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## Languages addressed

- Belarusian
- Russian
- Ukrainian
- Cassubian
- Czech
- Lower Sorbian
- Polish
- Slovak
- Upper Sorbian
- Bosnian-Croatian-Montenegrin-Serbian
- Slovene
- Bulgarian
- Macedonian
- Belarusian: Bel
- Russian: Rus
- Ukrainian: Ukr
- Cassubian: *Cas
- Czech: Cze
- Lower Sorbian: LSo
- Polish: Pol
- Slovak: Slk
- Upper Sorbian: USo
- Bosnian-Croatian-Montenegrin-Serbian: *BCMS
- Slovene: Sln
- Bulgarian: Bul
- Macedonian: Mac
Languages addressed
The Slavic conditional

- Belarusian: xadziũ by, xadzila b
- Russian: počitala b(y)
- Ukrainian: xodyv by, xodyla b

- Cassubian: ucekła b(ē(†m))
- Czech: přinesla bych
- Lower Sorbian: njasła by
- Polish: czytałabym
- Slovak: volala by som
- Upper Sorbian: njesła bych

- Bosnian-Croatian-Montenegrin-Serbian: nosila bi#(h)
- Slovene: rekla bi
- Bulgarian: kazala bih
- Macedonian: došla bi
The Slavic conditional

Common pattern

(1) AUX + L-FORM
The Slavic conditional

Common pattern

(1) AUX + L-FORM

Differences

- AUX does not inflect in all languages;
- Some languages allow for more than L-FORMs.
The Slavic conditional

⇒ Belarusian: xadziũ by, xadzila b / xadzic’ by
⇒ Russian: počitala b(y) / počitat’ by
⇒ Ukrainian: xodyv by, xodyla b / xodyty b

⇒ Cassubian: ucekła b(ě(†m)) / ucekac bě
  ■ Czech: přinesla bych
  ■ Lower Sorbian: njasła by
⇒ Polish: czytałabym / czytać by
  ■ Slovak: volala by som
  ■ Upper Sorbian: njesła bych

■ Bosnian-Croatian-Montenegrin-Serbian: nosila bi#(h)
■ Slovene: rekla bi
■ Bulgarian: kazala bih
■ Macedonian: došla bi
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East Slavic | Cas2
Symmetry between past tense and conditional mood form:

No inflection in AUX-position:

- Ø in past tense, particle (by/bë) in conditional;
- agreement on L-FORM only, namely NUM.GEN (but cf. Junghanns 1995: 8).

(2) a. ty zroby-v-Ø
    you make-L- SG.M
    ‘you (have) made’

b. ty {b} zroby-v-Ø {by}
   you PART make-L- SG.M PART
   ‘you would {make/have made}’

**Ukr** (Zovtobrjux and Moldovan 2005: 526)
Multiple marking:

There can be more than one instance of *by*.
True at least for Rus (Bel, Ukr?); impossible in Pol (Tomaszewicz 2012: 264).

(3) a. Ja by pogulja-l by segodnja večerom.
   I PART take.a.walk-LPT;SG.M PART today evening
   ‘I would like to take a walk tonight’

b. Čtoby ja tebja by zdes’ bol’še ne
   that.PART I you.ACC PART here more NEG
   videl.
   see-LPT;SG.M
   ‘So that I would not see you here again.’

*Rus* (Xrakovskij 2009: 277)
East Slavic | Cas2

**Infinitives in conditional clauses:**

Also attested: adjectives, adverbs, modal predicatives, other participles, present tense, imperative (see, e.g., Panzer 1967: 21-23); Pol: *no/to*.

(4) **Pospat’** _by!_

PREF.slee p. INF PART

‘If only (I could) sleep for a while!’

**Rus** (Isačenko 1962: 346)

**Alternation:**

*by/bē : b* (optional in Cas2 & Rus; obligatory in Bel & Ukr)
Asymmetry:

- **PS.NUM**-inflecting **AUX-verb** in the past/perfect tense;
- non-inflecting **particle** in the conditional.

“Remarkably enough, we find a modal particle [in LSo] without personal inflection, although the latter is otherwise common within the system of periphrastic forms.”

(Panzer 1967: 24; my translation)

No infinitives in the conditional!
   I AUX: 1SG work-L-SG.F
   ‘I (have) worked.’

   I PART work-L-SG.F
   ‘I would (have) work(ed).’  

LSo (Stone 1993: 638)
Symmetry:

PS.NUM-inflecting AUX-verbs plus (non-finite) /-participle
both in the past/perfect tense and in the conditional.

(6) a. Az săm če-l-a.
   I AUX: 1SG read-L-SG.F
   ‘I (have) read.’

b. Az bih če-l-a.
   I AUX: 1SG read-L-SG.F
   ‘I would (have) read.’
**AUX formation:**

Cas1, Slk, and Pol seem to build their conditional AUX analytically:

(7)  

a. \( \text{że} = \text{m} \) ja \( \text{przeczyta-ł-a} = \text{m} \).  
that=1SG \( \text{PFV.read-L-SG.F}=1SG \)  
‘that I (have) read.’

b. \( \text{że} = \text{by-m} \) ja \( \text{prze.czyta-ł-a} = \text{by-m} \).  
that=PART-1SG \( \text{PFV.read-L-SG.F}=\text{PART-1SG} \)  
‘that I would (have) read.’

Pol  

**cf. jest-em, winien-em (≈ winien jest-em), powinien-em.**
AUX formation:

Cas1, Slk, and Pol seem to build their conditional AUX analytically:

   I AUX:1SG PFV.read-L-SG.F
   ‘I (have) read.’

b. Já by som prečíta-l-a.
   I PART 1SG PFV.read-L-SG.F
   ‘I would (have) read.’
Only **Pol** and **Cas(1)** allow infinitives in the conditional:

(BCMS, Bul, Cze, OSo, and Slk do not.)

(9) ..., że=bë mie-ć jednã klasã wëži.
    that=PART have-INF one grade more
    ‘...(in order) to have one more grade [in school].’

<http://odroda.kaszubia.com/01-07/edukacja.htm>

(10) ..., (że=)by przeczyta-ć.
    that=PART PFV.read-INF
    ‘...(in order) to read.’
## Interim summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>past/perfect</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>IIIa</th>
<th>IIIb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conditional</td>
<td>PART</td>
<td>PART</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I – Bel Rus Ukr Cas2

II – BCMS2 Slv Mac LSo

IIIa – BCMS1 Bul Cze Slk USo

IIIb – Cas1 Pol
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Questions

- Why do Bel, Rus, Ukr, Ca and Pol allow INFs (i.a.) in conditional clauses, while all other languages do not?
- What are the differences between an auxiliary verb (AUX) and an invariant PART?
- Why are multiple instances of *by* possible in Rus (East Slavic?), but not in Pol (Cas?)?
- All all PARTs the same?
- How to account for the “asymmetry languages”??
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Hypotheses

1. INF is only possible if *by* is a PART (see Garde 1964: 88) reason: PART is unselective (AUX selects LPTs);

2. AUXs are semantically vacuous and merely reflect silent functional heads. They project an AuxP above VP;

3. Pol constructs “pseudo-AUXs”: *by* is a PART in T⁰ and adjoins to enclitic personal markers in Fin⁰ (Embick 1995; Migdalski 2006; Tomaszewicz 2012);

4. East Slavic has *by* in T⁰, too. Additionally, *by* can be merged as a semantically vacuous PART adjoining to V⁰ (Zimmermann 2013: 225). While usually only one of both is overt, both may be at the same time, at least in colloquial speech (see, e.g., Xrakovskij 2009).
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Relevant functional heads

(11) $C^0$ (Fin$^0$) $T^0$ ... $V^0$

CLAUSE TYPE AGREEMENT MOOD/TENSE LEXICAL VERB

- **Fin**: interpretable, unvalued agreement features ([iϕ: _])
  - to be valued by subject NP
  - absent in impersonal clauses

- **T**: uninterpretable, valued tense feature ([uT: PAST])
  - “fake past”, yields irrealis interpretation
  - (“not in w$^0$”; see Mezhevich 2008)
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CLAUSE TYPE AGREEMENT MOOD/TENSE LEXICAL VERB
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  - to be valued by subject NP
  - absent in impersonal clauses

- **T**: uninterpretable, valued tense feature ([uT:PAST])
  - “fake past”, yields irrealis interpretation
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Reflexes of Fin⁰ and T⁰ – auxiliary verbs

Auxiliary verbs:

- have developed from former Aorist past tense forms of byti;
  - remnant: uninterpretable Past-feature ([uT:PAST])
- have preserved their ‘verbiness’ in that they:
  - project their own VP (AuxP) above VP;
  - have an articulated argument structure, due to which they
    (i) select exclusively LPTs (via [uAsp:ANTERIOR]), and
    (ii) raise the highest individual argument of the LPT;
  - are semantically vacuous (identity function);
  - are equipped with uninterpretable, valued agreement features
    (e.g., [uϕ:2sg] for Czech bys)
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Reflexes of Fin⁰ and T⁰ – auxiliary verbs

→ Subject ty ‘you’ ([uT:_,iϕ:2SG]) gets nominative case.
Reflexes of Fin\(^0\) and T\(^0\) – particle

The particle...

- has the same origin as AUXs, hence also \([uT:\textit{PAST}]\);
- has undergone grammaticalization, i.e. ...
  (i) turning into an overt functional head (Fin\(^0\));
  (ii) grammaticalization as a pseudo-suffix (only East Slavic, Cas2)
- has lost its former ‘verbiness’, thus it ...
  - lacks agreement features;
  - does not affect the argument structure of V\(^0\);
  - does not select a specific verb form in V\(^0\);
  → availability of INF (i.a.) besides LPT.
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**Polish:**
- Pol has to have PART *by* as it employs INF in *impersonal* conditional clauses, which lack agreement markers (see Tomaszewicz 2012: 265);
- On the other hand, in *personal* clauses Pol employs enclitic “past auxiliaries” (-m, -ś, ...) in l-periphrases;
- Migdalski (2006) proposes the following projections:

  (12) C (Mod) T=-ś Mood=*by* \ldots VP

  I follow his analysis, but use different labels, since -m, -ś, etc. are mere agreement markers distinct from tense/mood (T$^0$) (they become part of tense/mood-AUXs only after T$^0$ adjoins to them; see Migdalski 2006)
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Polish:

- Pol has to have PART by as it employs INF in impersonal conditional clauses, which lack agreement markers (see Tomaszewicz 2012: 265);
- On the other hand, in personal clauses Pol employs enclitic “past auxiliaries” (-m, -ś, ...) in l-periphrases;
- Migdalski (2006) proposes the following projections:

(12)  C (Mod) \[T=-ś\] Mood=by \ldots\ VP

- I follow his analysis, but use different labels, since -m, -ś, etc. are mere agreement markers distinct from tense/mood (T⁰) (they become part of tense/mood-AUXs only after T⁰ adjoins to them; see Migdalski 2006)
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Polish:

- Pol has to have PART *by* as it employs INF in **impersonal** conditional clauses, which lack agreement markers (see Tomaszewicz 2012: 265);
- On the other hand, in **personal** clauses Pol employs enclitic “past auxiliaries” (-*m*, -ś, ...) in *l*-periphrases;
- Migdalski (2006) proposes the following projections:

\[(12) \quad C \ (\text{Mod}) \ [T=-ś] \ [\text{Mood}=by] \ldots \text{VP}\]

- I follow his analysis, but use different labels, since -*m*, -ś, etc. are mere agreement markers distinct from tense/mood (*T*\(^0\)) (they become part of tense/mood-AUXs only after *T*\(^0\) adjoins to them; see Migdalski 2006)

\[(13) \quad C \ [\text{Fin}=-ś] \ [T=by] \ldots \text{VP}\]
Polish personal conditional clauses:

- Thus, we arrive at the following structure for personal clauses:

  (14)  C Fin=$by$-$ść$  T=$by$  . . .  VP

- Crucially, there can only be one instance of $by$- (see Tomaszewicz 2012: 264).
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Polish personal conditional clauses:

- Thus, we arrive at the following structure for personal clauses:

\[
(14) \quad \text{C Fin} = \text{by-ś} \quad \text{T} = \text{by} \quad \ldots \quad \text{VP}
\]

- Crucially, there can only be one instance of by- (see Tomaszewicz 2012: 264).
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Polish personal conditional clauses:

C

Fin+T

by+-ś

[uT:PAST]

[iϕ:2SG]

[uAsp:ANTERIOR]

V

[uAsp:ANTERIOR]

→ Subject ty ‘you’ ([uT:_, iϕ:2SG]) gets nominative case.
→ The LPT will adjoin to Fin+T, if the “AUX” is not supported by preceding material.
Reflexes of Fin$^0$ and T$^0$ – particle

Polish **impersonal** conditional clauses:

- not much different, but without FinP (lack of agreement; see Tomaszewicz 2012: 265):

  ![Diagram](image)

  Note 1: No selection. INF is chosen to produce an impersonal, ‘subjectless’ clause (PRO).

  Note 2: NO/TO is likely to be personal (null subject, incorporated AV było, default agreement).
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- not much different, but without FinP (lack of agreement; see Tomaszewicz 2012: 265):

Note 1: No selection. INF is chosen to produce an impersonal, ‘subjectless’ clause (PRO).
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Polish **impersonal** conditional clauses:

- not much different, but without FinP (lack of agreement; see Tomaszewicz 2012: 265):

```
C
  T
  |
  V
  |
  by
[uT:PAST]  -ć
```

Note 1: No selection. INF is chosen to produce an impersonal, ‘subjectless’ clause (PRO).

Note 2: NO/TO is likely to be personal (null subject, incorporated AV *było*, default agreement).
Reflexes of Fin⁰ and T⁰ – particle

East Slavic:

- **diachrony**: loss of present tense forms of *byti* ‘to be’;
  - → LPTs reinterpreted as finite forms (through acquisition of an underspecified person feature α; see Junghanns 1995: 8);
  - → loss of AUXs/AuxP in (former) *i*-periphrases;
  - → former AUX got reinterpreted as PART → inflection dropped (*bych* → *by*) + loss of ability to select (additional evidence: phonological reduction to *b*);
  - → *by* now perceived either as a functional element or as kind of inflection, so it can either be in T⁰ and/or attached to V⁰;
  - → Like its AUX-predecessor, suffix-like *by* on V⁰ merely reflects silent T⁰.
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East Slavic:

- **diachrony**: loss of present tense forms of *byti* ‘to be’;
  → LPTs reinterpreted as finite forms (through acquisition of an underspecified person feature α; see Junghanns 1995: 8);
  → loss of AUXs/AuxP in (former) l-periphrases;
  → former AUX got reinterpreted as PART → inflection dropped (*bych* → *by*) + loss of ability to select (additional evidence: phonological reduction to *b*);
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Reflexes of Fin⁰ and T⁰ – particle

East Slavic personal conditional clauses:

```
C
  Fin
    ∅
  [i:\_]
  {∅, by}
  [uT: _]
  V+T
    -l-i+{by, ∅}
    [uϕ:αPL]
    [uT: PAST]
```
Reflexes of Fin⁰ and T⁰ – particle

East Slavic personal conditional clauses:

```
C
  /\      /
Fin  T    V+T
  \  \    |
∅    {∅, by} -/-i+{by, ∅}
      [uT:PAST]
      [uϕ:αPL]
      [uT:PAST]
```

→ Subject, e.g. my ‘we’, ([uT:_, iϕ:1PL]) gets nominative case.
**Reflexes of Fin$^0$ and T$^0$ – particle**

East Slavic **impersonal** conditional clauses:

![Diagram of the structure of reflexes of Fin$^0$ and T$^0$]

→ No overt subject due to lack of agreement features (→ PRO).
More than one *by*

(15)  

a. Ja **by** pogulja-**l** **by** segodnja večerom.  
I **PART** take.a.walk-LPT;SG.M **PART** today evening  
‘I would like to take a walk tonight’

b. Čtoby **by** ja tebja **by** zdes’ bol’še ne videl.  
that.PART I **PART** you.ACC here more **NEG** see-LPT;SG.M  
‘So that I would not see you here again.’

**Rus** (Xrakovskij 2009: 277)

The general option of having two instances of *by* in one clause follows straightforwardly from the above analysis, which follows Zimmermann (2013).
Reflexes of $\text{Fin}^0$ and $\text{T}^0$ – “pseudo-particle”

BCMS2, Mac, Slv, LSo seem to have PART, but do not allow INF.

- PART cannot be a “real” PART!
- Proposal: What looks like a PART, is really an underspecified AUX (silent inflection);
- The relevant languages/varieties differ only superficially from (canonical) “AUX languages”:
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Essentially, we find two major classes of Slavic languages:

(i) AUX languages

(ii) PART languages

- Pol is in-between in that it exhibits features of both (“pseudo-AUX”).
- “Pseudo-particle” languages (BCMS2, LSo, Mac, Slv) are likely to be moving towards the PART system, but are still very much in the beginning (hence the striking asymmetry).

- As it seems, Garde (1964) was on the right track.
Essentially, we find two major classes of Slavic languages:

(i) AUX languages
(ii) PART languages

- Pol is in-between in that it exhibits features of both ("pseudo-AUX").
- "Pseudo-particle" languages (BCMS2, LSo, Mac, Slv) are likely to be moving towards the PART system, but are still very much in the beginning (hence the striking asymmetry).

- As it seems, Garde (1964) was on the right track.
Summary

Essentially, we find two major classes of Slavic languages:

(i) AUX languages
(ii) PART languages

- Pol is in-between in that it exhibits features of both ("pseudo-AUX").
- "Pseudo-particle" languages (BCMS2, LSo, Mac, Slv) are likely to be moving towards the PART system, but are still very much in the beginning (hence the striking asymmetry).

- As it seems, Garde (1964) was on the right track.
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Open questions

¿ Does the semantically vacuous PART *by* in Rus (East Slavic) really only attach to V⁰? Some multiple instances-examples indicate that it is unselective as to the lexical category. 
Idea: PART may attach to X⁰ ∈ {A, N, V} with V the default choice due to its referring to situations.

¿ How come that Pol and Cas have a PART?

¿ How come that Pol and Cas have, unlike East Slavic, preserved personal markers and non-finite LPTs?

¿ Are Slovak (which has *by som, by si*, etc.) and similar languages on their way to the “Polish system”?

¿ Are there more “transitory” systems like “pseudo-PART” (BCMS2, Slv, etc.)? (A candidate is South-Western Ukrainian resembling Polish; cf. Panzer 1967: 24).
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