

Albrecht Lempp

Mieć

"to have" in Modern Polish

Verlag Otto Sagner München · Berlin · Washington D.C.

Digitalisiert im Rahmen der Kooperation mit dem DFG-Projekt „Digi20“ der Bayerischen Staatsbibliothek, München. OCR-Bearbeitung und Erstellung des eBooks durch den Verlag Otto Sagner:

<http://verlag.kubon-sagner.de>

© bei Verlag Otto Sagner. Eine Verwertung oder Weitergabe der Texte und Abbildungen, insbesondere durch Vervielfältigung, ist ohne vorherige schriftliche Genehmigung des Verlages unzulässig.

«Verlag Otto Sagner» ist ein Imprint der Kubon & Sagner GmbH.

Albrecht Lempp - 9783954792344

Downloaded from PubFactory at 01/10/2019 04:27:41AM

via free access

SLAVISTISCHE BEITRÄGE

BEGRÜNDET VON

ALOIS SCHMAUS

HERAUSGEGEBEN VON

JOHANNES HOLTHUSEN † · HEINRICH KUNSTMANN

PETER REHDER · JOSEF SCHRENK

REDAKTION

PETER REHDER

Band 204

VERLAG OTTO SAGNER
MÜNCHEN

ALBRECHT LEMPP

MIEĆ. 'TO HAVE' IN MODERN POLISH



VERLAG OTTO SAGNER · MÜNCHEN

1986



ISBN 3-87690-349-1
© Verlag Otto Sagner, München 1986
Abteilung der Firma Kubon & Sagner, München

Elżbiecie

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This study was completed in April 1986 and accepted by the Graduate School of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill as a doctoral dissertation in Slavic Linguistics in May 1986.

Preliminary work on mieć began in 1981 when I visited Poland on a two-year fellowship awarded by the German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD). I wish to thank my friends in Poland for their help during these two years. In particular, I would like to express my gratitude to Professor Krystyna Pisarkowa (PAN, Cracow) and Professor Violetta Koseska-Toszewa (PAN, Warsaw) for their encouragement, support, and helpful criticism.

During my stay at UNC, made possible by grants from the Graduate School of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and the Institute of Higher Education in New York, the present study took shape under the guidance of my academic adviser, Professor Lawrence Feinberg. Special thanks are due to him and to all members of the Slavic Department at UNC whose readiness to assist and advise me has contributed greatly to the completion of this dissertation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	ix
CHAPTER I	
ON WHAT WE HAVE	1
1.1 Possession	1
1.2 Form A	4
2.1 The Part-Whole Concept	7
2.2 The Whole	10
2.3 Definiteness	14
2.4 The Hierarchy of Closeness	18
3.1 Transitive Relations	25
3.2 Abstract Nouns	36
3.3 Other Restrictions	48
4 <u>Mieć</u> vs. <u>Być</u>	51
5 Existentials (Form B)	55
CHAPTER II	
<u>MIEĆ</u> + INFINITIVE	61
1 Form C	61
2.1 The Modal World of <u>Mieć</u>	65
2.2 Obligations	68
2.3 Intentions	72
2.4 Presumptions	75
2.5 The Future Tense	79
3 The Deleted Object of <u>Mieć</u>	81

CHAPTER III	
<u>DO-PHRASES</u>	86
1.1 Form D	86
1.2 Examples	88
2.1 The Minimal Form	89
2.2 The Expanded Form	96
3.1 Strategies	98
3.2 Specific - Non-Specific	102
3.3 More on the Modal Interpretation	103
3.4 Time Expressions	105
CHAPTER IV	
THE INTERROGATIVE TYPE	107
1 Form E	107
2 The Object Under <u>Mieć</u>	112
3 Existentials of Form E	117
CHAPTER V	
THE PARTICIPIAL TYPE	122
1 Form F	122
2 The Semantics of F	127
3 Possessor of a Result	131
CONCLUDING REMARKS	134
REFERENCES	136
SOURCES	148

INTRODUCTION

This study of mieć 'to have' is more and it is less than a study of possessivity. It is more, because included are occurrences of mieć which we, intuitively, would not classify as possessive. It is less, because no attempt is made to analyze the implementation of the linguistic notion of possession in the grammar of Modern Polish. Mieć is only one of the possible forms with which Polish can realize possessive structures. And, for the same reason, this study is more and it is less than an analysis of modal sentences and the notion of modality in Polish. A comprehensive study of mieć is a risky undertaking. It is easy to get lost in details, and it is equally easy to gloss over important aspects of some particular problem. I have tried to keep my balance. On the one hand, I have concentrated on those aspects only, which seemed relevant within my framework of description. On the other hand, I have tried to devote enough attention to details whenever I found them interesting enough to be included here.

The dissertation is divided into five chapters in order to allow for an independent treatment of each of the systematic occurrences of mieć. Each chapter deals with a particular surface form which contains mieć. The only exception is chapter one, in which two forms (A and B) are discussed. All forms are identified by upper-case letters from A through F:

- A = mieć + noun in the accusative/genitive;
- B = nie ma + noun in the genitive;
- C = mieć + infinitive;
- D = mieć + do + deverbal noun in the genitive;
- E = mieć + interrogative pronoun + infinitive;
- F = mieć + past passive participle.

However, more important than this formal division is the internal structure according to which the dissertation can be divided into three parts. In the first part (chapter 1), I introduce the general concept of the part-whole relations on the basis of form A. The second part (chapter 2) provides the link to the subsequent chapters 3 through 5 (part three). In the second part (form C), I will apply the framework developed in the first chapter to data which are, at least superficially, diametrically opposed to form A. Once the opposite ends are connected, it is relatively easy to integrate the remaining three forms (D through F) in the general framework of part-whole relations. Conversely, part three contains the material which is more interesting from the point of view of grammar and syntax than the data of the first part. The modal sentences in the second part provide again the natural link between part three and part one.

My goal is to identify the invariant meaning (primitive semantic structure) of mieć. Bogusławski's warning that "we cannot start with words" when trying to establish the meaning of an utterance (1970: 145) must be taken seriously in a study devoted to one single word. To pick just one word, however, is justified by the fact that we can well arrive at the representation of the primitive semantic structure of one single word by studying the various utterances in which it can occur. It is my understanding that utterances are produced by manipulating semantic material. The final output of this manipulation has a particular syntactic form. It is not this form and the

path that leads to it which I am interested in here, although the form will provide a means of classifying the data. My attention is directed towards finding an (almost) primitive semantic representation for the occurrences of mieć in a sentence. I am not overly strict about avoiding the term "sentence" parallel to "utterance". As long as it is understood that words have no meaning but only their occurrences in a sentence (utterance) have meaning, there is no danger of misunderstanding. The primitive semantic material which a language provides must be simple, small in extent, yet rich enough to allow the speaker to produce an infinite number of utterances. What material the set of semantic primitives should include eventually and how they combine to form more complex semantic representations is far from clear. It will have to be seen whether a set of semantic primitives as small as that developed by Wierzbicka (1980) will, in fact, be sufficient, and to what extent sentence connectives and quantificational operators have to be included as part of the set of primitives. McCawley's work (1972), for example, demonstrates convincingly the importance of a cooperation of logic and linguistics for providing explanations of how language works. Promising advances in the field of quantificational analyses of Slavic material were made by Koseska (1982) in recent years. The Polish verb mieć 'to have' has been the object of a variety of studies. Topolińska's (1968) brief study still provides the best comprehensive account of the various occurrences of mieć. Diachronic reference to OCS material is contained, for example, in Świdorska-Koneczna (1930). An overview of the syntax of mieć-constructions is found in Olszewska-Michalczyk (1981). Questions pertaining to the notion of possession are discussed in Pisarkowa (1974a; 1977). Modal occurrences of mieć are analyzed, for example, in Koseska (1983) and most recently in Weiss (1986). References to works devoted to individual problems

of mieć are given in the appropriate sections in my dissertation.

The particular approach to mieć proposed here finds no direct support in the literature. I will advance the claim that mieć establishes part-whole relations in all its occurrences, and that this has to be considered the invariant meaning of mieć. Thus my use of the notion of 'part-whole relations' is not restricted to body-part relations or physical containment relations. It is quite obvious that other verbs, too, will contain the same semantic material as part of their meaning: zawierać 'to contain', posiadać 'to possess'. As a matter of fact, all verbs which contain the element of 'have' (kupić 'to buy') will establish part-whole relations as part of their meaning. Yet unlike mieć these verbs contain other material as well. The core of data presented here are sentences made up in order to illustrate a particular point in the analysis of mieć. My prototype possessor is Pan Wojtek who will be exposed to a variety of situations in which a representation of him will be the whole to which a part is related by mieć. It is my understanding that grammar has no rigid limits. Sentences have to be made up, so that the general area in which limits are located can be identified. An absurd situation does not create an absurd sentence, but it can tell me at what point (or area) I will need a different sentence so that I will be able to speak of this new and even more absurd situation. I have tried to be careful in my use of devices such as "*" and "?". But a certain subjective choice is always involved here. Occasional use of an asterisk should indicate that the sentence is beyond the limits provided by the grammar of Polish. The question mark indicates that the limits have been reached and that in my opinion the form cannot be accepted while, at the same time, some speakers may not

reject it outright. Another notational convention is the use of upper-case spelling for semantic CASE relations and lower-case for grammatical cases. I occasionally use the term "strategy" to refer to a particular type of interpretation. The meaning of an utterance is subject to the context in which it occurs. Thus, specification of a reading tries to imitate the context. But apart from this type of interpretation, which is to a large degree a matter of reference, the forms in the utterance can be assigned different statuses which are not specified by the morphological markings. In particular CASE assignment can be subject to strategies. Whether człowieka 'someone-acc' in a sentence such as Wojtek ma człowieka do zabicia koguta. 'Wojtek has someone for killing the rooster', is assigned AGENS or INSTRUMENTAL status is a matter of strategies, because the utterance can occur in a context where the CASE assignment is not self-evident and the morphological make-up of człowieka is indifferent to this distinction. Or the subject of Mam operację 'I have an operation' can be assigned AGENS and PATIENS alike. The meaning of the utterance will change radically, yet the particular context reference which would establish the CASE assignment in the utterance may not be available. Often, the CASE assignment will be a matter of context and therefore part of the utterance, but it is not a necessary part of an utterance.

Forms A through F are systematic occurrences of mieć in Modern Polish. Unsystematic, i.e., mostly idiomatic, unproductive phrases are not included in my dissertation. The distinction between systematic and unsystematic occurrences is, admittedly, somewhat subjective, because no clear-cut division is possible. In some cases, especially with productive forms such as Mieć kogoś za coś 'To consider someone something', or 'to have someone as

something', the phrase is part of one of the above-mentioned five forms (e.g., form A mieć kogoś 'to have someone'), but requires further analyses because the prepositional phrase gives the basic mieć-relation a variety of particular readings. Such individual analyses will not be made. An intermediate stage of the explication of Mam cię za geniusza 'I consider you a genius' would probably contain a phrase such as 'The picture which I have of you is that of a genius'. This illustrates that not mieć needs to be explained here but the representation of the referent of cię 'you-acc' in the part-whole relation. In other contexts, the referent would be represented differently. The way the referent is represented as the part of the whole is subject to the input of the prepositional phrase:

Do jednej

Piotr miał cię za swą dziką żądę,
 Jan za to, że jest piękny ciałem
 Alojzy miał cię za pieniądze,
 Ja - zawsze cię za k... miałem.

Tuwim

Piotr had you for wanting you madly,
 Jan 'cause he has a nice body.
 Alojzy had you for money.
 Me? I had you down for a whore.

CHAPTER ONE

ON WHAT WE HAVE

1.1 Possession

The Polish verb mieć 'to have' establishes a relation between its subject and its direct object. The interpretation of this relation is subject to a variety of factors. Intuitively, we understand a sentence such as Wojtek ma dom 'Wojtek has a house' as a possessive relation in the sense that Wojtek owns a house, while it takes some mental gymnastics to come up with a context where a non-possessive interpretation (in an extralinguistic sense) would be more natural. A realtor may manage the houses of his clients without owning them, yet he still would have them. The situation is reversed in the sentence Wojtek ma nos swojej matki 'Wojtek has the nose of his mother'. The immediate understanding is that Wojtek has a nose like the nose of his mother. And we would be hard pressed to find a suitable context in which Wojtek is the owner of his mother's nose. And after having established that Wojtek has not the same instance of a nose as that of his mother but another instance of the same type, we probably would still say that the way Wojtek has a nose is different from the way he has a house. One of the reasons for this confusing situation is that we use the term "possessive" both for relations which hold within language and for those

which hold outside of language. Possession as a linguistic notion is deeply rooted in the grammatical terminology and it would only introduce confusion should I decide to ban it from the discussion of mieć-relations. The homonymy of terms notwithstanding, it will be necessary to draw a clear dividing line between the linguistic notion of possession and the extralinguistic notion of possession. I will refer to possessive relations within language as (linguistic) possessive relations or part-whole relations. The concept for which this latter term stands will be discussed in detail below. Extralinguistic possession is, basically, a legal notion and will be reserved for relations outside of language to which I will also refer as ownership relations. Extralinguistic possessive relations often can be inferred from linguistic possessive relations, yet they are interpretations of the relations which hold within the target language, Polish. The extralinguistic reality of possession will be of little interest in the context of mieć. Modern Polish has other words which establish linguistic possessive relations and some of them lend themselves more easily to an interpretation of ownership in the legal sense. Posiadać 'to own', e.g., has a greater potential for an occurrence in situations in which extralinguistic possessive relations hold. However in no case is there a verb which is true only of ownership relations. Posiadać 'to own' can be used with mądrość 'wisdom' and majątek 'estate' but is rarely used with less valuable items such as a pair of dirty socks (brudne skarpety).¹ Posiadać 'to own' is sensitive to our value scale of

¹For a discussion of the opposition to have : to own : to possess in English, cf. Seliverstova 1977; especially pp 59ff.

possessed items (cf. Pisarkowa 1974a: 15; 1974b),² while mieć is not. The type of relation established by mieć is extremely unspecific as far as the extralinguistic possessive reality is concerned. It has been pointed out repeatedly that the relation established by a verb such as to have is entirely dependent on the restrictions which hold between the nouns in this relation (e.g., Bendix 1966), and that, as a consequence, the possessive verb itself should be treated as an empty (or, logical) predicate (Berka 1961; Sawicka 1979; Seiler 1983); i.e., as a predicate which itself imposes no (or almost no) restrictions on the items which it connects. It is, indeed, a striking fact, that mieć (or whatever word establishes the same type of unmarked relation in another language) can occur with a great variety of nouns. The only feature which these occurrences appear to have in common is, that there is some kind of a relation between the two items bound by mieć: Mam 100 zł 'I have 100 zł', Mam pchły 'I have fleas', Mam ojca 'I have a father', Mam zdolności 'I have abilities', etc.

Any answer to the questions raised by this situation is trivially dependent on the concept one adopts for mieć. If mieć is considered an empty predicate, the analysis will try to establish certain groups of nouns and classify the various mieć-relations according to these groups. If one attempts to analyze all different mieć-relations as occurrences of different homonymous verbs mieć_{1...n}, one could use a syntactic classification and end up with a long

²At least in spoken Polish this distinction often is blurred; cf., Pisarkowa 1974a: 11. In addition, abstract properties (qualities) such as madrość 'wisdom' sometimes combine with posiadać but not with mieć. Compare also the expression: Nasz towar posiada ceny umowne 'Our merchandise possesses "contractual" prices'.

list of separate entries in the lexicon (cf. Słownik 1980). Another possibility is to establish a common denominator (an invariant meaning) for all occurrences of mieć which is more specific than just "a relation", while, at the same time, general enough to allow for the differences in the output. In particular, it should be able to account for the fact that, intuitively, we interpret a mieć-relation as an extralinguistic possessive relation - whenever possible.

1.2 Form A

The assumption with which I will work, is, that mieć is a possessive verb, a verb which establishes a linguistic possessive relation between two items from which an ownership relation can be inferred if nothing else blocks such an interpretation. This relation is represented by form A. The noun which refers to the possessed item is the direct object of mieć in the surface sentence:

A: Mieć + NP_{acc}

This assumption is not entirely different from one which classifies mieć (or the habeo-words in other languages) as an empty predicate; and it will still be necessary to formulate the restrictions which block an ownership interpretation. The difference, however, is that no special verbal category or status for mieć is necessary³

³Following the practice in logic, it has been proposed to treat to be, to have as connectives which are introduced by transformations when necessary; cf. Bach 1967; Bendix 1971.

and, what is more important, that the restrictions which hold between the nouns in a mieć-relation can block but do not establish the extralinguistic possessive reading available in mieć-sentences. This is, in a nutshell, the justification for calling mieć a possessive verb. The reason why mieć allows for an extralinguistic possessive reading is, in my understanding, due to the fact that linguistic possessive relations are part-whole relations: The possessor is the whole to which the possessed item is a part. Part-whole relations are directional (asymmetrical) relations, i.e., they are ordered pairs in which the door has the handle but not vice versa; and they are relations of non-identity which sets them apart from relations established by the copula być 'to be', which otherwise have a good deal in common with mieć-relations.⁴ Part-whole relations can be relations between members and sets or between subsets and sets and provide the natural link to extralinguistic possessive concepts. On the level of interpreting the part-whole relations, the restrictions which extend from the nouns in the mieć-sentence have, indeed, a strong influence on the semantic mixture which makes up the meaning of the sentence; and here is probably where all studies of mieć will merge, regardless of initial differences in their approaches. Mam jego nogę 'I have his leg' can have at least three different readings: 'I have a leg like his', 'I have his (detached) leg', and 'I hold onto his leg'. The potential of noga 'leg' allows for all these readings. 'Leg' can be in a body-part relation with the referent of jego 'his', but the pronoun can also be used figuratively: 'the leg he favors', and 'leg' can be a

⁴Cf. Benveniste 1960; Clasen (1981: 90) prefers, in some cases, to speak of a class-membership relation rather than an identity relation). Polish data are discussed in Dulewiczowa 1981.

type rather than an instance of a type. The actual reading is subject to the status of leg, but in each case, the subject is in a part-whole relation with the leg.

Possessive pronouns can establish possessive relations with items which are already within the scope of mieć. This does not create a scope conflict even if the pronoun and the subject do not refer to the same possessor. It will affect the interpretation of the part-whole relation but not the part-whole relation as such. Possessive pronouns and the possessive verb mieć are related, but their occurrences are subject to different rules. Typically, a possessive relation with mieć allows for a paraphrase in which the possessed item is qualified by a possessive pronoun which refers to the same item (possessor) as the subject of mieć. The reverse, however, does not hold: If Wojtek ma patelnię 'Wojtek has a frying pan' is possible, then the phrase Jego patelnia 'His frying pan' must also be possible; while from Jego patelnia 'His frying pan' it does not follow that Wojtek has a frying pan. Examples where the reverse relation is not available are: Moja ślepotą 'My blindness', or Jego śpiewanie 'His singing' have no verbal paraphrase: *Mam ślepotę 'I have blindness', *On ma śpiewanie 'He has singing' (where 'singing' is understood as a process).

Again, there is no question that whatever we call the meaning of a verb in a given utterance is subject to the input of all the participants in the sentence. Yet this is true not only of mieć-sentences but - to a larger or smaller degree - of all verbs. Picasso maluje domy 'Picasso paints houses' is more likely to have the reading 'Picasso makes paintings of houses' than, say, Wojtek maluje domy 'Wojtek paints houses' which is likely to be read as 'Wojtek is a house-painter'. The basic relation established by the verb malować 'to paint, color', however,

remains unaffected and may be something like: something applies color/paint to something. Mieć has much fewer restrictions than, for example, a verb such as podpisać 'to sign', so that the impact of the restrictions extending from the nouns in mieć-sentences is greater. This, however, is a matter of degree and need not lead to a categorial distinction.⁵

2.1 The Part-Whole Concept

Words are short-forms for realities as we perceive them. A single word stands for a complex whole. The name 'Wojtek' refers to an item (items are abstract entities or physical objects) which is a male person with a multitude of properties which make him unique. In order to establish reference with this item, it is neither necessary nor possible to specify or be aware of all the attributes which characterize Wojtek at a particular space-time point. The name 'Wojtek' always refers to the same person, but the entirety of items which make this person unique changes constantly. It is this complex something which I will call 'the whole'. Usually it is hidden behind the name or the physical manifestation (if any) for which the name stands. It is the characteristic feature of mieć to open the view, as it were, on this whole by telling us what items are part of it.

If I take apart a camera, I will have some parts x, y, and z, which, assembled in the correct order, will again

⁵Cf. Clasen 1981: 24-25 for a similar observation in a discussion of German data.

create an item which I call a camera and of which I can say that it consists of the parts x , y , and z . If I take apart a geometrical shape called a triangle, I will end up with 3 angles and 3 connecting lines, which together again create a triangle. With a triangle, I will, by definition, never have more than 6 parts. With a camera, I may find different parts each time I take one apart. Yet, a certain basic set of parts will always be the same and allow me to call the item a camera. All additional parts will make for the uniqueness of the camera. For a whole to be a camera, I may not know how many parts and which parts exactly I need to call it a camera. But if I have enough parts to create an identifiable whole (and strictly speaking, only those items which can create an identifiable whole are parts), then I am in a position to say of which parts this particular whole consists. For a whole to be a person, I will need a lot more items, because animate beings can enter relations with more items than inanimate objects. When Wojtek is born, the whole has as its members all the universal features of a person plus some unique items. Eventually, it will be necessary to add a variety of other items to the whole. The whole now is quite complex and consists of a house, a drug problem in the family, and a yacht in Florida in addition to all the parts which had been identified earlier. Of course, I could take most everything away from Wojtek, and he still would be Wojtek - after all, he was Wojtek already at his birth when he did not even have teeth. While Wojtek may still be Wojtek after I have stripped him of almost everything that he ever had, the whole has changed considerably. Relative to Wojtek, we may say that he has different properties at various space-time points. Relative to the whole, we must say that it is different at each space-time point. All the items to which the whole is in a miec'-relation are the parts out of which the whole is assembled. These parts are

rather abstract at times, but so is the number 2 in the set of natural numbers (which is also a part-whole relation). Because typically the object of mieć is an indefinite noun, we may prefer to think of the mieć-relation simply as a property of the subject. In principle, there is nothing wrong with that (after all, properties are parts of the whole) as long as it is understood that the possessed items are, indeed, parts of the whole. The subject in a unique (non-universal) mieć-relation always establishes reference with a specific item (even if it is not marked for definiteness grammatically; cf. below, 2.3), so that the subject noun refers already to a whole, while the whole of which the mieć-sentence is true, is different from the whole in subject position by exactly the part which mieć adds to the subject. If this addition did not give us a new part to add to the already existing whole, the sentence could be rather meaningless. For that reason, it can be meaningless to say Mam nos 'I have a nose', namely if the nose is already part of the original whole; while it is not meaningless to use the same item in the universal mieć-relation: Człowiek ma nos 'Man has a nose'. A nose is, for all practical purposes, an item which all human beings have, so that it is a defining part for the indefinite człowiek but a redundant part for a definite human being. For the same reason 1) is immediately acceptable, while there is normally not much sense in saying 2):

- 1) Trójkąt ma trzy kąty.
'A triangle has three angles'
- 2) Ten trójkąt ma trzy kąty.
'This triangle has three angles'

In universal statements, the part-whole relation identifies a type, while a sentence with a singular term or definite description in subject position requires a unique

mieć'-relation. But the principle is the same: a bad cough or a yacht as the possessed items define the particular instance in exactly the same way three angles define, universally, a triangle.

2.2. The Whole

Mieć'-relations are asymmetrical relations. The whole always has the part but not vice versa: The table has a drawer, but not: A drawer has the table. Even relational nouns such as sąsiad 'neighbor' are subject to the directionality of mieć'-relations:

- 3) Wojtek ma jakiegoś sąsiada.
'Wojtek has a certain neighbor'

If Wojtek has a certain neighbor, there is also a certain person who has Wojtek as his neighbor, viz., Wojtek's neighbor:

- 4) Jakiś człowiek ma Wojtka jako sąsiada.
'A certain person has Wojtek as his neighbor'

3) and 4) describe the same relation from two different points of view. But a simple reversal of 3) would result in something like: Jakiś sąsiad ma Wojtka 'A certain neighbor has Wojtek' which may not be entirely senseless in some specific context, but which certainly is not the same as 3). Sometimes the order of the relation appears counter-intuitive:

- 5) Dom ma właściciela.
'The house has an owner'

Własciciel 'owner' is a relational noun and only as such is własciciel part of the house: The mieć-relation is a property of the house, not of the owner. In addition, the same switch in definiteness between subject and direct object has to be observed. Having a house makes something an owner of a house, while having an owner says, e.g., that the house is not public property. I am not aware of any noun which could not occur in subject position of a mieć-relation. If nothing else, any item has some attribute, function, or name. The whole in a particular context is the set which consists of the item referred to by the subject plus the item referred to by the direct object. The item can be a member of the whole or a proper subset of the whole. So much for the reality of language. As for the relation between language and extralinguistic reality, it is extremely unclear what the whole refers to. Let us say the subject is a person named Wojtek.

- 6) Wojtek ma rower.
'Wojtek has a bike'

If one says 6), then what is it that the word Wojtek, or the whole (Wojtek + bike) for which it may stand, names? Certainly not the body of this person. Wierzbicka has made it very clear that referring to a person is not the same as referring to his body (Wierzbicka 1969: 62-65). Wojtek's body has other properties, but not the property of having a bike.

It is an intriguing problem to decide what the word Wojtek refers to in a sentence like: Spotkałem Wojtkę 'I met Wojtek'. Did the subject meet a person with blond hair and a yacht in Florida, or a short person with a drug problem in the family? When does an item A cease to be A? There are, basically, two planes on which the change-over from A to not-A can occur. One is the horizontal plane on

which the item A, say a cup, changes its shape, color, and function up to the point where it ceases to be A. The other one is the vertical plane where A is broken up into its parts. Say A is a wooden table at the top of the vertical axis, while at the end of this axis it is a wooden splinter. At what point does A cease to be a table and become a splinter? There may be no absolute area and even less an absolute point. Probably a subjective placement on one's individual scale of A-ness affects any such decision.⁶ Yet it may be possible to establish some of the properties of a table which are essential for the item to be called a table. If Wojtek's son has broken off all four legs of a table, Wojtek may say:

- 7) Musimy wyrzucić ten stół, bo nie ma nóg.
 'We have to throw this table out, because it has no legs'

Thus, Wojtek would still refer to A as 'table', while he seems to indicate that it cannot be used as a table any longer. If, instead, he were left with only the four legs, Wojtek would probably not say 7). Having a plain surface board, it can be concluded, is the more essential property. But if this board were cut into pieces, at what point would Wojtek stop calling it a table? Where, on the horizontal plane, is the turning point for a bowl-shaped cup to become a cup-shaped bowl? There is a fuzzy zone in which 'cup' and 'bowl' share enough parts to be both, simultaneously. Thus, I cannot answer the question of what members constitute the whole for an item called 'cup'. The potential of any item to change from A to not-A and the fuzziness of the transition indicate, furthermore, that

⁶In this context, studies about language acquisition by children are interesting, because they show what features are used to differentiate one item from another; cf. Clark 1973; Rosch 1973

each whole has among its members its own negation: The whole of 'cup', then, would be a set with the members 'cup' and 'not-cup'. In the framework of western thinking, this concept is hard to accommodate. However, we are used to it in the context of abstract entities - at least as a way of speaking:

- 8) Kto nie zna smutku, nie zna radości.
'He who does not know sorrow, does not know joy'

The reasoning behind such folk wisdoms is, that we can identify certain emotions only because we know the two opposed manifestations of it. They together create a scale and each related emotion can be given a value on this scale.⁷ The same holds true for concrete items: I can identify a tree as a tree only because I know what a not-tree is. Once I have a scale of treehood, I can place instances of trees and not-trees on my treehood scale. But that means that for the identification of an item, I use as a means of measurement a scale which consists of A and not-A. The philosophical concept of yin-yang comes to mind here. The yin-yang principle holds that everything contains its own negation or opposite. The assumption that each member is paired with its own negation can, I think, help account for some of the fuzziness in the transitional stages on the vertical and horizontal plane.

In natural discourse, it is not necessary to list all members of the item referred to. Reference is successfully established when all the members are listed which are essential in a particular discourse setting. Not only is it not necessary, it also would not be correct: For what is

⁷The notion of scale is central to the discussion of inherent possessive relations with abstract items in Clasen 1981; cf. also Seiler 1983.

the whole represented by the word świat 'world' at one moment at one place is different from the whole represented by the same word at some other time or place. Even with all other members being the same, at least the property of 'being referred to at time T' would distinguish both sets.

2.3 Definiteness

So far I have used examples which usually had a definite noun in the possessor position and an indefinite possessed item in the mieć-relation. Since an indefinite term does not identify any particular referent, the above mieć-sentences said something about the possessor, i.e., they identified the possessor as to the members he, as a set, contains. These members were (somewhat loosely) treated as properties of the possessor. It is very typical for possessive mieć-relations that the possessed item is semantically indefinite (cf. Sawicka 1979: 7). To have something is first and foremost a property of the possessor and nothing more. Polish has, however, sentences where the possessed noun is semantically definite. In Polish, a language without a formal distinction of definiteness by way of articles,⁸ data can be tested by inserting indefinite and definite pronouns, respectively (jakiś, pewien 'some, certain'; ten 'this one', etc.), or by taking examples with definite descriptions of some sort: Nos jego

⁸On the notion of grammatical and semantic definiteness in Slavic languages and Polish in particular, cf. Boguslawski 1977; Koseska-Toszewa 1984; 1983; 1982; 1979; 1979a; 1978; (Koseska) 1970; Topolińska 1978; Weiss 1983. Sawicka 1979a provides a brief discussion of how the term is used in the Polish literature.

matki 'The nose of his mother, Madrość Salomona 'Salomon's wisdom', etc. In discussing definiteness in mieć-examples, several manifestations of definiteness have to be distinguished for the subject noun: Singular terms such as Wojtek, definite descriptions such as (Ta) geś w piecu 'This goose in the oven', and specific terms (which are, in fact, elliptic definite descriptions) such as Chłop podpalił stajnię 'A farmer set fire to his stable', in a situation where chłop 'a farmer' refers to a person about whom the speaker was reading in the paper, then looked up from the paper, and told another person about what he had just read.

The Subject

The subject of a mieć-sentence is typically definite in one of the above senses.

- 9) Wojtek ma zapalenie płuc.
'Wojtek has pneumonia'
- 10) (To) mięso ma dużo kalorii.
'(This) meat has many calories'
- 11) "Kobieta ma pięć pokojówek", powiedział, jak czytał gazetę.
'"A woman has five chamber-maids", he said when reading the paper'

Besides these instances of unique mieć-relations with definite nouns in subject position, there are universal mieć-relations. The universally quantified nouns are indefinite with regard to any particular instance, but can be considered definite with respect to the type; hence, the mieć-relation in 12) is universal with regard to the instances of the type 'cow' but definite with regard to the type itself.

- 12) Każda krowa ma osiem nóg.
'Every cow has eight legs'

12) is of course false, but that is immaterial. The restriction to definite nouns in subject position accounts for the assymetry of mieć-relations with relational nouns such as pan - niewolnik 'master - slave':

- 13) (Ten) pan ma (jakiegoś) niewolnika.
'The master has a slave'
- 14) (Ten) niewolnik ma (jakiegoś) pana.
'The slave has a master'

The Object

The object in mieć-sentences, on the other hand, is typically indefinite. Grammatically definite nouns in the object position sometimes refer to an instance of a type and as such are semantically indefinite since not the (definite) type but the (indefinite) instance is in the range of mieć:

- 15) Wojtek ma nos swojej matki.
'Wojtek has the nose of his mother'
- 16) Mam książkę Miłosza na półce.
'I have Miłosz's book on the shelf'
- 17) Wreszcie mam przyczepę, o której marzyłem.
'At last I have the trailer that I was dreaming of'

Nos 'nose', książka 'book', and pryczepa 'trailer' taken as instances of types fit neatly into the pattern according to which the object of mieć is indefinite. But what if these nouns are given a definite reading? Wojtek in 15) may have found his mother's nose, or he may have it in his pocket. The subject in 16) may have a book on his shelf which is the only book which Miłosz possesses. And the subject of 17) may have been dreaming about getting the trailer parked in his neighbor's garden. **Polish grammar**

does not block any of these readings. In 17), I would argue, it is still an instance of a type, namely, an instance of my dream-trailer, no matter how singular the real trailer is. In other cases, however, the definiteness of the possessed item introduces a new element which influences the reading of the underlying part-whole relation. The new reading is one of 'to keep, to hold' (trzymać).

To Have - To Hold

- 18) "Kto ma mój klucz?" - "Wojtek go ma."
'"Who has my key?" - "Wojtek has it"'

The keep-reading is an interpretation of the part-whole relation established by mieć, the same way extralinguistic possession is an interpretation of form A instances. As such, the keep-reading is available in all mieć-sentences.⁹ Generally speaking, however, it is more likely to occur with definite direct objects. As far as Wojtek is concerned, he is in a part-whole relation with a key. But now that klucz 'key' is definite, the mieć-relation is a property of the key as much as it is a property of Wojtek. Since subject and object in form A are an ordered pair, the key does not have Wojtek. The key's property of "being had", so to speak, i.e., of being the possessed item in a directional relation with Wojtek, is what can be understood as the keep-element. The fact that the key may already be marked for another possessive relation does not cause any scope conflicts. Only if both possessive relations are interpreted as ownership relations, do we have a conflict. This, however, would not be a linguistic scope conflict but

⁹ 'To hold something in one's hand' and similar concepts are found to be part of the meaning of the habeo words in many languages; cf. Boeder 1980a; 1980b. For a diachronic account, cf. Meillet 1924.

a legal conflict and a problem to be solved in court. As it stands, the sentence simply states that Wojtek is in a part-whole relation with a key. The possessive pronoun may indicate that its referent also is in a part-whole relation with a key, in which case Wojtek is in a part-whole relation with somebody else's key, and nothing is wrong with that as long as the sentence is not interpreted as an extralinguistic possessive relation. The possessive pronoun may, of course, also be used figuratively: Mój klucz 'my key' is the key I like to play with; other readings are possible, too (cf. Pisarkowa 1977).

2.4 The Hierarchy of Closeness

Even with only a vague understanding of what the whole is exactly, it can be assumed that its essential parts are in close proximity to, or part of, the physical manifestation of the whole. It is for this reason that body-part relations are often treated as the prototype of part-whole relations (Anderson 1974). The idea behind that is, that, generally speaking, anything that affects part of one's body affects the self. Often, those items with which we are in a very intimate relation and which are neither for sale nor otherwise suited for processes of giving and taking,¹⁰ are also those items which define a type: Men can be defined via their having two legs and a nose, and triangles via their having three angles. Sometimes such a miec-relation holds by necessity for all instances of a type (e.g., descending kin-relations), sometimes they are

¹⁰ Processes of giving and taking all have an underlying miec-structure; cf. Zaron 1975; 1972.

only phenotypically universal (a particular person may have only one leg), i.e., they define the type but not the individual instances. This type of a universal possessive relation is often known as inalienable possession. Seiler points out that there is nothing inalienable in the possessed nouns themselves other than their being relational nouns (Seiler 1973: 235). The degree to which the item is treated as a universal part of the whole is, to some extent, a cultural matter. Some languages which make the distinction between "alienable" and "inalienable" possessive relations use it for household items or other specimens.¹¹ In Polish, all items which occur in inherent ("inalienable") relations can also occur in established ("alienable") relations, using a form of mieć in both cases. I think that, at least for Polish, the entire distinction between inherent vs. established possessive relations can even be given up and be replaced by a distinction of quantification, which is available as a concept for other phenomena of language anyhow. Inherent possessive mieć-relations are those relations between nouns which occur in universal statements (19, 20); established possessive mieć-relations are those relations which hold between the nouns of existentially quantified statements (21) or statements with definite descriptions and singular terms (22):

- 19) Wszystkie zęby mają dziury.
'All teeth have cavities'

¹¹Seiler prefers to speak of "inherent relations" as opposed to "established relations" (inalienable vs. alienable possessive relations); a practice which I will follow here as far as I use the distinction. However, in Seiler's view it is the habeo-word which typically establishes a relation, while inherent relations use other grammatical forms.

20

- 20) Każdy trójkąt ma trzy kąty.
'All triangles have three angles'
- 21) Niektóre zęby mają dziury.
'Some teeth have cavities'
- 22) Ten rower ma zepsute światło.
'This bike has a broken light'

19) is (probably) false exactly because not all teeth have cavities, so that 'cavities' cannot be used to define teeth. The distinction between inherent possessive relations and established possessive relations is of little importance in Polish. There are no morphological markers on the word for the possessed item. If we know that the possessed item is normally in a universal relation, the sentence may become odd if used with an individual possessor: Mam ojca 'I have a father'. If it is phrased as a universal statement, it is not odd at all: Każdy człowiek ma ojca 'Everybody has a father'. And neither is it odd when the possessed item is qualified so that we no longer expect a universal relation: Mam młodego ojca 'I have a young father', or Ale ma nos! 'Wow, he has a nose!'

The second factor, the closeness to the self, is interesting, because it is reflected on the level of syntax and makes it possible to establish different degrees of closeness in which the possessed items are in relation to the whole. Three levels, or stages, will be considered here. On the highest level, the possessor-noun is in the accusative (psa):

- 23) Zraniłem psa w nogę.
lit.: 'I wounded the dog in the leg'

Here, the dog is hurt because a part of it is hurt. The next lower stage in this hierarchy are dative expressions (psu):

- 24) Zraniłem psu nogę.
lit.: 'I wounded to the dog the leg'

The dog is affected as a whole and the legs have to be considered part of the whole, although they need not be inherently related to the dog: The leg in Pomalowałem psu nogę 'I painted to-the-dog-the-leg' could be the leg of the dog, or the leg of a table with which the dog played (with the verb zranić 'to wound' this interpretation is rather unlikely). The part of the whole need not be in close bodily proximity to the whole:

- 25) Sprzątałem mu mieszkanie, kiedy był po drodze do Będzina.
'I cleaned his apartment for him when he was on his way to Bedzin'

In order for the whole to be affected, the part has to be part of this whole. Therefore, 26) is not an example of a closeness relation:

- 26) Posprzątałem mu jej mieszkanie.
'I cleaned her apartment for him'
lit.: I-cleaned-to-him-her-apt.

26) reads something like: 'I cleaned her apartment so that he would not have to do it'. No part-whole relation holds between 'him' and 'her apartment', so that cleaning the apartment does not affect the person referred to by mu 'to him' in the same way as in 25). The dative mu 'him' in 26) is simply another way of saying dla niego 'for him', while mu 'him' in 25) is 'to-him' (which may, but need not, include 'for him'). The status of the dative pronoun is ambiguous:

- 27) Umyłem mu ręce.
'I washed his hands for him'

It is not the noun ręce 'hands' that establishes an inherent relation. Nothing in the grammatical structure

forces one to accept only one possible interpretation. Only if the referent of 'hands' and 'him' is established, is it possible to say what interpretation the part-whole relation has. The subject may wash some of the marble hands which the item referred to by mu 'him' has in his collection, or the washing is done to hands completely unrelated to 'him' (in the 'for-him' reading). But if there is a part-whole relation between the referents of the dative pronoun and the accusative object (27) or the prepositional phrase (28), then the referent of the dative pronoun is affected as a whole. Affecting one item by affecting another item requires that this part-whole relation exists:

- 28) Postawili mu płot przed domem.
 'They put a fence in front of his house'
 lit.: They-put-to-him-a-fence-in-front
 of-the-house

vs.

- 29) Postawili mu płot przed domem sąsiada.
 'They put a fence in front of his neighbor's
 house'
 lit.: They-put-to-him-a-fence-in-front-of
 the-neighbor's-house

In 28), the subject need not be the owner of the house, but he has to be in a part-whole relation with it: The house in which he lives, used to live, loves to be. In short: The house of which he can say at some point in some context Mam dom 'I have a house'.

The third stage in the hierarchy of part-whole relations (after those marked accusative and dative) are those with possessive pronouns: Mój dom 'My house', Jego śpiewanie 'His singing'. With these phrases, the relation between the whole and the part can be rather remote. The possessed item need not even be a part of a whole: Possessor and possessed item are two independent wholes

related only by a possessive interpretation:

30) Wojtek siedzi mi cały dzień w pokoju.
'Wojtek hangs around my room all day'
lit.: W. sits-to-me-the-whole-day-in-the-room

vs.

31) Wojtek siedzi cały dzień w moim pokoju.
'Wojtek sits all day in my room'

In 30), it seems that the person referred to by mi 'to-me' is directly affected by what is happening to his room, while the phrase w moim pokoju 'in my room' in 31) does not give the same impression of closeness. Clasen gives examples for German (1981: 50) (cf. also Anderson 1974) which are similar to 32) and 33). In Polish (and German, as far as I can see), examples such as 30) and 31) contain yet another reading. This second reading establishes a possessive relation between the dative noun and the subject. This reading is illustrated in 32) and 33):

32) Wojtek wpadł mi pod samochód.
lit.: 'Wojtek-fell-to-me-under-the-car'
'My Wojtek was run over by a car'

33) Wojtek wpadł pod mój samochód.
'Wojtek was run over by my car'

In view of the interpretation given for 30) and 31), 32) suggests that the referent of mi 'to-me' must have been driving the car, while in 33), this is not necessary. In the additional reading, the accident happened 'to-me' in 32), because it happened to someone very close to me ('My Wojtek'). Not the car, but Wojtek is a part of me. Semantically, the possessor in the dative is the BENEFICIARY.

The occurrence of a possessive pronoun (34) rather than a dative construction (35) in connection with body parts

immediately gives the impression that the person is either dead, or that the parts are detached from the body:

34) Otworzyłem jego oczy.
'I opened his eyes'

vs.

35) Otworzyłem mu oczy.
'I opened his eyes for him'

To sum up: The whole is the complex of parts which characterize an item. If the item is unique, the part-whole relations are unique. The mieć-relations which characterize a type are universal in character. When we refer to an item, we usually refer to some representation of it without any awareness of what the whole at this particular moment is. But we may well be aware that the item is more complex than the simple reference might suggest:

36) Kocham cię, ale nienawidzę twoje poglądy/nogi/kwiaty.
'I love you but I hate your ideas/legs/flowers'

The whole referred to by cię 'you' contains only members different from those under the scope of twoje 'your'. This does not make the referent of cię and twoje two different persons: alterations in the make-up of its members (on the horizontal or vertical plane) does not destroy the identity of the referent.

It is the job of mieć to establish the relation between the part and the whole. This relation can be interpreted as an ownership relation if no restrictions in the sentence block such a reading. An occurrence of a definite possessed item can trigger a reading of 'to keep, to hold' and block an ownership reading. Other restrictions which can block an ownership reading will be discussed in the following section.

3.1 Transitive Relations

Unlike the possessive verb posiadać 'to possess', an occurrence of mieć never requires the interpretation of an extralinguistic possessive relation; it only suggests such a conclusion, unless other factors prevent it. The factors which block such a conclusion are manifold and are often a reflex of the restrictions extending from the nouns in that relation. In addition to nouns (which will be discussed in section 3.2), there is a particular type of mieć-relations which prevents inference of ownership. I will call this a transitive relation. Transitive relations have the same surface form as mieć-relations with a locative complement, so that certain instances of this form have two possible interpretations.

In logic, a transitive relation holds if (A implies C) is the conclusion of the premise (A implies B and B implies C). I will call a mieć-relation transitive if (A has C) is the consequence of (A has B and B has C):

- 37) Wojtek ma plamę na koszulce.
'Wojtek has a stain on his shirt'
- 38) Wojtek ma szczury w piwnicy.
'Wojtek has rats in his basement'

My understanding is that the relation between Wojtek and the stain is only intermediate. That what Wojtek has in the first place is a shirt, and the shirt has a stain. Wojtek has the stain only via his having a shirt. For a transitive relation it is necessary that there is a possessive relation between the subject and the B-item, i.e., the locative phrase na koszulce 'on his shirt', in this example. If in 38) the basement is the basement of someone other than Wojtek, no transitive relation holds.

In that case, Wojtek has the rats and keeps them in the basement of his friend:

- 39) Wojtek ma szczury w piwnicy Jana.
'Wojtek has rats in Jan's basement'

Often a sentence cannot be interpreted as a transitive relation. If Wojtek had a house in Florida, it would be unlikely for him to be in a mieć-relation with Florida.¹² On the other hand, he may have a ball in his friend's car, in which case he either is in a mieć-relation with his friend's car and has the ball in a transitive relation, or he has a ball which he keeps in a car (which can become 'Wojtek's car' or somebody else's). Both options are available in 40):

- 40) Wojtek ma piłkę w samochodzie Jana.
'Wojtek has a ball in Jan's car'

Only in the reading with piłka 'ball' in the immediate possessive range of mieć would Wojtek refer to the ball as moja piłka 'my ball'. If mieć establishes a possessive relation between Wojtek and Jan's car, Wojtek could refer to the car as mój samochód 'my car', while he would not need to refer to the ball as moja piłka 'my ball'. This is the situation in transitive relations. Transitive relations account for a variety of cases in which mieć establishes a possessive relation which we would not consider possessive in an extralinguistic sense:

- 41) Mamy milicję w domu.
'We have the police in our house'
- 42) Mamy wojsko w mieście.
'We have the army in our town'

¹²In Wierzbicka's explications of space notions, Wojtek's 'house' would be a part of the whole 'Florida'; cf., 1971: 284.

It appears to be useful to extend the definition of transitive relations and include those cases where the second component is (C is in B) rather than (B has C). It is not necessary to force C into a mieć-relation with B:

- 43) Wojtek ma młotek w brzuchu.
'Wojtek has a hammer in his stomach'

Assuming that Wojtek does not keep the hammer there intentionally, 43) receives a transitive interpretation the second clause of which can be phrased: W brzuchu jest młotek 'In the stomach, there is a hammer', rather than Brzuch ma młotek w sobie 'The stomach has a hammer in it', which is rather clumsy. As long as the hammer is contained in the stomach, a transitive interpretation of the sentence as a whole is possible. It is secondary, if there is a mieć-phrase available on the surface for the locative relation between 'hammer' and 'stomach'. Particularly in those sentences where the locative is the (physical) body of the subject, the locative phrase can be omitted. Regardless of whether or not it is, in fact, omitted, the options for a reading of mieć with wide scope (transitive relation) and short scope (immediate possessive relation with the direct object), respectively, are both available:

- 44) Mam pchłę.
'I have a flea'

The owner of a flea circus may use 44) with short scope of mieć. Short scope of mieć allows one to infer that the subject is in an ownership relation with the possessed item. If the subject utters 44) after having inspected the red spots on his body, he would give 44) a transitive interpretation. A transitive reading of 44) assumes that there is a locative phrase which has been omitted (na sobie 'on oneself'). In that case, the fleas are only indirectly

possessed and no ownership relation can be inferred. With fleas, the understood locative noun is likely to be the subject's body; in the case of rats, it may be the subject's house or something to that effect. Depending on the direct object of mieć, the implied locative will be different. In order to reconstruct a locative phrase and make the transitive interpretation available, the item referred to by the locative noun has to be considered an extension of the subject, i.e., it has to be in a mieć-relation with the subject. Whether such a reduced transitive form is available is subject to the restrictions imposed by the nouns in that relation. 41) would not have a reduced form because of the noun milicja 'police'. 'Police' typically enters a possessive relation as the possessed item only if the subject (possessor) is the collective for which the police works or a representative of this collective. (The head of the police force, a dictator, or a private citizen speaking in the name of his country.) Without representing this collective, it is odd to say Mam milicję 'I have the police' and, in accordance with the above rule that a possessive mieć-relation has a paraphrase with a possessive pronoun, Moja milicja 'my police' is equally odd. If 41) has the direct object gości 'guests', the reduced transitive form becomes available: Mam gości 'I have guests'. The fact that we, intuitively, distinguish between the type of mieć-relations in Mam gości 'I have guests' and Mam patelnię 'I have a frying pan' is due to the fact that they are instances of different types (the fact that gości 'guests' is a relational noun is immaterial here). If a word can occur in both types (locative and transitive), it becomes a matter of strategies and context how the sentence is read. If a word is restricted to one of the two types, its restrictions determine the selection.

Animate B-Nouns

Transitive relations show that it makes a difference whether the possessor is an animate item or an inanimate item.¹³ Wojtek may have a perforated dog and a wise girlfriend, yet it would be odd if he had a hole in his dog and wisdom in his girlfriend:

- 45) ?Wojtek ma dziurę w psie.
'Wojtek has a hole in his dog'
- 46) ?Wojtek ma mądrość w dziewczynie.
'Wojtek has wisdom in his sweetheart'

These examples are extremely odd. The reason why I did not simply asterisk them is that they could be instances of objectivization (cf. below). Formally, at least 45) meets the conditions for transitive structures: Wojtek has a dog, and the dog has a hole. 46) is somewhat different in that mądrość 'wisdom' is restricted to qualified occurrences in form A relations:

- 47) ?Wojtek ma mądrość.
'Wojtek has wisdom'

but qualified:

- 48) Wojtek ma mądrość Salomona.
'Wojtek has the wisdom of Solomon'
- 49) Wojtek ma mądrość w spojrzeniu.
'Wojtek has wisdom in his looks'

49) is a clear instance of a transitive relation where Wojtek's looks contain wisdom while he himself may be a complete fool. Mądrość 'wisdom' is an abstract term and

¹³ Animacy is a feature often used in the discussion of possessive relations. Pitha, e.g., considers only those relations which have an animate possessor noun true possessive relations (distinguished from "attributive" and "copulative" having); cf. 1971; 1972.

restricted to transitive relations whose locative nouns are in an inherent possessive relation with the subject. No such restrictions can be found with words for inanimate concrete items:

50) Wojtek ma dziurę w oponie swego samochodu.
'Wojtek has a hole in the tire of his car'

51) Wojtek ma dziurę w zębie.
'Wojtek has a cavity in his tooth'

The restrictions which block 52), on the other hand, are a ref of the fact that pies 'dog' is animate:

52) ?Wojtek ma dziurę w ogonie swego psa.
'Wojtek has a hole in the tail of his dog'

It appears that whenever we enter a possessive relation with an animate item as the possessed noun, we possess only some complex representation of the animate item but not the individual parts of it. In other words, we cannot establish a transitive relation with those items which are possessed by the animate noun in the locative phrase. If Wojtek has a car and someone touches its headlights, he may react by saying 53):

53) Odpieprz się od moich lamp!
'Leave my lights alone!'

If, on the other hand, someone tried to touch the tail of Wojtek's dog, or the fleas on this dog, he would not say 54):

54) Odpieprz się od mojego ogona/moich pcheł!
'Leave my tail/my fleas alone!'

Assume, however, that Wojtek has caught an alligator, killed it, and nailed its tail to the wall. Now, he may well say something equivalent to 54) if someone pokes his finger in the tail of the alligator. The reason for this may be that inanimate items literally contain (in a

physical sense) most of the items which they have, while animate items can establish miec'-relations with items which otherwise are completely unrelated to them in space or time. This, however, is not the important factor, because then we could at least establish transitive miec'-relations with the body parts of an animate item plus all the stains and scratches on these parts. Yet, this is not the case. More generally, therefore, I assume that possessive relations established by animate possessors are different in nature from those established by inanimate possessors. In the above examples, it was irrelevant, that ogon 'tail' was in a body-part relation with dog. When instead of ogon 'tail' the possessed item was pchły 'fleas', the situation was not different. Thus, it is not the fact that the dog's tail is in an inherently possessed body-part relation with the dog in (52/54) that makes the sentences unacceptable. It is the fact that ogon 'tail' is within the possessive range of an animate item other than the subject of the miec'-sentence (Wojtek). Possession is, as it turns out, an animo-centric notion. Of course, a triangle has three angles and a house may have a swimming pool but the possessive relations which are established between an inanimate possessor and its possessed items are rather instances of containment and can become the item in short scope of miec' of a transitive relation. Inanimate concrete items have a very restricted set of items over which their possessive relations can extend. Basically, these are properties, dimensions, and the parts that they consist of. For the most part, everything that is contained in these inanimate items is within the possessive range of an animate item which has the inanimate item:

- 55) Dom Wojtka ma ogródek. W ogródku jest drzewo.
 Na drzewie jest gniazdo. W gnieździe - ptak.
 'Wojtek's house has a garden. In the garden,
 there is a tree. In the tree, there is a nest.
 In the nest, there is a bird.

Since Wojtek has the house, he has all the items which go with the house, right down to the bird:

- 56) Wojtek ma ptaka w gnieździe na drzewie w ogródku swojego domu.
'Wojtek has a bird in the nest on the tree in the garden of his house'

If, however, the bird has a red bill, the bill does not come under the scope of mieć with Wojtek in subject position.

Transitive relations show two things: a) possessive relations are sensitive to the feature "animate/inanimate", and b) they show how an inference from a mieć-relation to an ownership relation can be blocked. The features "in/animate" are, of course, not inherent to the words of Polish. This feature assignment can have a grammatical function in language and be part of the morphological apparatus of language. But as far as words are concerned, stones can be animate and dogs inanimate, so that I would rather say that transitive relations are possible with items which stand to the possessor in a relation of a properly included subset to a set, where all members of the subset are also members of the set, while transitive relations are not possible with items which stand to the possessor in a relation of a member to a set, where the item which functions as a member may by itself be a set, but its members are not members of the higher set. Both relations are part-whole relations (Wall 1972: 2-11), and both relations are established by mieć. The difference between the locative and the transitive reading, in turn, can also be accounted for with the assumption of two different underlying semantic structures. 58) would be a representation of the semantic structure posited for the locative reading of 57), while 59) would be the structure

for the transitive reading of 57):

- 57) Wojtek ma szczury w piwnicy.
'Wojtek has rats in the basement'
- 58) Wojtek ma szczury. (Jego) szczury są w piwnicy.
'Wojtek has rats. (His) rats are in the basement'
- 59) Wojtek ma piwnicę. W piwnicy są szczury.
'Wojtek has a basement. In his basement, there are rats'

Abstract nouns fare slightly differently in transitive relations. The distinction between animate and inanimate should be vacuous. As will be seen later, however, abstract nouns are assigned features of concrete objects and treated, as a way of speaking, as if they were animate or inanimate (if one desires to keep this distinction): Nadzieja go opuściła 'His hope left him', is an instance where Polish has assigned properties of animate items to the abstract term nadzieja 'hope'. An analysis of the restrictions for the verb opuścić 'to leave' reveals that it requires an animate subject. This fact precludes a treatment of abstract nouns as a homogenous set. Each abstract term has to be analyzed individually for the feature it has been assigned. Someone's patience may have limits, yet this someone does not have limits in his patience:

- 60) Cierpliwość Wojtka ma granice.
'Wojtek's patience has limits'

vs.

- 61) *Wojtek ma granice w cierpliwości.
'Wojtek has limits in his patience'

Cierpliwość 'patience', like nadzieja 'hope' shows characteristics of animate items: Cierpliwość opuściła go 'His patience left him [He lost his patience]'. An interesting group of abstract nouns in the context of

transitive relations are some of those nouns which contain the element 'to give'. Examples are obietnica, sympatia, zaufanie 'promise, sympathy, confidence' (concrete items such as prezent 'gift' show similar characteristics). We have somebody's promise, sympathy, or confidence, yet, this someone's promise never becomes my promise; i.e., it never becomes the promise of the possessor in the mieć-relation.¹⁴

62) Wojtek ma jej obietnicę.
'Wojtek has her promise'

I suspect that the nouns of this group are, in fact, special instances of a transitive relation: Wojtek has the promise on or with him. Nadzieja 'hope', on the other hand, is also given, but it is not the hope of the person who gave it:

63) Wojtek dał mi nową nadzieję.
'Wojtek gave me new hope'

Thus, the last example must be considered a way of speaking for Wojtek spowodował, żebym miał nową nadzieję. 'Wojtek caused me to have new hope'.

Strategies

The restrictions formulated for transitive relations pertain to mieć-relations which are interpreted as extra-linguistic possessive relations. I have indicated that an interpretation of 'to hold something' for mieć is another way of blocking an ownership reading. It is not surprising, therefore, that transitive relations do not affect the 'hold'-reading. The strategy which interprets a

¹⁴For a similar observation for English, cf. Ross 1978: 267.

transitive relation in that sense must also assign short scope to mieć. The locative noun is not in a mieć-relation with the subject. A possessive relation between the subject and the locative noun has to be marked separately:

- 64) Wojtek ma [= trzyma] piłkę na głowie psa.
'Wojtek has [= holds/keeps] a ball on the dog's head'

The possibility of a sentence such as 65) cannot be excluded:

- 65) "Przyszedłem do pana, bo mam robaki w moim psie."
'"I came to you because I have worms in my dog."'

65) must not be considered a counter-example to the claim that we cannot, in a transitive relation, have items which are possessed by other animate items. The example is an instance of objectivization (and of a markedly comical utterance). The dog is no longer treated as an item with all the properties of an animate item (hence the comical effect), but as the location of something that Wojtek has, or as the inanimate possessor item to whose parts Wojtek is in a transitive relation. Both readings are possible. Words as referring terms, after all, are only part of language but not part of the reality to which they refer. The assignment of features to these words is a matter of language, not of reality. Even relational nouns which occur usually in inherent possessive relations ('father of') can be subjected to a strategy by which they become available to established relations. Imagine a party game in which everybody has to pick a person as his father for the duration of the game. The word ojciec 'father' would still be a relational noun, but no longer would it be in an inherent possessive relation. 'I have a father' in this context would be an established possessive relation. Polish grammar reflects this by allowing 66) for both situations (inherent and established), while allowing 67)

for the established reading only:

- 66) To jest ojciec Wojtka.
'This is Wojtek's father'
- 67) To jest ojciec, którego miał Wojtek.
'This is the father Wojtek had'

3.2 Abstract Nouns

Abstract nouns can be the possessed items in mieć-sentences. We have feelings, emotions, intentions, rights, and obligations.¹⁵ These nouns, however, show more restrictions than those referring to concrete items.

- 68) ?Wojtek ma mądrość.
'Wojtek has wisdom'
- 69) ?Wojtek ma ślepotę.
'Wojtek has blindness'
- 70) ?Wojtek ma chorobę.
'Wojtek has illness'

Such examples are definitely odd but cannot always be entirely excluded as possible borderline cases, i.e., as instances of mieć-relations which may be acceptable for some speakers, while being rejected by others. I think that it is not possible to classify each noun (even if it

¹⁵ A discussion of feelings, emotions, and related concepts is found in Jordanskaja 1972; Wajszczuk 1972. cf. also Wierzbicka 1970-72 - a series of articles (ca. 20) called "Medytacje Semantyczne" which appeared between 1970 and 1972. (They are not listed individually in my bibliography).

were feasible to list all such nouns) as to its capability to occur as the possessed item in a mieć-relation of form A. What is possible, and what I attempt to do, is to identify the features which a term must have in order to occur as the direct object of mieć. As a matter of fact, the distinction between abstract and concrete items becomes rather vacuous for the nouns under mieć: All possessed items are treated as if they referred to "concrete", i.e., quantifiable items. This is rather fortunate, because it is not always clear where to draw the line between abstract and concrete occurrences. If I speak about the smoothness of a table, do I refer to the property of smoothness as an abstract attribute of the table, or to the sensation which I have when my fingers glide over the surface of the table? Probably both. In natural discourse, we hurt feelings (Zranił moje uczucia 'He hurt my feelings'), give someone new hope or courage (Dałem jej nową nadzieję 'I gave her new hope'; Wydarzenie dodało mu śmiałości 'The event gave him courage'), etc. Whenever we have something, we have results not processes. Wojtek can have the property of 'is singing a song', but he does not have the singing as a process. The derivational history of Polish words gives some indication as to whether it refers to a process or a result, but the morphological make-up of a word cannot be taken as a means of classification for processes and results:

- 71) *Mam prasowanie/śpiewanie/pływanie.
'I have ironing/singing/swimming'

These processes cannot be part of the subject. The same words can sometimes be used for results, i.e., for manifestations of processes, in which case they can occur in the NP_{acc} position:

- 72) O piątej mam pływani^ę.
'I have swimming [as a course] at five'

Other nouns in -ie usually refer only to results:

- 73) Mam zebrani^e.
'I have a meeting'

Nouns in -ość usually refer to properties which have a limited capability of occurring under mieć:

- 74) *Mam nachalnoś^ć/próżnoś^ć.
'I have impudence/vanity'

But not all nouns in -ość are so restricted:

- 75) Mam śmiałoś^ć/przyszłoś^ć.
'I have courage/a future'

Conversely, other nouns which clearly refer to physical manifestations of some property can be restricted:

- 76) ?Mam ślepotę.
'I have blindness'

This brief overview is meant to illustrate that more general semantic criteria have to be formulated in order to account for possible restrictions for abstract nouns under mieć. Morphological considerations or groupings with labels such as 'emotions', 'feelings' are not operational.

All material objects are results of some processes. Only results can be the possessed part in a mieć-relation. Results need not have physical manifestations in any strict sense. Results are the output of processes which result in a new state of affairs. Materialistic thinking and its kin, the extralinguistic notion of possession, may be

responsible for the fact that "have-languages"¹⁶ tend to substitute purely verbal phrases with instances of form A¹⁷, but it is not because of any materialistic way of thinking that the item under mieć has to be a result. This requirement is a result of the fact that mieć establishes part-whole relations. The result is often identified via its physical manifestation:

- 78) Mam jego śpiewanie na taśmie.
'I have his singing on tape'

If this result is marked for another possessive relation as in 78) (by the possessive pronoun jego 'his'), it can only be in a transitive relation with the subject of 78). Different from material objects, abstract nouns are, indeed, inalienable, and cannot be given a 'keep'-reading in a mieć-sentence. As noted earlier, nouns such as obietnica 'promise' automatically establish a transitive relation which, therefore, need not contain a locative phrase in the surface sentence. In non-transitive relations, Wojtek cannot have my hopes, impressions, or allergies (only the same kind of allergy or hope):

- 79) *Wojtek ma moją nadzieję/moje wrażenia/moje uczulenie.
'Wojtek has my hope/my impressions/my allergy'

Because of this limitation, it is less natural to qualify the possessed abstract item with a pronoun which

¹⁶On the typological distinction between "have" and "be" languages for IE languages and especially for Slavic, cf. Isačenko 1974; also Birnbaum 1978.

¹⁷"I have a longing" instead of "I desire", cf. Fromm 1976: 20 (with further references). This phenomenon is a substitution of a verbal form by a mixed verbal-nominal form. Brinkmann, in addition, points out that the occurrence of concrete items as direct objects of German haben 'to have' is more recent than the occurrence of abstract items in that position (Brinkmann 1959: 184-185).

has the same value as the subject, than it would be with nouns for concrete items. For 80), a certain emphatic contrast¹⁸ is required:

80) Mam swoją nadzieję/swoje uczulenie.
'I have my own hope/my own allergy'

Quantification

The important property for any noun, which enters a mieć-relation of form A as the possessed item, is that it is quantified. All concrete nouns are inherently quantifiable. Unless they are singularia tantum or piuralia tantum, they have plural and singular forms. No additional manipulations are necessary to mark the concrete nouns for quantification in the sentence. Nouns which are not inherently quantifiable can become the possessed item only if they are explicitly marked for quantification in a given sentence. A very simple test for abstract terms which indicates whether or not a noun is inherently quantifiable is the plural test. If the noun has a plural the meaning of which is plurality of the singular noun meaning, then it is inherently quantifiable. Examples are: Nadzieja/nadziei 'hope/hopes'; zdolność/zdolności 'ability/abilities'; etc. Nouns which are not inherently quantified are, e.g., ślepotę/*ślepoty 'blindness/blindnesses'; nachalność/*nachalności 'impudence/impudencies'. The restriction that the plural must not change the meaning of the singular noun other than for plurality applies in cases such as: Mądrość/mądrości 'wisdom/wise words'; różność/różności 'difference/various things'; starożytność/starożytności 'antiquity/

¹⁸Such a contrast can have the underlying structure of a double negation: It is not the case that I do not have an allergy.

antiquities'. The asterisked nouns occur in the singular also in combination with expressions such as różne gatunki/rodzaje czegoś 'different types of something', or różne stopnie czegoś 'different degrees of something'. Even if colloquially a plural form would occur here, it would not name the plurality of one type but only create different types which by themselves again do not have a plural form.

There are several ways that such nouns can still become the possessed items in a mieć-relation. As soon as the noun refers to a physical manifestation of a process or property, it need not be marked for quantification separately, no matter whether or not it has a plural form:

- 81) Ten stół ma gładkość.
'This table has smoothness'

This is certainly not an example of the beauty of the Polish language and some speakers may reject it outright, yet, there is no question that such sentences do occur. (The example is from: Topolinska 1979: 107). This is similar to the case mentioned earlier when a deverbal noun refers to the manifestation (result) of a process rather than to the process itself (Mamy pływanię 'We have swimming (as a course)'). Grammatical manipulations are another way of making abstract nouns available for the position of the direct object in mieć-sentences.

Singularity

Singular, unique reference is an instance of quantification. This can be achieved with comparisons:

- 82) Wojtek ma mądrość Salomona.
'Wojtek has the wisdom of Solomon'

- 83) Wojtek ma grzeczność Rosjanina.
'Wojtek has the politeness of a Russian'

It also can be obtained with relative clauses or adjectives which identify the noun as a unique instance of some property:

- 84) Wojtek ma (tę właśnie) ślepotę, która mu jest potrzebna w takiej sytuacji.
'Wojtek has (this particular) blindness which is needed in this situation'
- 85) Stół ma potrzebną okragłość.
'The table has the necessary roundness'
- 86) Proszek ma dobrą rozpuszczalność.
'The powder has a good dilutability'

In these cases, it is possible to insert the phrase rodzaj/stopień 'type, degree', etc.:

- 87) Dziecko ma zdumiewający rodzaj wrażliwości.
'The child has an amazing kind of receptiveness'
- 88) Jego głos ma wybitną skalę sztuczności.
'His voice has an outstanding degree of artificiality'

Expressions of degree are also those which contain expressions of measurements:

- 89) Pociąg ma wielką szybkość.
'The train has great speed'
- 90) Ma wysokość pięciu metrów.
'He has a height of 5 meters'

Superficially, all these examples seem to be parallel to an example discussed earlier:

- 91) Mam młodego ojca.
'I have a young father'

91) without the adjective would have been rather senseless. The oddity of Mam ojca 'I have a father', I pointed out, stems from the fact that a universal property

is asserted of an individual item. The same, I think, is the case with examples which contain measurements. But it is not so clear whether wrażliwość 'receptiveness' in 87), or rozpuszczalność 'dilutibility' in 86) are universal properties of children and powders, respectively. Clasen makes the interesting observation that while not each person is intelligent, each person still has some degree of intelligence on a scale which ranges from utter stupidity to great wisdom (loosely speaking) (Clasen 1981: 29-31). While this may be the case in 86) and 87), it hardly can account for nouns such as ślepotą 'blindness' or małżeństwo 'marriage'. Yet, both nouns require an adjective (or comparable manipulations) in order to become available as the possessed item in form A:

- 92) Pies ma długotrwałą ślepotę.
'The dog has a long-lasting
[type of] blindness'
- 93) Mamy udane małżeństwo.
'We have a successful marriage'

Thus, the adjectival modification here is different from the one operative in 91). Here, the nouns must first be made available for quantification by differentiating between different types or degrees, while in 91) the noun 'father' is already inherently quantified and need only be qualified for some unique property. The result is, basically, the same for both instances, but the rationale behind it is different.

The same function which dobra 'good' has in 86), can be fulfilled by an indefinite pronoun. There is a subtle difference, however, between pewien 'a certain' and jakiś 'some'. While pewien reads something like 'a certain type of', jakiś reads rather like 'some unspecific type of':

- 94) To drzewo ma pewną chropowatość,
mianowicie taką jak skóra słonia.
'This tree has a certain roughness,
namely like the skin of an elephant'
- 95) To drzewo ma jakąś chropowatość,
no nie mogę powiedzieć jaką.
'This tree has some sort of roughness,
but I do not know what sort'

95) requires an emphatic stress on ma 'has' as an instance of a double negation: 'It is not true that the tree is not rough'. In 94), the assumption of a double negation is optional. The reason for this is, that in 94), the speaker indicates that he knows the type of roughness the tree has, and the roughness is identified as to its type; while in 95), the speaker suggests that roughness is a feature of this tree, yet he is unable to say what type/degree it is. The more physical evidence there is for a particular property, the less important becomes this distinction:

- 96) Wojtek ma pewną chorobę.
'Wojtek has a certain disease'
- 97) Wojtek ma jakąś chorobę.
'Wojtek has some kind of a disease'

Here, no double negation is required for 97). The distinction between jakiś and pewien is reduced to the general some-unspecific vs. some-specific, because choroba 'disease' may be the word not only for the process of being sick, but also for the resulting manifestation of the illness. Therefore, some speakers may even accept the somewhat odd: Mam chorobę 'I have illness' as a short form of Mam jakąś/pewną chorobę 'I have an illness'. The word for the individual diseases occurs unrestricted under mieć:

- 98) Wojtek ma raka/gruźlicę.
'Wojtek has cancer/tuberculosis'

Finally, abstract terms can be quantified by appearing in transitive relations:

- 99) Wojtek ma skromność w zachowaniu.
'Wojtek has modesty in his behavior'
- 100) Krowa ma szybkość w nogach.
'The cow has speed in its legs'

As mentioned earlier, it is not necessary for the abstract term to appear in a mieć-sentence with the locative noun. If Wojtek's behavior is modest it need not have (and has not) modesty. Because a part of Wojtek is the place where a particular property can be found, it can also be found as a part of Wojtek in a transitive relation. Its occurrence in a transitive form makes the property available for a mieć-relation as a member of a set: 'Modesty' is a member of the set 'behavior', 'behavior', in turn, is properly included in 'Wojtek'. Marginally, there appears to be a variant of the transitive relation which does not use a locative complement but a genitive:

- 101) Wojtek ma bystrość umysłu.
'Wojtek has quickness of mind'

The type of quantificational structure which is necessary for an abstract word in form A does not suggest that there are pieces of properties lying around which can become part of the possessor. It may help to think of properties simply as the class of all manifestations of this property. The words skwapliwość 'stinginess' or łapownictwo 'corruptibility' refer to the entire class of stingy and corrupt things, respectively. This class cannot become the possessed item in form A. But the quantified occurrences are individual manifestations of this property and can occur under mieć. Although we speak of individual manifestations, the property need not be broken up into

pieces. In other contexts, we also refer to parts of a whole by the name of the whole:

102) Przed moim domem płynie Wisła.
'In front of my house flows the Vistula'

And I can have wisdom in my looks as I can have the Atlantic Ocean in front of my house. The subject is in a transitive relation with both wisdom and the Atlantic, and the subject has neither of them in its entirety - taken with a grain of salt, because there is nothing inherent in Atlantyk which would not allow me to have it in its entirety, as I can have a lake or a glass of water, while it is inherent in properties that I cannot have them as a class.

With abstract terms in miec-sentences, there is never a clear border which would mark off the acceptable from the unacceptable. There is only the principle that they have to be quantified. It is not even clear which abstract words should be considered part of the Polish language. The endings -ość and -stwo/-ctwo are very productive in Polish (Gramatyka 1984: 359-360). Whether a noun is introduced into the language is largely a matter of demand. If there is a demand, the form is available and, I suggest, indicates that the speaker has some conceptual comprehension of what this abstract whole is. Our ways of speaking in non-technical idioms show a clear tendency to mold abstract notions in a cast of physical, even animate, appearance. This is probably true of many languages, because we react to (physical) stimuli. There is no absolute reality, hence, there are no absolute words for it. We do not perceive a chair as something consisting of atoms or even smaller units with large empty space in between, and we do not see infrared light or feel magnetic waves, and our interpretation of reality proceeds

accordingly. In this interpretation, we use familiar physical shapes and attributes to relate to these otherwise "unreal" phenomena. We speak of lightwaves and empty space where, in fact, there could be something else. The level of abstract thinking may vary from culture to culture,¹⁹ but we still hardly lift our feet off the physical reality of our earth's surface when we speak about abstract concepts: Strach ogarnia ludzi 'Fear overcomes people', or 'descends on a city (Strach spadł na miasto 'Fear descended on the city'), and ład i porządek panują w kraju 'Law and order reign in the country', while in fact nothing is there which would attack or reign. These are, of course, only ways of speaking but they reflect our perception of reality. We lose hope and give our word, like losing a key and giving a kiss. Beliefs leave us like old friends and we inflict injustices like wounds. The deeper the words for such concepts are integrated into language, the more likely it is that they are assigned features of physical realities as we know them.²⁰ Once this point is reached, nothing precludes their occurrence in form A sentences. For other words, we cannot even be sure whether they "exist": Are there words in Polish such as dziurawość, rybność, wroniarstwo 'holishness, fishiness, ravenhood'? Probably not. Not that they are ill-formed or that there is no such property of being a fish or the class of everything fishy. I suspect that they are odd because we

¹⁹ Bloom reports that the use of counter-factual constructions is foreign to Chinese speakers and that they consider it a typical Western way of thinking (1981: 13-33).

²⁰ Words for emotions, e.g., are complex descriptions based on simple comparisons; cf. the explications for words of emotions in Wierzbicka 1972: 57-70. It should be noted, however, that in general Wierzbicka's treatment of possession is entirely different from what I propose here; cf. Wierzbicka 1977.

do not need them, and fish and ravens do not speak (they probably would have them in their lexicons). Ordinarily speaking, we do not have much use for a word such as rybność 'fishiness', unless we have some manifestation to which we can relate it. Such a manifestation is available when the word refers to certain aspects of human behavior (by way of comparing it to qualities of animals):

Małpiarstwo 'apishness' already exists, so why not also rybność 'fishiness':

103) Wojtek ma rybność w zachowaniu.
'Wojtek has fishiness in his behavior'

Here, a transitive context is created for a new word to say that Wojtek shows fish-like properties. This form makes rybność available as a quantifiable term and I have a manifestation to which I can relate fishiness.

3.3 Other Restrictions

In 3.1, the factors which influenced the reading of mieć-relations of form A were attributed to the structure of the entire sentence, and in 3.2, they were a reflex of the possessed noun. In this brief final section, I will turn to questions pertaining to the possessor noun. In general, this position is open to any noun, although semantic compatibility with the possessed item is required: A carpet has no bride; at least not under normal circumstances. The definiteness requirement for the subject noun was discussed in the context of the part-whole structure.

In some instances of form A, the possessor noun is typically a plural form or some collective:

104) Polacy mają nowy rząd.
'The Poles have a new government'

105) W Paryżu mają tyfus.
'In Paris, they have typhus'

106) Mieliśmy mróz przez całą zimę.
'We had frost all winter long'

Sometimes this is a requirement imposed by the possessed item as in 104). Tyfus 'typhus', on the other hand, imposes no such restrictions:

107) Wojtek ma tyfus.
'Wojtek has typhus'

But in 107), Wojtek is sick, while in 105), he may be in Paris without having the disease. As a collective, we can have typhus in our town, without each citizen being necessarily ill. As an individual I either have typhus or I do not have it, but I do not have it in the town other than in a temporal reading (which is not part of 108):

108) Mamy tyfus w mieście.
'We have typhus in the town'

109) ?Mam tyfus w mieście.
'I have typhus in town'

(The temporal reading which makes 109) available can be glossed as: 'Whenever I am in town, I have typhus (while I do not have it when I am elsewhere)'). For an individual to have typhus, typhus has to be part of that individual. This is the case when the individual has typhus in short scope of mieć, in which case he is ill, or when he has it in a transitive relation, in which case he, as an individual, must be in a mieć-relation with the locative: The individual may, e.g., be a physician in a hospital. Phenomena which affect everything at a given place or time usually have a plural possessor. **If the possessor is an**

individual instance of this collective, the reading changes slightly:

110) Miałem mróz przez całą zimę.
'I had frost all winter long'

To say 106) is more typical for someone who speaks about the place where he usually spends his winter, while 110) is more typical for someone like a tourist speaking about the place he had visited. It is, however, an entirely extralinguistic choice whether or not the speaker considers himself part of the collective.

110) Mam teraz siódmą.
'I have 7 o'clock now'

111) Mamy teraz siódmą.
'We have 7 o'clock now'

It seems that 111) is uttered when someone wants to communicate that it is 7 o'clock. 110) can have the additional component of someone's telling the other party that, regardless of what the time is for everybody else, for the subject it is now 7 o'clock. And what is more important, 110) contains the transitive element: Na moim zegarku jest siódma 'On my watch it is 7', or something to that effect. It would not be uttered in a situation where the subject looks at a public clock, because then he cannot establish a transitive relation, with 'clock' in the locative position.

To sum up: mieć-sentences of form A are part-whole relations. These relations are directional and can be interpreted as extralinguistic possessive relations unless specific restrictions apply. Transitive relations are those in which the direct object of mieć is in an intermediate possessive relation with the subject. This precludes the interpretation of an ownership relation.

Abstract entities are perceived as quantifiable objects when they occur in mieć-relations. In general, more restrictions apply for the possessed item than for the possessor. It is not possible to define the whole (i.e., the possessor) in absolute terms. Animate possessed items are related to the whole like members to a set, while inanimate possessed items are related to the whole like subsets to sets.

4 Mieć vs. Być

Adjectives as a word group are of little interest in the context of form A,²¹ but their occurrences in copulative być-sentences often provide almost-synonymous variants of mieć-sentences with abstract nouns as the possessed items.

112) Wojtek jest chory. (?mieć chorobę)
'Wojtek is sick' (to have a disease)

113) Wojtek jest nachalny. (*mieć nachalność)
'Wojtek is impudent' (to have impudence)

Copulative sentences show fewer restrictions than mieć-sentences. Universally possessed items, for example, whose unqualified occurrence in mieć-sentences is rather odd, obtain a reading of 'more than expected' when used as

²¹ Instead of a noun, form A can also have an adjectival form or an adverb in the NPacc position under mieć: Dziecko ma mokro. 'The child is [lit.: has] wet'; Masz zielone. 'You have green'. As far as mieć is concerned, there is nothing particular to these instances: the adjective or adverb function basically as a noun. It is a short-hand way of saying that the child has wet pants and that you have a green light.

properties of the subject in copulative sentences:

- 114) Ten pies jest włochaty.
'This dog is hairy'

Qualified occurrences of nouns in mieć-sentences sometimes have synonymous instances with an adjective in a copulative sentence:

- 114) Wojtek ma długie nogi - Wojtek jest długonogi.
'Wojtek has long legs - Wojtek is long-legged'

Such parallel forms for concrete items other than body-parts usually do not exist. If there are related forms, they are not exactly parallel:

- 115) Wojtek nie ma domu.
'Wojtek has no house'

vs.

- 116) Wojtek jest bezdomny.
'Wojtek is homeless'

Transitive mieć-relations, too, show the general pattern of a related form with być 'to be':

- 117) Mam dziurę w butach - Moje buty są dziurawe.
'I have a hole in my shoes - My shoes are perforated.'

With mieć in a sentence, we say something about the whole by saying something about its parts. In copulative sentences, on the other hand, we say nothing about the individual parts of the whole. In fact, we say nothing about a whole at all, because no part-whole relation is established in which the subject could be the whole. The subject is an item of a certain property, not with a certain property. Thus, mieć and być sentences may say the same for all we care in natural discourse, yet the point of view changes drastically.

The adjective denotes a property which is true of the subject as an item. Translated into the language of mieć-relations, the property is true of the whole. Sometimes it is possible to equate the whole of the mieć-relation to the subject in the copulative sentence:

118) Stół ma zadrapaną deskę.
'The table has a scratched top'

119) Stół jest zadrapany.
'The table is scratched'

Despite the fact that in 118) only a part of the whole is ruined, it is possible to assert this as a property of the entire item without a change in meaning. Sometimes this is not possible:

120) Wojtek ma czarne oczy.
'Wojtek has black eyes'

121) Wojtek jest czarny.
'Wojtek is black'

Again, the question is: What is the whole? What are its essential parts? If Wojtek has a stoned rabbit, we are not allowed to infer that Wojtek is stoned. If anything is essential, then it will probably be found close to the body, i.e., close to the physical manifestation of the whole. When we say that the money is under the table, we mean underneath the table-top, not under the legs of the table. When we ask someone to put the money in the mug, we ask him to put it in the part of the mug which can contain liquid, not in the handle of the mug, although the handle may well hold paper money. The essential parts of inanimate items are probably those parts which account for the particular function of the item. In addition, a quantitative aspect is involved, too. If someone says Pomaluj ten samochód! 'Paint this car!', chances are that only the body will be painted, despite the fact that the

engine may be more essential, functionally. This quantitative aspect was the reason for the difference between the pairs 118/119) vs. 120/121); cf. 122/123):

122) Wojtek ma czerwoną skórę.
'Wojtek has red skin'

123) Wojtek jest czerwony.
'Wojtek is red'

The explanation provided here need not be in contrast to a claim which is sometimes made, namely, that the copulative form typically occurs with constant attributes of the subject, while a habeo-type form occurs rather with accidental, temporary attributes (e.g., Daniels 1963: 81). A temporal and a spatial explanation are the two faces of one quantitative aspect: If a large enough amount of parts of the whole have a certain property, then the property can also be attributed to the whole. Jestem chory 'I am sick', or Jestem odważny 'I am courageous', translated into part-whole relations, create the impression that the whole consists almost entirely of instances of sickness or courage, while Mam grype 'I have the flu', or Mam odwagę 'I have courage' speak only of one instance (part) of sickness and courage. Constant attributes consist of a large number of temporal instances, i.e., they have more instances per whole than temporary attributes, so that for them the copulative expression with an adjective is preferred.

The answer to the question of what parts are essential for the whole in order to be A rather than not-A, however, remains without an answer. If Wojtek is on an astral flight, he may say:

124) Leciałem nad swoim ciałem.
'I was flying above my body'

Whatever is flying in such a situation would be called Wojtek, while his body would not.

5 Existentials

Negated existential statements in the present tense have the form ma. This is a form of mieć. The word for the item whose existence is negated appears in the genitive. I will refer to this type as form B:

B: Nie ma + NP_{gen}

Nie ma 'there is/are no' is the counterpart to jest (a form of być 'to be' which appears in statements where existence is asserted.) A form of być 'to be' is also used in the past and future tense of negated existential sentences:

- 125) Nie ma czasu.
'There is no time'
- 126) Nie było/będzie czasu.
'There was no/will not be time'
- 127) Jest jeszcze czas.
'There still is time'

Existential statements can be discussed from the point of view of morphology (Ziv 1982), or from the point of view of logic (Koseska-Toszewa 1982a).²² The close proximity of

²² For Polish, cf. also: Feleszko 1982; Grzegorzczkova 1982; Koseska-Toszewa 1979. Comparative studies which include Polish, e.g.: Feleszko 1977; Maksimovska et al. 1981. In a recent paper with Osadnik, I have tried to combine aspects pertaining to the theme/rheme structure of utterances and to quantification in language (Lempp/Osadnik 1986).

existential statements to locative statements,²³ makes the apparatus needed for a description of existential sentences with jest rather involved. Negated existentials with nie ma, on the other hand, display a morphological structure which sets them clearly apart from locative structures. Negated existentials have no subject, the verb form is invariably nie ma, and the noun is in the genitive. The close proximity of existentials to locatives is understandable because in natural discourse we are often not so much concerned with absolute existence, but with the existence (or non-existence) of an item relative to a limited universe of discourse. The limited universe of discourse is the spatio-temporal location where the item can be found or from which it is absent. In logic, on the other hand, questions of existence center on God, Pegasus, and unicorns and, historically, existential questions were mainly questions about the existence of God (cf. Nakhnikian/Salmon 1957). Consequently, the universe of discourse was the largest possible: the absolute whole (Munitz 1974: 187). The linguist encounters existential statements which pertain to much smaller universes: Speakers are often more interested in the question whether or not there is butter in the fridge, than whether or not there is a God or a unicorn.

128) Czy jest masło w lodówce?
'Is there butter in the fridge?'

129) Czy jest Bóg?
'Is there a God'

Regardless of any philosophical considerations, it is immediately clear that Polish has the same morphological form in both cases. Denying the existence of unicorns,

²³Which is not particular to Polish; for a comparative study, cf. e.g., Clark 1978.

however, has more far-reaching consequences because their existence is denied for the entire universe, while denying the existence of butter in the fridge does not deny that the word masło 'butter' can have a referent. The existential verb istnieć 'to exist', consequently, occurs rather in the context of unicorns and gods than in the context of butter. Often, substitutions of a negated form of istnieć 'to exist' for nie ma result in somewhat unnatural, even funny, sentences if the item whose existence is denied is a rather common thing in our daily life. Istnieć 'to exist' tends to occur with quite extended universes of discourse. The rationale for not treating instances of existentials such as 127) as locatives is that the nouns in existentials are indefinite, while they are definite in locatives.²⁴ For instances of form B, this consideration is immaterial, because negated locatives have a different morphological shape:

130) Masło nie jest w lodówce.

'The butter is not in the refrigerator'

In the past (or future) tense, the noun is in the genitive in existential statements, while it is in the nominative in locatives:

131) Nie było masła w lodówce.

'There was no butter in the refrigerator'

132) Masło nie było w lodówce (a gdzieś indziej).

'The butter was not in the fridge (but elsewhere)'

²⁴Cf. Clark 1978: 91; Sawicka 1983. Allowance is usually made for so-called "list-there sentences": "Q: How could we get there? A: Well, there's the trolley..." (Rando and Napoli 1978: 300). For a discussion of list-there sentences cf. Ziv 1982 (with additional references).

Instances of form B can have indefinite and definite nouns:

- 133) Nie ma łez w jej oczach.
'There are no tears in her eyes'
- 134) Nie ma go w pracy.²⁵
'He is not at work'
lit.: There-is-no-him-gen-at-work

The value of the pro-form could be Wojtek. Definite forms in type B refer to items which have been introduced earlier in the text as definite descriptions or by their names (which can be considered a special type of a definite description). Typically, definite descriptions are represented by pro-forms in the sentence (as in 134), but they can also occur in their full form:

- 135) Nie ma Wojtka.
'Wojtek is not here'
lit.: There-is-no-Wojtek-gen
- 136) Nie ma takiej formy po polsku.
'There is no such form in Polish'

Of course, it is not the existence of Wojtek that is negated in general, nor is it denied that the ill-formed form, which I just showed to my informant, exists. What is denied, is that Wojtek or the ill-formed form are part of the universe of discourse, which may be Wojtek's place of work in 135), or the Polish language in 136). In order to account for the difference between negated existentials and negated locatives, the distinction between naming and mentioning is, I think, applicable here (Quine 1980; esp. pp 1-19): Negated existentials contain no ontological commitment. In 135) and 136), Wojtek and the ill-formed

²⁵ Negated locatives vs. negated existentials of instances such as 134) are discussed in Klebanowska 1975; Sawicka 1979.

form are only mentioned, not named. In a locative, on the other hand, they would be named, not mentioned. The distinction between naming and mentioning is useful because we can deny the existence of items while still using the word which could refer to just that something which we claim does not exist. If a German linguist claims that there are no laryngeals, he does not want to imply that he is referring to anything such as a laryngeal. By only mentioning them, he cannot be accused of having committed himself to any ontology. In the above examples, the speaker is probably less anxious about avoiding any ontological commitment. He may well agree that Wojtek exists. And he can do so for any other universe of discourse, because lack of ontological commitment does not preclude that the item mentioned does exist; and its existence has been denied only for a limited universe of discourse. If the term is mentioned only, definiteness becomes secondary. For all practical purposes, I would agree that the distinction between naming and mentioning of definite terms in negated existential sentences with a limited universe of discourse is rather academic, because the speaker may be indifferent as to whether or not he is committing himself to any ontology. But it can help explain why Polish has the same morphological form for a negative answer to the questions 128) and 129).

Miec' in form A establishes a part-whole relation between object and subject. If ma in form B is semantically related to miec', and I think it is, then it must establish a part-whole relation with an item which is not, and a subject which is absent, too. The only whole to which miec' can relate in form B, is, I suggest, the universe of discourse of which the item mentioned by the NP_{gen} is a part, or rather: would be a part if it would exist. A negated existential says that something is not a

member of the set, where the set is the universe of discourse. Negated locatives, on the other hand, say that something is absent from the place (time-space), which is the universe of discourse, or absent from one place but present at another place, in which case the universe of discourse contains both locations. The latter is typical of Polish, where naming an item in a negated locative clause usually requires naming the item also in a positive locative clause:

- 137) Wojtek nie jest w kinie, ale w knajpie.
 'Wojtek is not in the movie theater, but in a bar'

The universe of discourse in a negated locative has, of course, a different function than the universe of discourse in a negated existential, but absence of a named item from a place and non-membership of a mentioned item in a set, are two faces of the same reality or at least close kin.

To sum up: Polish uses a form of miec¹ for negated existentials. The part-whole relation is established between a (mentioned) item and the universe of discourse. The morphological shape of negated existentials distinguishes form B from negated locatives. Therefore it is not necessary to have recourse to word order and theme/rheme structure in order to identify instances of form B. Typically, the noun in the existential is indefinite, but definite nouns can occur. The distinction between naming and mentioning can account for the secondary status of the definiteness feature.

CHAPTER TWO

MIEĆ + INFINITIVE

1 Form C

At first sight, infinitival mieć-sentences do not have much in common with type A: There is no direct object in the sentence and mieć means many things, but none of these is in any obvious way related to a habeo-reading. The basic form of the infinitival type consists of a form of mieć marked for person, number, or gender (whatever is applicable) and an infinitive. I will refer to this sentence type as form C.

- 1) Mam spać.
'I have to sleep'

Any accusative object in the sentence is governed by the infinitive or other (optional) material in the sentence, but not by mieć:

- 2) Masz trzymać ręce do góry.
'You have to hold your hands up'
- 3) Mamy mu pomóc.
'We have to help him-dat'

The infinitive clause cannot be considered the sentential object of mieć:

- 4) Masz umyć naczynia.
 *Czy ja naprawdę to mam?
 'You have to do the dishes'
 'Do I really have this?'

With a verb such as musieć 'must' this is possible:

- 5) Czy ja naprawdę to muszę?
 'Do I really must this?'

Mam to 'I have this' immediately establishes a relation of type A, i.e., a possessive relation with the pro-form to 'this', which has as its value the infinitival clause. Generally speaking, type C instances are modal sentences, so that it should be possible to classify mieć as a modal verb along with móc, musieć 'can, must' and maybe even chcieć 'want to'. While we have an immediate intuitive understanding of what these latter verbs could mean even outside the context of an infinitive clause, this intuition usually fails when mieć occurs without an infinitive. A possible exception is given in 6). (The example is from a telephone conversation; Pisarkowa 1974c: 45, IX19):

- 6) -Ale, słuchaj, jak tam nie ma nikogo na zewnątrz,
 a piesek szczeka, to ja mam tam?
 'But listen, if there is nobody outside, and the
 dog barks, then I have there?'

If I read this example correctly, mam 'I have' is the first part of a C-instance: Mam stać/czekać/pójść tam 'I have to stand/wait/go there', or something similar. The assignment to form C is the only possible way to get a meaningful sentence here, because there is no direct object available which could become the possessed item in an instance of form A. The modal reading of form C, it could be argued, is simply a consequence of the infinitive. This is certainly true and rather trivial. It does not explain what function mieć has in these modal sentences and why instances of form C display such a dazzling variety of

readings, many more than any other modal verb in Polish. When analyzing the Polish verb mieć in form C, one is confronted not only with necessity (mostly obligation), but also with intention/wish, something like a plain future tense, a type of future in the past, and a reported, unwitnessed form of speech.¹ Narrower or wider context restrictions limit the number of possibilities to some extent, yet there is a certain systematic ambiguity which characterizes mieć-sentences of form C throughout.

Examples:

- 7) Jeśli ci każą zeżreć gówno, to masz jeść i mówić, że smaczne. Masz się zachwycać.
(Hłasko Op)
'If they tell you to eat shit, then you have to eat and say that it is tasty. You are expected to be delighted'
- 8) Obywatel Grzybek doznał mglistego wrażenia, że ten telefon także jego dotyczy, już miał o to spytać, gdy profesor nagle zwrócił się do niego.
(Srokowski)
'Citizen G. had the vague impression that this phone call also concerned him, he had already wanted to ask about it, when the professor suddenly turned to him'
- 9) [P]oetka Ewelina Sarna miała wyrzec głośne potem słowa: 'Na nic moje walizki koniaków...'. Ale nie jest to pewne.
(Srokowski)
'Then the poet E.S. supposedly exclaimed the famous words: "My suitcases with cognac are in vain". But this is not certain'

¹ Instances of the infinitival type of mieć are discussed, e.g., in Koseska-Toszewa 1983; Popova 1976; Rytel 1982; Topolińska 1968; Weiss 1986. Koseska-Toszewa's and Popova's articles are on a comparative basis with Bulgarian; Rytel compares Polish and Czech data; Weiss discusses the German influence on the Polish modal (verbal) system.

- 10) Wycieranie konia po szybkim galopie to już nie była jego sprawa. To miał za niego robić ktoś inny.
(Szatyn)
'Rubbing the horse down after a fast ride, that was not his concern anymore. This somebody else had to do for him'
- 11) Zapowiadanej w prasie "karty zaopatrzenia", która ma wyeliminować wszelkie oszustwa, jak dotąd nie wydrukowano. Nawet nikt nie wie, jak ma wyglądać, choć miała wejść w życie 1 marca br.
(Życie Literackie)
'The "ration card" announced in the press, which is supposed to eliminate all fraud, has still not been printed. It isn't even known what it is supposed to look like, although it was supposed to come out on March 1'
- 12) Szedł teraz do domu z ufnością, tak samo jak za kilka dni miał iść z wielką ufnością do pracy.
(Srokowski)
'He went home now with confidence, just as he would go to work with great confidence a few days later'

In these examples, the context provides fairly clear guidelines for an interpretation. Without a context, most readings are available simultaneously:

- 13) Mieli się spotkać.
'They allegedly met'
'They were supposed to meet'
'They are supposed to meet'
'They wanted to meet'
'They would meet'

Negation can have short or wide scope. Short scope negates the infinitive clause and leaves the value of mieć untouched (14), while wide scope negates the entire sentence, adding a new component to the value of mieć (15):²

²The verbal aspect which is predominantly perfective in form B sentences, is consistently imperfective in negated instances of form B; cf. Topolińska 1968: 429.

- 14) - Pójdiesz się wykapać?
 - Pójdę - rzekłem. - Co bym miał nie iść?
 (Hłasko Op)
 'Are you going to take a swim?
 I am going to, I said. Why should I not go?'
- 15) - Nie, a dlaczego masz skakać, skoro ja mogę
 skoczyć.
 - No wiesz, bo ci obiecałem, że będę się starał
 to ci załatwić.
 - Nic nie masz załatwić, stary.
 (from: Pisarkowa 1974c: 186/10-12)
 'No, and why should you run, when I can do it.
 'Well, because I promised you that I would try to
 get it for you'
 'You don't have to do anything, buddy'

Sentences where information from a third party is communicated ("Presumption", cf. below 2.4) lose their reading of "hearsay" if negation with wide scope occurs:

Jan miał wyjechać z W. 'Jan supposedly has left W.' vs. Jan nie miał wyjechać z W. 'Jan did not intend to leave W.'
 (Grzegorzczkowska 1973: 204).

2.1 The Modal World of Mieć

Modal sentences are characterized by the fact that they take recourse to more than one possible world. Saying that something is possible, required, or desired means to open the view, as it were, to a variety of possible scenarios, or possible worlds (Bradley/Swartz 1979). With modal sentences we say something about the relations which hold between the different possible worlds. In logic, if a proposition is necessarily true, then it is true in all possible worlds (at least, in all the possible worlds where this logic is accepted). In language, we utter words such as koniecznie 'necessary' or musisz 'you must' in a seemingly less comprehensive sense. But, in fact, both

situations are not entirely different. When I say that 'it is necessary that you do the dishes', I may well be aware that there can be a world in which you do not do the dishes, thus, it is not necessary that you do the dishes. But by saying that it is necessary, I indicate that the addressee of my order had better not imagine any possible world in which he could get away without doing the dishes. Whether or not an order is obeyed often depends on whether or not it can be shown convincingly why something has to be done. The answer to the question "Why?" tells us something about the type of necessity. Syllogisms answer the "Why?" in the premise and the truth of the conclusion follows logically. Because it follows logically, it is not necessary to say that 'it must follow', but simply 'it follows'. If Wojtek drops a bucket of water out of the window, the bucket will fall down. Of course, we can also say that it must fall down, but that is not necessary. It is not necessary despite the fact that the premise is not logical but based on our knowledge of the physical laws. Thus, the necessity relation is different in both cases, but in neither case does language require a 'must' here. An occurrence of 'must' or musieć in ordinary discourse generally indicates that the premises may not be entirely convincing. A natural consequence of this is, that the conclusion is not very convincing either. If Wojtek has to steal rabbits, we normally cannot say whether he will, in fact, steal them. What we can say is that the proposition Wojtek kradnie zająca 'Wojtek steals a rabbit' is true in those possible worlds where all orders are obeyed. This is the function of the modal operator which expresses the obligation: To state what the possible worlds are for which the proposition of the infinitive phrase holds.

This short digression to musieć 'must' is justified because mieć very often is used interchangeably with

musieć. In this chapter, however, I am interested in the mieć-sentences. References to other modal verbs of Polish will be made only when necessary.³ The above outline of my view of modality was largely restricted to the notions of necessity/obligation. As the examples 7) through 12) illustrate, these are not the only modal environments encountered with mieć: intentions, in particular, are an important factor, too. In the following, I will devote a short section to each of these modal environments. In the final part of this chapter, I will propose a way of combining all modal occurrences of mieć under a uniform explication and link them to the occurrences of mieć from the previous chapter (form A). My approach is based on two assumptions, for which I will try to provide evidence. The first assumption is that a common denominator for mieć in form C can be formulated. The second assumption is that mieć in form C is formally and semantically the same as mieć in form A or B. While I will treat both assumptions jointly, it is possible to accept one while rejecting the other. For a form of mieć in C to be the same as in an A-type sentence, mieć must have a direct object of some kind. The NP_{acc} under mieć, I will argue, is deleted in form C. The semantic material in this position is limited to instances of modal environments which can be reduced to the common denominator of the modal relations in C. This common denominator of the modal relations in C is an expression of intention (zamierzać, chcieć 'to intend, want to'). 'Want to' is one of the thirteen semantic primitives proposed by Wierzbicka,⁴ so that no attempt is made to find

³For a more comprehensive presentation of the modal verbs in Polish, cf. Weiss 1986.

⁴The latest "list" of these primitives which I am aware of is in Wierzbicka 1980. It contains the following words: "I, you, someone, something, world, this, want, not want, ..."

an even more primitive or formal representation for the modal relations in instances of form C. The result of the deletion in form C are systematically ambiguous mieć-sentences.

2.2 Obligations

16) Musisz stać bardzo prosto. I głowę masz trzymać do góry.

(Hłasko Op)

'You must stand very straight. And you have to hold your head up'

The notion of obligation is most intimately associated with mieć in form C because of its similarity with musieć 'must', and the fact that imperatives can be phrased analytically with mieć:⁵

17) Masz pójść do domu!
'You have to go home!'

An inquiry into the reasons why the subject is obliged to do something reveals that there is a systematic difference between musieć and mieć. Kratzer explains the various readings of the necessity relation established by must (in English/German) by means of the underlying phrase "must in view of..." (1981 ;1979; 1978; 1977). This phrase represents one of the "Redehintergründe" (conversational backgrounds (1981: 42)) which can account for different

think of, say, imagine, be a part of, become", p. 10. An earlier version included the word "feel" (1972: 15-16). Concerning "want" as a primitive, cf. also Bogusławski 1970: 145. For a critique of Wierbicka's "want/not want", cf. Puzynina 1974.

⁵On imperatives in Polish: Topolińska 1966. Albrecht Lempp - 9783954792344
Downloaded from PubFactory at 01/10/2019 04:27:41AM
via free access

readings of a given sentence. Polish musieć seems to have the same structure:

- 18) Musi być chory, bo nie jadł swoich lodów.
'He must be sick, because he did not eat his ice-cream'
- 19) Musisz dodać pieprzu.
'You have to add pepper'
- 20) Muszę być na lotnisku o szóstej.
'I have to be at the airport at six'

In 18), the subject must be sick in view of the fact that he did not eat the ice-cream, while he eats his ice-cream whenever he is in good health. In 19), pepper has to be added in view of the fact that the dish tastes dull; and in 20), the subject has to be at the airport in view of the information printed on the schedule. (Kratzer's phrasings would have been somewhat different). My phrasing 'In view of the fact' is supposed to indicate that the situation in view of which something is necessary, is not interpreted; thus, the necessity is a reflex of certain facts. The facts may be falsely stated, but they are given as facts. With mieć, the situation changes:

- 21) Ma być chory, bo nie jadł swoich lodów.
'He is supposed to be ill, because he did not eat his ice-cream'
- 22) Masz dodać pieprzu.
'You are expected to add pepper'
- 23) Mam być na lotnisku o szóstej.
'I should be at the airport at six'

As the English glossings are supposed to indicate, in mieć-sentences, there is always a source in view of which something is necessary. In 21), the source is the thing (person) which claimed that On jest chory, bo nie jadł lodów 'He is ill because he did not eat the ice-cream'; in 22), the source is the recipe or some person who wants the

subject to add pepper; and in 23), the source may be the schedule. The sources indicated for these examples are only some of the many sources which are possible, hence a variety of readings is possible. As such, this is not much different from the explanation given for musieć. In both cases, the necessity can be 'in view of the schedule', e.g., and the given situation in view of which something is necessary could simply be equated with the source. The difference lies in the fact that with musieć, it is a necessary consequence of what the situation is (this can be a deontic necessity, an epistemic necessity, or any other type of necessity); while with mieć, the situation is interpreted as a source which wants something. Thus, in mieć-sentences, the situation is interpreted and not taken for granted. It is justified to introduce the notion of 'a source' here, because the speaker does not claim that something is necessary in view of a particular situation, but with respect to what this source wants or claims. The source need not be a person. Situations can have the status of sources. In 23), the schedule can have the status of a source which claims that the airliner will depart at a certain time. The presence of this intermediate stage, the source, allows the speaker to keep a certain distance from what he says, because he only says what the source claims. This "distance" is a very typical feature of mieć-sentences in general.

Powinno 'ought to' is another modal operator in Polish which occurs in environments similar to those of mieć and musieć:

- 24) Jeśli chcesz zdarzyć na ten lot, powinieneś się śpieszyć.
'If you want to make this flight, you should hurry'

With powinno the situation is also interpreted, but unlike mieć, it is the speaker himself who is the source in view of which something is necessary: 'In my view you must hurry', or 'In view of how I interpret the situation'. The different conversational backgrounds account for the different readings of a modal verb. The different ways of how we relate to these backgrounds account for the differences among related modal verbs.

In no case is it possible to infer with any certainty whether the obligation has been complied with. Especially in the past tense, however, musieć-sentences are more likely to have a truth value without recourse to possible worlds than mieć-sentences:

- 25) Musiałem się wspinać na krzesło, aby dostać się do górnej półki; - ale nie było krzesła.
'I had to climb a chair in order to reach the upper shelf - but there was no chair'
- 26) Miałem się wspinać na krzesło, aby dostać się do górnej półki; - ale nie było krzesła.
'I was supposed to climb on a chair in order to reach the upper shelf - but there was no chair'

The continuation with ale nie było krzesła 'but there was no chair', which indicates that the subject did not climb a chair, is much more likely in 26) than in 25). The fact that instances of form C always have an underlying source, makes it always possible to deny that the proposition under the scope of the modal operator is true, and the modal relation is usually not restricted to one interpretation only:

- 27) Chórzysta II: "Mieli przyjechać Fenicjanie po ceramikę i tkaniny."
Chórzysta III: "Nie przyjechali..."
(Herbert)
'Chorister II: The Phoenicians were supposed to [obliged to/wanted to/expected to] come for pottery and fabrics...'

Chorister III: They did not come...'

Because musieć 'must' has the conversational background 'in view of the fact that', it becomes rather unnatural to assert that 'in view of some fact' something was necessary, at a moment of speech when it is already known that it is not necessary. Even ordinary speech has a certain degree of logic. A conditional clause becomes the more natural choice here: ...musiałbym się wspinać na krzesło 'I would have had to climb a chair'. This does not claim that the truth of the proposition in a past tense musieć-sentence follows automatically:

- 28) Tak strasznie musiałem się załatwić, ale nie było gdzie.
'I had to relieve myself so badly, but there was nowhere [to do it]'

Thus, the main difference between musieć 'must' and mieć is not in what follows, but in the premise. What the sources for mieć all have in common, is that they are perceived as institutions which want something.

2.3 Intentions

- 29) Tak strasznie chciało mi się spać, ale goście nie poszli sobie.
'I wanted to/had to sleep so badly, but the guests would not go'

The urgent needs of our body may well cause us to want something desperately. This, however, is not the type of wanting found in mieć-sentences. Form C instances can be true of situations in which the subject intends (zamierzać) to do something. The distinction between my wanting to

kill you and my intending to kill you may be blurred, for all practical purposes, because of the often close link between desire and intention.⁶ As far as the source is concerned, the difference is very real: The source wants the subject to do something, the subject of the mieć-sentence intends to do something:

- 30) Miłość jest sztuką, której trzeba się zupełnie poświęcić, jeżeli ma się w niej być doskonałym.
(Lechoń)
'Love is an art to which one must devote oneself entirely, if one wants to/intends to be perfect in it'
- 31) [P]rzestraszył się nagle i już nawet miał się do tego przyznać, kiedy jakaś tajemna moc powstrzymała go przed spowiedzią.
(Srokowski)
'Suddendly fear seized him and he already wanted to/intended to admit it, when some secret power kept him from confessing'

The source in sentences with a reading of obligation wants the subject to do something. In the above examples, however, the subject is not told to do anything: The subject itself intends and/or wants to do something. As a matter of fact, mieć in these examples could be substituted by a form of zamierzać/chcieć 'intend/want' without any obvious need for a source other than the subject. Even the fact that mieć without the appropriate context never could replace zamierzać, chcieć 'intend, want' is no real hindrance. The condition for an intend-reading is simply the lack of a source in an infinitival environment (plus, if necessary, other such specific instructions). In examples where the reading fluctuates between intention and obligation, the assumption has to be made that in one reading no source is present, while in the other reading a

⁶Cf. Korytkowska 1976 for a discussion of this difference (on a comparative basis Polish-Bulgarian).

2.4 Presumptions⁷

The presence of a source in instances of form C allows the speaker to keep a certain distance, as it were, from what he is saying:

- 33) Masz się zgłosić do dyrektora.
'You are supposed to report to the manager'

The order in 33) is not given by the speaker himself, he only relates it. This distance, or lack of commitment, can be greater or smaller, and it can be superimposed on an order (less so on an intention), or constitute the sole content of the mieć-clause:

- 34) W niedzielę miała odbyć się premiera sztuki
któregoś z naszych mistrzów realizmu socjalistycz-
nego.

(Hłasko PD)

'On Sunday, the premiere of a play of one of our masters of socialist realism was supposed to take place'

- 35) W czasie wojny koreańskiej rozeszła się pogłoska,
że Polacy mają wysłać na Koreę ochotników. Nie
wiadomo kto puścił tę plotkę.

(Hłasko PD)

'During the time of the Korean War, rumor had it that the Poles would sent volunteers to Korea. It is not known who started this rumor'

The lack of commitment on the part of the speaker as to the truth of what he is saying can be more or less explicit. Adverbs such as podobno, rzekomo, jakoby 'allegedly, so they say, as if' can strengthen the element of doubt (cf. Bralczyk 1974: 76; Topolińska 1968: 428). As

⁷There is no standard term for this type of discourse. It usually is described as a form of discourse where information obtained from a third party is communicated. "Presumption", thus, is a label for a mode of indirect discourse, where the speaker accepts no responsibility for the proposition of his utterance.

long as this element of doubt is only superimposed and/or a reflex of such an adverb in addition to the basic meaning of obligation (or intention) in the sentence, the presence of a source as such would be enough to explain the superimposed element of doubt. The possibility, however, of making this element the focal point of the proposition in the mieć-clause indicates that it should be considered on a par with obligation and intention as a third value which the variable mieć as a modal operator can take.⁸

In example 9), the poet Ewelina Sarna Miała wyrzec słowa 'Allegedly exclaimed the words'. That means that someone claims that she did something. She is, as it stands, not obliged to exclaim nor does she intend to exclaim anything. If the source claims something, it, in effect, wants us to believe that whatever it says is true. Neither in the reading of obligation nor here is the subject directly addressed by the source. The phrase used earlier to illustrate the source-subject relation was somewhat simplified. In fact, however, such a relation can be less direct. For the obligation it can be rephrased as:

⁸ A parallel pattern can be observed in Germanic languages such as German (with sollen 'should') or English (with suppose): Er soll das machen, Er soll das gemacht haben 'He is supposed to do that, He supposedly did that'; cf.: Ma to zrobić, Miał to zrobić. Bulgarian and Albanian, as examples of Balkan languages which also have instances of modal imam-sentences ('to have') and kam-sentences ('to have'), respectively, show a different situation: in these languages the verb has either the meaning of necessity, or possibility, or plain future. For Albanian, cf. Mansaku 1980, largely a diachronic account of the development of kam in the Albanian dialects; on the meaning of necessity (and possibility), cf. p. 141-142; also Demiraj 1970. For Bulgarian - Popova 1976. The author, in fact, claims that the Bulg. imam constructions lack almost entirely the element of necessity (1976: 132-133). While I would dispute the latter claim, it appears that only the Polish mieć sentences contain this element of doubt and/or distance.

'The source wants that the subject do something'. With the reading of allegation, the source claims that the subject does something. 'Claim' and 'want', are instances of the same relation ('want' being the more basic element). If someone claims, orders, or wants something, he wants that the world which he conceives of, be the actual world. Without a concept of what the world looks like in which what I claim or want is true, I cannot utter wishes, claims, or anything. This may sound somewhat idealistic, since it is not difficult to point out examples of people who "do not seem to know what they want" while uttering various conflicting wishes or claims. Yet, they may not know what the consequences of their wishes or claims are, but they still have a concept of how the world looks in which their wishes or claims hold. If someone really "does not know what he wants", his problem is, indeed, that he cannot visualize any such world. The source, then, conceives of a world x , such that x is the world in which his wishes and claims have a reality. In order for this claim or wish to be fulfilled, it will be necessary for the subject to act accordingly. This is an entirely formal relation and has nothing to do with any moral obligation in extralinguistic reality. And it is a necessity relation based on an "in view of"-interpretation. As such it is too strong. It becomes interpreted as a consequence which results from the presence of a source. This interpretation of the necessity relation occurs automatically, because miec¹ in form C always has an underlying source. The formal relation between the source and the name Ewelina Sarna is the following: The source conceives of a world. In this world the person Ewelina Sarna utters certain words. For this relation to be true, it is necessary that Sarna utter certain words. As a result, Sarna is now under the obligation to say certain words. Since the necessity relation is based on a wish, the implication is rather weak.

and spelled out as 'supposedly'. exactly the same holds for obligations: If Wojtek ma pójść do szefa 'is supposed to go to the boss', the source conceives of a world in which Wojtek goes to his boss. The source's wish imposes an obligation on Wojtek. Wojtek now is in a part-whole relation with an obligation. And this is the situation when this formal relation is put into words. To what extent Wojtek or Ewelina Sarna are morally obliged to do anything is a matter to be resolved in extralinguistic reality. The distinction between formal relations within language and how they translate with respect to the reality outside of language is well-known in the context of passive transformations:

- 36) Góra musi być przeniesiona.
'The mountain must be moved'
- 37) Góra ma być przeniesiona.
'The mountain should be moved'

The mountain need not do anything in reality. But with respect to the reality of language, the mountain is the item which has the obligation or necessity of being moved.

The multiple ambiguity of sentence 38), now, has the same structure for all its readings. Only the values of the variable change:

- 38) Wojtek ma przyjechać jutro.
a) 'Wojtek is obliged to come tomorrow'
b) 'Wojtek supposedly will come tomorrow'
c) 'Wojtek intends to come tomorrow'

The variable x is the source in the explication: The source x conceives of a world. In this world, the subject 'Wojtek' comes tomorrow. For the latter to be true, the following relations obtain:

- a) Wojtek is obliged to come if x is not Wojtek and if

x "speaks to" Wojtek; i.e., the source constitutes a moral institution with respect to Wojtek;

- b) Wojtek supposedly comes if the source "speaks about" Wojtek; i.e., if the wish-world of x is 'about' what Wojtek does;
- c) Wojtek intends to come if x takes the value 'Wojtek'.

In b), the value of x appears to be rather irrelevant. It could be 'Wojtek' or anybody else.

2.5 The Future Tense

The degree of credibility which the speaker gives the source is not a fixed value. Contextually, the proposition of the infinitival clause in a mieć-sentence can have the same degree of probability as a plain future statement:

- 39) Wojtek ma się z nią spotkać o piątej.
'Wojtek will meet her at five'

Where the mieć-sentence is almost synonymous with 40):

- 40) Wojtek spotka się z nią o piątej.
'Wojtek will meet her at five'

The speaker may not have any reason to doubt Wojtek's intentions or the truth of what he was told; he can use mieć simply to indicate that there is a source for the information he is communicating. Interpretations such as this are options available for instances of form C, but they are not systematic. Whether or not Wojtek will indeed meet the lady at some point in the future is another

question and can be asked with regard to 40) as well as with regard to 39). Can anything be asserted about a future event? I now think that this is not the correct question. Discontinued points in time are not different from discontinued spatial points (cf. Taylor 1973). If someone in Charlotte, N.C. says: "Hurricane Gloria is over Florida", then no possible worlds have to be accessed, because the fact that Gloria is over Florida is asserted as true without any speculations about other possibilities; and if I do not believe it, I can go to Florida and see for myself whether or not it is true. And if I do not believe that Wojtek will meet the lady in 39) or 40), I can wait until tomorrow. Again: what is at stake is not the reality of our world, but what is contained in the sentence.⁹ In another type of miec'-sentence with a future temporal relation, it is contained in the sentence that the proposition of the infinitive clause is true:

41) Ciężkie warunki więzienne miały stać się
przyczyną przybierającej na sile w późniejszych
latach głuchoty poety.

(Nowak)

'The hard conditions in the prison would become
the cause of the increasing deafness of the poet
in later years'

This sentence contains the assertion that the poet (Norwid) was deaf in his later years. The use of miec' here reflects the historical chain of events in their chronological order. The miec'-clause is in a future temporal relation to the existing conditions in the prison. It is in a past tense relation with the moment of

⁹The status of the future tense paradigm in a language may vary. Vater (1975) shows that in German the forms in werden are indeed modal phrases which stand in opposition to the plain future tense (expressed with present tense forms).

speech. Consequently, this form is used typically in cases where there is a narrator relating past events. At the point when the conditions in the prison were hard, it was not yet known what consequences they might have. The source which conceives of a world in which the conditions in the prison are the cause of the poet's deafness is the narrator himself: 'I tell you (claim) that the prison conditions are such that the poet will become deaf'. In order for this claim to be true, the conditions must become the cause of the deafness.

To sum up: Infinitival mieć¹-sentences are modal statements with the possibility of a simultaneous reading of obligation, intention, and presumption. Their common denominator is a semantic structure in which a source imposes a necessity relation on the subject. It can be represented by the phrase: 'A source wants --'. Depending on how the blanks are interpreted, and depending on what value the source (interpreted as a variable) takes, one obtains the different modal readings.

3 The Deleted Object of Mieć

The previous section provided an explanation for the different readings of instances of form C. It did not explain the status of mieć itself. The options for mieć are limited, unless one claims that there are many different mieć's (which I do not). Mieć is either a modal verb, in which case it is necessary to explain what a modal verb is. This approach has the advantage that mieć can be compared to other so-called modal verbs of Polish. Or mieć is the same verb as the mieć in form A, in which case it has to be explained at what point it has lost its direct

object and its meaning of 'to have'. The advantage here is that there is only one word rather than two (or even many homonymous) forms. Unfortunately, there is not much direct evidence for either of these two possibilities.

Modal verbs have a limited capability to occur under the scope of a temporal quantifier different from the one which ranges over the infinitival clause:

- 42) ?Wczoraj mogłem dziś pojechać do Warszawy.
'Yesterday, I could have gone [lit.: could go] to Warsaw today'
- 43) ?Wczoraj musiałem nakarmić psa dziś.
'Yesterday I had to feed the dog today'

The verb chcieć 'want to' and mieć do not show these restrictions:

- 44) Wczoraj chciałem dziś pojechać do Warszawy.
'Yesterday, I wanted to go to Warsaw today'
- 45) Wczoraj miałem nakarmić psa dziś.
'Yesterday, I was supposed to feed the dog today'

Chcieć 'want to' does not require subject agreement:

- 46) Chcę, żebyś ty to zrobił.
'I want you to do this'

The verb chcieć, therefore, is often not classified as a genuine modal verb. The typical modal verb in Polish can occur without an infinitive, while mieć in comparable environments cannot:

- 47) Czy Wojtek musi na milicję?
'Must Wojtek [go] to the police?'
- 48) Czy Wojtek może do kina?
'Can Wojtek [go] to the movies?'
- 49) *Czy Wojtek ma na milicję/do kina?
'Should/can Wojtek [go] to the police/movies?'

Other modal verbs can enter the lexicon with a fairly clear definition of what they mean even without the supporting context of an infinitive; mieć cannot. Although mieć may be similar in some respects to so-called modal verbs, it certainly is not a very typical one.

Two temporal adverbs with different scopes can be used in modal mieć-sentences (45). The same structure is available in sentences which contain two different propositions, each of which is qualified by one adverb. This structure can be obtained by rephrasing musieć, móc 'must, can' as mieć obowiązek 'to have the obligation' and mieć możliwość 'to have the possibility/opportunity'. The result are full-fledged propositions rather than modal operators (variables):

- 50) Wczoraj Wojtek miał możliwość pojechania dziś do Warszawy.
'Yesterday, Wojtek had the possibility of going to Warsaw today'
- 51) Wczoraj Wojtek miał obowiązek nakarmić psa dziś.
'Yesterday, Wojtek had the obligation to feed the dog today'

One consequence of such a rephrasing is that the modal relation becomes a part-whole relation between the subject and the modal property. Compound phrases such as miał możliwość 'he had the possibility' or miał obowiązek 'he had the obligation' are not entirely synonymous with the verbs musieć 'must' and móc 'can'. They are more specific instances of the type of necessity or possibility expressed by the respective modal verbs. The exact value of a modal operator is subject to the environments in which it is used. In addition, it may not be necessary or desirable to specify the exact type of modal relation, but to leave the combined value of all instances of the modal type intact:

"Can you pick me up at five?" - "Yes/no, I have the

permission, but I do not have the physical ability", may be the correct way to split up the verb can in a particular context, but it certainly is not always required. A deletion of the specifying direct object (obowiązek, możliwość 'obligation, possibility' in the above examples would leave mieć as the general indicator for a modal proposition in juxtaposition with an infinitive. In addition, it would explain why mieć shows different characteristics from other modal verbs in the environments illustrated above. It could be added that *Czy Wojtek ma możliwość/obowiązek do kina? 'Has Wojtek the opportunity/-obligation to [go to] the movie theater?' is, like (49), also impossible.

Which material becomes deleted under mieć is, at some point, a matter of choice. Polish has reserved mieć-sentences for those instances where there is a semantic structure with a source plus the element of wish. 'Possibility' (even as 'permission') is not a component of infinitival mieć-sentences.

The discussion of modal relations in form C sentences has shown that the semantic material which could be posited as a noun phrase under mieć is limited to words such as obowiązek, powinność 'obligation', zamiar 'intention', and maybe prawdopodobieństwo, przypuszczenie 'probability, assumption'. These nouns, however, are all reflexes of the interpretation of the modal relation in a particular context. At an earlier stage, the common semantic structure was "source wants --", which caused the subject to be under a certain obligation (obowiązek). In that case, the semantic material which is posited for the NP position under mieć is limited to obowiązek or powinność 'obligation' for all interpretations of the modal relations in form C. The part-whole relation established by mieć at this point, can then be analyzed on the basis of the

discussion of abstract nouns, in the previous chapter.

To sum up: The assumption is made that mieć establishes a part-whole relation with a noun. This noun represents the modal property of the subject as a result of the source-subject relation. As an approximation, this noun can be given as obowiązek 'obligation'. By not allowing this noun to surface, multiple ambiguous interpretations of the modal relation are possible for a particular context. The multiple ambiguity can be considered the semantic function of the NP-deletion.

CHAPTER THREE

DO-PHRASES

1.1 Form D

The sentence type which will be discussed in this chapter has the following surface form:

D: mieć + NP_{acc} + do + NP_{gen}

The verb mieć governs a direct object which, in turn, has a prepositional complement. The genitive noun phrase, which is dependent on the preposition do, is a deverbal noun, typically ending in -cie or -nie.¹ Strictly speaking, D is an instance of the basic form A ma B with some material attached to the direct object. Since the instances of form D, however, can be considered modal phrases which show certain similarities to the infinitival

¹A construction with similar semantic properties exists in Modern Bulgarian: Imam za pisane ošte dve stranici. 'I still have two pages to write', Dimova 1983: 38. Dimova (1983) discusses some aspects of it in comparison with German. I was unable to verify a reference in Dimova 1983: 38 to a forthcoming article devoted entirely to the Bulgarian equivalent of form D. For Polish, cf. Otfinowski 1976; Weiss 1985 (the latter is on a comparative basis with German).

mieć-sentences discussed in the previous chapter,² it will be treated as a distinct type. It should be kept in mind, however, that the modal reading of D is not a reflex of the presence of mieć, but a reflex of the juxtaposition of the noun phrases in the accusative and genitive, respectively. The modal content of the instances of D fluctuates between the meaning of possibility, obligation, and intention. The factors which condition the individual modal reading have not yet been stated in any conclusive fashion. In this chapter, I will set forth these factors and discuss their interaction. The four major categories which have to be considered relevant in this context are:

- The semantic case relations which hold between the direct object of mieć and the noun phrase in the genitive under do.
- The aspect of the verb form underlying the derived NP_{gen}.
- The distinction 'specific' vs. 'non-specific' for the NP_{acc}.
- The coreferentiality of AGENS between the form of mieć and the NP_{gen}.

Form D, which I will call the minimal form, can be expanded by adding another nominal phrase to the right of form D. This second noun phrase is typically also a form in the genitive and will be represented here by the letter Z:

D') mieć + NP_{acc} + do + NP_{gen} + Z.

²This similarity is also found in German. For a comparative Polish-German study cf. Faustlich 1978.

This form will be referred to as the expanded form.

1.2 Examples

The Minimal Form:

- 1) Wojtek ma sok do picia.
'Wojtek has potable juice'
- 2) Wojtek ma sok do wypicia.
'Wojtek must drink juice'
- 3) Wojtek ma wapno do bielenia.
'Wojtek has lime for whitewashing'
- 4) Wojtek ma ołówek do pomalowania.
'Wojtek has to color a pencil'

The Expanded Form:

- 5) Wojtek ma wapno do wy/bielenia ściany.
'Wojtek has lime for whitewashing the wall'
- 6) Wojtek ma ołówek do pomalowania książki.
'Wojtek has a pencil for coloring the book'
- 7) Wojtek ma dzyndzek do w/kręcania śrub.
'Wojtek has a whatchamacallit for screwing in screws'

It is sometimes necessary to "push the language to its limits", in order to see where the breaking point is; i.e., the borderline between acceptable and unacceptable utterances. Example 4) may look rather odd as it stands, yet it is not strange because it is incompatible with the rules of Polish grammar, but only because it requires a rather specific context. 4) clearly is still within the potential of the grammar of Polish. If Wojtek were a worker in a pencil factory and his job were to hand-color pencils, nothing strange could be found in 4) - the job may

be strange but not the utterance.

2.1 The Minimal Form

The Properties:

Sok do picia is a highly codified phrase which purports to name an item (juice) with a particular property (potable). This type of phrase is very common in Polish: Maszyna do pisania 'typewriter', deska do prasowania 'ironing board'. The property denoted by the deverbal NP_{gen} (which I will call "do-phrase" or "do-component") is the common or ordinary property of the item specified by the do-phrase (sok do picia) or the common, ordinary purpose of the item (deska do prasowania). The NP_{gen} in these instances is derived from an underlying imperfective verb form. Typically, an explication of these phrases would contain można 'can': Maszyna, którą można pisać 'A machine with which one can write', Sok, który można pić 'Juice which one can drink'.

Less codified are the phrases which are built on a perfective verb form: Koszmar do zapamiętania 'A nightmare to remember', Długi do zapłacenia 'Debts for paying'. The implied modal reading is one of trzeba, powinno się 'must': Koszmar, którego nie można nie zapamiętać 'A nightmare which one cannot not [= must] remember'.

If codified expressions such as sok do picia are transformed into established expressions with underlying perfective verb forms as in:

- 2) Wojtek ma sok do wypicia.
'Wojtek has to drink juice',

the modal reading inevitably becomes one of trzeba/
powinno się 'must/should', while, at the same time, the
intimate connection of the primary form is lost. The sok
'juice' in 2), consequently, is no longer necessarily the
type of juice named by sok do picia 'potable juice'. It
could be (as far as Polish grammar is concerned) some sort
of a medicine, stomach juices (soki żołądkowe), or even
worse.

The degree of lexicalization varies. While maszyna do
pisania 'typewriter' is intuitively perceived as one single
expression, a less codified phrase is perceived as
referring to some item plus its particular purpose or
property: Dzyndzek do kręcenia 'The whatchamacallit for
twisting/screwing'. Typically, the codified phrases are
perfectly complete in the minimal form (maszyna do
pisania), while established do-phrases (dzyndzek do
kręcenia) tend to be instances of form D' (the expanded
form): Dzyndzek do w/kręcenia śrub 'The whatchamacallit for
turning screws'. Codified expressions can also take the
expanded form. This automatically transforms them into
established expressions:

- 8) Maszyna do na/pisania tekstu.
'A machine for writing text'

This machine no longer needs to be a typewriter.
Established expanded do-phrases derived from codified
minimal phrases (example 8) often sound odd, because the
transformation has the effect of breaking up an otherwise
homogeneous unit into its underlying components. The
minimal codified forms are less homogeneous, however, than
it might appear at first sight. The NP_{acc} is the possessed
item under miec' in any case. Since all examples considered

here will have mieć as their main verb, they all show a possessive relation between the sentence subject and the direct object (the basic A-form). The interpretation of the mieć-relation varies according to the items named by the nouns related possessively. Independently of the individual interpretation, the possessed item will be considered a PATIENS relative to the possessor in terms of semantic case relations. Relative to the do-phrase, on the other hand, the NP_{acc} is in a PATIENS-relation only in 1):

- 1) Wojtek ma sok do picia.
'Wojtek has (potable) juice'

- while it is in the INSTRUMENTAL in 9):

- 9) Wojtek ma maszynę do pisania.
'Wojtek has a typewriter'

- or in a LOCATIVE in 10):

- 10) Wojtek ma deskę do prasowania.
'Wojtek has an ironing board'

The CASE relations can be brought to the surface via explications of the type illustrated above: 'A machine with which one can write'; 'A board on which one can iron'.

Typically, the do-phrase qualifies the direct object of mieć, thus it functions as a relativizer (like a relative clause). This relation is reversed when the direct object is a modal noun: here the modal noun (strictly speaking, of course, the modal property referred to by the noun) qualifies the do-phrase. As a consequence, the modal reading associated with the do-phrase is lacking:

- 11) Wojtek ma możliwość do golenia się.
'Wojtek has the opportunity (capability) to shave'.

Wojtek is not capable of shaving the opportunity, but rather his shaving is qualified as possible. The former interpretation could be nonsensical simply because no PATIENS-relation holds between możliwość 'opportunity' and golienia się 'his shaving'. But he is also not capable of shaving on or with the opportunity. The fact of the matter is simply that no relation holds between the two nouns other than a modal relation of possibility. In the light of 11), it might be tempting to posit a modal noun as NP_{acc} under mieć and have it account for the modal content of the do-phrase similar to the procedure in the previous chapter. This, however, is counter-intuitive: Instrument do pisania 'An instrument for writing' all by itself contains the modal property of 'being possible' without its being in a mieć-relation. In addition, different from form C (infinitival mieć-sentences), mieć in form D/D' has a direct object on the surface and Wojtek has an instrument and not merely the possibility of writing with one. The fact that mieć, indeed, governs the accusative noun in D is illustrated in 12):

- 12) Wojtek ma coś do poczęstowania gości.
'Wojtek has something to treat his guests with'

Coś is in the accusative; poczęstować takes an instrumental (czymś) if it governs a NP:

- 13) Wojtek ma gości czymś poczęstować.
'Wojtek has to offer his guests something'

Polish, commonly, does not allow sentences of type D without a direct object. Colloquially or as stylistic variants, however, elliptic (14) or quasi-elliptic (15) sentences are possible:

- 14) Wojtek ma mu do pomagania.
'Wojtek has [something] to help him'

- 15) Mam mu zresztą do zawdzięczenia i to dużo.
(Hłasko Op)
'I have to thank him and that for a lot'

I consider 15) quasi-elliptic because dużo is not lacking entirely but added, as it were, at the end. Words such as dużo or jeszcze 'still, in addition' can fill the NP_{acc} position:

- 16) Wojtek ma mu dużo do pomagania.
'Wojtek has to help him a lot'

Reflexive pronouns can fill this slot (17), too; the reflexive particle się, however, cannot (18):

- 17) Wojtek ma siebie do ogolenia.
'Wojtek has himself for shaving'
- 18) *Wojtek ma się do ogolenia.
'Wojtek-has-reflexive particle-for-shaving'

In form C, where the NP_{acc} position need not be filled on the surface, no such restrictions apply:

- 19) Wojtek ma się ogolić.
'Wojtek has to shave [himself]'

The CASE-Relations

The common CASE-relations found in instances of form D are: PATIENS, INSTRUMENTAL, and LOCATIVE. Time expressions can, for the most part, be treated under the general heading INSTRUMENTAL-LOCATIVE, yet for some cases additional specifications have to be introduced (cf. below). If the do-phrase is in a PATIENS-relation with the NP_{acc} (the precondition of this is, that the underlying form of the genitive noun is a transitive verb), the modal reading can be both one of 'can' or 'must' depending on the aspect form of the verb form from which the noun in the do-phrase is derived (sok do picia 'juice which can be drunk' vs. sok

do wycicia 'juice which has to be drunk'). If the do-phrase is in an INSTRUMENTAL relation with the NP_{acc} (automatic with all intransitive verbs at the base of the deverbal noun), the modal reading is one of 'can'.

Generally speaking, the modal can-reading is a reflex of the relation between an item and its typical properties: Szmata do mycia 'A rag for cleaning'. The predominant CASE relations for the can-reading are the INSTRUMENTAL or LOCATIVE. The must-reading (also: 'want to') with an underlying perfective verb form has an (implied) source which issues the order. The relation between the item referred to by the NP_{acc} is a particular, specific instance. Only in the few cases where the accusative noun names an item which by its very nature implies an obligation, is the must-reading more typical; i.e., the perfective aspect in that case is predictable in terms of the subject noun: Długi do zapłacenia 'Debts for paying'.

The Conditioning Factors

In order to establish the factors which determine the type of modal reading in the minimal form, it is sufficient to show how CASE and aspect (of the verb underlying the do-phrase) pattern:

- 20) Wojtek ma ołówek do malowania.
'Wojtek has a pencil for drawing/coloring'

Ołówek 'pencil' in 20) is INSTRUMENTAL relative to the do-phrase. Malowanie 'drawing' is (one of) the typical things a pencil is used for. The underlying verbal aspect is imperfective.

- 21) Wojtek ma ołówek do pomalowania.
'Wojtek has to color a/his pencil'

Ołówek in 21) is PATIENS with respect to pomalowania. The do-phrase is derived from a perfective verbal form. To color a pencil (with something) is a particular and rather special instance of what one does with a pencil. The source which requests the coloring of the pencil is not known and is possibly Wojtek himself. In that case 21) can read:

- 22) Wojtek ma zamiar pomalować ołówek.
'Wojtek has the intention to color his pencil'.

Example 23) patterns the same way as Mam sok do picia 'I have potable juice'. Zupa 'soup' is PATIENS relative to the do-phrase. The underlying verb form is imperfective:

- 23) Wojtek ma chińską zupę do jedzenia.
'Wojtek has Chinese soup to eat'

Using a perfective verb form for the derived do-phrase automatically triggers a must-reading with zupa still in PATIENS:

- 24) Wojtek ma chińską zupę do zjedzenia.
'Wojtek has to eat Chinese soup'

To sum up: The NP_{acc} in the minimal form under mieć has to be in the INSTRUMENTAL or LOCATIVE in order to trigger the modal can-reading. The underlying verb form of the do-phrase is imperfective. When the NP_{acc} is in the PATIENS, the aspect distinction becomes essential: Perfective aspect triggers must-reading, imperfective aspect triggers can-reading.

2.2 The Expanded Form

The must-reading requires an object in the PATIENS. The NP_{acc} which is required by mieć, automatically becomes INSTRUMENTAL or LOCATIVE when Z (the second genitive) is added. An INSTRUMENTAL under mieć with respect to the do-phrase, in its turn, triggers the can-reading regardless of the underlying verbal aspect of the do-phrase:

- 24) Wojtek ma ołówek do pomalowania.
'Wojtek has to color his pencil'
- 25) Wojtek ma ołówek do pomalowania książki.
'Wojtek has a pencil for coloring the book'

The last example has a can-reading and ołówek 'pencil' has INSTRUMENTAL status. The aspect form of pomalowania is irrelevant for the modal interpretation:

- 26) Wojtek ma ołówek do malowania książki.
'Wojtek has a pencil for drawing a book'

This example says something different from 25), yet the modal can-reading is preserved.

The INSTRUMENTAL case relation is typical for the expanded form while it has a restricted occurrence with the minimal form. As shown earlier, INSTRUMENTAL minimal forms are usually highly codified expressions (maszyna do pisania 'typewriter'). Less codified phrases normally tend to occur in the expanded form. The minimal form is possible in suitable context settings, however:

- 27) Wojtek ma pudełko do wysłania.
'Wojtek has to mail a box'

Pudełko 'box' is in the PATIENS relative to the do-phrase. The verbal aspect is perfective and the reading is one of 'must'. Given a situation in which it is known to the participants of the discourse that Wojtek wants to mail

something, someone might ask:

28) Czy masz pudełko do wysyłania?
'Do you have a mailing box?' -

- implying of course:

29) Czy masz pudełko do wysłania/wysyłania książki?
'Do you have a box for mailing the book?'

In both 28) and 29), pudełko has INSTRUMENTAL status. The underlying aspect form in 29) is irrelevant. It could be argued that pudełko is more of a LOCATIVE (as is also possibly the typewriter - maszyna do pisania). This, however, has no impact on the interpretation of the modal reading. The LOCATIVE has been introduced mostly to account for cases such as 30):

30) Wojtek ma miejsce do spania.
'Wojtek has a place to sleep'

There is no doubt that more semantic CASE relations can be established. The important distinction is between the PATIENS and NON-PATIENS, the latter being typically INSTRUMENTAL. The somewhat elliptic sentence 28) is not so rare and could be the cause of confusions, cf.:

31) Wojtek ma ołówek do podpisania dokumentu.
'Wojtek has a pencil for signing the document'

32) Wojtek ma ołówek do podpisania.
'Wojtek has a pencil to sign'

According to the rules established above, 32) should have a must-reading, i.e., Wojtek must or wants to sign a pencil. In 31), on the other hand, ołówek is clearly INSTRUMENTAL (form D', dokumentu is Z). Example 32) can, indeed, have the must-reading if it is taken as a complete utterance. In contexts more down-to-earth, however, 32) would rather be an elliptic form of 31) where the complement Z is understood from the discourse setting. The

elliptic form 32) is quite typical for questions:

- 33) Czy masz ołówek do podpisania?
'Do you have a pencil for signing?'

3.1 Strategies

All previous examples had coreferentiality of AGENS or subject agreement. The item which was possessor in the mieć-relation was at the same time AGENS of the (possibly hypothetical) action referred to by the do-phrase, that is subject of the modal phrase. Both the minimal form and the expanded form can have occurrences without coreferentiality:

- 34) Wojtek ma sługę do sprzątnia (pokoju).
'Wojtek has a servant for cleaning (the room)'

A non-coreferential reading of this type lacks the modal reading (cf. 35). The AGENS status of sługa 'servant' seems to be incompatible with a modal interpretation of the do-component: Sługa do sprzątnia 'A cleaning servant' taken as an independent phrase with servant as the person who does the cleaning (if any) has no modal interpretation either.

- 35) Wojtek ma sługę. Sługa sprząta (pokoj).
'Wojtek has a servant. The servant cleans (the room)'

A non-coreferential reading of 34) is a matter of conventions based on our knowledge of what the world is like. It is quite possible to read 34) in such a way that the servant becomes the instrument in Wojtek's hands. In that case, Wojtek uses the servant like a broom to clean

his room. While this may seem far-fetched, at least no rules of Polish grammar are hurt and other examples in contexts more easily available are not difficult to find: Dictator Wojtek commands an army which he uses to protect his palace. His army can either be perceived as a mere instrument or as an acting body of soldiers which perform a certain duty:

- 36) Wojtek ma wojsko do zabezpieczenia pałacu.
'Wojtek has an army for securing his palace'

Employing a strategy which assigns the INSTRUMENTAL to wojsko, the sentence reads: 'Wojtek has an army by means of which he can defend his palace'. Here, coreferentiality is preserved and so is the can-reading of the expanded form. Assigning an AGENS to wojsko relative to the do-phrase renders the sentence's meaning as: 'Wojtek has an army which defends his palace'. Here, no coreferentiality is given and no modal relations hold which could be associated with the properties of the minimal or expanded form.

Above, I used the term 'strategies' to imply that the interpretation of these utterances is not grammatically conditioned. The participants of discourse have to assign a particular CASE relation. Depending on the choice of CASE, the meaning of the utterance differs. This factor, I suggest, accounts for many of the fluctuations in meaning which are so typical for form D/D'. My understanding is that there is always a dominant or preferred interpretation which is due to the semantic relation which holds between the nouns in these examples. At the same time, however, there is the possibility of choosing a different reading. To provide the choice is a feature of the grammar of Polish. To make the selection by choosing a particular CASE relation is beyond the scope of Polish grammar:

- 37) Wojtek ma człowieka do zabicia koguta.
'Wojtek has a person to kill the rooster'

This example is likely to get a non-coreferential interpretation with człowiek 'someone' in the AGENS relative to the do-phrase. While 38) is likely to get a coreferential reading with szabla 'sword' in the INSTRUMENTAL:

- 38) Wojtek ma szablę do zabicia koguta.
'Wojtek has a sword to kill the rooster'

The grammar of Polish allows, however, for strategies which reverse both readings: Człowiek 'someone' can be assigned INSTRUMENTAL status in which case coreferentiality is established and Wojtek uses this person to kill the rooster, e.g., by throwing the person on the rooster. Szabla 'sword' can be given AGENS status in which case non-coreferentiality is established and Wojtek has a sword which does the killing of the rooster for him. In order to establish this reading all that is needed is a fairy tale setting in which Pan Wojtek and Pani Szabla live together and Pani Szabla serves as the rooster-killer in the house. The same strategies can be used in the minimal form:

- 40) Wojtek ma okulary do szukania.
'Wojtek has glasses for searching'

Given the typical purpose of glasses, the reading could be one in which Wojtek has glasses with which he can do his searching (otherwise he would not be able to see). Given a situation in which Wojtek is asked by his child for some item that can be used in a hide-and-seek game, he might say: Tu masz okulary do szukania 'Here are some glasses for searching'. In that case, okulary 'glasses' are in the PATIENS. Since the underlying aspect form of the do-phrase is imperfective, the can-reading is preserved. The form poszukania (perfective) in 41), would have as the preferred

reading PATIENS for okulary and consequently a must-interpretation:

- 41) Wojtek ma okulary do poszukania.
'Wojtek has to look for glasses'

41), in turn, can be understood as the elliptic version of the expanded form, in which case okulary have INSTRUMENTAL status with automatic can-reading.

The purpose of the rather lengthy presentation of possible strategies is to illustrate the interaction of various factors which account for the often vague or ambiguous appearance of these modal sentences. Often their readings are predictable simply in terms of conventional knowledge. The AGENS of the NP_{gen} is typically an animate being. An inanimate noun appears typically in the INSTRUMENTAL in that position. Therefore, 37) tends to have a non-coreferential AGENS reading, while 38) tends to have a coreferential INSTRUMENTAL reading. Examples such as 42) show, that there are cases which fall between both extremes because their INSTRUMENTAL vs. AGENS reading is less determined by the semantic relation which holds between the nouns:

- 42) Wojtek ma robota do sprzątania (pokoju).
'Wojtek has a robot for cleaning (the room)'

An AGENS relative to the do-phrase in a non-coreferential reading is, of course, the PATIENS relative to mieć in the coreferential reading. It seems that there is a scale of INSTRUMENTAL/AGENS - AGENS/INSTRUMENTAL relations. Each noun belongs typically to one side of the scale. But the strategies allow it to appear on the opposite side. The more a noun is located towards the middle of the scale, the easier it is to switch sides.

Człowiek is predominantly AGENS, but possibly INSTRUMENTAL

(37); szabla is predominantly INSTRUMENTAL but possibly AGENS (38); and robot is (roughly) INSTRUMENTAL/AGENS or AGENS/INSTRUMENTAL without preference.

3.2 Specific - Non-Specific

Abstract items in *miec* relations are treated as quantifiable objects, items in negated existentials are mentioned only. What is the status of words for which there is no referent in form D? What is it that Wojtek has in 42)?:

42) Wojtek ma artykuł do napisania.
'Wojtek has a paper to write'

All that Wojtek apparently has is the assignment or wish to write an article. If it is simply the assignment or concept of an article, Wojtek would be obliged to write an assignment or concept of an article. This, clearly, is not what Wojtek is expected to write and it might be enough to simply say that the article in 42) is only mentioned. However, when instances of form D are compared to those of C (infinitival mieć), there seems to be yet another factor worth mentioning here: the item in 42) must be considered a more specific item than in comparable infinitival phrase:

43) Wojtek ma napisać artykuł.
'Wojtek has to write a paper'

Here, any paper will do, theoretically. The specific character of the direct object in form D may be a reflex of the fact that it had been mentioned earlier: Masz jeszcze artykuł (o którym mówiliśmy) do napisania. 'You still have the article (about which we were talking) to write'. Or in

a different context: 'You have to do three things in order to become a member of our club: you have to pay a fee, you have to cut your hair, and you have to catch a rabbit. You already paid your fees and you cut your hair: But you still have the rabbit to catch':

- 44) Masz jeszcze zająca do złapania.
'You still have a/the rabbit to catch'

The infinitival phrase can also have a specific reading, but it need not. In terms of markedness, the direct object in D is markedly specific, while the NP under the infinitive in form C is unmarked for this feature.

3.3 More On The Modal Interpretation

So far, I have been concerned mostly with the distinction of a can-reading vs. a must-reading in both the minimal and expanded forms. Examples such as 44) and 45), however, have typically an intend-reading (chcieć/zamierzać):

- 44) Wojtek ma (ci) kilka słów do powiedzenia.
'Wojtek has a few words to say (to you)'
- 45) Wojtek ma komputer do sprzedania.
'Wojtek has a computer to sell'

The can-reading is typical for the INSTRUMENTAL strategy and the PATIENS strategy with underlying imperfective aspect in the minimal form. I have called this the general instance (as opposed to the particular instance with the must-reading). This general instance has the form i): i) Whoever wants (to do) p, can (do) p; where p can be the component pić sok 'drink juice' or prasować na

desce 'iron on a board'. The must-reading, the particular instance, has the form ii): ii) Somebody wants (that someone does) p, therefore p is required. The implication is of course rather weak, it is an obligation imposed on the referent of 'someone' by the source 'somebody'. If the instantiation is the same for both pronouns, then the one who must do something is the one who wants it to be done, as noted in the previous chapter. Thus, the instance of a want-reading of form D is simply coreferentiality of deontic source and target referent. Since the deontic source in the above examples (44, 45) is not identified, establishing the type of coreferentiality becomes again a matter of conventions and strategies.

Coreferentiality of a different kind is also subject to strategies: Theoretically, a sentence such as Wojtek ma rower do sprzedania 'Wojtek has a bike to sell', allows for a non-coreferential interpretation in which Wojtek has the bike and someone else does the potential selling (very much like in expressions of the type: Mam pokój posprzątany 'I have the room cleaned'; cf. chapter 5). Such an interpretation is automatic when the second AGENS is named:

- 46) Mam dla ciebie coś do bawienia się.
'I have something for you to play with'

This strategy, however, does not affect the modal interpretation because it does not affect the NP_{acc} under mieć (coś), while earlier, in the example with the robot and the servant (34, 35), the second AGENS relation was between the do-component and the NP_{acc} and did affect the modal interpretation.

3.4 Time Expressions

According to the rules set up in this chapter, the following example should have a can-reading, while, in fact, it seems to oscillate between a can-reading and a must-reading:

- 47) Wojtek ma jeszcze 5 minut do obliczenia problemu.
'Wojtek has 5 more minutes to calculate the problem' -

- or even stronger:

- 48) Masz jeszcze 5 minut do załatwienia sprawy.
'You have 5 more minutes to take care of the matter'

The can-reading should be expected because both examples are instances of form D'. I propose accepting them, indeed, as clear can-instances onto which absolute limits have been superimposed. The must-component is a reflex of these limits. 48), in effect, says that there are five minutes available for the subject to get a certain matter settled. Above, the AGENS had a board on which he could iron, now he has five minutes during which he can work. The superimposed must-reading is not automatic with time expressions, but appears to depend on the semantics of the noun in the do-phrase:

- 49) Wojtek ma jeszcze 5 minut do życia.
'Wojtek has 5 more minutes to live'

Classifying these time expressions as form D'-instances, assumed that the CASE relation between the do-phrase and the direct object can be read as a LOCATIVE (or INSTRUMENTAL) for which D' was formulated. This, I think, is justified because of the close proximity of temporal and spatial concepts. It seems to be relatively arbitrary that we have a physical (locative) concept of space but not of time. And it is quite common to consider time and space as

one time-space entity. Time expressions, therefore, have only LOCATIVE status - even in the minimal form D. Consequently, the aspect distinction is irrelevant for time expressions in the minimal form:

- 50) Mamy sobotę do wyspania się/spania.
'We have Saturday to sleep late'

Conclusion

Two basic types of form D can be distinguished: a minimal form and an expanded form. In the minimal form, the modal reading is 'must' only if the NP_{acc} under mieć is in a PATIENS relation with the do-component and the verb underlying the do-component is perfective. Time expressions never enter a PATIENS relation in the minimal form. Hence, the aspect distinction becomes superfluous with time expressions. The can-reading is given whenever the NP_{acc} is in an INSTRUMENTAL or LOCATIVE (generally: NON-PATIENS) relation with the do-phrase. If it is a PATIENS relation, underlying do-verb has to be imperfective.

In the expanded form, the NP_{acc} is automatically NON-PATIENS (typically INSTRUMENTAL) while the second NP_{gen} is the object of the do-component. Consequently, all expanded forms have a can-reading. Different from the infinitival form C, form D/D' has a direct object under mieć on the surface. The object is markedly specific. The modal reading is lacking if the two parts of the mieć-sentence are not coreferential and the PATIENS in the mieć-relation is the AGENS relative to the do-phrase. Otherwise, regardless of coreferentiality conditions, mieć-sentences of form D have a modal reading. The assignment of CASE and coreferentiality relations is mostly a matter of strategies, i.e., it is not triggered by features of Polish grammar.

CHAPTER FOUR

THE INTERROGATIVE TYPE

1 Form E

The sentence type discussed in this chapter has the following form:

E: mieć + interrogative pronoun + infinitive¹

- 1) Nie mam dokąd uciekać.
lit.: Not-I-have-where-to-flee
'I have nowhere to run away to'

Form E shares some properties with the type discussed in the previous chapter (form D).² In some instances, form E can even be considered a full paraphrase of the do-type sentence:

- 2) Wojtek ma gdzie spać.
'Wojtek has where to sleep'
- 3) Wojtek ma miejsce do spania.
'Wojtek has a place to sleep'

¹Some verbs in this form are, strictly speaking, not infinitives but only function as such: widzieć, słuchać 'to see, to hear'. They do not have finite forms; cf. Bartnicka 1982: 17.

²For this type in Bulgarian, cf. Penčev 1981.

Like form D, the grammatical features which characterize form E are not restricted to sentences with mieć as the main verb:

- 4) A Filip nie bardzo wiedział, co ma dalej robić.
W ogóle nie wiedział, dokąd iść, z kim rozmawiać,
na kogo czekać.

(Srokowski)

'And Filip did not quite know what he should do next. In general, he did not know where to go, with whom to talk, for whom to wait'

Thus, the implicit modal interpretation of this form cannot be attributed to the presence of mieć. An occurrence of mieć, however, which is the type for which E is defined, restricts the modal reading automatically to one of possibility ('can'). Coreferentiality of AGENS (the subject in the explication) is consistently required: 'Wojtek has a place where he can sleep'. A perfective aspect of the verb form does not trigger a must-reading:

- 5) Wojtek ma w czym upiec ciasto.
'Wojtek has something to bake the cake in'

The perfective aspect form rather reflects the quantificational status of the infinitive clause. The imperfective aspect is used typically when the infinitive can be universally quantified, while the perfective aspect typically suggests a particular reading (existentially quantified or definite). Reference to this particular instance is established via a complement to the right of the infinitive. Consequently, instances of form E with an optional complement usually have a perfective verb form, while those with imperfective verb forms lack the optional complement. In keeping with the distinction of the previous chapter, the latter can be called the minimal form, while the former would be the expanded form. 5) is an example of the expanded form with perfective aspect and the additional element ciasto 'cake', whereas 6) is an

example of the minimal form with universal reading:

- 6) Wojtek ma w czym piec.
Wojtek has something to bake in.

Negation

Although I have not worked with statistical data, it appears that the majority of examples of type E are instances with a negation:

- 7) I będę go taszczył ze sobą z jednego końca
świata na drugi, choćbym sam nie miał co żryć.
(Hłasko Op)
'And I will drag him with me from one end of
the world to the other even if I myself didn't
have a bite to eat'

Maybe it is more important to say what we do not have than to say what we have. The situations where unnegated instances of E are encountered most frequently are answers to questions such as (Czy) masz...? 'Do you have...?' (8), with underlying double negation ('it is not the case that I do not have') (9), or other emphatic environments (10):

- 8) Masz z kim pojechać do Warszawy? - Mam (z kim).
'Do you have someone to go with to W.? - I have
(with whom)'
- 9) Mam gdzie, tylko nie wiem jak!
'I have where [to do it], only I don't know how!'
- 10) - Przy twoim łóżku wciąż brudno. Papierki roz-
rzucaasz.
- Żeby mieli co sprzątać!
(Benski)
'It is still messy around your bed. You scatter
papers.'
'So that they have something to clean!'

Negation in E has wide scope: It is attached to the main verb (mieć) and triggers the genitive form in the noun under the infinitive:

- 11) Nie mam czym zapłacić tych podatków.
'I do not have anything to pay these taxes with'

Negation, therefore, can override aspect and complement-form considerations related to the quantification of the infinitival part. Compare below the examples of a minimal form (imperfective aspect) (12), an expanded form (perfective aspect) (13), and a negated form without aspect restrictions (14):

- 12) Mam czym myć.
'I have something to brush with'
- 13) Mam czym umyć zęby.
'I have something to brush my teeth with'
- 14) Nie mam czym u/myć zębów.
'I do not have anything to brush my teeth with'

In general, the (indefinite) object of mieć is existentially quantified 'I have something (indefinite)', so that a logical negation before the quantifier turns the phrase into a universally quantified sentence (DeMorgan's law),³ which imposes no real restrictions but only a preference for the imperfective aspect.

As illustrated in 8), mieć can occur alone in an answer; the presence of the interrogative pronoun is optional.⁴ The relation between mieć and the infinitive is entirely different from that in the infinitival form C,

³E.g. in Quine 1982: 140. The effect of an application of DeMorgan's law in this context is a change from the existential quantifier to a universal quantifier as a result of pushing the negation over the quantifier "deeper" into the sentence: 'It is not the case that there is an x such that --' becomes 'For all x, if there is an x, then it is not the case that --'.

⁴Other such examples can be found in Pisarkowa 1974c: e.g., p 62 ex. IIA 85-88.

where the presence of an infinitive was required in order to get a modal reading. There is, however, a superficial resemblance between the two. Neither one has a direct object under mieć in the surface sentence, and both have an infinitival form. In some (marginal) instances, the sole distinctive factor is the aspect marking of the infinitive:

- 15) A co ja mam jeść?
'And what have I [that I could] eat?'
- 16) A co ja mam zjeść?
'And what have I [that I must] eat?'

The distinction between the interrogative pronoun and the indefinite pronoun (e.g., co - coś), which otherwise distinguishes both forms⁵ (cf. below 19/20), is eliminated in questions introduced by an interrogative pronoun (15/16). Example 15) should be considered an instance of E (imperfective infinitive), while 16) is an instance of C (perfective infinitive). Admittedly, 15) may appear to be somewhat odd, yet this is again a matter of context, not of grammatical form. Questions such as A co ja mam robić? 'But what can I do?' (form E), as opposed to A co ja mam zrobić? 'But what am I supposed to do?' (form C), are common. The distinction between both instances can be rather irrelevant in a given situation, because the context for an instance of form E is somewhat rhetorical at times: The speaker asks about an item with which he himself is supposed to be in a part-whole relation. In all other cases, there is no room for this type of ambiguity. The minimal distinction between co - coś, gdzie - gdzieś, etc., obtains systematically. A question introduced with an

⁵English which disambiguates mostly via the word order ('Irving has bagels to eat' vs. 'Irving has to eat bagels') can use the contracted form 'hafta' to disambiguate the question; cf. the discussion and reference in Lakoff 1976: 60 ft. 6.

interrogative pronoun and a perfective infinitive seems unavailable for an E-type interpretation:

- 17) Czym mam napisać ten list?
'With what do I have to [must I] write this letter?'

17) is clearly a C-type sentence. In order to get a can-reading, the question would have to be phrased differently:

- 18) Co ja mam, czym mogę/mogłbym napisać ten list?
'What do I have that I can write this letter with?'

The systematic distinction is illustrated in 19) for an instance of E, and in 20) for an instance of C:

- 19) Wojtek miał kiedy zrobić zakupy.
'Wojtek had time (when) to run errands'
- 20) Wojtek miał kiedyś zrobić zakupy.
'Wojtek was/is supposed to run errands at some time'

2 The Object Under mieć

Mieć in the relation A ma B has an object in the accusative. In form E, an accusative (if any) is dependent on the infinitive. Despite the lack of an accusative object, mieć in E clearly has its "genuine" habeo-reading. Apparently, the interrogative pronoun (in whatever case or form) does, indeed, function as the direct object of mieć. In that case, the interrogative pro-form occupies the slot of the NP_{acc}. This assumption is justified because the value of the interrogative pronoun is nothing more than another pronoun or a very general term:

- 21) Wreszcie mam kogoś, z kim mogę porozmawiać.
(Benski)
'At last I have someone with whom I can talk'
- 22) Wreszcie mam z kim rozmawiać.
'At last I have someone to talk to'

Such pseudo-relative clauses (21) are always possible as paraphrases of form E-instances (and sometimes necessary as illustrated in example 18). The pro-form under mieć in 21) is indefinite (-ś marker) as could be expected. It is qualified by a clause whose complementizer usually functions as an interrogative pronoun. In 22), indefinite pro-form and modal verb are deleted. Both, it can be concluded, are redundant. Three factors have to be considered here: the deletion of the direct object of the main clause, the deletion of the modal verb in the complement clause, and the use of an interrogative pronoun rather than a relative pronoun as complementizer.

The direct object of the main clause can be deleted only if it is indefinite. The object must not contain more information than can be expressed by the interrogative pronoun. Therefore, the only words which can be deleted are indefinite pronouns, i.e., variables which have not been assigned a specific value. To the same category belong the variables for temporal and spatial values: place and time (miejsce, czas). All other words in the NP_{acc} position contain more information than could be handled by the complementizer. (The variable for powód 'cause' occurs in an existential variant of form E; cf. below).

For the same reason, only the interrogative pronoun can be used as a complementizer. Relative pronouns can only function as complementizers of nouns but not of pro-forms:

- 23) Widziałem dziś faceta, o którym (*o kim) mi wczoraj mówiłeś.
'Today I saw the guy about whom (about who) you had told me yesterday'
- 24) Widziałem to, o czym (*o którym) mi mówiłeś.
'I saw that, about what (about which) you had told me'

The exception to this rule are universal statements:

- 25) Człowiek co/kiedy pije, nie powinien jeździć.
'A man who [lit.: what] drinks/when he drinks, should not drive'

The juxtaposition of the interrogative pronoun with the subject guarantees that the subject is read as a universally quantified sentence. This exactly parallels the occurrence of the indefinite pronouns in form E: 'Thing', 'person', 'place', and 'time' in their most general meaning are the values of the pro-forms in E. In addition, they introduce a certain ontological commitment on the side of language. This ontological commitment need not be attributed to mieć. The interrogative pronoun proper already introduces this element:

- 26) Kto przyszedł?
Who came?

vs.

- 27) (Czy) ktoś przyszedł?
'Did anybody come'

In 26) (interrogative case), the question is not whether or not anybody came, but who the person is that came. In 27) (indefinite pronoun), on the other hand, the question is if anybody at all came. With respect to this ontology, the interrogative pronoun is more specific than the indefinite pronoun, which can occur in form C and which entirely lacks such a commitment. Form C never has a reading of possibility. For something to be possible it is

necessary that there be an item of which it can be said that it is possible. In logic, it is widely accepted that there is a relation between the existential quantifier and the possibility operator, as well as a relation between the universal quantifier and the necessity operator. The distribution of the can-reading in C and E forms fits in nicely here.

The assertion that there is something, however, is not sufficient to explain the redundancy of the modal verb móc 'can' in form E. The ontology of E, the strict requirement of coreferentiality, and the fact that the aspect form in E is, in principle, imperfective (the occurrence of a perfective form is subject to the presence of a complement Z), all seem to point in the same direction, viz., that the modal can-reading is predictable and an occurrence of the verb móc 'can' on the surface is not necessary. Form E per se is an example of the principle of least effort in language. Form E was (and maybe still is) considered a colloquialism, especially when it is personally construed, i.e., with a subject for mieć (about the existential type, cf. below). The explanation which I will offer for the redundancy of móc 'can', again has recourse to the presence of the interrogative pronoun. In form D (do-type) which is similar in some respects to E, the item which entered the part-whole relation as the possessum was identified, while the CASE relation in which it stood with the do-phrase and/or the possessor was subject to strategies, and the modal reading was subject to aspect marking and AGENS distribution. In form E, on the other hand, the CASE relation is explicitly contained in the pro-form (w czym, którym, czego, etc. 'in which, with whom, of which') and it is this pro-form which enters (as a place-holder) the part-whole relation of mieć. The question introduced by an interrogative pronoun does not contain any modal element of

possibility: Czym się sprząta pokój? 'With what does one clean a/the room?', or Czym sprzątasz pokój? 'With what do you clean the room?'. The infinitive in E introduces the element of possibility because it does not assert that the subject cleans the room: 'Wojtek has with what to clean the room' (Wojtek ma czym sprzątać pokój). In form D, on the other hand, the clause qualifying the item which is at the subject's disposal, contains a modal notion independent of its occurrence in form D: Pokój jest do sprzątania 'The room is for cleaning'. The modal interpretation is subject to CASE relations and aspect, two factors which are not operative in form E. The relevance of both factors is preserved when the jest-clause is linked to the possessed item, i.e., to the mieć-clause in general: Wojtek ma pokój do posprzątania 'Wojtek has a room for cleaning--perfective'.

Another factor distinguishes occurrences of type E from those of type D. In E, where coreferentiality is automatic, the possibility to do something is always a possibility with regard to the subject. In a negated mieć-clause, it is asserted that the subject lacks this possibility. In D, where coreferentiality is not a requirement of the form, the lack of a possibility (or obligation) is asserted with regard to the subject or something (someone) other than the subject. Consequently, 28) has a much more urgent tone than 29):

28) Nie mamy co jeść.
 'We do not have anything to eat'
 paraphrased: We want to eat but we cannot because we do not have anything to eat.

29) Nie mamy nic do jedzenia.
 'We do not have anything for eating'
 possible paraphrase: If anybody wants to eat here (with us) he cannot, because we do not have anything edible.

3 Existentials of Form E

A type (with two variants) closely related to E is a negated existential form. Its positive equivalent takes the existential jest 'there is':

- 30) Nie ma się o co skarżyć.
'There is nothing to complain about'
- 31) Jest o czym narzekać.
'There is something to complain about'

According to Szupryczyńska (1965), these existentials can occur in two different forms. Form 1 is the existential variant of E with the interrogative pronoun in the infinitive clause functioning as the place-holder for the direct object of mieć (32). Form 2 has an interrogative pronoun in the genitive or accusative, regardless of the case form required by the infinitive (33):

- 32) Nie ma o czym gadać.
'There is nothing to talk about'
- 33) Nie ma po co gadać.
'There is no point in talking'

Both forms are well-documented in Szupryczyńska (1965). The forms jest/nie ma 'there is/there is no' are the standard forms of negated existential statements in Modern Polish. The non-present tense forms have będzie/nie będzie 'there will be/will be not' and było/nie było 'there was/was not' rather than negated personal mieć: będę miał/nie będę miał 'I will have/not have' and miałem/nie miałem 'I had/not', which are the non-present tense forms of type E. This formal requirement, however, is not without exceptions. Both variants show characteristics which have

not been covered in the previous section.

Form 1

The coreferentiality requirement makes it impossible for the pro-form kto 'who' in the nominative to appear as the complementizer of the infinitival clause of form E. Kto in the existential variant of E is possible but it displays some peculiar restrictions:

- 34) Przed 35 laty zlikwidowano prawa i dochody tzw. "kamieniczników", nie miał więc kto remontować domów od fundamentów i kanalizacji aż po dachy.
(Tygodnik Powszechny)
'35 years ago, the provisions and income of the so-called "concierge" was liquidated, hence there was no one to fix the houses from the foundations and plumbing to the roof'

The past tense form of mieć is not było 'was' as could have been expected, but miał 'had'. Thus grammatically the example is construed not as a negated existential but as a sentence with a personal form of mieć. While the existential form nie było 'there was not' is ungrammatical:

- 35) *Nie było kto remontować domów.
'There was no one to fix the houses'

In the non-past, the negated form is:

- 36) Nie ma kto remontować domów.
'There is no one to fix the houses';

An unnegated instance with kto is not possible:

- 37) *Jest kto remontować domy.
'There is someone to fix the houses'

There are two ways to say 37):

- 38) Jest ktoś, kto naprawia/może naprawić domy.
'There is someone who fixes/can fix the houses'

- 39) Jest komu naprawić domy.
'There is someone who can fix the houses'

The last example with komu 'who' in the dative seems to be markedly stylistic and, at least in my understanding, archaic (cf. Szupryczyńska 1965: 63). It has, however, the expected past tense form było/nie było 'there was/was not':

- 40) Nie było komu remontować domów.
'There was no one to fix the houses'

40) has a second reading in which komu is not the subject of the infinitival clause but a dative proper, i.e., the person is the beneficiary of the restoration of the houses. This seems to be the only case where a CASE assignment in form E is subject to strategies.

Form ?

The pro-forms which can occur in this form are co 'what-acc', po co 'what for', dla czego 'why', and czego 'what-gen'. They are not subject to any case requirements of the infinitive, nor is the genitive marking a result of the negation. (41/42 are from Szupryczyńska 1965: 65):

- 41) Jest się co martwić.
'There is reason [lit.: what-acc] to be concerned'
- 42) Jest się czego martwić.
'There is reason [lit.: what-gen] to be concerned'
- 43) Nie ma się czego dziwić.
'There is no reason [lit.: what-gen] to be surprised'

The case forms required by martwić się czymś 'to be concerned about something' and dziwić się czemuś 'to be surprised about something' are instrumental and dative, respectively. The genitive czego 'what-gen' in 43) cannot be related to the negation, as shown in 42), with the same form but without a negation. Co and czego 'what-acc/gen'

have to be considered reflexes of the interrogative pro-forms dla czego 'why' and co/po co 'why'. All propositions in examples of Form 2 assert that there is/is not a reason (a "why") to do something, or, by the same token, that it is worthwhile/not worthwhile to do something. The mieć-clause can occur as an elliptic sentence by itself:

- 44) Nie ma po co/co/dla czego.
lit.: There-is-no-what-for/what/why
'Never mind'

Depending on the context, this 'never mind' reads 'there is no point in doing that' or 'there is no reason for doing that'. The modal interpretation of the infinitival clause is consistently one of 'should' ('There is a reason why one should do something'). This is the only variant of form E which has a reading of obligation. The degree and type of obligation is a matter of context:

- 45) Jest po co jechać tam.
possible reading: 'It is worthwhile going there'
- 46) Nie ma co się zastanawiać.
possible reading: 'Why hesitate?'

The aspect form of the infinitive has no impact on the modal reading. The aspect is typically (or even necessarily) imperfective. Since this form is greatly productive in spoken Polish but less in the written language, occurrences of perfective aspect forms should not be ruled out entirely. Szupryczyńska suggests that *Nie ma się co zmartwić 'There is nothing to worry about', with a perfective infinitive, has to be rejected for today's state of the language.

To sum up: Form E has a modal reading of possibility. Only a defined set of forms in a variant type of E consistently has a reading of obligation. Despite the fact

that miec' does not have a direct object on the surface, the habeo-reading is immediately available. It is not necessary to posit any deleted accusative noun. Its meaning is extremely indefinite and represented in the sentence as the value of the interrogative pronoun.

CHAPTER FIVE

THE PARTICIPIAL TYPE

1 Form F

Finally, as the last systematic sentence type with mieć, I will discuss a relatively new form in Modern Polish, which I will call type F:¹

F: mieć + past passive participle + (NP_{acc})

It is not possible to provide a final description for this form. Some of its parameters are in a state of flux. Typically, the past passive participle (ppp) agrees in gender and number with the NP_{acc}:

- 1) Wojtek ma zabrudzoną koszulkę.
 'Wojtek has a stained shirt',
 or: 'W. has his shirt stained'

The direct object of mieć is optional. If there is no direct object in the sentence, the ppp agrees in form with the noun of which the property referred to by the ppp is

¹For a general account of such constructions in Slavic languages, cf. Gallis 1960. In Bulgarian, this form has been discussed, among others, by Georgiev 1957; Kostov 1972. In Russian, cf. Kuz'mina and Nemcenko 1971. For Polish, cf. Pisarkowa 1964; Topolińska 1968; Weiss 1977. A comparative Polish-Bulgarian study is found in Popova 1977.

true/false. This noun may occur earlier somewhere in the text:

- 2) I tylko mi tu nic nie gadać, że żadnej pracy nigdy nie zrobię. Zrobiłem! To znaczy ... mam prawie zrobioną!
 (Broszkiewicz)
 'And I do not want to hear any talk that I never do any work. I did it! That is ... I have it almost done!

The values for the parameters gender and number are provided by praca 'work' which occurs earlier in the text. The grammatical case marking is not determined by the referent noun: pracy in 2) is genitive while the ppp is marked for accusative. The ppp can also have a sentential referent (possibly implicit) in which case the ppp is neuter:

- 3) Skąd wiesz, że dostaniesz tę książkę?
 - Mam obiecać.
 'How do you know that you will receive the book?
 lit.: I-have-promised'
 'It is promised to me'
 (ex. from Topolińska 1968: 430)

The case marking is accusative if no NP_{acc} appears in the sentence itself. It is typically genitive or accusative depending on whether the direct object of mieć is in the genitive (after quantifiers) or accusative. The ppp thus has the properties of an adjective in attributive or predicative position. However, the case agreement, which is automatic with adjectives proper, is not automatic in form F. (Both examples are fragments of a telephone conversation; the material is from Pisarkowa 1974c: 187/66; 193/7):

- 5) - Nie, stary, już mam pół taśmy nagrane od wczoraj.
 'No, buddy, I have half the tape recorded since yesterday'

- 6) - Mam cztery strony tekstu zapisanego.
'I have four pages of text written down'

The NP_{acc} in both examples have a quantifier which triggers a genitive form of the nouns. But only 6) shows case agreement with the ppp, while 5) has a ppp marked neuter. The neuter form seems to be newer, replacing the form which shows agreement. These data have led to the conclusion that form F is, indeed, a new tense form in Modern Polish with a uniform ending of the ppp which is not in any agreement relation with the direct object.² For my particular purpose, there is no relevance in this question. A description of the properties of mieć-sentences can be achieved independently of any assignment to the various grammatical categories. And it probably remains a matter of taste how we classify form F, as long as it has not established itself firmly in the grammar of Polish.

The word order in form F has the ppp typically in attributive position, but the ppp can also follow the noun. Both instances allow for the same readings. The ambiguity in reading is threefold. The ppp can be read simply as a qualification of the noun, in which case the subject is in a possessive relation with the noun and the ppp functions like an adjective (7); the ppp can be read as the result of a process, in which case it is similar to the compound habeo-tense forms of French or German. In the first case, the ppp has the characteristics of a nominal

²For a more extensive discussion of this question, cf. Pisarkowa (1964) and Weiss (1977) who discuss in detail the historical status of this form and weigh the arguments for and against a possibility of classifying this type as a new tense form. For Polish, a German influence is usually assumed, cf. also Weinreich 1966: 41.

form and an AGENS assignment for the verbal process underlying the ppp is rather irrelevant. In the second case, the ppp has the characteristics of a verbal form and an AGENS assignment can be relevant (8):

- 7) Mam sprzątnięte mieszkanie.
 = Mam mieszkanie, które jest sprzątnięte.
 'I have a cleaned apartment'
 'I have an apartment which is cleaned'
- 8) Mam sprzątnięte mieszkanie.
 = Ktoś sprzątnął (moje) mieszkanie.
 'I have a cleaned apartment'
 'Somebody has cleaned (my) apartment'
 (Examples and interpretations adapted from
 Topolińska 1968: 429)

As a participial form, however, 8) is not marked for any AGENS. As a result, the AGENS can be either the subject or anything (anybody) else. This triggers two distinct (albeit not always available) variants. a) The subject is the AGENS of the verbal process. Here, the mieć-relations is established between the subject and the ppp; b) Something other than the subject is the AGENS of the verbal process. This latter raises the question of what the status of the subject is. For the verbal interpretation, the possessive relation between the subject and the noun is irrelevant. The mieć-relation is established between the subject and the ppp as a verb-like expression; to say that the subject has the noun, while something else is the AGENS relative to the ppp, therefore, would be a re-interpretation of the nominal variant. The status of the subject in b) has to be interpreted as a BENEFICIARY, because the subject is in a mieć-relation with the result of a verbal process to which another AGENS has already been assigned. The BENEFICIARY status, however, is an interpretation of the part-whole relation between the subject and the ppp, so that I will call the AGENS assigned to the verbal process the 'second AGENS'. This second AGENS can

optionally be spelled out. Sometimes it is more (9), sometimes less (10) readily available:

9) Wojtek ma wątrobę wyciętą przez lekarza.
'Wojtek has his liver removed by a doctor'

10) Wojtek ma złamaną nogę.
'Wojtek has a broken leg'

PPP's from intransitive verbs, obviously, cannot have a second AGENS introduced by przez 'by':

11) Wojtek ma nogi spuchnięte (od słońca).
'Wojtek has his legs swollen (from the sun)'

The main distinction is between the variants 7) and 8). While the AGENS vs. BENEFICIARY assignment are rather marginal (optional) interpretations within this basic distinction. Since word order does not indicate the appropriate interpretation, I will mark the constituents with delimiters:

12) Mam [zgubione banknoty].
'I have [lost banknotes]'

13) [Mam zgubione] banknoty.
'[I have lost] banknotes'

In 12), the suggested reading has 'money bills' qualified by 'lost' as the immediate constituent under mieć and the subject may not care the least who lost the bills as long as he, the subject, has them. In 13), the subject has reason to be less indifferent: He knows that he himself lost the money, in other words, he has no money to begin with. The (unlikely) interpretation of 13) with the subject as BENEFICIARY would have the glossing: 'I have banknotes lost'. 13), I will call the verbal form, while 12) is the nominal interpretation and belongs to form A. Form F, as it stands, is not marked for either reading. Thus, contrary to the procedure in the previous chapters,

two distinct semantic structures may have to be posited which both have the same output: form F. Whether such an assumption is justified will be tested in the following sections.

2 The Semantics of F

There are some formal properties which determine the reading of the particular sentence. These formal differences can be seen as reflexes of the underlying semantic differences and can be used to justify the assumption of a distinct form F.

Topolinska points out that additional material (te 'this', in 14) inserted between mieć and the ppp automatically triggers the nominal interpretation (1968: 429, fn. 8):

- 14) Mam tę zgubioną chusteczkę.
'I have this lost handkerchief'

In order to get a verbal reading, the common preterite form could be used:

- 15) Zgubiłem tę chusteczkę.
'I lost this handkerchief'

More important than the split-up of mieć and the ppp in their linear order, it seems to me, is the discontinuous order of the nominal constituent te 'this' and chusteczkę 'handkerchief' which encloses the ppp. For nothing restricts a verbal reading of 16), as an alternative word order to the synonymous 17):

16) Mam te chusteczkę zgubiona.
'I have lost this handkerchief'

17) Mam zgubioną tę chusteczkę.
'I have lost this handkerchief'

The ppp enclosed by nominal material of one (dis-continuous) constituent (14) is simply forced to become part of the nominal component. Outside of this position, it can come directly under the scope of mieć independent of its placement before or after the nominal part.

The Possessive Relations

In the verbal interpretation, the process denoted by the verb is in a part-whole relation with the subject of mieć. This is possible only if the process can be referred to as a result. This requirement is satisfied because the ppp's are derived from perfective verb forms. If mieć establishes a possessive relation with the accusative noun in both the nominal interpretation, and with the ppp in the verbal interpretation, then it should be possible to test examples which are formally F for differences in their possessive structure by manipulating the semantic material in the possessive relations. Insertion of a reflexive possessive pronoun should have little effect on the overall reading in instances of F proper (verbal reading) with a body-part noun in NP_{acc} position, because then the NP_{acc} (noge 'leg' in 18) should not be in the immediate scope of mieć. If this noun is in the scope of mieć, which it is in the nominal reading (19), the result should be the same as with simple A-examples: Mam swoje długie nogi 'I have my own long legs'. That is, it should have some emphatic contrast or an implied double negation; otherwise it should be nonsensical:

- 18) Wojtek ma skreconą swoją nogę.
'Wojtek has twisted his own legs'
- 19) Wojtek ma swoją skreconą nogę.
'Wojtek has his own twisted leg'

It is not essential who did the leg-twisting. This could have been done by somebody other than Wojtek in either case. The question is, whether in 18), Wojtek is in the possession of the result of the twisting; i.e., whether he is in a part-whole relation with a result referred to by the ppp. And conversely, whether Wojtek in 19), is in a part-whole relation with his own legs (not necessarily the legs of his own body), which happen to be twisted. The way both examples "react" differently to the insertion of the reflexive swoje 'his own', indicates that this is indeed the case. If in 18) somebody other than Wojtek did the twisting, Wojtek would be the BENEFICIARY of the twisting rather than the AGENS. In 19), the question who did the twisting is rather irrelevant.

The Temporal Relations

If the phrase mieć + ppp is taken as a compound tense form, then we are dealing with only one verbal process in the sentence rather than two. As a consequence, the co-occurrence of temporal adverbs with different temporal ranges in the same sentence must become impossible, if the adverbs quantify the verbal process. In the nominal reading, on the other hand, mieć could be within the scope of one adverb, while the ppp could be in the scope of a second adverb:

- 20) Dziś mam te bilety wczoraj zarezerwowane.
'Today I have the tickets reserved yesterday'

This sentence is read as a nominal form only: wczoraj zarezerwowane 'yesterday reserved' modifies bilety

'tickets'. An optional second AGENS can be inserted:

- 21) Dziś mam te przez ciebie wczoraj zarezerwowane bilety.
'Today I have the tickets which you reserved yesterday'

A verbal interpretation requires the time adverb wczoraj 'yesterday' to be deleted:

- 22) Dziś mam zarezerwowane te bilety.
'Today I have reserved the tickets'

Only in the nominal A-type instance, does the subject have tickets. In the verbal F-type instance, he only has a reservation. In both cases, the subject may have the tickets and the reservation, respectively, as a result of his own doings or as a result of someone else's making the reservation.

Trzymać 'To Keep'

- 23) Kiedy ich nie ma w domu, mają wyłączony gaz.
'When they are not home, they have the gas turned off'

Here, the finite form of mieć could be substituted by the verb trzymać 'to keep/to hold':

- 24) Kiedy ich nie ma w domu, trzymają gaz wyłączony.
'When they are not home, they keep the gas turned off'

Such a substitution is possible only with a verbal reading. A nominal interpretation with trzymać 'to keep' is not available in ordinary speech, unless it is forced on the sentence as a marked instance of a "mis-interpretation":

- 25) Kiedy Wojtek choruje, trzyma zamknięte okna.
'When Wojtek is sick, he keeps his windows closed'

The forced "mis-interpretation" would read zamknięte okna as 'closed windows' and give trzymać the interpretation of 'to hold s.th. physically'.

3 Possessor of a Result

A final note on the type of possessive relation between mieć and the ppp in form F (verbal instances) seems to be in place. The fact that the ppp shows a tendency to develop a general form rather than to agree with the noun in the accusative does not cause any difficulties for an interpretation of the mieć-relation as a part-whole relation. It even supports, I think, the assumption that the result of the verbal process can enter the mieć-relation as an independent member. Because the ppp in form F (example 25) is always perfective, it is true of the result of a process, not of the ongoing process. Seiler's concept of a 'possessor of an act' (1973a) is, I think, the adequate framework for these relations. The idea of speaking about a possessor of an act (understood as the result of a process), in the context of type F instances, has not remained undisputed. According to Weiss, the ppp in 26) cannot, by any stretch of one's imagination, be understood as the possessed item in a mieć-relation (Weiss 1977: 372):

26) Mam już wszystkie egzaminy pozdawane.
'I have already all exams taken'

In my interpretation of possessive relations as part-whole relations, I do not see a real problem with the possessor of a result concept, here. The result of the verbal process is an abstract item which can become part of

the subject-whole. The subject can have either AGENS status or BENEFICIARY status. The relation may be more abstract than, e.g., Mam klucz 'I have a key', but so are all possessive relations with abstract nouns: Mam nadzieję 'I have hope'. What can be bothersome, especially with an explicit second AGENS (27), is the question: What is it that the subject has, anyway?:

- 27) Wreszcie Wojtek ma przez Jana zaproszoną żonę Wacka.
'At last, Wojtek has Wacek's wife invited through Jan'

Jan did the inviting, the wife is Wacek's, and there is not much left for the subject of mieć, Wojtek, to have. The BENEFICIARY status of Wojtek may not be much of a possession in any materialistic (extralinguistic) sense, but it is an instance of a possessive relation not unknown from other environments. The BENEFICIARY, represented by a dative form, occurs in the hierarchy of closeness (chapter 1). Diachronic and comparative studies repeatedly center on the issue of dative expressions mihi est as predecessors of habeo-constructions.³ Dative expressions with być as the verb are common in Polish (28). As pointed out in the section on być vs. mieć, the copulative structure assigns a property to the entire item, while in the mieć-structure, only one part of the whole represents this property. The same distinction applies when the BENEFICIARY is in a dative (28), and in a nominative (29), respectively:

- 28) Jest mi chłodno.
'I am cold'

³In the context of Seiler's "possessor of an act", cf. Rosen 1980. (The volume in which Rosen's article appeared, contains more articles on the same subject with further references).

- 29) Mam chłódno w pokoju.
'I have [it] cold in my room'

Thus, the BENEFICIARY need not be marked dative. This is the case in 28). While Jan did the inviting (as a process), Wojtek has the result of this process (and he may or may not benefit from it). BENEFICIARY is, of course, neutral with respect to a distinction between good and bad. Wojtek is simply the item at the receiving end in the directional BENEFICIARY relation.

To sum up: Form F is, strictly speaking, the surface form of two semantic structures, which appear to be developing in Modern Polish. By definition, I have assigned F to only one of these structures, so that the prototype form of this chapter has to be looked at, in fact, as a semantic representation, not as a surface form. Manipulations with temporal and possessive material have shown that the assumption of two distinct semantic structures is justified. I have labeled form F the verbal instance as opposed to the nominal instance which is represented by form A. In form F, mieć establishes a part-whole relation with the result of a process.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

Reducing the variety of forms to the essential few without mutilating the capacity of language to generate an indefinite multitude, is the linguist's task and pastime. The analysis of possessive, and not-so-possessive, and non-possessive utterances has been the subject of many articles and books, of which only a few are known to me and even fewer are listed in my bibliography. Neither the multitude of possible utterances with mieć nor possession as a linguistic category were at the center of my attention. The question which I asked myself was: What type of a job does mieć do? How is it possible, synchronically, to account for its various and superficially unrelated occurrences? The semantic primitives of which utterances are made must be meaningful enough to produce meaningful utterances, yet they must be general enough to allow for an unrestricted combination with other primitives. An analysis of mieć as a form which relates an item as a part to a whole, is, I think, already close to satisfying these two requirements. It has to be kept in mind that the primitive structure of mieć is formulated for mieć as part of an utterance. Every form in an utterance makes its contribution to the meaning of this utterance. What a particular form contributes is primitive (semantic) material arranged in a particular order. The final output is subject to how this material is combined in the

utterance. The material which is inputted by miec' is the part-whole relation. The presence of a part-whole relation signals that we are dealing with a (linguistic) possessive structure. Possessive structures tend to receive an extralinguistic possessive interpretation - and sometimes they do receive it. It was not my prime concern in this study to identify the factors which block or support the various interpretations of these possessive utterances in any detail, nor did I describe how miec' is related to other possessive forms (such as genitives and possessive pronouns). It was my goal to identify (almost) primitive material, which would make it possible to account for the occurrence of miec' in instances of form A through F alike, as well as for the fact that miec'-relations are likely to be interpreted as extralinguistic possessive relations whenever there is an object available in the sentence.

The general concept of a part-whole relation was introduced in the first chapter on the basis of form A. In the following chapters, I attempted to show how this concept can be applied to occurrences of miec' in other forms as well. Form A is the prototype representation of a part-whole relation: A ma B 'A has B'. In chapters 2 through 5, my goal was twofold. I gave a short description of the grammatical structure of the individual miec'-relations, and I showed how the individual forms can be reduced to the semantic representation of 'A has B'. The assumption of a whole is essential, because it makes it possible to treat the different interpretations of the miec'-relations, which often are grouped as "copulative", "attributive", and "possessive", as instances of one semantic structure. Relative to the whole, every item is a part; while relative to the subject, some items are possessions, others qualities, and still others (physical) parts.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, L.B. 1974. "The Part-Whole Squish, Main- vs. Subsidiary Predications, and Why 'Grammatical Insertion' is Like 'Lexical Insertion'." Papers from the Chicago Linguistic Society 10. 1-16.
- Bach, E. 1967. "Have and Be in English Syntax." Language 43. 462-485
- Bartnicka, B. 1982. Funkcje semantyczno-składniowe bezokolicznika we współczesnej polszczyźnie. Wrocław: PAN.
- Bendix, E.H. 1966. Componential Analysis of General Vocabulary: The Semantic Structure of a Set of Verbs in English, Hindi, and Japanese. Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University.
- 1971. "The Data of Semantic Description." in D.D. Steinberg and L.A. Jakobovits (eds.), Semantics. An Interdisciplinary Reader in Philosophy, Linguistics and Psychology. 393-409. Cambridge: University Press.
- Benveniste, E. 1960. "'Etre' et 'avoir' dans leur fonctions linguistique." Bulletin de la Societé de Linguistique de Paris. 113-134.
- Berka, K. 1961. "Funkcii glagola byt' s točki zrenija sovremennoj formal'noj logiki." Logiko-grammatičeskie

očerki. 160-180. Moskva: Vysšaja škola.

- Birnbaum, H. 1978. "To Be Or Not To Have. Some Notes on Russian Surface Data and Their Typological and Universal Implications." Studia Linguistica Alexandro Vasilii Filio Issatschenko A Collegis Amicisque Oblata. 27.-33. Lisse: De Ridder.
- Bloom, A. 1981. The Linguistic Shaping of Thought. A Study in the Impact of Language on Thinking in China and the West. Hillsdale: Erlbaum.
- Roeder, W. 1980a. "Probleme der Geschichte von 'haben'." Typoscript 20p (preliminary version). Oldenburg.
- 1980b. "'Haben' in den Kartwelsprachen." in G. Brettschneider and Ch. Lehmann (eds.), Wege zur Universalienforschung. 207-217. Tuebingen: Narr.
- Bogusławski, A. 1970. "On Semantic Primitives and Meaningfulness." Sign, Language, Culture. 143-152. The Hague: Mouton.
- Bradley R., N. Swartz. 1979. Possible Worlds. An Introduction to Logic and its Philosophy. Indianapolis: Hackett.
- Bralczyk, J. 1974. "Leksykalne wykładniki niepewności sądów." Biuletyn Polskiego Towarzystwa Językoznawczego 32. 115-118.
- Brinkmann, H. 1959. "Die 'haben'-Perspektive im Deutschen." in H. Gipper (ed.), Sprache, Schluessel zur Welt. Festschrift fuer Leo Weisgerber. 176-194. Duesseldorf.
- Clark, E.V. 1973. "What's in a Word? On the Child's Acquisition of Semantics in His First Language." in

- T.E. Moore (ed.), Cognitive Development and the Acquisition of Language. 65-110. New York: Academic Press.
- 1978. "Locational: Existential, Locative, and Possessive Constructions." in J.H. Greenberg (ed.) Universals of Human Language. Vol. 4. Syntax. 85-126. Stanford.
- Clasen, B. 1981. Inhaerenz und Etablierung. Arbeiten des Koelner Universalien-Projekts. 41. Koeln.
- Daniels, K. 1963. "Substantivierungstendenzen in der deutschen Gegenwartssprache. Nominaler Ausbau des verbalen Denkkreises." in L. Weisgerber (ed.) Sprache und Gemeinschaft. III. Duesseldorf: Schwann.
- Demiraj, Sh. 1970. "Rreth formavet të së ardhmes në gjuhën shqipe." Studime Filologjike 3. 69-84.
- Dimova, A. 1983. "Modalnite konstrukcii 'sein + zu + Infinitive - sŭm + za + Nomen Actionis'." Sŭpostavitelno Ezikoznanie 1. 35-43.
- Dulewiczowa, I. 1981. "Czasowniki być i mieć w języku polskim i rosyjskim." Acta Baltico-Slavica 14. 91-107
- Faulstich, G. 1978. "Die Konstruktionen 'haben + Infinitiv' und 'sein + Infinitiv' und ihre polnischen Entsprechungen." Linguistische Arbeitsberichte 20. 163-170.
- Feleszko, K. 1977 "Z problematyki zdań egzystencjalnych w języku polskim i bułgarskim." in Kategorie werbalne w języku polskim i bułgarskim. Materiały na konferencję naukową polsko-bułgarską w Warszawie 23-25 XI 1977. 9-13.

- 1982. "Sądy egzystencjalne a kategorie nominalne."
Studia gramatyczne 5. 65-71.
- Fromm, E. 1976. To have or to be? New York: Harper.
- Gallis, A. 1960. "Die neuen slavischen Perfekte vom Typus factum habeo und *casus sum, *casum habeo."
Scando-Slavica 6. 176-188.
- Georgiev, V. 1957. "Vŭznikvane na novi složni formi sŭs spomagatelen glagol imam." Izvestija na instituta po bŭlgarski ezik 5. 31-59.
- Grzegorzczkova, R. 1973. "Czasowniki modalne jako wykładniki różnych postaw nadawcy." Otázky slovanské syntaxe. III. Spisy University J.E. Purkyně v Brně. Filosofická fakulata. 180. 201-204.
- 1982. "Zdania egzystencjalne a tzw. kwantyfikator egzystencjalny." Studia gramatyczne 5. 23-29.
- Gramatyka 1984. Gramatyka współczesnego języka polskiego. Morfologia. Pod red. R. Grzegorzczkovej, R. Laskowskiego, H. Wróbla. Warszawa: PWN.
- Isačenko, A.V. 1974. "On 'Have' and 'Be' Languages." in M.S. Flier (ed.), Slavic Forum. Essays in Linguistics and Literature. 43-77. The Hague: Mouton.
- Jordanskaja, L. 1972. "Popytka leksikograficeskogo tolkovanija grupy russkix slov so značeniem čuvstva." Masinnyj perevod i prikladnaja lingvistika 13. 3-26.
- Klebanowska, B. 1975. "Nie ma, nie było, nie będzie." Prace Filologiczne 25. 155-160.
- Korytkowska, M. 1976. "Z semantyki i składni czasowników bułgarskich i polskich. Bg. iskam - pol. Chcieć." Albrecht, Ingrid 09783954792344
Downloaded from PubFactory at 01/10/2019 04:27:41AM
via free access

Bjuletin za sŭpostavitelno izsledvane na bŭlgarski ezik s drugi ezici 2. 31-44.

- Kostov, K. 1972. "Semantische Beobachtungen ueber die Verbindung von imam mit dem Partizipium Perfecti Passivi im Bulgarischen." Zeitschrift fuer Slawistik. 371-379.
- Koseska, V. 1970. "Uwagi o tzw. kategorii określoności. Na materiale języka bułgarskiego i rosyjskiego." Rocznik Slawistyczny 1. 39-44.
- Koseska-Toszewa, V. 1978. "Informacja o określoności we frazie werbalnej i nominalnej języka bułgarskiego, polskiego i rosyjskiego." Slavia Orientalis 2. 259-265.
- 1979. "Otnovo po vŭprosa za ekzistencialnite izrečenija." Sŭpostavitelno ezikoznanie 3. 11-17
- 1979a. "Kategorija modal'nosti v rel'acij s kategoriej opredelennosti." Slavia Orientalis 2. 273-277
- 1982. Semantyczne aspekty kategorii określoności/ nieokreśloności. Na materiale z języka bułgarskiego, polskiego i rosyjskiego. Wrocław: PAN.
- 1982a. "Czy istnieje zdanie egzystencjalne w języku naturalnym?" Studia gramatyczne 5. 47-51.
- 1983. "Konstrukcje z polskim mieć i bułgarskim imam." Studia linguistica memoriae Zdisłai Stieber dedicata. Materiały z sesji naukowej, Warszawa 20-21 X 1981. 137-143. Wrocław: PAN.
- 1984. "O kategorii określoności/nieokreśloności w bułgarskim i polskim." Studia konfrontatywne polsko-południowosłowiańskie. 39-53. Wrocław: PAN.

- Kratzer, A. 1977. "What 'Must' and 'Can' Must and Can Mean." Linguistics and Philosophy 3. 337-355.
- 1978. Semantik der Rede. Kontexttheorie, Modalwoerter, Konditionalsaeetze. Koenigstein: Scriptor.
- 1979. "Conditional Necessity and Possibility." in R. Baeuerle, U. Egli, A. Stechow (eds.), Semantics from Different Points of View. 117-147. Berlin: Springer
- 1981. "The Notional Category of Modality." in H.-J. Eikmeher, H. Rieser (eds.), Words, Worlds, and Contexts. 38-74. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Kuz'mina, I.B., E.V. Nemcenko. 1971. Sintaksis pričastnyx form v russkix govorax. Moskva: Nauka.
- Lakoff, G. 1976. "Global Rules." in J. Nawrocka-Fisiak (ed.), Readings in Generative Semantics. 49-61. (Reprinted from Language 46. 627-639.)
- Lempp, A., W. Osadnik. 1986. "Z problematyki zdań egzystencjalnych w języku polskim i bułgarskim." Súpostavitelno ezikoznanie. (forthcoming).
- McCawley, J. 1972. "A Program For Logic." in D. Davidson and G. Harman (eds), Semantics of Natural Language. 498-544. Dordrecht: Reidel.
- Maksimovska, S. [et al.] 1981. "Egzystencjalne znaczenie czasowników 'być' i 'mieć' w językach polskim, macedońskim, serbsko-chorwackim i słoweńskim." Studia z filologii polskiej i słowiańskiej 20. 141-156.
- Mansaku, S. 1980. "Ndërtimet me foljen ndihmëse kam + paskajore te autorët e vjetër." Studime Filologjike 2. 137-148.

- Meillet, A. 1924. "Le développement du verbe 'avoir'." Antidoron. Festschrift Jacob Wackernagel zur Vollendung des 70. Lebensjahres am 11. Dezember 1923. 9-13. Goettingen.
- Munitz, M.K. 1974. Existence and Logic. New York: Univ. Press.
- Nakhnikian G, W.C. Salmon. 1957. "Exists as a Predicate." Philosophical Review 535-542.
- Olszewska-Michalczyk, H. [1981]. Składnia konstrukcji z czasownikiem "mieć". Poznań. (Doctoral Dissertation.)
- Otfinowski, A. 1976. Konstrukcje orzeczeniowe z transformą gerundialną bez przyimka i z przyimkami: dla, do. Bydgoszcz: Wyższa Szkoła Ped.
- Penčev, J. 1981. "Nebensaetze des Typs 'Interrogativpronomen - da - Verb' im Bulgarischen." Zeitschrift fuer Slawistik 5. 667-669.
- Pisarkowa, K. 1964. "Składniowa funkcja imiesłowów z czasownikiem mieć." Język Polski 231-237.
- 1974a. "Posesywność jako przykład problemu gramatycznego." Biuletyn Polskiego Towarzystwa Językoznawczego 32: 3-11.
- 1974b. "Posessivnost' kak grammatičeskaja problema (na primere pol'skogo jazyka). Grammatičeskoe opisanie slavjanskix jazykov. Konceptii i metody. 171-176. Moskva: Nauka.
- 1974c. "O spójności tekstu mówionego." in M.R. Mayenowa (ed.), Tekst i język. Problemy semantyczne. 41-71. Wrocław: PAN.

- 1977. "Ueber die Possessivitaet im Polnischen und Deutschen." in U. Engel (ed.), Deutsche Sprache im Kontakt. 83-99. Tuebingen: Narr.
- Pitha, P. 1971. "Remarks on Possessivity." The Prague Bulletin of Mathematical Linguistics. 16. 33-46.
- 1972. "Remarks on Possessivity II." The Prague Bulletin of Mathematical Linguistics. 17. 25-36.
- Popova, A. 1976. "Njakoi polski modalni konstrukcii i texnite bułgarskii sŭotvetstvija." Bjuletin za sŭpostavitelno izsledvane na bułgarskija ezik s drugi ezici 1, 2. 128-138.
- 1977. "Njakoi osobenosti na imam + minalo stradatelno pričastie v bułgarski i polski." Kategorie werbalne w języku polskim i bułgarskim. Materiały na konferencję naukową polsko-bułgarską w Warszawie 23-25 XI 1977. 113-116.
- Puzynina, J. 1974. "O modalności w polskich derywatach." in M.R. Mayenowa (ed.), Tekst i język. Problemy semantyczne. 36-39.
- Quine, W.V. 1980. From a Logical Point of View. 9 Logico-Philosophical Essays. 2nd revised edition. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- 1982. Methods of Logic. 4th edition. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Rando E., D. Napoli. 1978. "Definites in 'There' Sentences." Language 54. 300-313.
- Rosch, E.H. 1973. "On the Internal Structure of Perceptual and Semantic Categories." in T.E. Moore (ed.), Cognitive Development and the Acquisition of Language

111-144. New York: Academic Press.

Rosen, H.B. 1980. "Weiteres ueber die Entstehung der periphrastischen 'Perfekt' Formen im Lateinischen. Zum Begriff 'Zustand des Akt(resultats)besitzes'." in G. Brettscheider and Ch. Lehmann (eds.), Wege zur Universalienforschung. 311-316. Tuebingen: Narr.

Ross, J.R. 1978. "To Have Have and to Not Have Have." Linguistic and Literary Studies. In Honor of Archibald A. Hill. I: General and Theoretical Linguistics. 263-270. The Hague: Mouton.

Rytel, D. 1982. Leksykalne środki wyrażania modalności w języku czeskim i polskim. Wrocław: PAN.

Sawicka, I. 1979. Problematyka predykcji imiennej na przykładzie języka serbsko-chorwackiego. Wrocław: PAN.

--- 1979a. "Wieloznaczność terminu "określoność" w tekstach językoznawczych." Studia z filologii polskiej i słowiańskiej 18. 257-263.

--- 1983. "Użycie czasowników być i mieć w zdaniach lokatywnych w polskim, i ich odpowiedników w serbsko-chorwackim i albańskim." Studia Linguistica. Posebna Izdanja. Knjiga LXI. Odjeljenje društvenih nauka. Knjiga 10. Sarajevo: AN.

Seiler, H. 1973. "Zum Problem der sprachlichen Possessivitaet." Folia Linguistica 3/4. 231-250.

--- 1973a. "On the Semanto-Syntactic Configuration 'Possessor of an Act'." Issues in Linguistics. Papers in Honor of Henry and Renee Kahane. 836-853. Urbana.

--- 1983. POSSESSION as an Operational Dimension of

Language. Tuebingen: Narr.

Seliverstova, O.N. 1977. "Semantičeskii analiz ekzistencial'nyx i possessivnyx konstrukcij v anglijskom jazyke." in V.N Jarceva (ed.), Kategorii bytija i obladanija v jazyke. 5-67. Moskva: Nauka.

Słownik. 1980. Słownik syntaktyczno-generatywny czasowników polskich. Vol. 1. Pod red. K. Polańskiego. Wrocław: Ossolineum.

Świdarska-Koneczna, H. 1930. "Użycie czasownika mieć jako słowa posiłkowego w języku polskim." Prace Filologiczne 15. 263-272.

Szupryczyńska, M. 1965. "Konstrukcje typu nie ma co robić." Zeszyty naukowe UMK, 12, seria 1, filologia polska V. 59-68.

Taylor, R. 1973. "Spatial and Temporal Analogies and the Concept of Identity." in J.J.C. Smart (ed.), Problems of Space and Time. 3rd edition. 381-396. New York: Macmillan.

Topolińska, Z. 1966. "O kategoriach gramatycznych polskiego imperatywu." Język Polski 3. 167-173.

--- 1968. "Miejsce konstrukcji z czasownikiem mieć w polskim systemie werbalnym." Slavia Orientalis 3. 427-431.

--- 1978. "An Attempt Towards a Semantic Interpretation of The So-Called Grammatical Category of Definiteness." Studia Linguistica Alexandro Vasiliu Filio Issatschenko A Collegis Amicisque Oblata. 417-424. Lisse: De Ridder.

--- 1979. "Z problematyki nominalizacji odprzymiotnikowych

- w języku polskim." Studia z filologii polskiej i słowiańskiej 18. 107-117.
- Vater, H. 1975. "'Werden' als Modalverb." in J. Calbert and H. Vater (eds.), Aspekte der Modalitaet. 71-148. Tuebingen: Narr.
- Wajszczuk, J. 1972. "O 'podziwie' i 'zachwycie'. Na marginesie artykułu L. Jordańskiej." in A. Wierzbicka (ed.), Semantyka i Słownik. 125-132. Wrocław: PAN.
- Wall, R. 1972. Introduction to Mathematical Linguistics. Englewood: Prentice-Hall.
- Weinreich, U. 1966. Languages in Contact. 4th edition. New York.
- Weiss, D. 1977. Syntax und Semantik polnischer Partizipialkonstruktionen im Rahmen einer generativ-transformationellen Sprachbeschreibung. Bern: Lang.
- 1983. "Indefinite, definite und generische Referenz in artikellosen slavischen Sprachen." in H.R. Mehlig (ed.), Slavistische Linguistik 1982. 229-261. Muenchen: Sagner.
- 1985. "Funkcjonowanie i pochodzenie polskich konstrukcji typu 'mam coś do załatwienia', 'coś jest do załatwienia'." (Typoscript 22p). To appear in A. de Vincenz and A. Pohl (eds.), Deutsch-polnische Sprachkontakte. Koeln: Boehlau.
- 1986. "Polsko-niemieckie paralele w zakresie czasowników modalnych." (Typoscript 24p). To appear in Festschrift fuer A. de Vincenz.
- Wierzbicka, A. 1969. Dociekania semantyczne. Wrocław: PAN.

- 1970-1972. "Medytacje semantyczne." Series of articles in Miesięcznik Literacki.
- 1971. "The Semantic Structure of Space Notions." in A. Stechow (ed.), Beitraege zur generativen Grammatik. Referate des 5. Linguistischen Kolloquiums Regensburg. 283-291. Braunschweig: Vieweg.
- 1972. Semantic Primitives. Frankfurt/M: Athenaemum.
- 1977. "Mind and Body." in J. McCawley (ed.), Syntax and Semantics. Vol. 7 of Notes from the Linguistic Underground. 129-157. New York: Academic Press.
- 1980. Lingua Mentalis. The Semantics of Natural Language. Sydney: Academic Press.
- Zaron, Z. 1972. "Kupić, sprzedać, zarobić, ukraść." in A. Wierzbicka (ed.), Semantyka i słownik. 179-190. Wrocław: PAN.
- 1975. "Niektóre słowa z elementem zacząć/przestać mieć." Słownik i semantyka. Definicje semantyczne. 105-111. Wrocław: PAN.
- Ziv, Y. 1982. "Another Look at Definites in Existentials." Journal of Linguistics 18. 73-88.

SOURCES:

- Andrzejewski: Jerzy Andrzejewski, Popiół i diament.
Warszawa: PIW. 1966.
- Benski: Stanisław Benski, Cesarski walc. Kraków: WL. 1985.
- Broszkiewicz: Jerzy Broszkiewicz, Doktor Twardowski.
Warszawa: Czytelnik. 1981.
- Herbert: Zbigniew Herbert, Wybór poezji. Warszawa:
Czytelnik. 1973.
- Hłasko Op.: Marek Hłasko, Opowiadania. Warszawa:
Czytelnik. 1976.
- Hłasko PD: Marek Hłasko, Piekni Dwudziestoletni. Paris:
IL. 1966.
- Lechoń: Jan Lechoń, Dziennik I. London. 1962.
- Nowak: Cyprian Kamil Norwid. "Gorzki to chleb jest
polskość". Wybór myśli politycznych i społecznych.
Ed. and intro. by Jerzy Robert Nowak. Kraków: WL.
1984.
- Szatyn: Bronisław Szatyn, Na aryjskich papierach. Kraków:
WL. 1983.
- Srokowski: Stanisław Srokowski, Sen Belzebuba. Wrocław:
Ossolineum. 1982.

SLAVISTISCHE BEITRÄGE

(1985 - 1986)

183. Kammer, Gerlinde: Probleme bei der Übersetzung von phrasologischen Einheiten aus dem Russischen ins Deutsche (anhand von Werken V.F. Panovas). 1985. IX, 223, XXV S.
184. Slavistische Linguistik 1984. Referate des X. Konstanzer Slavistischen Arbeitstreffens Konstanz 11. mit 14. 9. 1984. Herausgegeben von Werner Lehfeldt. 1985. 359 S.
185. Kahlenborn, Ulrike: Goethes Lyrik in russischer Übersetzung. V.A. Žukovskij und F.I. Tjutčev als bedeutendste Goethe-Übersetzer der russischen Romantik. 1985. XIV, 309 S.
186. Hauenschild, Christa: Zur Interpretation russischer Nominalgruppen. Anaphorische Bezüge und thematische Strukturen im Satz und im Text. 1985. IX, 391 S.
187. Rathmayr, Renate: Die russischen Partikeln als Pragmalexeme. 1985. 354 S.
188. Boss, Dagmar: Das sowjetische Autorenlied. Eine Untersuchung am Beispiel des Schaffens von Aleksandr Galić, Bulat Okudžava und Vladimir Vysockij. 1985. VIII, 119 S.
189. Hiller, Peter: D.I. Fonvizin und P.A. Plavil'sčikov. Ein Kapitel aus der russischen Theatergeschichte im 18. Jahrhundert. 1985. X, 344 S.
- ♦
190. Kaltwasser, Jörg: Die deadjektivische Wortbildung des Russischen. Versuch einer 'analytisch-synthetisch-funktionellen' Beschreibung. 1986. VIII, 235 S.
191. Grbavac, Josip: Ethische und didaktisch-aufklärerische Tendenzen bei Filip Grabovac. „Cvit razgovora“. 1986. 196 S.
192. Janda, Laura A.: A Semantic Analysis of the Russian Verbal Prefixes za-, pere-, do-, and ot-. 1986. VIII, 261 S.
193. Bojić, Vera, Wolf Oschlies: Lehrbuch der makedonischen Sprache Zweite, erweiterte und verbesserte Auflage. 1986. 252 S.

194. Wett, Barbara: ‚Neuer Mensch‘ und ‚Goldene Mittelmäßigkeit‘. F.M. Dostoevskijs Kritik am rationalistisch-utopischen Menschenbild. 1986. VIII, 238 S.
195. Schmidt, Evelies: Ägypten und ägyptische Mythologie - Bilder der Transition im Werk Andrej Belyjs. 1986. IX, 439 S., 1 Faltblatt.
196. Ketchian, Sonia: The Poetry of Anna Akhmatova: A Conquest of Time and Space. 1986. VIII, 225 S.
197. Zeichen und Funktion. Beiträge zur ästhetischen Konzeption Jan Mukařovskýs. Herausgegeben von Hans Günther. 1986. X, 207 S.
198. Kramer, Christina Elizabeth: Analytic Modality in Macedonian. 1986. X, 177 S.
199. Eggeling, Wolfram: Die Prosa sowjetischer Kinderzeitschriften (1919-1925). Eine Themen- und Motivanalyse in Bezug auf das Bild des Jungen Protagonisten. 1986. X, 506 S.
200. Slavistische Linguistik 1985. Referate des XI. Konstanzer Slavistischen Arbeitstreffens Innsbruck 10. mit 12.9. 1985. Herausgegeben von Renate Rathmayr. 1986. 326 S.
201. Berger, Tilman: Wortbildung und Akzent im Russischen. 1986. VIII, 373 S.
202. Hock, Wolfgang: Das Nominalsystem im Uspenskij Sbornik. 1986. VI, 179 S.
203. Weidner, Anneliese: Die russischen Übersetzungsäquivalente der deutschen Modalverben. Versuch einer logisch-semantischen Charakterisierung. 1986. 340 S.
204. Lempp, Albrecht: Mieć. 'To Have' in Modern Polish. 1986. XIV, 148 S.
205. Timroth, Wilhelm von: Russian and Soviet Sociolinguistics and Taboo Varieties of the Russian Language. (Argot, Jargon, Slang, and "Mat".) Revised and Enlarged Edition. 1986. X, 164 S.