(A whirlwind tour of) Polish declension

Basic facts

Polish nouns decline for case (nom., gen., dat., acc., ins., loc., voc.) and number (sg. and pl.).

Declension is conditioned by gender (masc., fem., neut.) and in masculines, animacy (inan., anim., and hum., the latter also known as *virile* in the literature).

Feminines (1/)

Most feminines have a nom.sg. in -a and a gen.sg. in -i [i] or -y [i]; e.g., mapa 'map':

	sg.	pl.
nom.	map a	map y
gen.	map y	map
dat.	map ie	map om
acc.	map ę	map y
ins.	map ą	map ami
loc.	map ie	map ach
VOC.	map o	map y

Nom.sg. -a is likely an affix, not part of the stem (cf. the gen.pl.).

Feminines (2/)

The gen.sg. suffixes -i and -y are in complementary distribution, thus it is generally believed that -i is a phonologically-conditioned allomorph of /i.

"Soft stems", those that end with /l/ or a [+palatal] consonant, take -i. E.g.:

bila-bili 'billiard ball'

mrówk**a**-mrówk**i** 'ant'

mość-mości 'majesty (term of address)'

Neuters

Most neuters end have a nom.sg. in -o [ɔ] and a gen.sg. in -a; e.g., piwo 'beer':

	sg.	pl.
nom.	piw o	piw a
gen.	piw a	piw
dat.	piw u	piw om
acc.	piw o	piw a
ins.	piw em	piw ami
loc.	piw ie	piw ach
VOC.	piw o	piw a

Nom.sg. -o is likely an affix, not part of the stem (cf. the gen.pl.).

Masculine animates

Most masculine animates (including "viriles") have a null nom.sg. and a gen.sg. in -a, e.g. rolnik 'farmer':

	sg.	pl.
nom.	rolnik	rolnic y
gen.	rolnik a	rolnik ów
dat.	rolnik owi	rolnik om
acc.	rolnik a	rolnik ów
ins.	rolnik iem	rolnik ami
loc.	rolnik u	rolnik ach
VOC.	rolnik u	rolnic y

Masculine inanimates

Most masculine inanimates have a null nom.sg. and a gen.sg. in either -a or -u, e.g., słoik 'jar':

	sg.	pl.
nom.	słoik	słoik i
gen.	słoik a	słoik ów
dat.	słoik owi	słoik om
acc.	słoik	słoik i
ins.	słoik iem	słoik ami
loc.	słoik u	słoik ach
VOC.	słoik u	słoiki

Dąbrowska (2001:558)

Which of these two endings a particular noun takes is largely arbitrary, although there are some broad regularities. For example, most nouns which designate tools and body parts, the names of the months, and native place names require the -a ending. In contrast, abstract nouns, collective nouns, and mass nouns usually take -u, as do most borrowings and most foreign place names. Certain derivational affixes favour one or the other inflection: for example, nouns that end in -ak and -nik and most diminutives ending in -ek, -ik, and -yk take -a (but nouns ending in *-unek* take *-u*). Phonological criteria also play a role (nouns that end in a palatalised consonant nearly always take -a). However, there are many exceptions to these tendencies, and some of them are contradictory (see Kottum, 1981).

Gorman & Yang (2019:184)

In Polish, masculine nouns in the genitive singular (gen.sg.) either take the -a or -u suffix, but Dabrowska (2001) shows that neither is the default according to conventional criteria (Marcus [et al. --kbg] 1995). For instance, unlike the English past tense -d, which is always extended to novel verbs (e.g., googled), some novel Polish masculine nouns take -a whereas others take -u. The distribution of these two suffixes is widely studied but has consistently defied philologists' attempts to provide a systematic classification; the choice appears to be largely arbitrary (Maunsch 2003). [...] which suffixes a noun selects must be learned by rote, a process which continues well into the teenage years (Dabrowska 2001, 2005).

What's going on here?

Consider the paradigm of the masculine inanimate *ocet* 'vinegar':

	sg.	pl.
nom.	oc e t	octy
gen.	octa	octów
dat.	octu	octom
acc.	oc e t	octy
ins.	octe	octami
loc.	octu	octach
VOC.	octem	octy

Meet the yers

In Common Slavic a sound change known as Havlík's law led to the reduction, and ultimately, loss, of alternating high vowels called *yers* (or *jers*). Lightner (1965) discovered that a form of this rule is present in the synchronic grammars of many modern Slavic languages.

In Polish, nearly all fleeting vowels are *ie/e*. There are three words with a fleeting *io* (*kocioł-kotła* 'cauldron', *osioł-osła* 'donkey', *kozioł-kozła* 'goat'), and Rubach (2013:1140, fn. 4) argues these too should be counted among the yers.

Yers in Polish

It is believed to be impossible to predict, from the shape of a stem,

- whether or not a given ie/e in a Polish stem will delete (i.e., is a yer), or
- where or whether to "insert" a yer.

Gussman (1980) and Rubach (1984) propose that the Polish yers are underlyingly present but featurally distinct from non-yer mid-vowels; e.g., the underlying form of 'vinegar' might be written /ɔt͡sEt/ where /E/ is an underspecified vowel of some sort.

What's going on here?

Many Polish nouns feature an alternation in which o [5] becomes \acute{o} [u] when it is immediately before a word-final voiced consonant; e.g., $st\acute{o}l$ 'table':

	sg.	pl.
nom.	st ó ł	st o ły
gen.	st o łu	st o łów
dat.	st o łowi	st o łom
acc.	st ó ł	st o ły
ins.	st o łem	st o łami
loc.	st o łe	st o łach
VOC.	st o łe	st o ły

o-raising in Polish

Historically, the "raised" \acute{o} is the result of compensatory lengthening followed by allophonic raising of the long vowel. When Polish lost contrastive vowel lengthening in the early 16th century, the lengthened o merged with /u/.

However, Buckley (2001) shows that there are a large number of exceptions and argues that the generalization has been fully lexicalized.

He proposes that the vowel alternating between o and \acute{o} be phonologized as an underspecified /O/, thus /stOw/ 'table'.

Consequences for morphological generation

Gorman et al. (2019) and Gorman (2020) find that

- masculine inanimate gen.sg. suffixes and
- yers

account for a large percentage of the errors made by neural morphological generation systems.

(Unfortunately, I haven't looked for o-raising errors yet.)

Why this is difficult

The yer and o-raising patterns are not something we should expect to be able to predict from the citation form alone. In this way, the HW3 task (and others like it) could be said to be ill-posed.

Of course, the language faculty did not evolve so that the citation form of a stem is predictable of its full paradigm.

The mere notion of *principal parts* in language pedagogy suggests that any one inflectional form will be insufficient to predict full inflectional paradigms.

Future work

- "Tolerance"/productivity analyses of various phenomena in Polish
- "Unnamed morphological abstractness project"

Buckley, Eugene. 2001. Polish o-raising and phonological explanation. Talk presented at the LSA Annual Meeting.

Dąbrowska, Ewa. 2001. Learning a morphological system without a default: the Polish genitive. *Journal of Child Language* 28:545-574.

Dąbrowska, Ewa. 2005. Productivity and beyond: mastering the Polish genitive. Journal of Child Language 32:191-205.

Gorman, Kyle, Arya D. McCarthy, Ryan Cotterell, Ekaterina Vylomova, Miika Silfverberg, and Magdalena Markowska. 2019. Weird inflects but OK: making sense of morphological generation errors. In *Proceedings of the 23rd Conference on Computational Natural Language Learning*, pages 140-151.

Gorman, Kyle, and Charles Yang. 2019. When nobody wins. In Franz Rainer, Francesco Gardani, Hans Christian Luschützky and Wolfgang U. Dressler (ed.), *Competition in Inflection and Word Formation*, pages 169-193. Springer.

Gorman, Kyle. 2020. Abstractness, arbitrariness, and productivity in Polish declension. Talk presented at the Graduate Center, CUNY.

Gussman, Edmund. 1980. Studies in Abstract Phonology. MIT Press.

Kottum, Steiner E. 1981. The genitive singular form of masculine nouns in Polish. *Scando-Slavica* 27:179-186.

Lightner, Theodore M. 1965. Segmental phonology of Modern Standard Russian. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.

Marcus, Gary, Ursula Brinkmann, Harald Clahsen, Richard Wiese, and Steven Pinker. 1995. German inflection: the exception that proves the rule. *Cognitive Psychology* 29:189-256.

Maunsch, Hanna. 2003. Current alternations in inflection of Polish masculine inanimate nouns in the singular: a pilot study. *Investigationes Linguisticae* 9:4-21.

Rubach, Jerzy. 1984. Cyclic and Lexical Phonology: The Structure of Polish. Foris.

Rubach, Jerzy. 2013. Exceptional segments in Polish. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 31:1139-1162.