziński (1985), Nagórko (1996), Świdziński (1997)). It is also the most prominent criterion in explicit discussions of verbal valency (e.g., Vater (1978a), Pollard and Sag (1987), Sawicki (1988)).

This is the criterion we assume here.

1.2 Other Criteria

Iterability Criterion According to this test, **two or more instances of the same adjunct type can combine with the same head, but this is impossible for complements** Pollard and Sag (1987) (als, e.g., Sgall *et al.* (1986), Polański (1993)). This test is the basis for distinguishing complements from adjuncts in LFG, cf. Kaplan and Bresnan (1982).

Predictability Criterion **Adjuncts are predictable (and have constant semantic contribution), while complements are unpredictable, depend on particular verbs and, hence, have to be stated in the lexicon**, e.g., Pollard and Sag (1987), Borsley (1991), Polański (1993), Labocha (1996).¹

¹There is a variant of this test used, e.g., in the Functional Generative Description (cf. Hajičová and Panevová (1984); Sgall *et al.* (1986)): if a dependent can occur with every verb, it is an adjunct (or ‘free modification’ in FGD’s terminology).

We will show how this criterion is reflected in our analysis.

Semantic Criterion This criterion is assumed in much of traditional Slavic linguistics. For example, Szober (1953) says that **complements (*dopelnienia*) are dependents referring to entities, while adjuncts (*okoliczniki*) refer to various circumstances in which the actions and states are placed**, cf. also Gołąb *et al.* (1968), Jodłowski (1976), Bąk (1984), Jaworski (1986), Bartnicka and Satkiewicz (1990).

Within GB, the importance of the semantic criterion has been re-discovered on the basis of extraction facts. Compare the passage below (from (Rizzi, 1990, pp.85–86)) to the traditional Slavic concept of the complement-adjunct dichotomy:

Some selected elements refer to participants in the event described by the verb (John, apples, books, etc.); other selected elements do not refer to participants but rather qualify the event (compositionally (measure, manner, etc.) or idiosyncratically (idiom chunks)).²

We will show below that the semantic criterion is independent from the above criteria.

2 Configurational Reflexes of the Dichotomy?

2.1 Extraction

2.1.1 Extraction of __ Complements and Adjuncts

Inner (Negative) Island? On the basis of Witkoś (1992, 1993), who claims that Inner Island is a weak island in Polish,

- (1) a. *Nie rozmawiałem z Brianem poufnie.*
NEG spoke_{1,sg} with Brian confidentially
‘I didn’t speak with Brian confidentially.’
b. *Z kim nie rozmawiałeś poufnie?*
with whom NEG spoke_{2,sg} confidentially
‘With whom didn’t you speak confidentially?’
c. * *Jak nie rozmawiałeś z Brianem?*
how NEG spoke_{2,sg} with Brian
‘How didn’t you speak with Brian?’
- (2) a. *Ziemniaki nie ważyły dwa kilo.*
potatoes NEG weigh two kilos
‘The potatoes didn’t weigh two kilos.’
b. * *Ile nie ważyły ziemniaki?*
how much NEG weigh potatoes
‘How much didn’t the potatoes weigh?’

²Note, however, that what Rizzi (1990) divides into referential and non-referential classes are just the selected elements (i.e., complements) rather than dependents. Since only selected referential elements get an index (and hence can be antecedent-governed, i.e., can escape the cyclicity of movement), this implies that non-referential complements and all adjuncts pattern alike with respect to movement. This, however, forces (Rizzi, 1990, p.91) to assume that all instrumental (as well as locative) PP’s, generally considered to be adjuncts, are in fact selected complements: they are as extractable as non-controversially selected PP’s.

(2) actually provides a counter-example to Witkoś's claim: *dwa kilo* is an obligatory dependent and, hence, it is a complement.³ And yet, the relative unacceptability of (2b) is similar to that of (1c).

Independence of extraction possibilities from the (functional) adjunct-complement dichotomy is further confirmed by the following sentences, which should be contrasted with (1):

- (3) a. *Nie zachowywałem się nieprzyzwoicie z Brianem.*
NEG behaved_{1sg} REFL indecently with Brian
'I didn't behave indecently with Brian.'
- b. *Z kim nie zachowywałeś się nieprzyzwoicie?*
with whom NEG behaved_{2sg} REFL indecently
'With whom didn't you behave indecently?'
- c. **Jak nie zachowywałeś się z Brianem?*
how NEG behaved_{2sg} REFL with Brian
'How didn't you behave with Brian?'

Wh-Island? On the basis of Witkoś (1993).

- (4) a. *Co_i Iwona chce, żeby jak_i Tomek zjadł t_i t_j?*
what Iwonne want_{3sg} COMP how Tom eat
- b. **Jak_j Iwona chce, żeby co_i Tomek zjadł t_i t_j?*
how Iwonne want_{3sg} COMP what Tom eat

Whatever the grammaticality status of (4), it seems to be parallel to the following examples, and thus orthogonal to the complement-adjunct distinction:

- (5) a. *[Z kim]_j Iwona chce, żeby jak_i Tomek się zachowywał t_i t_j?*
with whom Iwonne want_{3sg} COMP how Tom REFL behave
- b. **Jak_i Iwona chce, żeby [z kim]_j Tomek się zachowywał t_i t_j?*
how Iwonne want_{3sg} COMP with whom Tom REFL behave

Moreover, it seems that the acceptability status of the pattern (4b) improves drastically under the right discourse-linking conditions (cf. Dornisch (1995)). The question below becomes completely acceptable if the knowledge of who the possible examinees are is shared by the speaker and the hearer (thus, *kogo* is D-linked), but the speaker does not know Jacek's wishes as to the method of examination (*jak* is not D-linked).

- (6) *Jak_j Jacek chce, żeby kogo_i Iwona przeegzaminowała t_i t_j?*
how Jack want_{3sg} COMP who Iwonne examine
'How does Jack want Iwonne to examine whom?'

Conclusion There is no evidence for the relevance of the complement-adjunct distinction for extraction in Polish.

³It is unambiguously a complement also within the host framework of Witkoś's analysis, i.e., Rizzi (1990) and Cinque (1990). Actually, selected measure adverbials, apart from selected manner adverbials and idiom chunks, provided main argument for Rizzi's use of referential indices, cf. Rizzi (1990), §§3.2 and 3.5.

2.1.2 Extraction from Complements and Adjuncts

Extraction from Subordinate Clauses Although it is a well known fact that extraction from subordinate clauses in Polish is fairly restricted (e.g., Kardela (1986), Willim (1989, ch.4), Witkoś (1993)), there is some controversy as to what exactly can be moved out of what kind of clause. For example, most authors deny the possibility of extracting anything out of indicative *że*-clauses (Kardela, 1986; Willim, 1989; Witkoś, 1993), others postulate the existence of bridge verbs allowing for extraction of complements but not subjects (Cichocki, 1983), and some claim that under proper circumstances also subjects can be extracted (Bobrowski, 1988, ch.3), or even that multiple *wh*-extraction (e.g., involving the subject and an object) is possible (Zabrocki, 1990). Similar confusion concerns the subjunctive *żeby* clauses, but it is clear that they can at least in some positions allow extraction of at least complements and adjuncts.

- (7) **Komu_i zrobiłem to, żeby pomóc t_i?*
who_{dat} did_{1sg} this COMP help_{inf}
'I did it in order to help whom?'
- (8) **Komu_i kazałem mu, żeby pomógł t_i?*
who_{dat} ordered_{1sg} him_{dat} COMP help_{3sg}
'Whom did I order him to help?'
- (9) **Komu_i prosiłem go, żeby pomógł t_i?*
who_{dat} asked_{1sg} him_{acc} COMP help_{3sg}
'Whom did I ask him to help?'
- (10) ?*Komu_i chciałem, żeby pomógł t_i?*
who_{dat} wanted_{1sg} COMP help_{3sg}
'Whom did I want him to help?'
- (11) ?*Komu_i chciałem, żeby pomóc t_i?*
who_{dat} wanted_{1sg} COMP help_{inf}
'Whom did I want one/us to help?'
- (12) *Komu_i chciałem pomóc t_i?*
who_{dat} wanted_{1sg} help_{inf}
'Whom did I want to help?'

Again, the extraction from facts do not parallel the complement-adjunct dichotomy: the extraction from the purposive adjunct (7) sounds unacceptable, so does the extraction from the complement *żeby*-clauses (8)-(9).

2.2 Case Assignment

2.2.1 Genitive of Negation

There is an aspect of Polish GoN which has received very little attention: not only objects can undergo this process, but also accusative adjuncts.⁴ However, as discussed by Franks and Dziwirek

⁴This has been noted for Russian, e.g., by Babby (1980a) (cf. also Timberlake (1975), Babby (1980b, fn.2), Babby (1986, fn.43), Fowler (1987, pp.307f.)), who claims that in Russian "the only reason that subjects, direct objects, and time adverbs are marked genitive [under negation] is that they do not happen to be marked by an oblique case" (p.86, see also p.150). See also (Przepiórkowski, 1997a) and references cited therein for cross-linguistic arguments for the claim that case assignment does not clearly distinguish between complements and adjuncts.

(1993), there seems to be an important difference: apparently, although GoN is obligatory for complements, it is optional for adjuncts:⁵

- (13) a. *Janek pisze list/*listu.*
John writes letter_{acc/*gen}
'John is writing a letter.'
- b. *Janek nie pisze listu/*list.*
John NEG writes letter_{gen/*acc}
'John is not writing a letter.'
- (14) a. *Rozmawiałem z nim dwie godziny / *dwóch godzin.*
talked-I with him [two hours]_{acc/*gen}
'We were talking for two hours.'
- b. *Nie rozmawiałem z nim dwie godziny / dwóch godzin.*
NEG talked-I with him [two hours]_{acc/gen}
'We weren't talking for two hours.'

We claim that what is at stake here is not the complement-adjunct distinction in the sense of the functional criterion of §1.1. This is shown by the examples below:⁶

- (15) a. *Bielany leżą milę/*mili od Warszawy.*
Bielany_{nom} lie mile_{acc/*gen} from Warsaw
'Bielany lies a mile from Warsaw.'
- b. *Bielany nie leżą milę/mili od Warszawy.*
Bielany_{nom} NEG lie mile_{acc/gen} from Warsaw
'Bielany doesn't lie a mile from Warsaw.'
- (16) a. *Ta ryba waży kilogram/*kilograma.*
[this fish]_{nom} weigh kilogram_{acc/*gen}
'This fish weighs a kilogram.'
- b. *Ta ryba nie waży kilogram/kilograma.*
[this fish]_{nom} NEG weigh kilogram_{acc/gen}
'This fish doesn't weigh a kilogram.'

What, then, matters for optionality of GoN? The answer is, again, referentiality:⁷ apparently referential NP[acc] dependents undergo GoN obligatorily, the other NP[acc] elements — only optionally.

- (17) *Danusia nie spędziła czterech/*cztery dni w Ithace.*
Danusia NEG spent four_{gen/*acc} days in Ithaca
'Danusia didn't spend four days in Ithaca.'

⁵Actually, it is denied by Willim (1990, p.211) and Tajsner (1990, p.246) that adjuncts can undergo GoN. On the other hand, Holvoet (1991, p.85) and Franks and Dziwirek (1993) consider such examples grammatical. We are not sure if this is the result of a genuine variation, or whether Willim's and Tajsner's judgements stem from the fact that additional presuppositions are connected with the genitive variant, pace Holvoet (1991, p.85), or that they may have partitive meaning, pace Franks and Dziwirek (1993). In any case, all our informants considered both possibilities fully acceptable.

⁶Examples (10) and (12) in Franks and Dziwirek (1993), where the relevant NPs are classified as adjuncts (without discussion).

⁷The material in the rest of this section is inspired by (Fowler and Yadroff, 1993), although our conclusions differ from theirs. See Przepiórkowski (1997b) for discussion.

- (18) *Janek nie przeszedł pięciu/*pięć kilometrów w ciągu godziny.*
John NEG walked through five_{gen/*acc} kilometers during hour
'John didn't cover five kilometers in one hour.'

What distinguishes the accusative/genitive NPs in (14)–(16) from those in (17)–(18) is their referentiality status as shown by two co-reference tests: pronominal substitution test (cf. (19) and (21)) and relative pronominalization test (cf. (20) and (22)).

- (19) **Bielany leżą milę od Warszawy, a Wersal leży ją od Paryża.*
Bielany_{nom} lie mile_{acc} from Warsaw and Versailles lies it from Paris.
'Bielany lies a mile from Warsaw, and Versailles lies the same distance from Paris.'
- (20) **To jest ta mila, którą Bielany leżą od Warszawy.*
this is this mile which Bielany lie from Warsaw
'This is the mile that is the distance between Bielany and Warsaw.'
- (21) *Janek przeszedł pięć kilometrów w ciągu godziny, a Tomek przeszedł je w ciągu trzech.*
John walked through five_{acc} kilometres during hour and Tom walked through them during three
'John covered five kilometres in one hour and Tom covered this distance in three hours.'
- (22) *To są te trzy kilometry, które Janek przeszedł w ciągu godziny.*
this are these three kilometres which John walked through during hour
'This is the three-kilometre distance that John covered in one hour.'

2.2.2 Nominalization

Nominalization facts independently confirm the results of the previous subsection. Just as with GoN, it seems at first blush that nominalization distinguishes NP[acc] complements from NP[acc] adjuncts: the former obligatorily change their case in this process to genitive, the latter are not perfect either in accusative or in genitive, although accusative sounds markedly better:

- (23) *pisanie listu/*list*
writing letter_{gen/*acc}
'writing a letter'
- (24) *rozmawianie przez telefon ?*dwóch godzin / ? dwie godziny*
talking through phone [two hours]_{?*gen/?acc}
'talking over phone for two hours'

However, again, the parallelism with the functional distinction is only apparent. For example, the obligatory complement of the non-agentive *ważyć* (cf. (16)) behaves just like prototypical NP[acc] adjuncts:⁸

- (25) *ważenie ?*stu pięćdziesięciu / ? sto pięćdziesiąt kilogramów*
weighing [hundred fifty]_{?*gen/?acc} kilo
'weighing 150 kilo'

⁸Example (25) is acceptable in its agentive meaning, as in: *Ważenie stu pięćdziesięciu kilogramów mięsa w drobnych kawałkach zajęło mu cały dzień* 'Weighing 150 kilo of finely chopped meat took him whole day.'

2.3 Binding

2.3.1 Adjuncts outside the Scope of BT?

According to the binding theory of (Pollard and Sag, 1994, ch.6), only arguments (subjects and complements) are subject to binding principle⁹. One prediction of this analysis is that bare NP adjunct anaphors are actually *logophors*, i.e., their co-indexation properties are discourse- and processing-driven (Pollard and Sag, 1994, sec.6.7). In particular, logophors are assumed to reflect the point of view with which the narrator sympathizes, as in (26), taken from Reinhart and Reuland (1993) (after Zribi-Hertz (1989)), who support this view:

(26) “It angered him that she... tried to attract a man like himself.”

This view cannot be maintained for Polish:

- (27) *Marek_i chwalił sie_e, że Ewa_j rozwiązała zadanie swoim_{wi/j} sposobem.*
 Mark boosted REFL COMP Eve solved problem SELF.POSS_{ins} method_{ins}
 ‘Mark boosted of Mary’s solving the problem with his/her own method.’
- (28) *Złościło ją_i, że Marek_j wysłał zaproszenie swoim_{wi/j} samochodem.*
 anger_{3sg} she_{acc} COMP Mark sent_{3sg} invitation SELF.POSS_{ins} car_{ins}
 ‘It made her angry that Mark sent the invitation by her/his own car.’
- (29) *Tomek_i podejrzewał, że Maria_j nie ugotowała sobie_{wi/j} obiadu (bo go*
 Tom suspected_{3sg} COMP Mary NEG cooked_{3sg,fem} SELF_{dat} dinner (because he_{acc}
chciała ukarać).
 wanted_{3sg,fem} punish)
 ‘Tom suspected that Mary hadn’t cooked himself/herself the dinner (because she wanted to punish him).’
- (30) *Ewa_i poprosiła pielęgniarkę_j, żeby poprawiła poduszkę swojej_{wi/j} mamie.*
 Eve asked_{3sg,fem} nurse COMP correct pillow SELF.POSS_{dat} mother
 ‘Eve asked the nurse to move the her mother’s pillow.’
- (31) *Janek_i chciał, żeby Ewa_j biegła swoim_{wi/j} tempem (i nie zostawała*
 John wanted_{3sg,masc} COMP Eve run SELF.POSS_{ins} speed (and NEG stay
w tyle).
 behind)
 ‘John wanted Eve to proceed with his/her own speed (and not to stay behind).’

Note that the reflexive has to be subject-bound in its tense domain (cf. Willim (1989, ch.3), Reinders-Machowska (1991)) regardless of the kind of adjunct it occurs in (instrument (27), means (28), benefactive (29), recipient of action (30) and manner (31)), whether it is a personal pronoun (29) or a reflexive, and whether the subordinate clause is a barrier for *wh*-extraction (in (31) it is not). Even if the adjuncts in (27)–(31) were assumed to be arguments, there are other problems to be solved, e.g., the fact that the arguments of locative prepositions in Polish behave in the same way as arguments of ‘case-marking’ prepositions (cf. (32)–(33), based on (Reinhart and Reuland, 1993, (15)–(16))).

⁹This is the result of defining such notions as (*local*) *o-command* and (*local*) *o-binding* in terms of the SUBCAT attribute (later renamed as ARG-S and subsequently as ARG-ST), which contains only the (*synsems* of) subcategorized dependents.

- (32) a. *Max_i rozmawia z *nim_i / ze sobą_i.*
 Max talk with he_{ins} / with SELF_{ins}
 ‘Max talks to him/himself.’
 b. *Max_i polega na *nim_i / na sobie_i.*
 Max relies on he_{loc} / on SELF_{loc}
 ‘Max relies on him/himself.’
- (33) a. *Max_i zobaczył pistolet kolo *niego_i / kolo siebie_i.*
 Max saw_{3sg} gun near he_{gen} / near SELF_{gen}
 ‘Max saw a gun near him/himself.’
 b. *Max_i posadził Lucję kolo *niego_i / kolo siebie_i.*
 Max placed Lucy near he_{gen} / near SELF_{gen}
 ‘Max placed Lucy near him/himself.’

We conclude that the complement-adjunct difference of the kind assumed by Pollard and Sag (1992, 1994); Reinhart and Reuland (1993) cannot be observed in Polish.

2.3.2 Condition C Effects

The configurational complement-adjunct distinction is also often held responsible for various Condition C asymmetries, particularly in the so-called antireconstruction case

Condition C for Adjuncts Hukari and Levine (1996) argue on the basis of examples such as (34)–(35) that names contained in adjuncts show Condition C effects, albeit different than those contained in complements: they cannot be co-indexed with a c-commanding (*valence c-commanding*, in the terminology of Hukari and Levine (1996)) subject, although they can be co-indexed with complements of the higher clause.

- (34) a. **They_i went into the city without the twins_i being noticed.*
 b. *You can’t say anything to them_i without the twins_i being offended.*
- (35) a. **She_i always gets angry when Kim_i is criticized.*
 b. *We always console her_i when Kim_i is criticized.*

This apparently contrasts with names contained in a complement: they cannot be co-indexed either with a higher complement, or with a higher subject:

- (36) *She_i asked her maid_j when Mary_{wi/*j} could finally leave.*

Note that the real difference lies in the possibility of co-indexation with a higher complement: it is possible if the name is embedded in an adjunct (cf. (34a) and (35a)), but not if it is in a complement (36).

Polish does not show similar contrasts between complement and adjunct clauses:

- (37) a. **Pytałem ją_i, kiedy Ewa_i wreszcie posprząta mieszkanie.*
 asked_{1sg} she_{acc} when Eve finally clean flat
 ‘I asked her when will Eve finally clean the flat.’
 b. **Widziałem ją_i, kiedy Ewa_i sprzątała mieszkanie.*
 saw_{1sg} she_{nom} when Eve cleaned_{1sg,fem} flat
 ‘I saw her when Eve was cleaning the flat.’

Although in (37a) *Ewa* is contained in a complement clause, while in (37b) — in a temporal adjunct clause, the acceptability judgements are similar.¹⁰ Here is another example of this lack of contrast:

- (38) a. *? *Zawsze ją_i prosimy, żeby Ewa_i się nie rozplakała.*
 always she_{acc} ask_{1pl} COMP Eve REFL NEG cry
 ‘We always ask her not to cry.’
 b. *? *Zawsze ją_i pocieszamy, żeby Ewa_i się nie rozplakała.*
 always she_{nom} comfort COMP Eve REFL NEG cry
 ‘We always comfort her so that Eve doesn’t cry.’

Antireconstruction Similarly, antireconstruction effects of the kind discussed in Lebeaux (1988) (cf. also Hukari and Levine (1996) and references therein) do not seem to have a correlate in Polish. Consider the examples (39) based on (Lebeaux, 1988, ex.(54)). Unlike their English counterparts, they do not show any clear difference in acceptability.

- (39) a. ?? *W domu Tomka_i mieszka on_i razem z rodziną.*
 in house Tom_{gen} live_{3sg} he_{nom} together with family
 ‘In Tom’s house, he lives together with his family.’
 b. ?? *W domu Tomka_i słucha on_i muzyki razem z rodziną.*
 in house Tom_{gen} listen_{3sg} he_{nom} music together with family
 ‘In Tom’s house, he is listening to music together with his family.’

One reason for this symmetry might be that these examples do not involve extraction at all, but rather scrambling (Polish is a relatively free word order language). More telling are examples (40).

- (40) a. ? *W którym domu Janka chciałeś, żeby mieszkał on przez najbliższy rok?*
 in which house John_{gen} wanted_{2sg} COMP live he_{nom} through closest year
 ‘In which house of John’s did you want him to live for the next year?’
 b. ? *W którym domu Janka chciałeś, żeby dbał on szczególnie o porządek?*
 in which house John_{gen} wanted_{2sg} COMP take care he_{nom} especially about order
 ‘In which house of John’s did you want him to take special care of cleanness?’

These sentences, however, also do not show clear grammaticality difference. It seems, thus, that binding facts do not distinguish between complements and adjuncts in Polish.

2.4 Negative Concord

Aranovich (1993) notices that in Spanish, no *n*-words can be licensed across strong barriers (in the sense of Cinque (1990)), while only complement *n*-words can be licensed across weak barriers.

In Polish, however, there seem to be no differences of this kind. Note first that, as shown in (Przepiórkowski and Kupść, 1997a,b), *n*-licensing is always illicit across tensed clauses, whether indicative or subjunctive, complement or adjunct. This could be explained by the assumption that all such clauses are strong islands in Polish. However, *żeby*-clauses allow for extraction in Polish, and yet they are barriers for *n*-licensing:

¹⁰For most speakers both are unacceptable, although some speakers prefer examples like (37a), while others prefer (37b).

- (41) * *Nie chciałem, żeby Tomek nikogo uderzył.*
 NEG wanted_{1sg} COMP Tom nobody_{acc} hit
 ‘I didn’t want Tom to hit anybody.’ (putative)
 (42) * *Nie chciałem, żeby Tomek nigdy szedł po papierosy.*
 NEG wanted_{1sg} COMP Tom never went for cigarettes
 ‘I didn’t want Tom to be ever fetching cigarettes’

We therefore maintain the claim in Przepiórkowski and Kupść 1997a,b that Polish NC is not sensitive to the complement-adjunct dichotomy.

A remark concerning binding and NC is in order here.¹¹ As discussed in Przepiórkowski and Kupść 1997a,b, Polish NC is unbounded in the sense that it can cross any number of PP and NP projections. The same seems to be true of binding. Thus, even when an *n*-word (an anaphor) is embedded deep in an NP or a PP dependent of a verb, it can still be licensed by the negation on the verb (resp., by the subject of the verb), provided no sentential barrier is crossed. However, this is not always true as the examples below show:

- (43) a. * *Według/zdaniem żadnego rosyjskiego polityka, Polska nie powinna przystąpić do NATO.*
 according to none Russian pol Poland NEG should join to NATO.
 ‘According to no Russian politician, should Poland join NATO.’ (putative)
 b. * *Janek to kanalia, (przynajmniej) według/zdaniem swojego brata.*
 John is scoundrel at least according to SELF.POSS brother
 ‘John is a scoundrel, at least according to his brother.’ (putative)

Thus, in both binding and NC, there are differences in behaviour between various dependents, and, again, these differences do not correlate with the complement-adjunct dichotomy. At least on a first approximation, what seems to matter is rather the event-modifying versus proposition-modifying status of the dependent. This issue certainly deserves further investigation.

2.5 The ‘do so’ Test

The ‘do so’ (‘do that’) test, presented by Lakoff and Ross (1976), subsequently promoted to textbooks, e.g.: (Radford, 1988, pp.234–235), (Borsley, 1991, pp.62–63) and (Haegeman, 1994, p.88).¹²

The assumption is that ‘do so’ replaces a *V'*, i.e., the verb with all its complements and perhaps some adjuncts, cf. (44) from (Borsley, 1991, p.63).

- (44) a. *Stefan will wash his socks in the bathroom and Ben will do so in the kitchen.*
 b. * *Stefan will put his socks in the bathroom and Ben will do so in the kitchen.*
 (45) a. *Stefan upierze skarpetki w łazience, a Ben zrobi to w kuchni.*
 b. * *Stefan położy skarpetki w łazience, a Ben zrobi to w kuchni.*

¹¹We are grateful to Manfred Sailer and Frank Richter for bringing this issue to our attention.

¹²The ‘do so’ and ‘one’ proform tests are extensively criticized by Miller (1992).

2.5.1 Some Predictions for Polish

Instrumentals are Adjuncts

- (46) *Janek wbił gwóźdź młotkiem, a Tomek zrobił to siekierą.*
John hammered nail hammer_{INS} and Tom did it axe_{INS}

This is contra the treatment of instrumentals in LFG.

Some NP[ins] Adverbials of Means are Complements

- (47) *?* Janek pojechał na konferencję pociągiem, a Maria zrobiła to samolotem.*
John went to conference train_{INS} and Mary did it plane_{INS}
- (48) *?* Janek przesłał zaproszenie pocztą, a Maria zrobiła to gońcem.*
John sent invitation post_{INS} and Mary did it messenger_{INS}

Compare these to the grammatical:

- (49) *Janek pojechał na konferencję dzisiaj, a Maria zrobiła to wczoraj.*
John went to conference today and Mary did it yesterday

NP[dat] Benefactives are Complements

- (50) *?* Janek poszedł mamie po papierosy, a Marysia zrobiła to ojcu.*
John went mum_{DAT} for cigarettes and Mary did it father_{DAT}

NP[dat] Malefactives are Adjuncts

- (51) *Janek spalił mamie dom, a Marysia zrobiła to ojcu.*
John burned mum_{DAT} house and Mary did it father_{INS}

Żeby Purpose Clauses are Adjuncts

- (52) *Janek poszedł do sklepu, żeby kupić chleb, a Tomek zrobił to, żeby kupić wódkę.*
John went to shop to buy bread and Tom did it to buy vodka

Infinitival Purpose Clauses are Complements

- (53) ** Janek poszedł do sklepu kupić chleb, a Tomek zrobił to kupić wódkę.*
John went to shop buy bread and Tom did it buy vodka

2.5.2 An Alternative Analysis

- (54)
- | | | |
|----|---|----------------|
| a. | ... <i>zrobił to siekierą.</i> | (instrumental) |
| b. | ... <i>zrobił to samolotem.</i> | (instrumental) |
| c. | ... <i>zrobił to gońcem.</i> | (instrumental) |
| d. | ... <i>zrobił to wczoraj.</i> | (temporal) |
| e. | ... <i>zrobił to ojcu.</i> | (malefactive) |
| f. | ... <i>zrobił to, żeby kupić wódkę.</i> | (purposive) |
| g. | * ... <i>zrobił to kupić wódkę.</i> | (purposive) |

The outline of the analysis:

- ‘*zrobić to*’, just like any other verb, is compatible only with a class of adjuncts;
- ‘*zrobić to*’ refers to a contextually prominent predicate;
- the lexical process adding adjuncts to a verb’s valence changes its semantics: it creates a new predicate structure, which properly contains the original predicate structure;
- normally, both predicate structures remain contextually prominent, so ‘*zrobić to*’ can refer to either.

3 Evidence for an HPSG Account

On the basis of the discussion above, we posit as a zero hypothesis that **the complement vs. adjunct dichotomy plays no configurational rôle in Polish syntax**. This adds evidence for the strain of HPSG research on adjuncts according to which some or all adjuncts are added to a verbs valency list via a lexical process. The result of this assumption is that adjuncts cannot be distinguished from complements in the syntax.

There are various formalizations of this lexical process, e.g., Miller (1992); van Noord and Bouma (1994); Manning *et al.* (1997); Przepiórkowski (1997c). What they all have in common is that:

- the lexical process (lexical rule, lexical types) is in principle iterative;
- it is optional;
- it effectively divides the lexicon into basic lexical entries (containing on their valency lists just the ‘indispensable to complete the meaning of the verb’, often syntactically obligatory) and the derived lexical entries (containing also adjuncts, in principle optional¹³);
- it predicts that adjuncts are predictable (they are added via a general lexical process), while complements are not (they are part of the basic lexical entries);
- it obliterates the configurational difference between complements and adjuncts.

¹³But nothings forbids particular event structures to actually require an adjunct, pace Grimshaw and Vikner (1993).

References

- Aranovich, R. (1993). Negative concord in Spanish and *in-situ* licensing. In E. Duncan, D. Farkas, and P. Spaelti, editors, *Proceedings of Twelfth West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*.
- Babby, L. (1980a). *Existential Sentences and Negation in Russian*. Karoma Publishers, Ann Arbor.
- Babby, L. (1980b). The syntax of surface case marking. In W. Harbert and J. Herschensohn, editors, *Cornell Working Papers in Linguistics*, volume 1, pages 1–32. Department of Modern Languages and Linguistics, Cornell University.
- Babby, L. H. (1986). The locus of case assignment and the direction of percolation: Case theory and Russian. In Brecht and Levine (1986), pages 170–219.
- Bąk, P. (1984). *Gramatyka języka polskiego*. Wiedza Powszechna, Warszawa, fourth edition.
- Bartnicka, B. and Satkiewicz, H. (1990). *Gramatyka języka polskiego dla cudzoziemców*. Wiedza Powszechna, Warszawa.
- Bobrowski, I. (1988). *Gramatyka generatywno-transformacyjna (TG) a uogólniona gramatyka struktur frazowych (GPSG)*. Prace Habilitacyjne. Ossolineum, Wrocław.
- Borsley, R. D. (1991). *Syntactic Theory: A Unified Approach*. Edward Arnold, London.
- Brecht, R. D. and Levine, J. S., editors (1986). *Case in Slavic*. Slavica Publishers, Inc.
- Büntig, K.-D. (1989). *Wstęp do lingwistyki*. Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, Warszawa. Translated from German *Einführung in die Linguistik*, 1981, Athenäum Verlag.
- Bußmann, H. (1990). *Lexikon der Sprachwissenschaft*. Alfred Kröner Verlag, Stuttgart.
- Cichocki, W. (1983). Multiple wh-questions in Polish: A two-comp analysis. *Toronto Working Papers in Linguistics*, 4, 53–71.
- Cinque, G. (1990). *Types of A'-Dependencies*. The MIT Press, Cambridge, Mas.
- Crystal, D. (1997). *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*. The Language Library. Blackwell Publishers, Oxford, fourth edition.
- Dornisch, E. (1995). Discourse-linking and multiple wh-questions in Polish. In E. Gussman, editor, *Licensing in Syntax and Phonology*, volume 1 of *PASE Studies and Monographs*, pages 71–86. Polish Linguistics, Lublin.
- Fowler, G. and Yadoff, M. (1993). The argument status of accusative measure nominals in Russian. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics*, 1(2), 251–79.
- Fowler, G. H. (1987). *The Syntax of the Genitive Case in Russian*. PhD dissertation, University of Chicago.
- Franks, S. and Dziwirek, K. (1993). Negated adjunct phrases are really partitive. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics*, 1(2), 280–305.
- Gołąb, Z., Heinz, A., and Polański, K. (1968). *Słownik Terminologii Językoznawczej*. Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
- Grimshaw, J. and Vikner, S. (1993). Obligatory adjuncts and the structure of events. In E. Reuland and W. Abraham, editors, *Knowledge and Language*, volume II, pages 143–155. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht.
- Haegeman, L. (1994). *Introduction to Government and Binding Theory*. Blackwell Textbooks in Linguistics. Blackwell Publishers, Oxford, second edition.
- Hajičová, E. and Panevová, J. (1984). Valency (case) frames of verbs. In P. Sgall, editor, *Contributions to Functional Syntax, Semantics and Language Comprehension*, volume 16 of *Linguistic & Literary Studies in Eastern Europe (LISEE)*, pages 147–188. Benjamins, Amsterdam.
- Holvoet, A. (1991). *Transitivity and Clause Structure in Polish. A Study in Case Marking*, volume 95 of *Prace Slawistyczne*. Slawistyczny Ośrodek Wydawniczy PAN, Warszawa.
- Hukari, T. E. and Levine, R. D. (1996). On valence and antireconstruction. Unpublished manuscript. Version of 20 October, 1996.
- Jaworski, M. (1986). *Podręczna gramatyka języka polskiego*. Wydawnictwa Szkolne i Pedagogiczne, Warszawa, fourth edition.
- Jodłowski, S. (1976). *Podstawy polskiej składni*. Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, Warszawa.
- Kaplan, R. M. and Bresnan, J. (1982). Lexical-functional grammar: A formal system for grammatical representation. In J. Bresnan, editor, *The Mental Representation of Grammatical Relations*, MIT Press Series on Cognitive Theory and Mental Representation, chapter 4, pages 173–281. The MIT Press, Cambridge, Mas.
- Kardela, H. (1986). *Wh-movement in English and Polish: Theoretical Implications*, volume XLI of *Rozprawy Wydziału Humanistycznego: Rozprawy habilitacyjne*. Uniwersytet Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej, Wydział humanistyczny, Lublin.
- Labocha, J. (1996). *Gramatyka polska: Składnia*. Księgarnia Akademicka, Kraków.
- Lakoff, G. and Ross, J. R. (1976). Why you can't *do so* into the sink. In J. McCawley, editor, *Notes from the linguistic underground*, volume 7 of *Syntax and semantics*, pages 101–111. Academic Press, New York.
- Lebeaux, D. S. (1988). *Language Acquisition and the Form of the Grammar*. PhD dissertation, University of Massachusetts.
- Lyons, J. (1976). *Wstęp do językoznawstwa*. Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, Warszawa. Translated from English *Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics*, 1971, Cambridge University Press.
- Manning, C. D., Sag, I. A., and Iida, M. (1997). The lexical integrity of Japanese causatives. To appear in G. Green and R. Levine (eds.), *Readings in HPSG*, Cambridge University Press. Version of March 5, 1997.
- Miller, P. (1992). *Clitics and Constituents in Phrase Structure Grammar*. Garland, New York.
- Nagórko, A. (1996). *Zarys gramatyki polskiej*. Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, Warszawa.
- Polański, K., editor (1993). *Encyklopedia językoznawstwa ogólnego*. Ossolineum, Wrocław.
- Pollard, C. and Sag, I. A. (1987). *Information-Based Syntax and Semantics, Volume 1: Fundamentals*. Center for the Study of Language and Information.
- Pollard, C. and Sag, I. A. (1992). Anaphors in English and the scope of binding theory. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 23(2), 261–303.
- Pollard, C. and Sag, I. A. (1994). *Head-driven Phrase Structure Grammar*. Chicago University Press.

- Przepiórkowski, A. (1997a). On case assignment and “adjuncts as complements”. Unpublished manuscript. Submitted to: A. Kathol, J.-P. Koenig, and G. Webelhuth (eds.), *HPSG volume in “Studies in Constraint-Based Lexicalism”*, CSLI.
- Przepiórkowski, A. (1997b). On complements and adjuncts in Polish. Unpublished manuscript. Submitted to: R. D. Borsley and A. Przepiórkowski (eds.), *Slavic in HPSG*, CSLI.
- Przepiórkowski, A. (1997c). Quantifiers, adjuncts as complements, and scope ambiguity. Draft of October 21, 1997.
- Przepiórkowski, A. and Kupść, A. (1997a). Negative concord in Polish. Technical Report 828, Institute of Computer Science, Polish Academy of Science
- Przepiórkowski, A. and Kupść, A. (1997b). On locality of negative concord in Polish and Romance: A lexicalist approach. Unpublished manuscript. Submitted to: R. D. Borsley and A. Przepiórkowski (eds.), *Slavic in HPSG*, CSLI.
- Przepiórkowski, A. and Kupść, A. (1997c). Unbounded negative concord in Polish: A lexicalist HPSG approach. In J. Landsbergen, J. Odijk, K. van Deemter, and G. V. van Zanten, editors, *Computational Linguistics in the Netherlands 1996: Papers from the Seventh CLIN Meeting*, pages 129–143, Eindhoven. IPO, Center for Research on User-System Interaction, Technische Universiteit Eindhoven.
- Przepiórkowski, A. and Kupść, A. (1997d). Verbal negation and complex predicate formation in Polish. In *Proceedings of the 1997 Conference of the Texas Linguistics Society on the Syntax and Semantics of Predication*, Austin. To appear.
- Radford, A. (1988). *Transformational Grammar: A First Course*. Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Reinders-Machowska, E. (1991). Binding in Polish. In J. Koster and E. Reuland, editors, *Long-distance anaphora*, chapter 6, pages 137–150. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Reinhart, T. and Reuland, E. (1993). Reflexivity. *Linguistic Inquiry*, **24**(3), 657–720.
- Rizzi, L. (1990). *Relativized Minimality*. The MIT Press, Cambridge, Mas.
- Saloni, Z. and Świdziński, M. (1985). *Składnia współczesnego języka polskiego*. Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, second edition.
- Sawicki, L. (1988). *Verb-Valency in Contemporary Polish*. Number 319 in *Tübinger Beiträge zur Linguistik*. Gunter Narr Verlag Tübingen.
- Sgall, P., Hajičová, E., and Panevová, J. (1986). *The Meaning of the Sentence in Its Semantic and Pragmatic Aspects*. Reidel, Dordrecht.
- Świdziński, M. (1997). *Elementy gramatyki opisowej języka polskiego*. Uniwersytet Warszawski, Wydział Polonistyki, Warszawa.
- Szober, S. (1953). *Gramatyka języka polskiego*. Nasza Księgarnia, Warszawa, third edition.
- Tajnsner, P. (1990). *Case Marking in English and Polish: A Government and Binding Study*. PhD dissertation, Uniwersytet im. Adama Mickiewicza, Poznań.
- Tesnière, L. (1959). *Éléments de syntaxe structurale*. Klincksieck, Paris.
- Timberlake, A. (1975). Hierarchies in the genitive of negation. *Slavic and East European Journal*, **19**, 123–38.
- van Noord, G. and Bouma, G. (1994). Adjuncts and the processing of lexical rule. In *Fifteenth International Conference on Computational Linguistics (COLING '94)*, pages 250–256, Kyoto, Japan.
- Vater, H. (1978a). On the possibility of distinguishing between complements and adjuncts. In W. Abraham, editor, *Valence, Semantic Case and Grammatical Relations*, volume 1 of *Studies in Language Companion Series (SLCS)*, pages 21–45. Benjamins, Amsterdam.
- Vater, H. (1978b). Probleme der Verbalenz. Technical Report KLAG Nr.1, Universität Köln.
- Willim, E. (1989). *On Word Order: A Government-Binding Study of English and Polish*, volume 100 of *Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego*. Uniwersytet Jagielloński, Kraków.
- Willim, E. (1990). On case-marking in Polish. *Papers and Studies in Contrastive Linguistics*, **XXV**, 203–220.
- Witkoś, J. (1992). Subject/object asymmetry in extraction from clausal complements in Polish. Paper presented at the XXVI International Conference on Polish-English Contrastive Linguistics, Rydzyna.
- Witkoś, J. (1993). *Some Aspects of Phrasal Movement in English and Polish*. PhD dissertation, Uniwersytet im. Adama Mickiewicza, Poznań.
- Zabrocki, T. (1990). A surface structure constraint and its consequence for a positional and an inflectional language. In J. Fisiak, editor, *Further Insights into Contrastive Analysis*, pages 85–109. Benjamins, Amsterdam.
- Zribi-Hertz, A. (1989). A-type binding and narrative point of view. *Language*, **65**, 695–727.

Do you also hate handouts without bibliography?

Let's give bibliography in handouts!

I know, I might have overdone it...