

UDK 811.162.1*367

811.162.1*366.543

Izvorni znanstveni rad

Rukopis primljen 28. III. 2025.

Prihvaćen za tisak 10. VI. 2025.

<https://doi.org/10.31724/rihjj.51.2.10>

Anna Bondaruk

Anna Prażmowska

The John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin

Al. Raławickie 14, 20-950 Lublin, Poland

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7718-2960>

anna.bondaruk@kul.pl

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1589-4495>

anna.prazmowska@kul.pl

DEMARCATING THE SCOPE OF INTENSIONAL GENITIVE IN POLISH

Abstract

Intensional verbs display three intensionality effects in their complement, namely the availability of nonspecific readings, the failure of extensional substitution and the lack of existential import. In some Balto-Slavic languages, including Polish, intensional verbs may take complements marked for genitive case, which is referred to as “intensional genitive”. The distribution and properties of Polish intensional genitive are largely understudied, especially in comparison to the genitive of negation and partitive genitive. In a response to this research gap, the aim of this paper is to establish the scope of intensional genitive in Polish by verifying which Polish verbs co-occurring with genitive complements exhibit the three intensionality effects. The study consists primarily in subjecting Polish verbs with genitive complements to three intensionality tests under the premise that only verbs that satisfy all the three intensionality diagnostics can be classified as intensional. The results of the tests indicate that there are 49 intensional verbs with genitive complements in Polish, which belong to four semantic classes: verbs of desire and volition, verbs of expectation and presumption, verbs of search and verbs of absence.

1. Introduction

The earliest insights into the phenomenon of intensionality are commonly credited to Frege (1892), who made a distinction between the concepts of “reference” and “sense”, observing that co-referential terms cannot be substituted for one another without altering the truth value of the statement when they express the ‘sense’ of the terms, viz., in intensional contexts (as opposed to extensional contexts, where this substitution is possible). This paved the way for further studies into such intensionality contexts, including research on the distinctive properties of intensionality and intensional verbs (e.g., Quine 1956, 1960; Montague 1973; Partee 1974; Zimmermann 1993, 2001; Moltmann 1997, 2008, 2013, 2020; Forbes and Saul 2002; Larson 2002; Forbes 2006, 2020; Hinzen, Sheehan and Reichard 2014; den Dikken, Larson and Ludlow 2018; Schwarz 2021).

Crosslinguistically, intensional verbs (also referred to in the literature as “intensional transitive verbs”) belong to different semantic classes, including verbs of search, absence, desire, expectation or depiction (see Schwarz 2021). They are considered to share the following three properties, treated as diagnostic of intensionality: (i) the availability of nonspecific readings, (ii) the failure of truth preservation under extensional substitution, and (iii) the lack of existential import. The first property, viz., the availability of nonspecific readings, determines that the complements of intensional verbs may be interpreted as nonspecific, as in *John is looking for a horse*, where the complement may be interpreted as ‘any horse’ (as opposed to the sentence *John found a horse*, where the complement is necessarily interpreted as ‘a specific horse’). The second property, viz., failure of extensional substitution, blocks the replacement of complements of intensional verbs by their co-referential terms without changing the truth value of the statement (Frege 1892). For instance, the sentence *John is looking for Superman* does not necessarily mean the same as *John is looking for Clark Kent* since John may not be aware that Clark Kent is Superman (viz., he is intentionally looking for Superman, not for Clark Kent). In contrast, the sentence *John found Superman* necessarily implies that he found Clark Kent as well (even though he may not know that this is the same person). The third property, viz., lack of existential import, specifies that intensional verbs may co-occur with complements whose referents do not actually exist, without affecting the truth value of the sentence.

For example, the sentence *John is looking for a unicorn* may be true, regardless of whether unicorns exist or not. By contrast, the sentence *John found a unicorn* cannot be factually accurate in a reality where unicorns do not exist.

In a number of Balto-Slavic languages, including Russian, Ukrainian, Lithuanian, Latvian, Slovenian and Polish, verbs that display the intensionality properties outlined above may take complements marked for genitive case, which is referred to as “intensional genitive” (e.g., Neidle 1988; Partee et al. 2012; Kagan 2013; Šereikaitė 2020; Sigurðsson and Šereikaitė 2024). Although the genitive of negation and partitive genitive in Polish have been extensively studied (see, e.g., Franks 1995; Przepiórkowski 2000; Witkoś 2020), the distribution and syntactic properties of Polish intensional genitive have not received much attention so far. Therefore, the overarching aim of this paper is to fill this research gap for Polish by demarcating the scope of intensional genitive in Polish as a preliminary but necessary step before embarking on a syntactic analysis of this phenomenon. Specifically, the purpose of this study is to examine which Polish verbs with genitive complements display intensionality properties and to eventually establish a comprehensive inventory of Polish intensional verbs co-occurring with genitive complements, which can serve as a launch pad for a syntactic analysis of intensional genitive in Polish.¹ In Section 2, we outline the procedure adopted to extract, screen and verify the properties of the verbs analysed in this study. Section 3 illustrates the application and discusses the results of the traditional intensionality tests, outlined in the preceding paragraph, with the aim of identifying Polish intensional verbs with genitive complements. In section 4, we provide the inventory of these verbs and their division into semantic classes. Section 5 concludes the paper.

2. Data collection and verification

The data analysed in this study was extracted from *Walenty: A Valence Dictionary of Polish* (Przepiórkowski et al. 2017), using the plain text version to obtain the largest possible set of Polish verbs that combine with nominal phrases

¹ We do not attempt to identify all intensional verbs in Polish, but to determine the scope of intensional genitive, viz., to verify which Polish verbs that co-occur with genitive complements are intensional.

marked for genitive case. The dictionary contains 18,240 entries in total, 13,025 of which are verbs. Each verb entry is composed of a list of subcategorisation frames representing the verb's valence as a set of syntactic positions occupied by precisely identified types of phrases. The data set that we initially extracted for further analysis consisted of all frames for verbs containing the tag “np(gen)”, i.e., all instances of verbs with at least one noun in the frame(s) marked for genitive case.² As a result, we obtained 3,702 frames (found in 1,638 verbal entries) in which at least one nominal phrase is marked for genitive case. These frames were then carefully screened to eliminate those where the genitive nominal is not a complement of the verb. Consequently, we identified 1,462 frames for verbs with complements marked for genitive in 653 verbal entries. In sum, at this stage of data collection, we identified 653 Polish verbs co-occurring with genitive complements, which constituted the basis for our further analysis.

The next stage involved identification of verbs that can be classified as intensional based on the three traditional diagnostics, viz. properties of intensional verbs: (i) availability of nonspecific readings, (ii) failure of extensional substitution and (iii) lack of existential import (the terms from Schwarz 2021: 5–7; cf. Section 1). We applied these intensionality tests to the set of 653 verbs taking genitive complements, with the assumption that only verbs that display all three intensionality diagnostics may be classified as intensional. In consequence, the tests yielded four groups of verbs with different properties: a) intensional verbs that satisfy all three traditional diagnostics, b) verbs that do not satisfy any diagnostic (henceforth referred to as non-intensional), c) telic verbs that fail only one diagnostic, viz. lack of existential import, and d) *fear*-type and negative-emotion verbs that satisfy only one diagnostic, viz. failure of extensional substitution. In the subsequent section, we present the application of each of the three traditional intensionality tests and discuss their results to determine the inventory of Polish intensional verbs with genitive complements, which delineates the scope of intensional genitive in Polish.

² This set excludes nominal phrases marked for either partitive genitive or genitive of negation as the tags used in *Walenty* for these two cases are “np(part)” and “np(str)”, respectively.

3. Intensionality tests

This section presents and discusses the results of the intensionality tests applied to 653 Polish verbs with genitive complements in order to identify verbs that satisfy all of them and can hence be classified as intensional. The three traditional intensionality diagnostics, viz., (i) availability of nonspecific readings, (ii) failure of extensional substitution and (iii) lack of existential import, have already been outlined in Section 1 and are elaborated on in Sections 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3, respectively. Due to space limitations, each of the tests presented and discussed below involves only selected representatives of intensional verbs, viz., verbs that turned out to pass all three tests, as well as two representatives of verbs that pass only one test, and one other non-intensional verb with a genitive complement as a representative of verbs that fail all three tests.

3.1. Availability of nonspecific readings

One of the core properties of intensional verbs is that they can co-occur with complements that can be interpreted as having nonspecific referents. In other words, this property of intensional verbs indicates that their complements may denote a more or less specified entity, rather than only a specific entity. To determine which of the Polish verbs under our scrutiny satisfy this intensionality diagnostic, we needed to check which of them can take such complements and produce this intensionality effect. The application of this test to Polish verbs that take genitive complements is presented in (1),³ where the nonspecific reading of the complement ‘new assistant’ is indicated by the phrase ‘but no particular one’. Only verbs that allow such a nonspecific reading of their complements can satisfy this diagnostic, which is illustrated in (1a) with four verbs eventually classified as intensional (see Section 4): *chcieć* ‘to want’, *potrzebować* ‘to need’, *szukać* ‘to search’ and *oczekiwać* ‘to expect, to await’. These verbs are contrasted with other verbs with genitive complements that are immune to this intensionality effect – the sentence in (1b) contains a *fear*-type verb *bać się* ‘to fear, to be afraid’ and a negative-emotion verb *nienawidzić* ‘to hate’, and the sentence in (1c) contains a non-intensional verb *czepiać się* ‘to pick on’.

- (1) a. *Nasz prezes chce /potrzebuje /szuka /oczekuje nowej asystentki,*
 our CEO wants needs looks-for expects new assistant.GEN
ale nie jakiejś konkretnej.
 but not any specific
 ‘Our CEO wants/needs/looks for/expects a new assistant, but no particular one.’
- b. **Nasz prezes boi się /nienawidzi nowej asystentki, ale nie*
 our CEO fears REFL hates new assistant.GEN but not
jakiejś konkretnej.
 any specific
 ‘Our CEO fears/hates a new assistant, but no particular one.’
- c. **Nasz prezes czepia się nowej asystentki, ale nie jakiejś konkretnej.*
 our CEO picks-on REFL new assistant.GEN but not any specific
 ‘Our CEO picks on a new assistant, but no particular one.’

(1a) with intensional verbs is the only sentence in (1) with a consistently nonspecific interpretation of the complement, in that ‘a new assistant’ can only be interpreted as nonspecific (yet generally specified) person, viz., any woman who can be hired for this position. In contrast, the same complement in (1b) and (1c) cannot be interpreted as having a nonspecific reading, because the CEO can only fear, hate (in (1b)) or pick on (in (1c)) the specific person that he knows to be the new assistant, which directly contradicts the meaning of the phrase ‘but no particular one’. Consequently, we consider only verbs that yield a consistently nonspecific interpretation of the complement in contexts similar to (1a) to have this intensionality property. The application of this test revealed that 56 of the 653 verbs analysed satisfy this intensionality diagnostic, which makes them viable candidates for intensional verbs at this stage of the investigation.

3.2. Failure of extensional substitution

Another common property of intensional verbs is that their complements cannot be replaced by co-referential terms without affecting the truth value of the statement. In essence, substituting the complement of an intensional verb with another term or phrase that denotes the same entity will result in a statement with a different truth value or meaning. This implies that only intensional verbs are expected to affect the truth value of a sentence when the referent of the complement remains the same but is referred by another term. The application of this

test is illustrated in (2), where the co-referential terms used are ‘Superman’ and ‘Clark Kent’.

- (2) a. *Lois Lane chce /potrzebuje /szuka /oczekuje Supermana.*
 Lois Lane wants needs looks-for expects Superman.GEN
 ≠ *Lois Lane chce /potrzebuje /szuka /oczekuje Clarka Kenta.*
 Lois Lane wants needs looks-for expects Clark.GEN Kent.GEN
 ‘Lois Lane wants/needs/looks for/expects Superman ≠ Clark Kent.’
- b. *Lois Lane chwyciła się Supermana.*
 Lois Lane grabbed REFL Superman.GEN
 = *Lois Lane chwyciła się Clarka Kenta.*
 Lois Lane grabbed REFL Clark.GEN Kent.GEN
 ‘Lois Lane grabbed Superman = Clark Kent.’

The complement ‘Superman’ cannot be replaced with ‘Clark Kent’ without affecting the truth value of the statements in (2a), because Lois can want, need, look for or expect Superman without wanting, needing, looking for or expecting Clark Kent. Conversely, replacing ‘Superman’ with ‘Clark Kent’ as the complement of the non-intensional verb *chwycić się* ‘to grab’ in (2b) does not affect the truth value of the statement, because while grabbing Superman, Lois at the same time grabs Clark Kent, whether she knows that they are the same person or not. This demonstrates that the verbs in (2a) satisfy this intensionality diagnostic, which is not the case for the verb *chwycić się* ‘to grab’ in (2b).

Interestingly, there are some Polish verbs that pass this test despite failing the other two intensionality tests (see Sections 3.1 and 3.3). These verbs seem to fall into two semantic classes: *fear*-type verbs (e.g., *bać się* ‘to fear, to be afraid’, *obawiać się* ‘to fear, to be worried/concerned about’, *przestraszyć się* ‘to get scared’) and negative-emotion verbs (e.g., *brzydzić się* ‘to feel disgusted’, *nienawidzić* ‘to hate’, *wstydzić się* ‘to be ashamed, to feel embarrassed’). Both of these groups of verbs behave in the same manner with respect to the second intensionality test, as in (3) below.

- (3) a. *Lois Lane boi się Supermana.*
 Lois Lane fears REFL Superman.GEN
 ≠ *Lois Lane boi się Clarka Kenta.*
 Lois Lane fears REFL Clark.GEN Kent.GEN
 ‘Lois Lane fears Superman ≠ Clark Kent.’

b.	<i>Lois Lane</i>	<i>nienawidzi</i>	<i>Supermana.</i>	
	Lois Lane	hates	Superman.GEN	
≠	<i>Lois Lane</i>	<i>nienawidzi</i>	<i>Clarka</i>	<i>Kenta.</i>
	Lois Lane	hates	Clark.GEN	Kent.GEN

‘Lois Lane hates Superman ≠ Clark Kent.’

In (3a), substituting ‘Clark Kent’ for ‘Superman’ changes the truth value (or at least the meaning) of the statement, in that Lois being afraid of Superman does not imply that she fears Clark Kent as well. Similarly, the statement that Lois hates Superman is not equivalent to the statement that Lois hates Clark Kent, as indicated in (3b). The results of this test for *fear*-type and negative-emotion verbs are then the same as for intensional verbs since all three groups were found to block such extensional substitution.

The application of the second test revealed that 98 of the 653 verbs with genitive complements satisfy this intensionality diagnostic, including 31 *fear*-type verbs and 11 negative-emotion verbs, which fail the first test. The 56 verbs that passed the first test turned out to pass the second test as well, which strengthens their candidacy for intensional verbs at this stage of the verification process.

3.3. Lack of existential import

The third traditional intensionality diagnostic relies on the ability of intensional verbs to take complements that refer to non-existent entities without affecting the truth value of the statement. In other words, intensional verbs can co-occur with complements denoting entities that do not exist in a given reality and still produce true statements. This property is illustrated in (4a) using verbs which we will eventually deem as intensional (cf. Section 4) and the idiomatic noun phrase *gwiazdka z nieba* ‘lit. a little star from the sky’, which refers to something that cannot be realistically obtained.

- (4) a. *Maria chce /potrzebuje /szuka /oczekuje gwiazdki z nieba.*
 Maria wants needs looks-for expects star.GEN from sky
 ‘Maria wants/needs/looks for/expects something unattainable.’
- b. **Maria boi się /nienawidzi jednoroźca.*
 Maria fears REFL hates unicorn.GEN
 ‘Maria fears/hates a unicorn.’
- c. **Maria poradziła się syreny.*
 Maria consulted REFL mermaid.GEN
 ‘Maria asked a mermaid for advice.’

(4a) can be considered as true or factually accurate, because it is possible to want, need, look for or expect something that does not actually exist or cannot be realistically obtained. In contrast, it is not possible to seek advice from a non-existent entity, which is why the statement in (4c), with the non-intensional verb *poradzić się* ‘to ask for advice’, cannot be considered true or factually accurate (under the assumption that mermaids do not exist). As far as *fear*-type and negative-emotion verbs are concerned, although it is conceptually possible to fear or hate something that does not exist, such a reading is available in Polish only with generic plurals. Consequently, the singular *jednorożec* ‘unicorn’, which is the complement of the verbs *bać się* ‘to fear’ and *nienawidzić* ‘to hate’ in (4b), can only be interpreted as a particular unicorn, not any unicorn or all unicorns in general. In sum, the intensional verbs in (4a) satisfy this diagnostic, whereas the *fear*-type and negative-emotion verbs in (4b) and the non-intensional verb in (4c) fail the test.

It should be noted that this diagnostic is problematic for certain perfective forms of some verbs that satisfy the other two tests and whose imperfective forms successfully pass this test as well, cf. the contrasts in (5) and in (6) below.

- (5) a. *Dostuchiwał się w tych odgłosach ryku centaurów.* INTENSIONAL
 listened-for.IMPV REFL in these sounds roar.GEN centaurs
 ‘He listened for the roar of centaurs in these sounds.’ (= he was trying to hear them)
- b. *Dostuchał się w tych odgłosach ryku centaurów.* ONLY EXTENSIONAL
 heard.PFV REFL in these sounds roar.GEN centaurs
 ‘He heard the roar of centaurs in these sounds.’ (= he managed to hear them)

The interpretation of (5a), with the imperfective verb *dosluchiwać się* ‘to listen for’, is that someone is listening for the sound of centaurs roaring, which is possible to do whether these creatures exist or not. Under this interpretation, it satisfies this diagnostic. In contrast, the only interpretation of (5b), with the perfective verb *dosluchać się* ‘to manage to hear’, is that someone has actually managed to hear the centaurs roaring, which is not possible under the assumption that centaurs do not exist. Consequently, the perfective *dosluchać się* ‘to manage to hear’ does not pass this test because by taking a complement with a non-existent referent it produces a false or factually incorrect statement. The other six perfective verbs that behave in the same manner as *dosluchać się* ‘to manage to hear’, in that they pass the first two tests but fail the third one, are *doczekać się* ‘to finally get’, *dopatrzyć się/dopatrzyć się* ‘to discern, to catch sight of’, *doprosić się* ‘to finally get (after repeated asking)’, *doszukać się* ‘to manage to find’ and *wyczekać* ‘to finally get (after waiting for a long time)’. Note that all of them are inherently telic and their meaning entails some accomplishment (as opposed to their imperfective forms that are atelic). This clashes with the very premise of the third intensionality diagnostic which relies on a complement whose referent does not exist and, therefore, cannot be part of any accomplishment expressed by such verbs.

Interestingly, there is also a group of perfective verbs, such as *dopomnieć się* ‘to request insistently’, *zapragnąć* ‘to suddenly desire’ or *zażądać* ‘to demand strongly’, that pass this and the other two intensionality tests, as in (6):

- (6) a. *Nasz prezes dopomniął się /zapragnął /zażądał nowej asystentki,*
 our CEO requested.PFV REFL desired.PFV demanded.PFV new assistant.GEN
ale nie jakiegó konkretnej.
 but not any specific
 ‘Our CEO insistently requested / suddenly desired / strongly demanded a new assistant, but no particular one.’
- b. *Lois Lane dopomniwała się /zapragnęła /zażądała Supermana.*
 Lois Lane requested.PFV REFL desired.PFV demanded.PFV Superman.GEN
 ≠ *Lois Lane dopomniwała się /zapragnęła /zażądała Clarka Kenta.*
 Lois Lane requested.PFV REFL desired.PFV demanded.PFV Clark.GEN Kent.GEN
 ‘Lois Lane insistently requested / suddenly desired / strongly demanded Superman ≠ Clark Kent.’
- c. *Maria dopomniwała się /zapragnęła /zażądała gwiazdki z nieba.*
 Maria requested.PFV REFL desired.PFV demanded.PFV star.GEN from sky
 ‘Maria insistently requested / suddenly desired / strongly demanded something unattainable.’

(6a) shows that these three verbs can take a genitive complement with a non-specific interpretation. (6b) demonstrates that their complements cannot be replaced by co-referential terms without changing the truth value of the statement. Moreover, these three perfective verbs can co-occur with a complement whose referent is a non-existent entity and still produce a factually accurate statement, as in (6c). In short, these perfective verbs behave like other verbs that pass all the three traditional intensionality tests, including their imperfective counterparts (viz. *dopominać się* ‘to request insistently and repeatedly’, *pragnąć* ‘to desire’ and *żądać* ‘to demand strongly’), which justifies their treatment as intensional verbs. They differ from the perfective verbs that fail the third test (cf. (5b)) in that they are atelic and do not convey any notion of accomplishment, but rather express a single-time action (viz. the semelfactive aspect). In other words, the perfective forms of these verbs are used to refer to a single occurrence of the atelic action expressed by their imperfective equivalents. The lack of the notion of accomplishment in their meaning seems to be the reason why they can be used with complements whose referents do not exist; for instance, one can desire a unicorn either continuously for an extended time (which corresponds to the imperfective *pragnąć* ‘to desire’) or just momentarily on a whim (which corresponds to the perfective *zapagnąć* ‘to suddenly desire’), even if unicorns do not exist in a given reality.

A number of the Polish verbs with genitive complements identified as intensional based on the results of the three traditional tests are atelic and mono-aspectual, in that they only have imperfective forms (e.g., *domagać się* ‘to demand, to insist on’, *łaknąć* ‘to desire, to crave’, *oczekiwać* ‘to expect, to await’, *pożądać* ‘to desire’, *spodziewać się* ‘to expect, to anticipate’). Some intensional verbs, such as *szukać* ‘to search for’, have perfective forms that behave differently with respect to the intensionality tests. For instance, the perfective form *doszukać się* ‘to manage to find’ is telic, assigns genitive case to its complement and passes the first two tests, but it fails the third test because it cannot co-occur with a complement whose referent does not exist (cf. (5b)). Another perfective form *poszukać* ‘to search for briefly’ is atelic, also assigns genitive case to its complement and passes all three tests, suggesting that it is an intensional verb. Yet another perfective form *wyszukać* ‘to search out, to find’, which assigns accusative case to its complement, is telic and fails all three tests, allowing for an extensional reading only. The emerging pattern seems to relate the intensional

status of perfective verbs to atelicity. In other words, the opposition intensional vs. non-intensional corresponds to the opposition atelic vs. telic, rather than to the opposition imperfective vs. perfective.

Piccini (2015), who analyses parameters affecting the genitive marking of the object in Lithuanian, observes that all intensional verbs are atelic. This appears to be true for Polish as well; that is, all Polish verbs with genitive complements that pass all the three intensionality tests are atelic (even though some of them are perfective), and those that fail the third test are telic. However, atelicity is not a distinctive feature of intensional verbs. As noted by Piccini (2015), not every atelic verb that assigns genitive case is intensional. She cites the Lithuanian verb *klausyti* ‘to listen’ as an example of a genitive-assigning atelic verb which is nevertheless not considered as intensional because it can only co-occur with complements whose referents are both existing and specific (Piccini 2015: 189). The corresponding Polish verb *stuchać* ‘to listen’ has the same properties; in particular, it is atelic and assigns genitive case but it does not satisfy any of the three intensionality diagnostics. Therefore, although atelicity is a common feature of all intensional verbs, it is not diagnostic of intensionality as not every genitive-assigning atelic verb allows for an intensional reading of the complement.

To sum up, most of the verbs that were found to satisfy the first two diagnostics pass this test as well. The only exceptions are seven perfective verbs that are telic and thus imply the existence of the referents of their complements, which is the reason why they fail the third test despite passing the first two. This test has also revealed atelicity as a common feature of intensional verbs. The final outcome of the three traditional intensionality tests and the resultant inventory of Polish intensional verbs with genitive complements are provided in Section 4.³

³ The three traditional intensionality diagnostics discussed in this section have been supplemented by Moltmann (1997: 6–8) with three additional tests, namely lack of anaphora support (complements of intensional verbs cannot be referred to using their corresponding pronouns), availability of impersonal proforms (complements of intensional verbs seem to allow only impersonal proforms, e.g., ‘something’ rather than ‘someone’) and identity conditions (shared complements of intensional verbs cannot be used to refer to the same entity but to a more or less generally specified entity type). However, the properties that the additional tests verify seem to stem, to a considerable extent, from the fact that intensional verbs can take complements with nonspecific readings. For instance, when pronominal anaphors or personal proforms are used to refer back to complements of intensional verbs, the result is an extensional reading only, since their use appears to force a specific reading of the complement. Moreover, Schwarz (2021: 7) mentions that Moltmann’s (1997) tests are problematic, because native speakers’ judgements vary when confronted with

4. Polish intensional verbs with genitive complements and their semantic classification

The results of the three traditional intensionality tests presented and discussed in Section 3 allow us to determine the inventory of Polish intensional verbs with genitive complements. Specifically, building on the premise that, in order to be classified as intensional, a verb must be proven to display all the three traditional intensionality diagnostics, viz. availability of nonspecific readings, failure of extensional substitution and lack of existential import, we have identified 49 intensional verbs with genitive complements in Polish (listed in (7) below). Since these are the only Polish intensional verbs co-occurring with genitive complements, they delineate the scope of intensional genitive in Polish.

There is a number of semantic classes of intensional verbs proposed and analysed in the literature (see, e.g., Moltmann 1997, 2008, 2013; Larson 2002; Forbes 2006, 2020; see also Schwarz 2021: 8–12 for an overview). These classifications often feature comparable classes with similar labels, such as verbs of search (e.g., *to look for*), absence (e.g., *to lack*), desire (e.g., *to want*), creation/depiction/representation (e.g., *to draw*), or possession/transaction (e.g., *to owe*). However, the proposed inventories of these classes tend to differ. For instance, the verb *to need* is classified as a (modal) verb of absence by Moltmann (1997), Larson (2002) categorises it as a verb of desire and volition, whereas Forbes (2006) treats it as a verb of requirement. After analysing the meaning of the Polish verbs with genitive complements identified herein as intensional, we propose to categorise them into the following four semantic classes: verbs of desire and volition, verbs of expectation and presumption, verbs of search and verbs of absence (the labels taken from Schwarz 2021, after Larson 2002 and others), as shown in (7).⁴

English sentences illustrating the availability of impersonal proforms. He also takes the lack of anaphora support to be correlated with the availability of nonspecific readings. Therefore, Moltmann's (1997) additional criteria of intensionality have not been included in this paper as presumably redundant diagnostics since they do not seem to point to any truly independent properties or behaviour of intensional verbs.

⁴ The four semantic classes in (7) fully encompass all 49 verbs identified in this study as intensional, in that there do not seem to be any intensional verbs with genitive complements in Polish that belong to any other semantic classes proposed in the literature. However, since the data analysed here is limited to verbs that co-occur with genitive complements, verbs such as *rysować* 'to draw' (which could be classified as a verb of creation/depiction/representation) that potentially satisfy all intensionality diagnostics but assign accusative case are outside the scope of this study.

(7) Polish intensional verbs with genitive complements categorised into four semantic classes:

a. verbs of desire and volition:

chcieć (IMPFV) ‘to want’

chcieć się (IMPFV) ‘to feel like (having/doing sth)’

łaknąć (IMPFV) ‘to desire, to crave’

odechcieć się (PFV) ‘to stop wanting’

odechciewać się (IMPFV) ‘to stop wanting’

pożądać (IMPFV) ‘to desire’

pragnąć (IMPFV) ‘to desire, to long for’

zachcieć (PFV) ‘to suddenly want’

zachcieć się (PFV) ‘to suddenly feel like (having/doing sth)’

zachciewać się (IMPFV) ‘to intermittently feel like (having/doing sth)’

zapragnąć (PFV) ‘to suddenly desire’

zażyczyć (sobie) (PFV) ‘to firmly request for oneself’

zechcieć (PFV) ‘to deign to want’

życzyć (IMPFV) ‘to wish’

b. verbs of expectation and presumption:

czekać (IMPFV) ‘to wait for, to expect’

oczekiwać (IMPFV) ‘to expect, to await’

spodziewać się (IMPFV) ‘to expect, to anticipate’

wyczekać się (PFV) ‘to have waited for a long time’

wyczekiwać (IMPFV) ‘to eagerly await’

wyglądać (IMPFV) ‘to await in anticipation’

wypatrywać (IMPFV) ‘to await in anticipation’

c. verbs of search:

dopatrywać się (IMPFV) ‘to try to discern (with one’s eyes)’

dosłuchiwać się (IMPFV) ‘to listen for, to try to hear’

doszukiwać się (IMPFV) ‘to search for, to try to find’

naszukać się (PFV) ‘to search a lot’

patrzeć (IMPFV) ‘to search for’ (archaic)
patrzyć (IMPFV) ‘to search for’ (archaic, rare)
poszukać (PFV) ‘to search for briefly’
poszukiwać (IMPFV) ‘to search for, to seek’
szukać (IMPFV) ‘to search for’
upatrywać (IMPFV) ‘to search for, to look out for’

d. verbs of absence:

*brak*⁵ ‘to lack’
braknąć (IMPFV) ‘to lack’
brakować (IMPFV) ‘to lack’
domagać się (IMPFV) ‘to demand, to insist on’
dopominać się (IMPFV) ‘to demand, to request insistently’
dopomnieć się (PFV) ‘to demand, to request insistently’
dopraszać się (IMPFV) ‘to plead for, to request persistently’
potrzeba ‘to need’
potrzebować (IMPFV) ‘to need’
trza ‘to need’ (colloquial)
trzeba ‘to need’
wołać (IMPFV) ‘to demand, to request vehemently’
wymagać (IMPFV) ‘to require, to demand’
zabraknąć (PFV) ‘to lack’
zażądać (PFV) ‘to demand strongly’
zbraknąć (PFV) ‘to lack’ (dated)
żądać (IMPFV) ‘to demand’
żebrać (IMPFV) ‘to desperately request, to beg’

The meaning of intensional verbs determines their membership in the semantic classes proposed in the literature, including the classification in (7). Since

⁵ The items *brak* ‘to lack’, *potrzeba* ‘to need’ and *trza/trzeba* ‘to need’ in (7d) are nouns that can function as verbs (cf. Bondaruk and Szymanek 2007). Since they behave like the other verbs with respect to the intensionality diagnostics, we treat them here as intensional verbs.

these classes tend to be only generally differentiated, rather than precisely delimited, the inclusion of individual verbs in any particular class can potentially be debated. For instance, the Polish verbs *domagać się* ‘to demand’ and *żądać* ‘to demand’ are used to say that someone demands something because they do not have it and they want it, which might suggest that they are either verbs of absence or verbs of desire. Nevertheless, at least as far as Polish intensional verbs with genitive complements are concerned, their membership in particular semantic classes does not affect their behaviour with respect to the intensionality diagnostics, in that the tests of all the 49 verbs in the four semantic classes in (7) produce the same results. Therefore, their classification into semantic classes can be considered of secondary relevance in relation to their identification as intensional verbs, although it contributes to a more comprehensive representation of the scope of intensional genitive in Polish.

5. Conclusions

The aim of the study was to determine the scope of intensional genitive in Polish by investigating which Polish verbs that co-occur with genitive complements can be identified as intensional. To this end, we have analysed 653 verbs with genitive complements and found that 49 of them (listed in (7)) display all the three properties of intensional verbs, i.e., their complements can refer to non-specific or nonexistent entities and cannot be replaced by co-referential terms without affecting the truth value of the statement. They belong to four semantic classes, namely verbs of desire and volition, verbs of expectation and presumption, verbs of search and verbs of absence. In addition, the intensionality tests have revealed that Polish *fear*-type verbs and negative-emotion verbs are not intensional, and that atelicity is a common feature of intensional verbs, thus excluding telic verbs from the inventory of Polish intensional verbs. Therefore, since the 49 verbs identified in this study as intensional are the only Polish verbs with genitive complements that satisfy all the three intensionality diagnostics, we conclude that they delineate the scope of intensional genitive in Polish.

References

- BONDARUK, ANNA; SZYMANEK, BOGDAN. 2007. Polish nominativeless constructions with dative Experiencers: Form, meaning and structure. *Studies in Polish Linguistics* 4. 61–99.
- DEN DIKKEN, MARCEL; LARSON, RICHARD; LUDLOW, PETER. 2018. Intensional transitive verbs and abstract clausal complementation. *Non-propositional intentionality*. Eds. Grzankowski, Alex; Montague, Michelle. Oxford University Press. Oxford. 46–94. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198732570.003.0003>.
- FORBES, GRAEME. 2006. *Attitude problems*. Oxford University Press. Oxford. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199274949.001.0001>.
- FORBES, GRAEME. 2020. Intensional transitive verbs. *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Winter 2020 Edition). Ed. Zalta, Edward N. <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2020/entries/intensional-trans-verbs> (Accessed 6 March 2025).
- FORBES, GRAEME; SAUL, JENNIFER. 2002. Intensionality. *Aristotelian Society Supplementary Volume* 76. 75–119.
- FRANKS, STEVEN. 1995. *Parameters of Slavic morphosyntax*. Oxford University Press. New York – Oxford. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780195089707.001.0001>.
- FREGE, GOTTLÖB. 1892/1966. On sense and reference. *Translations from the philosophical writings of Gottlob Frege*. Eds. Geach, Peter; Black, Max. Blackwell. Oxford. 56–78.
- HINZEN, WOLFRAM; SHEEHAN, MICHELLE; REICHARD, ULRICH. 2014. Intensionality, grammar and the sententialist hypothesis. *Minimalism and beyond: Radicalizing the interfaces*. Eds. Kosta, Peter; Franks, Steven L.; Radeva-Bork, Teodora; Schrücks, Lilia. John Benjamins. Amsterdam. 315–349.
- KAGAN, OLGA. 2013. *Semantics of genitive objects in Russian. A study of genitive of negation and intensional genitive case*. Springer. Dordrecht. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-5225-2>.
- LARSON, RICHARD K. 2002. The grammar of intensionality. *Logical form and language*. Eds. Preyer, Gerhard; Peter, Georg. Clarendon Press. Oxford. 228–262. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780199244607.003.0009>.
- MOLTMANN, FREDERIKE. 1997. Intensional verbs and quantifiers. *Natural Language Semantics* 5(1). 1–52. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1008245409172>.
- MOLTMANN, FREDERIKE. 2008. Intensional verbs and their intentional objects. *Natural Language Semantics* 16(3). 239–270. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11050-008-9031-5>.
- MOLTMANN, FRIEDERIKE. 2013. *Abstract objects and the semantics of natural language*. Oxford University Press. Oxford. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199608744.001.0001>.

MOLTMANN, FRIEDERIKE. 2020. Truthmaker semantics for natural language: Attitude verbs, modals, and intensional transitive verbs. *Theoretical Linguistics* 46(3–4). 159–200. <https://doi.org/10.1515/tl-2020-0010>.

MONTAGUE, RICHARD. 1973. The proper treatment of quantification in ordinary English. *Approaches to natural language*. Eds. Suppes, Patrick; Moravcsik, Julius; Hintikka, Jaakko. Reidel. Dordrecht. 221–242.

NEIDLE, CAROL. 1988. *The role of case in Russian syntax*. Kluwer Academic Publishers. Dordrecht.

PARTEE, BARBARA H. 1974. Opacity and Scope. *Semantics and philosophy*. Eds. Munitz, Milton Karl; Unger, Peter K. New York University Press. New York. 81–101.

PARTEE, BARBARA H.; BORŠČEV, VLADIMIR; PADUČEVA, ELENA; TESTELETS, JAKOV; YANOVIČ, IGOR. 2012. The role of verb semantics in genitive alternations: Genitive of negation and genitive of intensionality. *Oslo Studies in Language* 4(1). 1–29. <https://doi.org/10.5617/osl.229>.

PICCINI, SILVIA. 2015. Low transitivity in Modern and Old Lithuanian: Parameters affecting genitive marking of the object. *Contributions to morphology and syntax. Proceedings of the 4th Greifswald University Conference on Baltic Languages*. Eds. Judžentis, Artūras; Kessler, Stephan. Logos Verlag. Berlin. 179–199.

PRZEPIÓRKOWSKI, ADAM. 2000. Long distance genitive of negation in Polish. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 8. 119–158.

PRZEPIÓRKOWSKI, ADAM; HAJNICZ, ELŻBIETA; ANDRZEJCZUK, ANNA; PATEJUK, AGNIESZKA; WOLIŃSKI, MARCIN. 2017. Walenty: gruntowny składniowo-semantyczny słownik walencyjny języka polskiego. *Język Polski* 97(1). 30–47. <https://doi.org/10.31286/JP.97.1.4>.

QUINE, WILLARD VAN ORMAN. 1956. Quantifiers and propositional attitudes. *Journal of Philosophy* 53(5). 177–187. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2022451>.

QUINE, WILLARD VAN ORMAN. 1960. *Word and object*. MIT Press. Cambridge, MA.

Sigurðsson, Einar Freyr; Šereikaitė, Milena. 2024. The dual face of structural object case: On Lithuanian genitive of negation. *Journal of Linguistics* 60(1). 161–212. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022226723000130>.

SCHWARZ, FLORIAN. 2021. Intensional transitive verbs: I owe you a horse. *The Wiley Blackwell companion to semantics*. Eds. Gutzmann, Denial; Matthewson, Lisa; Meier, Cécile; Rullmann, Hotze; Zimmermann, Thomas Ede. Wiley-Blackwell. Oxford. 1–33. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118788516.sem113>.

ŠEREIKAITĖ, MILENA. 2020. *Voice and case phenomena in Lithuanian morphosyntax*. Dissertation. The University of Pennsylvania.

WITKOŚ, JACEK. 2020. Genitive of negation (GoN) in Polish possessive and locative existential sentences: A testing tool for case overwriting, case projections and derivatio-

nal phases. *Approaches to predicative possession*. Eds. Dalmi, Gréte; Witkoś, Jacek; Ceglowski, Piotr. Bloomsbury. London. 11–40. <https://doi.org/10.5040/9781350062498.ch-002>.

ZIMMERMANN, THOMAS EDE. 1993. On the proper treatment of opacity in certain verbs. *Natural Language Semantics* 1. 149–179. <https://doi.org/10.1007/bf00372561>.

ZIMMERMANN, THOMAS EDE. 2001. Unspecificity and intensionality. *Audiatur vox sapientiae*. Eds. Féry, Caroline; Sternefeld, Wolfgang. Akademie. Berlin. 514–532. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783050080116.514>.

Određivanje dosega intencijskoga genitiva u poljskom jeziku

Sažetak

Intencijski glagoli pokazuju tri intencijska učinka u svojim dopunama, naime dostupnost nespecifične interpretacije, nemogućnost ekstencijske supstitucije i odsutnost egzistencijalnog smisla. U nekim baltoslavenskim jezicima, uključujući poljski, intencijski glagoli mogu imati dopune u genitivu, koji se tada naziva „intencijskim genitivom”. Rasprostranjenost i svojstva poljskog intencijskoga genitiva uglavnom su nedovoljno istražena, osobito u usporedbi s genitivom negacije i partitivnim genitivom. Kao odgovor na tu istraživačku prazninu ovom radu je cilj utvrditi opseg intencijskoga genitiva u poljskom jeziku ispitujući koji poljski glagoli s genitivnim dopunama pokazuju tri učinka intencionalnosti. Studija se ponajprije sastoji u primjeni triju testova intencionalnosti na poljske glagole s genitivnim dopunama. Samo se glagoli koji zadovoljavaju sva tri testa intencionalnosti mogu klasificirati kao intencijski. Rezultati testiranja pokazuju da u poljskom jeziku postoji 49 intencijskih glagola s genitivnim dopunama, koji pripadaju četirima semantičkim razredima: glagolima želje i volje, glagolima očekivanja i pretpostavke, glagolima traženja i glagolima odsutnosti.

Keywords: genitive, intensionality, intensional genitive, intensional verbs, the Polish language

Ključne riječi: genitiv, intencionalnost, intencijski genitiv, intencijski glagoli, poljski jezik

