REFLEXIVITY AND ARGUMENT-DEMOTION MARKING IN SLOVENE

Sabina Grahek

Abstract
This paper investigates Slovene constructions with the reflexive morpheme *se*, which, despite their apparent diversity, can be divided into only four major classes, corresponding to four different uses of *se* (reflexive/reciprocal *se*, inherent *se*, middle *se* and anticausative *se*). It is argued that these four uses follow from the interaction of two features: whether *se* is an internal argument or a demotion marker, and whether *se* is attached to the verb in the syntax or the lexicon. The paper attempts to systematically analyse all four types of Slovene constructions with *se* in order to identify their distinctive properties. The analysis reveals that each use of *se* has at least one property not shared by other uses, thus providing the evidence in support of the proposed classification. Moreover, it is shown that several semantic and aspectual properties, such as delimitedness, internal and external causation and spontaneous occurrence of an event, play an important role in the syntactic realisation of arguments in Slovene. In order to account for the full range of uses of *se*, future research will have to provide an explanation of how these properties interact with other features of Slovene predicates with *se*.

1. Introduction

Slovene constructions with the reflexive morpheme *se* display a considerable amount of diversity. Although they appear to have similar syntactic structure, they exhibit a wide variety of semantic relations and a range of degrees of productivity. Cognates of the Slovene morpheme *se* can be found in several other Indo-European languages, mostly Slavonic, Romance and some Germanic languages (e.g. Polish *się*, Russian *-sja*, French *se*, Italian *si*, German *sich*, Icelandic *-st*). Slovene *se* and its counterparts in other languages seem to occur in similar constructions and appear to share several properties. However, in each language, constructions with the reflexive morpheme manifest several unique properties, with idiosyncratic rules on their use and derivation. Therefore the classification of sentences containing the reflexive morpheme presents a difficult task not only cross-linguistically, but also within individual languages.

The literature dedicated to reflexive constructions across languages seems to focus on two important questions: first, how many distinct uses does the reflexive morpheme have, and second, is it possible to establish reliable criteria for their distinction. The researchers seem to agree that most of the languages displaying the reflexive morpheme share at least four distinct types of reflexive constructions, namely reflexive/reciprocal, inherent, middle and anticausative (as termed in this paper), although some researchers propose a few more uses (e.g. impersonal constructions, passives (Blevins 2003, Rivero & Milojević Sheppard 2003)). However, despite the fact that there is an abundant literature dedicated to reflexive constructions across languages, few of these studies address the full range of uses that the reflexive morpheme can display. Likewise, in the Slovene traditional as well as recent generative literature no attempt has been made to account for the full array of data. This paper therefore attempts to fill this gap and provide an overall treatment of constructions with *se* and a systematic description of the functions of the morpheme *se* in Slovene. The main aim of this paper is to classify Slovene constructions with *se* within current generative theories of argument structure and suggest the criteria for

their distinction. I will argue that Slovene constructions with *se* can be grouped into four classes matching those listed above (reflexive/reciprocal, inherent, middle and anticausatives) and that the corresponding uses of *se* in Slovene can be distinguished by using two independent features (whether *se* is an argument or argument-demotion marker, and whether the process deriving constructions with *se* is syntactic or lexical). I will try to show that we can find at least one syntactic or semantic property for each use of *se* that is not shared by other uses, which is evidence in support of the proposed classification. Throughout the paper I will also be pointing out those properties of Slovene predicates with *se* which seem to play an important role in linking of arguments in Slovene. Since constructions with *se* involve a complex interplay between the lexicon, syntax and semantics, they provide a rich source of data with which theories of argument structure and the syntax-semantics interface can be tested. By applying a unified approach to different types of sentences with *se* I hope to be able to establish how they interact within a language, and consequently propose an explanation of which properties of predicates with *se* may be syntactically relevant for argument linking in Slovene.

Examples in this paper are Slovene if not otherwise stated. It should be pointed out that unlike in most of the literature on Slovene morpheme *se* to date, a great effort has been made to ensure that all data used in this paper (standard and colloquial) are generally considered well-formed or at least attested, i.e. taken from written sources or informal speech on the radio and TV.

The structure of the paper will be as follows. First, I will describe basic morphological and syntactic properties of Slovene reflexive clitics. Then I will present each of the four types of Slovene constructions with *se* in detail. I will discuss the criteria for the distinction between different uses of *se* and for the classification of the corresponding constructions. I will also deal with some of the constructions with *se* which seem less easy to classify because of their unique semantic and syntactic properties, and give some tentative proposals for their analysis. I will propose that verbs expressing delimited excessive events and those expressing reciprocal events with a prototypical argument contain inherent *se*, while *se* in constructions expressing internally caused events has a similar function to anticausative *se*. Finally, I will conclude by summarising the main points of the paper, and by pointing out some of the issues that need further investigation.

2. Properties of Slovene reflexive clitics

Two most striking characteristics of Slovene verbs and constructions with the morpheme *se* are, first, their high frequency in the language, and second, their great variety in form and meaning. Before we have a closer look at the syntactic and semantic properties of these constructions, however, it is necessary to say a few words about the morphological properties of Slovene *se* and its usage.

Slovene has six cases, as shown in Table 1. Unlike other nominals (e.g. nouns, non-reflexive personal pronouns), the reflexive pronoun has only non-nominative forms and is not inflected for person, number and gender. Moreover, as shown in the table below, the clitic of the reflexive pronoun has only two forms, the accusative and genitive *se*, and the dative *si*.

Morphologically therefore, the morpheme *se* in question is the clitic of the accusative or genitive reflexive pronoun *sebe* 'self', as opposed to the morpheme *si*, which is the clitic of the dative reflexive pronoun *sebi* 'self'. In this paper I will try to show that the morpheme *se* can display four different functions in Slovene. The basic role is that of a reflexive or reciprocal clitic pronoun (e.g. *sovražiti se* 'hate self'). In

addition to this the morpheme *se* appears in intransitive verbs (e.g. *smejati se* 'laugh'), middle constructions (e.g. *Šola se obnavlja* 'The school is renovated') and anticausatives (e.g. *potopiti se* 'sink (all by itself)'). By contrast, the morpheme *si* can only function as a reflexive/reciprocal clitic pronoun or an inherent part of a verb.[1] *Si* cannot be employed to derive middles or anticausatives.

Table 1 Slovene reflexive pronouns

Case	Reflexive pronoun	Reflexive clitic pronoun
Nominative	/	/
Genitive	sebe	se
Dative	sebi	si
Accusative	sebe	se
Locative	sebi	/
Instrumental	seboj/sabo	/

In the following sections I will discuss the four uses of Slovene *se* in more detail. I will describe systematically syntactic and semantic properties of different types of Slovene predicates with *se*, and propose which of these properties can serve as the criteria for the distinction between the different uses of *se*.

3. Types of *se* in Slovene

Slovene has a great variety of constructions with *se*, which seem almost identical on the surface but exhibit different underlying structures. In this paper I attempt to show that despite the apparent diversity, Slovene constructions with *se* can be grouped into only four main classes corresponding to the above mentioned four different uses of *se*. Following Wehrli's (1986) slightly adapted analysis of the French morpheme *se*, I propose that the four types of Slovene *se* follow from the interaction of two independent features: first, whether *se* is the internal argument or argument-demotion marker, and second, whether the process deriving these constructions has been lexicalised or not. Thus *se* which is an inherent part of an intransitive verb can be viewed as the lexicalised version of *se* in transitive sentences with a reflexive or reciprocal reading. By contrast, the derivation of anticausatives is regarded as the lexicalised version of the same process by which an argument gets demoted in middles. This classification is set out in Table 2:

Table 2 Four types of Slovene *se*

	Internal argument	**Argument-demotion marker**
Non-lexicalised	Reflexive/reciprocal *se*	Middle *se*
Lexicalised	Inherent *se*	Anticausative *se*

---

[1] Here I disregard non-argument uses of *si*, usually referred to as the extra dative, such as for instance the use known as the dative of possession in (i). The scope of the paper does not allow me to deal with this issue in detail.

(i) Peter si je   uničil   kariero.
      Peter SI AUX.3SG   ruin.PCP.SG.MASC   career.ACC
      'Peter ruined his career.'

Some of the uses of *se* represent a heterogeneous class of constructions and can be further divided into subclasses. Let us now consider these four types of Slovene *se* and their corresponding constructions in more detail, and establish whether Slovene data support the above differentiation.

3.1 Reflexive/reciprocal *se*

The morpheme *se* most typically occurs as an anaphoric clitic pronoun in transitive sentences such as (1). Depending on the lexical semantics of the verb and the kind of participants involved, sentences with this type of *se* can have either a reflexive interpretation, indicated by *himself* in (1a), or a reciprocal interpretation, indicated by *each other* in (1b).

(1) a. Peter se sovraži. (reflexive)
         Peter SE hate.3SG.PRES
         'Peter hates himself.'

     b. Sosedje   se sovražijo. (reciprocal)
         neighbours   SE hate.3PL.PRES
         'The neighbours hate each other.'

This type of *se* is characterised by its ability to be replaced by a full pronoun. As illustrated in (2), reflexive/reciprocal *se* can be replaced by a reflexive pronoun *sebe* 'self' if the sentence has a reflexive reading, or by a reciprocal pronoun *eden drugega* 'each other' if the sentence has a reciprocal reading.

(2) a. Peter sovraži   sebe.
         Peter hate.3SG.PRES   self
         'Peter hates himself.'

     b. Sosedje   sovražijo   eden   drugega.
         neighbours   hate.3PL.PRES   each   other
         'The neighbours hate each other.'

Consequently, reflexive/reciprocal *se* can be analysed as a referential morpheme in transitive sentences with a reflexive or reciprocal reading. Another diagnostic test we can use is that reflexive/reciprocal *se* can be replaced by a full NP, such as *svoj značaj* 'his personality' in (3).

(3) Peter sovraži   svoj   značaj.
     Peter hate.3SG.PRES   his-own   personality.ACC
     'Peter hates his personality.'

The use of a full NP instead of *se* of course changes the meaning of the sentence. However, it demonstrates that reflexive/reciprocal *se* stands for a referential element in the direct object position and is therefore a syntactic argument. Further evidence in support of this claim is the fact that Slovene reflexive and reciprocal clitics distinguish between direct and indirect internal arguments. Thus when the indirect argument of a ditransitive verb, such as *kupiti* 'buy' in (4), is coreferential with the subject of the sentence, the reflexive clitic has the dative form *si* rather than the accusative form *se*.

(4)   Peter si je   kupil   nov   računalnik.
        Peter SI AUX.3SG buy.PCP.SG.MASC   new.ACC   computer.ACC
        'Peter bought a new computer for himself.'

Constructions with a referential reflexive/reciprocal *se* are highly productive in Slovene, as they can derive from virtually any transitive verb. The only exception is verbs like *pomivati* 'wash' which do not form felicitous sentences with reflexive/reciprocal *se*.

(5)   *Peter se pomiva.
        Peter   SE wash.3SG.PRES
        'Peter washes himself.'

The reason for the unacceptability of (5) is that *pomivati* 'wash' only subcategorises for inanimate objects, as shown in (6). As a result, *se* cannot be interpreted as a clitic pronoun coreferential with the animate, in this case, human subject.

(6)   Peter pomiva   posodo / okna /   *otroka / *sebe.
        Peter wash.3SG.PRES dishes /   windows /   child /   self
        'Peter washes the dishes / the windows / a child / himself.'

To sum up, the use of *se* termed here reflexive/reciprocal *se* refers to the clitic pronoun which represents a direct internal argument in transitive sentences with a reflexive or reciprocal reading. Its main characteristic appears to be the ability to be replaced by a full pronoun or NP in the object position. As a syntactic argument, reflexive/reciprocal *se* is considered to be thematic and referential, more precisely, coreferential with the syntactic subject. This type of *se* can occur with any transitive verb that subcategorises for animate objects (humans or animals). The relative productivity of this process suggests that reflexive/reciprocal *se* and its verb form a syntactic unit rather than a lexical one.

3.2 Inherent *se*

A large proportion of Slovene intransitive verbs seem to contain the morpheme *se* as part of their lexical entry, which is illustrated below by the unergative verb *smejati se* 'laugh' in (7) and the unaccusative verb *zgoditi se* 'happen' in (8).

(7)   Peter se smeje.
        Peter SE laugh.3SG.PRES
        'Peter laughs.'

(8)   Zgodila   se je   nesreča.
        happen.PCP.SG.FEM   SE AUX.3SG   accident.SG.FEM.NOM
        'An accident happened.'

The idea that this type of *se* functions as an inherent part of the verb is supported by the fact that *se* in these verbs cannot be omitted since forms without *se* (e.g. **smejati* 'laugh', **zgoditi* 'happen') do not exist in the language, as shown in the ungrammatical examples below.

(9)   *Peter smeje.
        Peter   laugh.3SG.PRES
        'Peter laughs.'

(10)   *Zgodila   je   nesreča.
        happen.PCP.SG.FEM   AUX.3SG   accident.SG.FEM.NOM
        'An accident happened.'

Possible exceptions to the proposition that verbs with inherent *se* have no non-*se* equivalents may be examples like (11) and (12), which show that verbs *jokati se* 'cry' and *imeti se* 'be' can appear without the morpheme *se*.

(11)   a. Otrok se joka.
            child   SE cry.3SG.PRES
            'The child cries.'

        b. Otrok joka.
            child   cry.3SG.PRES
            'The child cries.'

(12)   a. Kako se imaš?
            how   SE have.2SG.PRES
            'How are you?'

        b. Imaš   čas?
            have.2SG.PRES   time
            'Have you got any time?'

However, the non-*se* counterpart in (11b) represents one and the same verb with an optional *se* (*jokati se* 'cry' – *jokati* 'cry'), while the non-*se* form in (12b) represents an independent and semantically unrelated lexical item (*imeti se* 'be' – *imeti* 'have'). So the conclusion we can draw from the above examples is that verbs with inherent *se* are typical for having no semantically related non-*se* forms which may serve as the bases for their derivation. In this, inherent *se* differs from reflexive/reciprocal *se*, which does not form a lexical unit with the verb but rather is attached to the verb in the syntax. In order to show that inherent *se* has different properties from reflexive/reciprocal *se* we can run the two diagnostic tests for reflexive/reciprocal *se* used in the previous section on a sentence with inherent *se* below.

(13)   *Peter smeje   sebe / svoje šale.
        Peter   laugh.3SG.PRES   self / his-own jokes.ACC
        '*Peter laughs himself / his own jokes.'

We can see in (13) that inherent *se* cannot be replaced by the full pronoun *sebe* 'self' nor by the full NP *svoje šale* 'his own jokes', which suggests that inherent *se* does not refer to an entity. There is more evidence to support the claim that inherent *se* is non-referential, non-thematic and has no lexical meaning of its own. The first piece of evidence is verbs like *jokati se* 'cry' in (11) with an optional inherent *se*, which can be omitted without changing the lexical meaning or grammatical properties

of the verb. A further piece of evidence that inherent *se* is a non-referential morpheme is verbs which can contain either inherent *se* or *si*. In (14) we can see that *se* and *si* are freely interchangeable – the use of *si* instead of *se* does not impart new meaning to the verb.

(14)   Peter   se/si   premisli.
           Peter   SE/SI   change-his-mind.3SG.PRES
           'Peter changes his mind.'

This and similar examples provide evidence that inherent *se* cannot be analysed as an accusative clitic. Rather, it appears to be lexicalised and devoid of any semantic or grammatical content and does not seem to function as a syntactic argument. Thus we can explain why in some cases it can be omitted or replaced by *si* without affecting the verb's semantics. This of course raises a question of its origin. It has been pointed out in the literature (Wehrli 1986: 268) that in traditional grammars many examples of inherent *se* are considered to derive historically from reflexive or reciprocal *se*. For instance, examples that Grevisse (1961: 526) gives for French include, among others, verbs like *s'abstenir* 'give up', *se désister* 'renounce', *s'écrouler* 'collapse' and *s'emparer* 'seize'. Furthermore, verbs with inherent *se* may belong to a class of unergative verbs, such as *laugh, sneeze* and *dance*, which Hale and Keyser (1993: 53-54) term denominal verbs derived in the lexicon by a syntax-like process called incorporation. The question of the origin of inherent *se* is beyond the limitations of this paper and the question about which lexicalisation process derives Slovene verbs with inherent *se* will be left for further research.

To sum up, inherent *se* in Slovene is a free morpheme which forms part of the verb's lexical entry. Unlike reflexive/reciprocal *se*, it cannot be replaced by a full pronoun or a full NP. Inherent *se* is not always obligatory – sometimes it can be exchanged with *si* (which is dative in form) or altogether omitted without changing the verb's lexical meaning. This suggests that inherent *se* is a non-referential and non-thematic morpheme, and is not part of the verb's argument structure, although it may have derived historically from reflexive/reciprocal *se*. The main characteristic of verbs with inherent *se* appears to be the fact that they have no semantically related non-*se* base forms from which they could be predictably derived. If a form without *se* does exist, it represents either one and the same verb or an independent lexical entry with unrelated meaning.

However, some constructions which appear to contain inherent *se* display unique and idiosyncratic properties which make them less easy to classify. They present an interesting problem to the question of the relationship between the syntax and the lexicon, as it is more difficult to determine the relation between the "base" and the reflexivised form of the verb. In the following sections I will describe two constructions with *se* labelled here as constructions expressing delimited excessive events, and constructions expressing reciprocal events with a prototypical argument. I suggest that these also contain inherent *se* because their predicates display the same properties as verbs with inherent *se* discussed above, i.e. their *se* cannot be replaced by a referential element, and they have no related non-*se* forms. However, researchers have suggested several other analyses for these constructions, so in the sections below I will first present the proposed analyses and then provide arguments for analysing these instances of *se* as inherent *se*.

3.2.1 Delimited excessive events

First, let us turn to the pair of sentences below. As we can see, the verb *plesati* 'dance' in (15) changes into a reflexivised perfective verb *naplesati se* 'dance (to one's heart's content)' in (16), with *se* and the verbal prefix *na-* attached to the verb.

(15) Peter je   plesal.
       Peter AUX.3SG   dance.PCP.SG.MASC
       'Peter danced.'

(16) Peter se je   naplesal.
       Peter SE AUX.3SG   dance.PCP.SG.MASC
       'Peter danced (to his heart's content).'

Constructions like (16) are traditionally described as expressing excessive actions. As indicated in the translation, the reflexive perfective verb *naplesati se* 'dance (to one's heart's content)' implies that the event has lasted for a long time and reached a high degree of intensity. Herrity (2000: 157) suggests that the excessive nature of the event is the main aspectual content added to Slovene verbs by prefixation and reflexivisation.

When talking about Russian verbal prefixes, however, Tenny (1994: 141-142) points out that another distinction between the basic and the prefixed verbs is that of non-delimited vs. delimited events. As we can also see in the Slovene example (16), the predicate with the verbal prefix and the morpheme *se* implies that the event is bounded in time or that it has reached the end. The process deriving these constructions evidently depends on the aspectual property of delimitedness. As such it is an interesting example of the grammaticalisation of delimitedness or boundedness in a language where parts of meaning which get grammaticalised interact with the syntax (Tenny 1994: 142). We can therefore conclude that verbs like *naplesati se* 'dance (to one's heart's content)' express delimited excessive actions.

However, this process does not appear to be productive in Slovene, as also pointed out by Tenny (1994: 141) for Russian. There are strict lexical constraints on which prefixes can affix to which verbs, and which verbs can undergo this process at all. Only a handful of prefixed verbs with *se* in Slovene can express delimited and excessive events. This suggests that these verbs are lexically derived.

Moreover, Slovene prefixed verbs with *se* expressing delimited excessive events seem to require both the verbal prefix and the morpheme *se*. It seems to me that the morphological process deriving these verbs in Slovene involves two stages: prefixation and reflexivisation, that is attachment of *se*. For instance, the verb **naplesati* 'dance' without *se* does not exist, as shown below.

(17) *Peter je   naplesal.
       Peter AUX.3SG   dance.PCP.SG.MASC

Even if non-*se* forms of prefixed verbs do exist, they are not semantically related and represent independent lexical items (e.g. *najesti se* 'eat (one's fill)' – *najesti* 'corrode'). This further suggests that this use of *se* can be equated to that of inherent *se*, forming a lexical unit with the verb. Another piece of evidence for this view is the fact that prefixed verbs with *se* expressing delimited excessive events are always listed as separate entries in dictionaries, which indicates that they are interpreted as lexical units by Slovene native speakers.

3.2.2 Reciprocal events with a prototypical argument

Next, let us consider the pair of sentences below.

(18) Peter   poljublja   Ano.
     Peter.NOM   kiss.3SG.PRES   Ana.ACC
     'Peter kisses Ana.'

(19) Peter   se poljublja.
     Peter.NOM   SE kiss.3SG.PRES
     'Peter (and someone) kiss.'

Sentences equivalent to (19) are found in all Slavonic languages, but limited to a few verbs and belonging to different registers, according to Rivero & Milojević Sheppard (2003: 115-116). As they say, these constructions are standard in Slovene, while in some languages (e.g. Polish, Bulgarian, Croatian and Serbian) they are colloquial and typical of child language. The prevalent view in the literature is that the use of *se* in sentences like (19) corresponds to the object of the transitive verb, which is either unspecified (Schwartz 1988), null object (Rivero 2000) or defective/ indefinite human pronoun (Rivero & Milojević Sheppard 2001, 2003).

According to Rivero & Milojević Sheppard this use of *se*, which they term the object impersonal (2001: 141-142) and accusative indefinite (2003: 115-117), has the following properties: it is a defective accusative pronoun which lacks number, person and gender features, and denotes a human, equivalent in meaning to English expressions such as *someone* or *anyone*. They further point out that these sentences do not describe reflexive actions, therefore the morpheme *se*, which is analysed as the syntactic internal argument, is not a reflexiviser. This is illustrated in their example below where they gloss *se* as *other people*, rather than *yourself* (Rivero & Milojević Sheppard 2003: 115)[2].

(20) Pokaži,   kako   se poljubljaš.
     show.2SG.IMPERATIVE   how   SE kiss.2SG.PRES
     'Show me how you kiss (other people).'

What Rivero & Milojević Sheppard (2003) do not point out is that this construction requires a singular subject. As soon as the subject is plural, *se* is interpreted as reflexive/reciprocal *se* and the whole sentence gets a reciprocal interpretation. I suggest that Slovene example (21), which is equivalent to the Serbo-Croatian example given by Rivero & Milojević Sheppard (2003: 141), can only be interpreted as *The children are hugging each other*, rather than *The children are hugging others*, as suggested by Rivero & Milojević Sheppard. This *se* can be replaced by the reciprocal pronoun *eden drugega* 'each other', as shown in (22), unlike *se* in (19), which cannot be replaced by either *sebe* 'self' or *eden drugega* 'each other' without changing the meaning of the sentence (as in (23)) or making it ungrammatical (as in (24)).

(21) Otroci   se objemajo.

---

[2] In the examples taken from other sources the glosses are adapted to match the style used throughout this paper.

children   SE hug.3PL.PRES
'The children are hugging each other.'

(22)   Otroci   objemajo   eden   drugega.
       children   hug.3PL.PRES each   other
       'The children are hugging each other.'

(23)   Peter   poljublja   sebe.
       Peter   kiss.3SG.PRES   self
       'Peter is kissing himself.'

(24)   *Peter poljublja   eden   drugega.
       Peter   kiss.3SG.PRES   each   other
       '*Peter is kissing each other.'

In fact, what seems crucial for the semantics of this construction in Slovene, and what has not yet been pointed out in the literature, is that it has to have a reciprocal reading, which is indicated in the translation in (19). So the most natural interpretation of sentence (19) would be that of a reciprocal event which by its nature requires the volitional involvement of two (sets of) participants, following Dowty's (1991: 584-585) definition of reciprocal events. So it denotes an action which is recognised as symmetrical with respect to the two participants, although it may involve volition on the part of either one or both parties. This is also in accord with Reinhard & Reuland (1993 in Rivero & Milojević Sheppard 2003: 116) who argue that sentences like (19-20) describe actions involving two different sets of participants. The null element in this construction may therefore be described as referring to one of the participants involved in the reciprocal event. This semantic participant will probably be understood as the prototypical argument; in (19) this would be someone who is most likely to engage with Peter in the act of kissing, for instance his girlfriend or his fiancée, rather than generic *other people*.

Despite the fact that the construction has a reciprocal interpretation, this use of *se* cannot be analysed as reflexive/reciprocal *se* since, as shown in (23) and (24), it cannot be replaced by a full reflexive or reciprocal pronoun. The fact that this use of *se* is semantically restricted to a small number of verbs which can describe symmetrical reciprocal events (e.g. *poljubljati se* 'kiss', *objemati se* 'hug', *tepsti se* 'fight', *prerivati se* 'push', *gristi se* 'bite') suggests that this *se* may alternatively be viewed as inherent *se*, forming part of an independent lexical item in a similar way as in verbs with inherent *se* discussed above (e.g. *smejati se* 'laugh', *jokati se* 'cry'), or better still, verbs with inherent *se* which can describe reciprocal events (e.g. *boriti se* 'fight'). Native speakers also seem to perceive them as lexicalised units since we can find them in dictionaries as separate entries, like verbs expressing delimited excessive events. However, the question of their derivation and the syntactic status of this use of *se* remains open.

We can conclude from the above, then, that it is not always clear what function the morpheme *se* has in a sentence. The future research needs to thoroughly describe different uses of *se*, systematically analyse more attested data as well as explain whether aspectual and semantic properties such as delimitedness, excessive nature of events and symmetric human interaction may be said to play any role in the syntactic realisation of arguments in Slovene.

So far, we have discussed two uses of *se* which are associated with a syntactic internal argument of the verb, either functioning as one (reflexive/reciprocal *se*) or being historically derived from it (inherent *se*). We have also considered two uses of *se* where this association is less clear, and it is therefore more difficult to determine whether *se* is an inherent part of the verb or not. Let us now turn to consider two constructions with *se* which are treated here as derived by a process involving demotion of an argument, namely middles and anticausatives.

3.3 Middles

In this paper, middles are defined as the class of constructions which lie somewhere between the active and the passive since they exhibit formal properties of both constructions, i.e. active verb forms and promoted objects (Fagan 1992: 2-3). Following Keyser & Roeper (1984) and Stroik (1999), among others, I argue that middles, at least in Slovene, are syntactic constructions, derived by a syntactic process during which a human subject is demoted and the verb's object, if overt, can be promoted to the subject position. Despite different views the majority of researchers of Indo-European languages (especially Slavonic, Romance and some Germanic languages) seem to agree that sentences equivalent to the Slovene example (26) may be called canonical middle constructions. The pair of sentences below thus illustrates the process deriving a typical middle: the subject of the underlying sentence (25) (i.e. *ljudje* 'people') is demoted, while the direct object (i.e. *šola* 'school') is promoted to the subject position where it is assigned nominative case, as shown in (26). In Slovene, this process is always morphologically marked by the morpheme *se*.

(25)   Ljudje   obnavljajo   šolo.
        people.NOM   renovate.3PL.PRES   school.ACC
        'People renovate the school.'

(26)   Šola   se obnavlja.
        school.NOM   SE renovate.3SG.PRES
        'The school is renovated.'

Middles are considered to have a universal characteristic, semantic in nature: their demoted or implicit argument is always interpreted as human or as an entity associated with humans, such as institutions, companies, parties, organisations and groups. When referring to humans, the implicit argument in middles can be interpreted either as generic (e.g. *people, in general*) or indefinite (*some people, somebody*), as is the case in (26).

However, there is no agreement in the literature about the syntactic status of sentences such as (27-29) below. Like in (26), their interpretation also contains a human participant which is not syntactically expressed, but they differ from canonical middles in that they have no nominative NP. They are formed either from intransitive verbs (*živeti* 'live' in (27)) or intransitively used transitive verbs (*povedati* 'say' in (28)) or transitive verbs which retain their objects (*obnavljati šolo* 'renovate the school' in (29)).

(27)   Samo enkrat se živi.
        only   once   SE live.3SG.PRES
        'You only live once.'

(28) V mlinu se dvakrat   pove.
      in mill   SE twice   say.3SG.PRES
      'Only in a mill one has to repeat what one has said.' (a proverb)

(29) Šolo   se obnavlja.
      school.ACC   SE renovate.3SG.PRES
      'The school is renovated.'

In the traditional as well as recent generative literature sentences like (27-29) are usually analysed as impersonal active constructions, which therefore do not involve demotion and/or promotion of arguments. Contrary to this view, I will argue that these sentences are impersonal middle constructions, as they share crucial semantic and syntactic properties with canonical (personal) middles. I will further argue that the main difference between Slovene middles and passives is that middle formation does not involve detransitivisation, so the verb has the active form and preserves all its case-assigning properties. As a result, promotion in middles is optional, and the verb can retain its objects. This is demonstrated in (29), which is a variant of (26) with exactly the same semantic interpretation.

Below I will discuss two approaches which argue for the active status of the above types of sentences without a nominative NP: first, Blevins' (2003) distinction between passives and impersonals, and second, Rivero & Milojević Sheppard's (2003) analysis of certain Slavonic reflexive clitics as indefinite defective pronouns. I will try to show why their analyses cannot account for Slovene data, and provide arguments for the middle interpretation of the constructions in question.

3.3.1 Middles versus impersonal constructions

Blevins (2003: 475, 485), who makes a distinction between passives and impersonals, defines impersonal constructions as active. Unlike passives, which involve demotion (or deletion) of an underlying subject, impersonals are said to be derived by a valence-preserving process called impersonalisation, which merely suppresses a surface subject, that is inhibits its syntactic realisation. Since the suppressed subjects in impersonals are not demoted, there is also no promotion of the objects of transitive verbs. According to Blevins (2003: 482-506) impersonals include: impersonal verb forms in Balto-Finnic, impersonal *no/to* forms in Balto-Slavonic[3], autonomous forms in Celtic, and reflexive impersonals in Romance and Slavonic, mainly Polish and varieties of Slovene and Croatian. His example of a Slovene reflexive impersonal, taken from Priestly (1993: 439 in Blevins 2003: 505), is formally identical to (29) with the underlying object in the accusative.[4]

(30) Išče   se mlajšo   žensko.
      seek.3SG.PRES   SE younger.ACC woman.ACC
      'A younger woman is sought.'

---

[3] Impersonal *no/to* forms refer to an invariant form of Balto-Slavonic verbs, which ends in *-no* or *-to* in Slavonic and in *-ma* or *-ta* in Lithuanian (Blevins 2003: 490).

[4] Even though the accusative NP in (29) is in the pre-verbal position, it is syntactically still the object. Such sentences derive from the so-called inversion, optional movement of direct object NP, which is a characteristic property of pro-drop languages (Chomsky 1981:240). In Slovene, which is a pro-drop language, the object in impersonal reflexives can freely move from the post-verbal to pre-verbal position. It gets case *in situ*, since the verb is not passive and will not absorb case.

12

Blevins' arguments for the distinction between impersonal constructions and passives and consequently for the active status of impersonals are the following. First, unlike passives, impersonals disallow or tend to resist the use of agentive phrases, which suggests that there has been no demotion (2003: 485, 492). Second, suppressed subjects in impersonals receive an indefinite human interpretation, which conflicts with the explicit expression of an Agent and further suggests that the Agent has been suppressed rather than demoted (2003: 488, 489, 495). Finally, the verb form in impersonals is active since impersonals of transitive verbs can retain structural objects (2003: 8, 19). The inability of accusative objects to be promoted thus supports the idea that the subject has not been demoted in the first place nor has the verb been detransitivised.

The data, however, do not support Blevins' arguments. Even Blevins himself admits that impersonals can have agentive phrases, for instance, genitive *poolt* 'on the part of' phrases in Estonian (2003: 485) and instrumental obliques in Ukrainian (2003: 492). Although Blevins points out that the Estonian *poolt*-construction in impersonals is felt by native speakers to be intrusive, questionable and an Indo-European calque, we cannot ignore the fact that it is possible. Slovene data likewise show that *s strani* 'on the part of' phrases are allowed by sentences defined as reflexive impersonals by Blevins. The example below illustrates that the underlying subject *Telekom* of the verb *odklopiti* 'disconnect' can be syntactically expressed by the *s strani* 'on the part of' oblique in a subjectless (impersonal) sentence where the underlying object *telefon* 'telephone' is in the accusative.

(31) Naročniku   se je   s   strani   Telekoma   preprosto
     customer.DAT   SE AUX.3SG on the-part-of   Telekom.GEN simply
     odklopilo   telefon.
     disconnect.PCP.SG.NEUTER   telephone.ACC
      'Telekom simply disconnected the telephone for the customer.'

S strani 'on the part of' phrases in impersonals are not considered questionable or unacceptable in Slovene. They sound just as natural as in periphrastic passives (see (32)). An interesting semantic property of *on the part of* phrases, also pointed out by Nelson (2003) for Finnish, is that they are typically used to refer to entities associated with humans, or to a body of people, rather than specific Agents.

(32) Naša stališča   so   bila
     our   views.NOM.NEUTER AUX.3PL   be.PCP.PL.NEUTER
     napadana   s   strani   različnih   ideologov.
     attack.PCP.PL.NEUTER   on the-part-of   various.GEN ideologists.GEN
     'Our views were attacked by various ideologists.'

We can see from the above, that in Slovene impersonals, agentive *s strani* 'on the part of' phrases are not only possible (which in itself suggests that the Agent has been demoted), what is more, they have exactly the same distribution and semantic constraints as in passives.[5] Thus in Slovene, agentive phrases cannot be used as a feature distinguishing passives from reflexive impersonal sentences.

---

[5] Passives in Slovene are periphrastic, formed with the auxiliary *biti* 'be' and the passive participle ending in *-n* or *-t*. Unlike middles, they also allow agentive *od* 'by'-phrases, which, unlike *s strani* 'on the part of' phrases are not semantically restricted to entities associated with humans, but can refer to specific Agents. E.g. (Toporišič 2000: 502)

Furthermore, the data reveal that an indefinite human interpretation, another essential property of impersonals according to Blevins, is likewise not restricted to impersonals. Blevins (2003: 480-481) notes that subjectless passives like German (33) (Blevins 2003: 477) also have an indefinite human agentive interpretation.

(33) In der   Küche   wurde   geraucht.
      in the   kitchen   AUX.3SG smoke.PCP
      'Somebody/some people were smoking in the kitchen.'

Blevins concludes that an indefinite human interpretation must therefore be conventionally associated with a subjectless form of personal verbs, irrespective of the syntactic source of the subjectlessness (2003: 481, 489). He therefore suggests that not only a suppressed argument in impersonals but also a demoted argument in subjectless passives can both be interpreted as referring to an indefinite human Agent. If that is the case, I argue that we cannot view an indefinite interpretation as a distinguishing feature between impersonals and passives. It seems that an indefinite interpretation of an argument cannot by itself suggest that there has been no demotion. So the semantic interpretation of an argument in this case cannot be employed to reveal its syntactic status.

Finally, the lack of promotion of objects in reflexive impersonals does not necessarily mean that there has been no demotion of the subject. A similar situation can be found in subjectless passives – they do not promote objects, even though they demote subjects, simply because there is no obvious element to promote (Blevins 2003: 477). The same explanation could be applied to Slovene sentences (27) and (28) with no overt objects; the absence of promotion of the object does not rule out demotion of the subject. Similarly, demotion is not ruled out in (29) with the accusative object. Since the verb in impersonals has the active form, we can assume that promotion of the object is simply not necessary since the verb remains transitive and retains its case-assigning properties.

As a matter of fact, promotion in reflexive sentences with transitive verbs is possible, as illustrated in Russian example (34) (Blevins 2003: 503) and Slovene example (35) (Brown 1993: 333 in Blevins 2003: 505), in which the underlying objects are in the nominative.

(34) Cerkov'   stroit-sja   rabočimi.
      church.NOM   build.3SG.PRES-SJA workers.INST
      'The church is being built by workers.'

(35) Knjiga   se piše.
      book.NOM   SE write.3SG.PRES
      'The book is being written.'

According to Blevins, the above two sentences with nominative NPs require different explanations. Russian example (34) is described as a genuine passive. Although reflexive in form, it is considered morphosyntactically passive and passive in meaning, since it does not retain the accusative object, does not imply an indefinite

---

(i) Sin   je   bil   pohvaljen   od očeta.
     son.NOM   AUX.3SG   be.PCP.SG.MASC   praise.PCP.SG.MASC by father.GEN
     'The son was praised by his father.'

human Agent, and freely allows an agentive instrumental (Blevins 2003: 502-503). We can see that Blevins bases his classification of (34) on those properties which, as I tried to demonstrate above, do not appear to make a clear distinction between passives and impersonals.

By contrast, Slovene examples like (35) and their Croatian equivalents present an intriguing variation in a language according to Blevins (2003: 504), since they exist alongside reflexive sentences with accusative NPs. The alternative construction is illustrated in (36), which is a translation of the Croatian example used by Blevins (Browne 1993: 333 in Blevins 2003: 505).

(36) Knjigo   se piše.
      book.ACC SE write.3SG.PRES
      'The book is being written.'

Blevins suggests that this alternation between nominative and accusative could be explained as a means to reconcile the conflict between two generalisations about the case conventions of a language (whether the least oblique structural argument occurs in the nominative, or the affected object occurs in the accusative) (2003: 505). Blevins (2003: 505-506) further speculates that the nominative argument in Slovene example (35) may not be a true subject, but a nominative complement (such as found in Balto-Finnic). The problem with this explanation that I would like to point out is that so far nominative complements have not been attested in Slovene.

It is not clear, however, why identical constructions like (34) and (35) should need different explanations in different languages simply because some languages allow an alternative construction. In order to account for both constructions and for the variation described above we need to propose an analysis which will not assume properties that do not exist in a language (e.g. nominative complements in Slovene) and which will take into account properties shared by both constructions (e.g. agentive phrases).

Therefore, varieties of Slovene and Croatian, which allow constructions with accusative and nominative NPs, provide counterevidence to Blevins' argument that the lack of promotion in impersonals implies that the sentence involves no demotion. As already said, variants with nominative NPs have exactly the same semantic interpretation as those with accusative NPs, which suggests that they are not semantically passive. Furthermore, variants with nominative NPs, such as (34) and (35) appear to involve promotion of the underlying object, which implies that demotion is not restricted to passives. In addition, the active form of the verb does not necessarily mean that the construction itself is active. As stated by Fagan (1992: 2-3), not only passives but also middles contain the active verb form by definition.

The above conclusions suggest that we can draw a parallel between reflexive sentences with nominative NPs like (35) and those with accusative NPs like (36). Consequently, Slovene reflexive impersonal sentences (27-29) may be accounted for along similar lines. Like passives, they appear to have a demoted subject since they allow agentive phrases, yet they have the active verb form since they can keep underlying objects. Therefore I suggest that Slovene sentences like (27-29) should be analysed as middles, with demoted subjects and active verbs. I argue against Blevins' distinction between passives and impersonals, and suggest that instead the distinction should be made between passives and middles. On this view, passives are defined as sentences with a demoted subject and a detransitivised verb, while middles are defined as having a demoted subject and an active verb form.

The reason I propose this classification is the fact that Blevins' distinction between passives and impersonals does not account for the Slovene data. If we apply Blevins' classification to Slovene sentences (27-29) and (26), we can see that (27-29) would be termed impersonals, while (26) with a nominative NP would present a problem for his classification. In Russian, sentences equivalent to (26) would be labelled (reflexive) passives, while in Slovene, which allows the alternative construction with an accusative NP, they would be viewed as an example of unexplained variation in a language.

In contrast, the classification proposed here accounts for impersonal reflexive sentences with non-overt objects like (27-28), impersonal reflexive sentences with accusative objects like (29) as well as reflexive sentences with nominative NPs like (26). If we label all the above Slovene sentences as middles, the properties they have in common can be employed to distinguish them adequately from (periphrastic) passives. Thus, while passives involve demotion of a subject and detransitivisation of a verb, which triggers promotion of an object, middles involve demotion of a subject and optional promotion of an object, because the verb is not detransitivised. Promotion in middles is not possible where there is no overt object to promote (like in (27) and (28)), so as a consequence the subject position remains empty. By contrast, when the object in middles is overt, promotion is possible but not required because the verb has the active form and retains all its syntactic and semantic properties, including its case-assigning properties. If the object remains in the accusative, the subject position is empty (like in (29)). By contrast, if the object is promoted to the subject position, it gets the nominative case (like in (26)).

Of course, the two classifications arise from different definitions of the term impersonal. For Blevins, it refers to a construction derived by a process which suppresses a subject of an active verb. He also distinguishes these impersonal constructions from impersonal verbs, such as weather verbs. On the analysis I propose here, however, the term impersonal is used to refer to the inflection on the verb when the verb does not agree with the syntactic subject. This occurs either when there is no subject to agree with (e.g. subjectless sentences) or when the verb cannot agree with the syntactic subject in number, person and/or gender (e.g. clausal subjects, oblique subjects). On this view, even the so-called impersonal verbs cannot be regarded as inherently impersonal. For instance, the weather verb *deževati* 'rain' can have a personal form (i.e. agree with the subject) if used metaphorically, in which case it is pragmatic considerations that determine whether the verb will show agreement or not.

(37) Vprašanja   so   kar   deževala.
      questions.NOM.FEM AUX.3PL   just   rain.PCP.PL.FEM
      'The questions just rained down.'

As a result, the term impersonal in this paper is independent of grammatical voice; actives, passives as well as middles can have impersonal verb forms, as shown below. Note that Slovene verbs which do not agree with the syntactic subject get a default 3rd person singular neuter form.

(38) Deževalo   je. (active)
      rain.PCP.SG.NEUTER   AUX.3SG
      'It was raining.'

(39) Na dve   stvari je   bilo   opozorjeno. (passive)
      on two   things AUX.3SG be.PCP.SG.NEUTER   warn.PCP.SG.NEUTER
      'The attention was drawn to two things.'

(40) Plesalo   se je   pozno v noč. (middle)
      dance.PCP.SG.NEUTER   SE AUX.3SG late   at night
      'People were dancing till late at night.'

What is more, the term impersonal on this approach is not synonymous with the term subjectless. Subjectless is a narrower term than impersonal, since a sentence can be impersonal and not subjectless (like (41) below), but not vice versa – every subjectless sentence is also impersonal (like (38-40) above).

(41) Veliko   ljudi.GEN je   prišlo.
      a-lot-of people   AUX.3SG   arrive.PCP.SG.NEUTER
      'A lot of people arrived.'

To sum up, Blevins (2003) attempts to classify constructions which in the literature are commonly referred to as expressing "passive meaning". He divides them into (a) passives, which comprise periphrastic passives, including subjectless, as well as reflexive passives (termed personal middles in this paper), and (b) impersonals, which subsume a variety of sentences, including constructions termed impersonal middles in this paper. The main difference between the two constructions according to Blevins is that passives involve demotion of a subject, while impersonals involve suppression, i.e. non-expression, of a subject. However, this classification is unable to account for the situation in languages which allow reflexive sentences with accusative and nominative NPs, such as Slovene examples (29) and (26). If, following Blevins, we assume that impersonals (called here impersonal middles) do not involve demotion, the above variation in a language cannot be accounted for. Under the present analysis, the distinction is therefore made between passives and middles, assuming that both involve demotion of a subject, while only passives also involve detransitivisation of the verb. Let us now turn to see how this proposal compares with Rivero & Milojević Sheppard's (2003) account of Slovene reflexive sentences equivalent to (26-29).

3.3.2 Middle *se* versus nominative indefinite subject pronoun *se*

Rivero & Milojević Sheppard (2003) argue that in reflexive sentences without nominative NPs, such as (27-29), the morpheme *se* is a defective indefinite nominative pronoun since, according to them, a sentence must have a nominative subject, and there is no other overt or morphological nominative element. I, on the contrary, will argue that *se* in these sentences need not be analysed as nominative because Slovene sentences can be subjectless. I will try to provide evidence in support of the claim that sentences such as (27-29) are impersonal middle constructions, and propose that their *se* is a functional element having the same function as *se* in personal middles, i.e. marking morphologically the syntactic process during which a human argument is demoted.

Rivero & Milojević Sheppard (2003) group Slovene sentences with *se* termed middles in this paper into the following types: the so-called impersonal with nominative indefinite *se* ((42) and (43)), passive (44) and middle (45) (Rivero & Milojević Sheppard 2003: 92, 100, 105).

(42) Tukaj se veliko dela.
      here   SE a-lot work.3SG.PRES
      'Here people work a lot.'

(43) Starše   se je   ubogalo.
      parents.ACC SE AUX.3SG   obey.PCP.SG.NEUTER
      'People obeyed parents.'

(44) Ta   hiša   se je   hitro zgradila.
      this house.NOM   SE AUX.3SG fast   build.PCP.SG.FEM
      'This house was built fast.'

(45) Ta   knjiga   se lahko bere.
      this book.NOM   SE easy   read.3SG.PRES
      'This book reads easily.'

So in Rivero & Milojević Sheppard (2003) intransitive sentences with no nominative NP such as (42), equivalent to (27), are analysed as having nominative indefinite pronoun *se*. Transitive sentences with an overt accusative object and no nominative NP such as (43), equivalent to (29), are also classified as impersonals with nominative indefinite *se*. On the other hand, transitive sentences with an overt nominative NP such as (44) and (45), equivalent to (26), are analysed either as passives or middles.

It is not immediately clear why (44) and (45) should belong to two different classes of constructions since they seem to share all syntactic properties. As the tense and aspectual properties of the predicates cannot account for the differentiation, we can only assume that the differentiation is based on the English translations. Examples (42-45) above reveal that Slovene sentences which can be most naturally translated by English passives, are termed passives, sentences that can be translated by English middles, are termed middles, while sentences that contain generic or indefinite subjects (e.g. *people, one*) in their translations, are termed indefinites. It seems that Rivero & Milojević Sheppard treat English translations as their data for analysis. A typical example of such an approach is the two sentences below. (46) with a nominative NP is translated by a passive (and consequently analysed as passive), while (47) with an accusative NP is translated by an active with a generic subject (and consequently analysed as active impersonal). In fact, both Slovene sentences could be translated in English by either a passive or active since there is no semantic or pragmatic difference at all between the two; they are variant forms.

(46) Starši   se ubogajo.
      parents.NOM SE obey.3PL.PRES
      'Parents are obeyed.'

                                    (Rivero & Milojević Sheppard 2003: 96)

(47) Starše   se uboga.
      parents.ACC SE obey.3SG.PRES
      'People obey parents.'

                                    (Rivero & Milojević Sheppard 2003: 102)

Of the above sentences, Rivero & Milojević Sheppard focus mainly on those with nominative indefinites (i.e. nominative indefinite pronouns *se*), such as (42) and (43). Rivero & Milojević Sheppard (2003: 99) argue that the morpheme *se* in the above impersonal sentences should be analysed as nominative indefinite, that is a defective pronoun which lacks gender, number and person. They argue that nominative indefinites are Simplex Expression anaphors (SE-anaphors) in the sense of Reinhart & Reuland (1993), suggesting that they are syntactic arguments in A-position. Rivero & Milojević Sheppard list four morphosyntactic properties of nominative indefinites (case and agreement, binding of anaphors, control of passive complements, and the human feature), which support their hypothesis and can serve as diagnostic tests for nominative indefinites. I will examine these four properties in turn and try to show that in fact they are not reliable diagnostics for indefinite pronouns in Slovene.

First, nominative indefinites co-occur with a distinctive case and agreement pattern. Rivero & Milojević Sheppard (2003: 93, 102-106) argue that the above impersonal sentences must be active because they display an overt accusative NP when the verb is transitive, as illustrated in (43). Assuming that active sentences must contain nominative, Rivero & Milojević Sheppard conclude that the morpheme *se* in impersonal sentences must be analysed as nominative since there is no overt or morphological nominative case or verb agreement. However, as already discussed above, Slovene active sentences can be subjectless, that is without overt nominative case, and no other element needs to be analysed as nominative, even if the sentence contains the morpheme *se*. This is illustrated in (48), where *se* is an inherent part of the reflexive verb *bliskati s*e 'flash, lighten'.

(48) Bliskalo   se je.
      lighten.PCP.SG.NEUTER   SE AUX.3SG
      'There was lightning.'

Rivero & Milojević Sheppard (2003: 104) propose that the invariable default agreement pattern on the verb (3rd person singular neuter in Slovene) also indicates that the construction contains nominative indefinite. However, this default agreement in impersonal sentences may occur because there is no syntactic subject to agree with, and not because of the morpheme *se*. As shown below, verbs in impersonal active sentences display the default agreement pattern even when there is no morpheme *se*, and the sentence does not need any overt nominative element.

(49) Snežilo   je.
      snow.PCP.SG.NEUTER   AUX.3SG
      'It was snowing.'

Second, Rivero & Milojević Sheppard (2003: 106-110) attempt to show that nominative indefinites can antecede anaphors, thus providing evidence that nominative indefinites are syntactic arguments. The examples they give, however, do not seem to be attested and even Rivero and Milojević Sheppard admit that grammaticality judgements from native speakers vary. For instance, (50) and (51), where *se* is supposed to antecede reflexive anaphor *sebe* 'self' and reciprocal expression *drug drugemu* 'each other' respectively, would sound more natural with an overt generic subject, such as *ljudje* 'people' or *vsakdo* 'everybody'.

(50) Sedaj se misli samo na sebe.
   now   SE think.3SG.PRES   only   on self
   'Now people only think of themselves.'
<div align="right">(Rivero & Milojević Sheppard 2003: 106)</div>

(51) Drug drugemu se preveč gleda   v lonec.
   each   other.DAT SE too-much look.3SG.PRES   in pot
   'People poke their noses into each other's private affairs too often.'
   Literally: 'People look to each other in (the) pot too much.'
<div align="right">(Rivero & Milojević Sheppard 2003: 107)</div>

Likewise, examples (52) and (53) (Rivero & Milojević Sheppard 2003: 107), showing that *se* can antecede long distance anaphors such as the clause-mate possessives and those in the subordinate clause, respectively, would be more acceptable if the reflexive possessive *svoj* 'one's own' was replaced by the non-reflexive adjective *lasten* 'one's own'. What is more, example (53) is altogether ungrammatical in Slovene, as indicated here by an asterisk, because the reflexive possessive *svoj* 'one's own' has no nominative form and therefore cannot be a modifier in a subject NP of a subordinate clause. In order to make the sentence grammatical, *svoje napake* 'one's own mistakes' should be replaced by the non-reflexive *lastne napake* 'one's own mistakes'.

(52) Svojih   prijateljev   se tako   ne   tretira.
   one's-own.GEN   friends.GEN   SE so   NEG   treat.3SG.PRES
   'One does not treat one's friends like that.'

(53) *Verjame   se, da   so   svoje   napake
   believe.SG.PRES   SE that   be.3PL.PRES   one's-own   mistakes.NOM
   bolj   upravičene   kot   napake   drugih.
   more   justified   than   mistakes   of-others.GEN
   'People believe that their own mistakes are more justified than the mistakes of others.'

The third property of *se* which according to Rivero & Milojević Sheppard proves that *se* is a syntactic argument is its ability to control passive complements, as for instance in (54). However, similarly to examples (50-51) this sentence would sound less strange with an overt generic subject, such as *ljudje* 'people' or *vsakdo* 'everybody'.

(54) Vedno   se želi   biti   občudovan.
   always   SE want.3SG.PRES   be.INFIN   admired
   'People always want to be admired.'
<div align="right">(Rivero & Milojević Sheppard 2003: 110)</div>

Finally, Rivero & Milojević Sheppard (2003: 110-111) point out that nominative indefinite is semantically human, that is denotes a human or a personified being. They argue that the human feature is in fact central to identifying the nominative indefinite with intransitives because intransitive verbs fail to display most of the other diagnostics discussed above: for instance, intransitive sentences with *se*

and no nominative NP do not allow overt accusative NPs, or binding of an anaphor, or control into a complement clause. So according to Rivero & Milojević Sheppard, the human feature may be the property that signals an indefinite pronoun, even if there are no other clues.

However, the human feature is not restricted to sentences containing the so-called nominative indefinite with no overt nominative NP. We can see that sentences with transitives and nominative NPs (44-45), which Rivero & Milojević Sheppard term passives and middles, also have the human feature in their interpretation. Yet the morpheme *se* in these sentences is not analysed as nominative indefinite. This raises a question whether the human feature in impersonal sentences is indeed associated with *se* or is there another element present in all of these sentences that denotes a human argument. Before I attempt to address this question, I will consider a few other problems that result from Rivero & Milojević Sheppard's classification of indefinites, passives and middles.

First, because Rivero & Milojević Sheppard do not specify the morphosyntactic differences between the so-called passives and middles, their classification cannot be applied to new data. For instance, looking only at syntactic and semantic properties of a sentence like (55) it would be impossible to determine whether it is passive or middle because it is formally identical to both (44) and (45). Relying on English translations to determine its status would prove equally inadequate, since it can be translated either by a passive or middle, as shown below.

(55)　Ta　　obleka　　　se ne　　　zapenja.
　　　 this　 dress.NOM　 SE NEG　 fasten.3SG.PRES
　　　 'This dress cannot be fastened.' or 'This dress won't fasten.'

Second, Rivero & Milojević Sheppard's classification cannot be applied across languages. They (2003: 94-95) argue that Bulgarian sentence (56) with an intransitive verb and a human interpretation (as indicated in the translation) only looks identical to Slovene (42), yet the two sentences differ in that *se* in the Slovene sentence is a nominative indefinite pronoun, while *se* in the Bulgarian sentence is not a pronoun and the sentence has an implicit Agent argument. Rivero & Milojević Sheppard attribute this differentiation to variation: unlike Slovene, Bulgarian does not allow overt accusative NPs when the verb is transitive, which for Rivero & Milojević Sheppard is evidence that Bulgarian sentence (56) is not active and *se* is not nominative indefinite. Thus the human feature appears to be a central diagnostic test for nominative indefinites in some languages, but not in others, and identical sentences in different languages receive different syntactic analyses.

(56)　Tuk　se raboti　　　　 mnogo.
　　　 here　SE work.3SG.PRES　 a-lot
　　　 'Here people work a lot.'

Third, Rivero & Milojević Sheppard argue that intransitive sentences with *se* and transitive sentences with *se* and overt objects are active and that *se* is a nominative indefinite pronoun denoting a human (generic or indefinite, such as *people, somebody, few people*). As a result, such sentences should disallow agentive phrases referring to the implicit argument (e.g. *od* 'by'-phrases, *s strani* 'on the part of' phrases). Yet in Slovene such examples are attested, as shown in (31), repeated here as (57).

(57) Naročniku   se je   s strani   Telekoma   preprosto
     customer.DAT   SE AUX.3SG on the-part-of Telekom.GEN simply
     odklopilo   telefon.
     disconnect.PCP.SG.NEUTER   telephone.ACC
      'Telekom simply disconnected the telephone for the customer.'

The above example suggests that *se* should not (or need not) be analysed as having the human feature since there is no generic or indefinite human present in the interpretation of the sentence. This can be illustrated by two sentences below, of which only the first one with the subject *Telekom* is the most natural underlying sentence of (57) (if we assume that (57) is a middle construction derived in syntax), while the second one with the generic subject *ljudje* 'people' cannot be the underlying sentence of (57).

(58) Telekom je   naročniku   preprosto odklopil
     Telekom AUX.3SG   customer.DAT   simply   disconnect.PCP.SG.MASC
     telefon.
     telephone.ACC
      'Telekom simply disconnected the telephone for the customer.'

(59) *Ljudje   so   naročniku   s strani   Telekoma
     people   AUX.3PL   customer.DAT   on the-part-of Telekom.GEN
     preprosto odklopili   telefon.
     simply   disconnect.PCP.PL.MASC telephone.ACC
      '*People simply disconnected the telephone for the customer by Telekom.'

So in order to account for sentences like (57), *se* in Slovene sentences with intransitives and transitives with overt objects needs to be reanalysed.

As already discussed above, the active form of the verb does not necessarily indicate that the sentence is active, because middles also contain active verb forms. If we assume that middle formation is a syntactic process which demotes a human subject, but does not detransitivise a verb, Slovene sentences (27-29) and (42-43) can all be analysed as middles with an implicit human argument (*people, somebody, some people*) and the active verb form. The human interpretation in these sentences would be associated with the human argument which is demoted from the subject position to the adjunct during middle formation. When there is no overt object to promote, promotion to the subject position is not possible and the sentence is subjectless, just like subjectless passives. However, when there is an overt object, promotion in Slovene middles is allowed because the subject has been demoted, but it is not required because the verb retains its case-assigning properties.[6]

---

[6] Such is the situation in Slovene. But languages appear to have idiosyncratic constraints on whether promotion of the overt object is required in middles. The data presented in Rivero & Milojević Sheppard (2003) seem to support the idea that every language has its own rules regarding promotion in middles. Croatian, for example, resembles Slovene in having a standard variant with a promoted object, and a colloquial variant with an accusative object (2003: 105). Polish differs in having a standard variant with an accusative object and an obsolete variant with a promoted object (2003: 147). By contrast, Czech and Bulgarian seem to require promotion and disallow accusative objects in middles altogether (2003: 146).

The classification suggested in this paper has at least three advantages over that proposed by Rivero & Milojević Sheppard (2003). First, identical sentences within a language, such as (44) and (45) with transitive verbs and nominative NPs no longer need to be analysed as two distinct constructions, namely passives and middles. On current approach, both sentences are termed personal middles (since the verb shows morphological agreement with the nominative subject NP).

Second, identical sentences across languages, such as Slovene (42) and Bulgarian (56) no longer need different syntactic analyses – an active sentence with nominative indefinite *se*, and a sentence with an implicit argument, respectively. Under the current view, sentences with intransitive (or intransitively used) verbs and no overt nominative NP are labelled impersonal middles, since the verb shows a default, the so-called impersonal, agreement.

Finally, the current classification allows us to clearly distinguish Slovene sentences like (26), (27) and (29) (labelled middles in this paper) from (periphrastic) passives. While both middles and passives involve demotion of a subject, only passives involve detransitivisation of a verb, which results in obligatory promotion of an overt object. By contrast, in Slovene middles, which do not involve detransitivisation, promotion is optional, a situation which is reflected in the variation between standard nominative and colloquial accusative.

In the above sections I argued against the active status of Slovene sentences with *se* and no nominative NPs, because on this approach they cannot be satisfactorily distinguished from related constructions. I presented several arguments in favour of their classification as impersonal middles. I have also assumed and tried to provide evidence that impersonal as well as personal middles in Slovene are syntactic constructions derived by a process which demotes the underlying human subject, but does not detransitivise the verb. So as a result, overt underlying objects can remain in the object position (deriving impersonal middles), or are optionally promoted (deriving personal middles).

Now I turn to discuss some of the distinctive syntactic and semantic properties of Slovene middles in more detail.

3.3.3 Properties of Slovene middles

In this section I will discuss the constraints on middle formation in Slovene and present properties which seem to play an important role in the derivation of middles.

Middle formation is a fairly productive syntactic process in Slovene, especially compared to passivisation, which only applies to transitive verbs with overt objects. Middles, on the other hand, can be formed from transitive, unergative and even unaccusative verbs. There are only a few constraints on middle formation in Slovene, regarding the demoted argument, that is the underlying subject, and the verb. Let us have a closer look at each in turn.

Under the present analysis, middle formation targets the subject of the underlying sentence. In Slovene, subjects which can get demoted during middle formation must have the following properties. First, they must be referential – Slovene middles cannot be derived from subjectless active sentences like (60a).

(60)   a. Snežilo   je.
               snow.PCP.SG.NEUTER   AUX.3SG
               'It snowed.'

b. *Snežilo se je.
   snow.PCP.SG.NEUTER   SE   AUX.3SG
   Attempted: 'People snowed.'

The above example also indicates that the subject of the input sentence must be human, or at least an entity associated with humans, in order to derive a well-formed middle, because middles only describe events that involve human activity. Sentences with subjects that refer to animates, but not humans, do not derive felicitous middles, as shown below. (61b) gets a reading with a human interpretation, meaning that people build nests, rather than birds, and so it does not preserve the propositional content of the underlying sentence.

(61) a. Ptice gradijo   gnezda.
         birds build.3PL.PRES   nests.ACC
         'Birds build nests.'

      b. Gnezda   se gradijo.
         nests.NOM   SE build.3PL.PRES
         'Nests are built. / People build nests.'

Furthermore, the examples below show that even if the subject of the input sentence is human, it has to be in the nominative in order to be demoted during middle formation. Therefore middles cannot be formed from sentences with oblique subjects, such as the accusative *ljudi* 'people' in (62a).

(62) a. Ljudi   zebe.
         people.ACC   be-cold.3SG.PRES
         'People are cold.'

      b. *Zebe   se.
         be-cold.3SG.PRES   SE
         Attempted: 'People are cold.'

Another set of constraints regards the rules on which classes of verbs can undergo middle formation in Slovene. As we have seen in the examples discussed above, Slovene middles can be formed from transitive verbs (e.g. (26) and (29)), intransitively used transitive verbs (e.g. (28)) and intransitive verbs. However, middles in Slovene are formed not only from unergative intransitives (e.g. (27)), but also from unaccusatives, such as *umreti* 'die' and *priti* 'arrive' in the examples below. Therefore in Slovene, the implicit argument in middles does not necessarily have to be an external argument of the verb with the Agent θ-role, but can also be a Theme.

(63) a. Človek od   tega ne   umre.
         man   from this NEG   die.3SG.PRES
         'One doesn't die from this.'

      b. Od   tega se ne   umre.
         from this SE NEG   die.3SG.PRES
         'One doesn't die from this.'

24

(64) a. Človek   počasi   daleč pride.
          man   slowly   far   arrive.3SG.PRES
          'Easy does it.' Literally: 'Slowly one goes a long way.'

      b. Počasi   se daleč pride.
          slowly   SE far   arrive.3SG.PRES
          'Easy does it.' Literally: 'Slowly one goes a long way.'

However, not all unaccusatives form good middles in Slovene. According to Bolta (1988: 124) and Rivero & Milojević Sheppard (2003: 111, 114), middles should be able to derive also from copulas and the passive auxiliary *biti* 'be'. Yet, Rivero & Milojević Sheppard point out that such sentences receive different grammaticality judgements from Slovene native speakers; they are considered at least marginal if not ungrammatical. This is illustrated in (65b), a middle derived from a copula construction with an adjective, and (66b), a middle from a periphrastic passive.

(65) a. Človek   ni   nikoli srečen.
          man   be.NEG.3SG.PRES never happy
          'One is never happy.'

      b. ?Nikoli   se ni   srečen.
          never   SE be.NEG.3SG.PRES happy
          'One is never happy.'

                                    (Rivero & Milojević Sheppard 2003: 112)

(66) a. Ljudje   so   bili   večkrat   povabljeni   k
          people   AUX.3PL be.PCP.PL.MASC often   invited.PCP.PL.MASC to
          njim   na čaj.
          theirs for tea
          'People were often invited to theirs for tea.'

      b. ?Večkrat se je   bilo   k njim
          often   SE AUX.3SG be.PCP.SG.NEUTER to theirs
          povabljeno   na čaj.
          invited.PCP.SG.NEUTER   for tea
          'People are often invited to theirs for tea.'
                                                      (Bolta 1988: 124)

Finally, Slovene middles cannot derive from the so-called reflexive verbs, that is verbs which display the morpheme *se* as part of their lexical entry (verbs with inherent *se* in this paper), such as *smejati se* 'laugh'. Siewierska (1988: 265) likewise points out this phenomenon found in several Slavonic languages, but does not provide an explanation for it. In Slovene there might be a rule which disallows doubling of the clitic *se* in the language. Since middle formation in Slovene always involves the attachment of *se* to the verb, *se* would be doubled if a sentence like (67a) underwent middle formation.[7]

---

[7] Interestingly, reflexive verbs such as *smejati se* 'laugh' can undergo middle formation when they occur in a sentence with several coordinated predicates, as below.

(67) a. Ljudje   so   se smejali.
          people.NOM   AUX.3PL   SE laugh.PCP.PL.MASC
          'People laughed.'

      b. *Smejalo   se se je.
          laugh.PCP.SG.NEUTER   SE SE AUX.3SG
          Intended: 'People laughed.'

3.3.4 Properties of middle *se*

In this section I will examine the properties of the morpheme *se* in middles in order to provide evidence that middle *se* is a distinct type of *se*, and demonstrate how it differs from other uses of *se* discussed so far.

Unlike reflexive/reciprocal *se*, middle *se* cannot be replaced by a full pronoun or a full direct object NP, which suggests that middle *se* is not referring to an entity.

(68) Knjiga   se tiska.
      book   SE print.3SG.PRES
      'The book is being printed.'

(69) *Knjiga   tiska   sebe / svojo   naslovnico.
      book   print.3SG.PRES   self / its-own.ACC   cover.ACC
      '*The book is printing itself / its cover.'

Middle *se* also cannot be said to refer to the human argument present in the semantic interpretation of middles, as argued by Rivero & Milojević Sheppard (2003) for example. The evidence is based on the fact that the human argument in Slovene middles can be optionally expressed in the *s strani* 'on the part of' phrase, which implies that Slovene middles contain implicit human arguments and that consequently *se* cannot refer to the same entity. *S strani* 'on the part of' phrases occur not only in impersonal middles with accusative NPs, as in (31), but also in personal middles with promoted NPs, as shown below.

(70) Predlagamo,   da   se s strani   države   uvedejo
      suggest.1PL.PRES that SE on the-part-of   state.GEN   introduce.3PL.PRES
      zaščitni   mehanizmi.
      protective.NOM   mechanisms.NOM
      'We suggest that protective mechanisms be introduced by the state.'

As opposed to verbs with inherent *se*, which are derived in the lexicon, sentences with middle *se* seem to be derived in the syntax. There are several pieces of evidence that support the idea that middles in Slovene are syntactic. First, there are no exceptions to the rule, meaning that *se* in middles is obligatory and cannot be optionally omitted without changing the syntactic and semantic properties of a predicate, as is the case with inherent *se*. Let us compare the two sentences below as

---

(i) Pilo   se je,   jedlo,   plesalo   in
     drink.PCP.SG.NEUTER   SE AUX.3SG, eat.PCP.SG.NEUTER, dance.PCP.SG.NEUTER   and
     smejalo.
     laugh.PCP.SG.NEUTER
     'People were drinking, eating, dancing and laughing.'

an example: in (71), the subordinate clause with *se* is a middle with an implicit human argument, while in (72), the subordinate clause without *se* can only be interpreted as an active sentence with a *pro* in the subject position.

(71)　Ni　　　　　　res,　kar　　se govori.
　　　be.NEG.3SG.PRES true　　what　SE say.3SG.PRES
　　　'It's not true what people say.'

(72)　Ni　　　　　　res,　kar　　govori.
　　　be.NEG.3SG.PRES true　　what　say.3SG.PRES
　　　'It's not true what he/she says.'

The second piece of evidence that middle formation in Slovene is syntactic is the fact that it is highly productive and predictable, with only a few constraints, as illustrated above. And lastly, the combination of a verb + middle *se* never appears in a dictionary as a separate entry, which suggests that middles are perceived as syntactic constructions by Slovene native speakers.

Finally, middle *se* differs from both reflexive/reciprocal *se* and inherent *se* in that it does not correlate with the dative *si*. This means that middle *se* can never be replaced by *si* without changing the semantics of the sentence. We can see below that exchanging *si* for *se* in a personal middle with a nominative NP results in an ungrammatical sentence (73). By contrast, if *se* is replaced with *si* in an impersonal middle with an accusative object and no nominative NP, this changes the middle reading into an active one with *si* interpreted as a reflexive pronoun in the indirect object position (example (74)). The inability to distinguish between direct and indirect arguments within this use of the clitic *se* suggests that this distinction is either impossible or irrelevant, and thus implies that middle *se* is not a syntactic argument.

(73)　*Knjiga　　si　tiska.
　　　book.NOM　　SI　print.3SG.PRES
　　　Intended: 'The book is being printed.'

(74)　Knjigo　　si　tiska.
　　　book.ACC　SI　print.3SG.PRES
　　　'He/she is printing a book for himself/herself.'

So, if the above evidence shows that *se* in Slovene middles is neither a referential and thematic morpheme nor a syntactic argument, the question arises what kind of element middle *se* does represent. Here I will make a tentative proposal that *se* in middles could be analysed as a functional element marking demotion of a human argument during middle formation. This assumption of course raises several questions for further research. For instance, if middle *se* is an argument-demotion marker, that is a functional element, could it be analysed in line with Ramchand's (1998) analysis of the Scottish Gaelic aspectual particle, which represents a separate entry in the lexicon which only subsequently combines with the rest of the predicate at the level of syntactic structure? Moreover, can middle *se* be said to represent a functional category in the lexicon projecting its own phrase into syntax, similar to what Rivero & Milojević Sheppard (2003) propose for the morpheme *se* which they analyse as indefinite pronoun? And if so, what is the nature of this functional projection and

where in the sentence tree does it occur? A full discussion of these issues is beyond the scope of this paper and will be left for further research.

3.4 Anticausatives

The term anticausatives (also labelled ergatives (Keyser & Roeper 1984, Fagan 1992) and inchoatives (Schwartz 1988, Grimshaw 1990)) refers to the intransitive variants of causative verbs such as *sink, break* and *open*. In English, for example, the two variants of the so-called causative alternation pair are morphologically indistinguishable (e.g. sink.TRANS – sink.INTRANS). In Slovene, on the other hand, the intransitive member is most often morphologically marked by the morpheme *se* (e.g. *potopiti* 'sink.TRANS' – *potopiti se* 'sink.INTRANS'), as illustrated below.

(75) Sovražnik   potopi   ladjo. (transitive)
      enemy.NOM   sink.3SG.PRES   ship.ACC
      'The enemy sinks the ship.'

(76) Ladja   se potopi. (intransitive)
      ship.NOM SE sink.3SG.PRES
      'The ship sinks.'

Along with Levin & Rappaport Hovav (1995) I assume that anticausatives, that is intransitive variants of causative verbs, are derived from transitive variants and not the other way round as argued by Rosen (1996), among others. The first argument in support of this assumption is based on formal properties of anticausatives. In languages where causative alternation is morphologically marked, it is the intransitive verb that is morphologically more complex, which suggests that it is derived. Furthermore, the transitive and intransitive uses of causative verbs do not share the same restrictions on their arguments. Levin & Rappaport Hovav (1995: 86) point out that the set of the possible subjects for the intransitive use of the verb is only a subset of the possible objects for the transitive use of the same verb, which can also be illustrated with the Slovene verb *razbiti* 'break' in (77) (Bajec *et al.* 1997).

(77) a. Nasprotna   skupina   je   razbila   sestanek/demonstracijo/teorijo.
         opposing   group   AUX   break.PCP   meeting/demonstration/theory

      b. *Sestanek/Demonstracija/Teorija   se   je   razbil/a.
         meeting/demonstration/theory   SE   AUX   break.PCP.SG.MASC/FEM

The above examples show that objects of the transitive *razbiti* 'break' do not coincide with subjects of the intransitive *razbiti* 'break'.[8] Since the transitive form of a causative pair clearly imposes fewer selectional restrictions on its arguments, this is further evidence that it is basic and the intransitive form derived.

A typical characteristic of anticausative constructions found universally is that they do not allow the syntactic expression of the underlying subject of the predicate. As illustrated in (78), the Agent can never be explicitly expressed by an oblique phrase:

---

[8] The examples in (77b) are ungrammatical only because of the nature of the noun in the subject position. Our knowledge of the world tells us that the events described cannot happen spontaneously without a volitional Agent, which is typically implied by anticausative constructions.

(78) Ladja se potopi   (*od   sovražnika).
     ship   SE sink.3SG.PRES   (by   enemy)
     'The ship sinks (*by the enemy).'

This suggests that the derivation of anticausatives involves deletion of the Agent θ-role normally assigned to the external argument of the transitive variant, as proposed by Keyser & Roeper (1984: 402). Despite being agentless, however, anticausatives always imply an external cause that brings about the event. As demonstrated by Levin & Rappaport Hovav (1995), anticausatives only derive from verbs denoting externally caused events, such as *break*, while verbs describing internally caused events, such as *blush*, cannot decausativise. However, if we look at the anticausative construction in (76), we can see that the external cause of the event is not overtly expressed. This is possible because our knowledge of the world tells us that the event could not happen without an external cause even when this causer argument is not specified. Thus, anticausatives can be said to denote externally caused events which can occur spontaneously, that is events caused by an unspecified external cause.

However, if the intransitivity of anticausatives is a result of a process, the causer argument should be contained at some level of representation and its presence could be reflected by an adverbial modifier, as argued by Levin & Rappaport Hovav (1995: 88). They suggest that the adverbial *all by itself* in the sense of "without outside help" can serve for this purpose. The same is true in Slovene, as shown in (79), which contains the Slovene equivalent of the phrase *sam od sebe* 'all by itself'.

(79) Ladja se potopi   sama od sebe.
     ship   SE sink.3SG.PRES   all   by itself
     'The ship sinks all by itself.'

Similarly, Keyser & Roeper (1984: 405) note that anticausatives allow the phrase *all by itself* meaning "totally without external help" because this notion is compatible with agentlessness. On the other hand, agentive unergative intransitive verbs, such as *sing*, which are not derived forms, cannot co-occur with this phrase.

We have seen therefore that anticausatives involve deletion of the Agent, but contain an unspecified external cause in their semantic interpretation because they describe externally caused events which can come about spontaneously. The question therefore remains what is the function of the morpheme *se* which normally occurs in Slovene anticausatives, and how it differs from other uses of *se* in Slovene. I will address these issues in the following section.

3.4.1 Properties of anticausative *se*
In this section, I will compare the morpheme *se* in anticausatives with other uses of *se* discussed so far, and try to show that anticausative *se* does not share the same properties with any other use.

Unlike reflexive/reciprocal *se*, anticausative *se* cannot be replaced by a full pronoun or a full NP. This is an expected result since anticausatives are intransitive and therefore cannot have a syntactic object.

(80) Ladja potopi   *sebe /   *mornarje.
     ship   sink.3SG.PRES   itself /   sailors.ACC
     'The ship sinks *itself / *sailors.'

The above suggests that anticausative *se* is a non-referential element because it cannot be coreferential with the subject nor can it refer to any other entity. Consequently, anticausative *se* is not a syntactic argument. But unlike verbs with inherent *se*, which is also non-referential, each anticausative verb has a semantically related non-*se* base form, i.e. the transitive causative verb from which it is derived and with which it shares the same lexical semantic representation, according to Levin & Rappaport Hovav (1995: 82-84) (e.g. *potopiti* 'sink.TRANS' – *potopiti se* 'sink.INTRANS', *razbiti* 'break.TRANS' – *razbiti se* 'break.INTRANS').

Thus in having variants without *se* Slovene anticausatives resemble middles. However, there is an important difference. While middle *se* is an obligatory element in all middles, anticausative *se* does not appear in all anticausative constructions. Derivation of the majority of anticausatives in Slovene indeed involves the attachment of *se* to the verb, especially when they are derived from new causative verbs (e.g. *internetizirati* 'get online.TRANS' – *internetizirati se* 'get online.INTRANS'). However, there exist two other processes that can derive anticausatives from transitive causative verbs in Slovene. The intransitive form can be derived with the vowel change in the verbal suffix (e.g. *počrniti* 'blacken.TRANS' – *počrneti* 'blacken.INTRANS') or, like in English, it can be derived with no morphological marking on the verb (e.g. *počiti* 'burst.TRANS' – *počiti* 'burst.INTRANS'). These processes are illustrated below.

(81) Vlada   poskuša   internetizirati   družbo. (transitive)
       government   try.3SG.PRES   get-online.INFIN   society.ACC
       'The government tries to get society online.'

(82) Družba   se   internetizira. (intransitive)
       society   SE   get-online.3SG.PRES
       'Society is getting online.'

(83) Dim je   počrnil   kuhinjo. (transitive)
       smoke AUX   blacken.PCP   kitchen.ACC
       'The smoke blackened the kitchen.'

(84) Kuhinja je   počrnela. (intransitive)
       kitchen   AUX   blacken.PCP
       'The kitchen blackened.'

(85) Otrok je   počil   balon. (transitive)
       child AUX   burst.PCP balloon.ACC
       'The child burst the balloon.'

(86) Balon   je   počil. (intransitive)
       balloon AUX   burst.PCP
       'The balloon burst.'

Judging by this evidence, the attachment of *se* is only one of the possible processes deriving anticausatives in Slovene. There must be one of the following: either the vowel change, or no morphological marking, or *se*. But we cannot have both the vowel change and *se*, for instance. These processes deriving Slovene anticausatives appear to be fairly idiosyncratic and the information about which

process derives the intransitive form from a given causative verb seems to be stored in the lexicon. Thus anticausative *se*, when attached to a verb, can be viewed as part of a lexical unit, without lexical meaning of its own. This view is supported by Keyser & Roeper's (1984: 395) claim about English anticausatives, which are said to derive in the lexicon by a syntax-like process which demotes the verb's external argument, as well as by Levin & Rappaport Hovav's (1995: 80) proposal that cross-linguistically anticausatives are basically unaccusative verbs derived in the lexicon, having a subject which is not an external argument but rather an underlying object.

On this view, derivation of anticausatives resembles middle formation in involving demotion of the underlying subject. However, unlike middles, which can have their human argument overtly expressed, anticausatives do not allow the syntactic expression of the Agent, which appears to be deleted. Therefore I propose the idea that like middle *se*, anticausative *se* may be analysed as a demotion marker in Slovene, that is a functional element which marks demotion, or rather, deletion of the external argument. However, unlike middle *se*, which marks demotion of the human argument (not necessarily an Agent) during middle formation, anticausative *se* marks deletion of the Agent during the derivation of an anticausative verb.

In summary, anticausative *se* is the morpheme which is attached to the majority of Slovene anticausative verbs, that is intransitive variants of causative verbs. Like inherent *se* and unlike reflexive/reciprocal *se*, anticausative *se* is non-referential since it cannot be replaced by a full pronoun or an NP. Unlike verbs with inherent *se*, each anticausative verb has a semantically related non-*se* form which serves as a base for its derivation. However, unlike in middles, the presence of the morpheme *se* in Slovene anticausatives is not obligatory and seems to be lexically determined. Although the majority of Slovene anticausatives contain *se*, the operation that prevents the Agent from being syntactically expressed can alternatively be marked by the vowel change in the verbal suffix or, like in English, by no morphological marking on the verb. Anticausatives resemble middles in involving demotion of the external argument. However, while the demoted argument in middles is only implicit and can occasionally be overtly expressed in an agentive phrase, the external argument in anticausatives is deleted and can never be overt. Instead, anticausatives always imply an unspecified external cause in their interpretation, which brings about the event that can happen spontaneously. This causer argument need not be syntactically expressed since our extra-linguistic knowledge tells us that the event could not happen without an external cause; however, its presence can be reflected by an adverbial *sam od sebe* 'all by itself'. Anticausative *se* can therefore be viewed as a non-referential morpheme, functioning not as a syntactic argument but rather as a functional element marking morphologically the derivation of an anticausative.

3.4.2 Internally caused events

This section deals with constructions with *se* which, as I will argue, resemble anticausatives in having a demoted external argument in their syntax and an unspecified cause in their semantics. They differ from anticausatives in that their Agent is not deleted but appears to be demoted to the indirect object, and that their unspecified cause is interpreted as internal rather than external. Therefore I propose that anticausatives and verbs expressing internally caused events together form a group of derived causatives in Slovene.

The two pairs of sentences below illustrate the relationship between the agentive sentence and the construction expressing an internally caused event. We can see that in (88) and (90) the verbs *rigati* 'belch' and *iti* 'go' have *se* attached to them, and that

the NP *Peter* and the 1st person singular pronoun are in the dative case, which suggests that their semantic role is that of an Experiencer rather than an Agent.[9] As a result, the verbs in (88) and (90) do not agree with the NPs, but show default agreement, that is 3rd person singular neuter.

(87) Peter   je   rigal.
      Peter.NOM   AUX.3SG   belch.PCP.SG.MASC
      'Peter belched.'

(88) Petru   se je   rigalo.
      Peter.DAT SE AUX.3SG   belch.PCP.SG.NEUTER
      'Peter belched (involuntarily).'

(89) Ne   grem   na reko.
      NEG   go.1SG.PRES   on river
      'I'm not going on the river.'

(90) Ne   gre   se mi   na reko.[10]
      NEG   go.3SG.PRES SE I.DAT on river
      'I don't feel like going on the river.'

It is also apparent that despite sharing the same syntactic structure on the surface, (88) and (90) have different semantic interpretations, also indicated in the translations. While (88) describes an involuntary event, (90) expresses a desire, intention or disposition, or rather lack of it. This semantic difference can be demonstrated by trying to paraphrase the above sentences by the verbs *dati* 'give' and *ljubiti* 'love' (only possible with negation), or *hoteti* 'want'. We can see below that only (90), expressing (lack of) intention, can be paraphrased with these verbs, while (88), expressing an involuntary event, is not compatible with the idea of intention or disposition. Hence the oddness of (92).

(91) Ne   da /   ljubi   se mi   iti   na reko.
      NEG   give.3SG.PRES / love.3SG.PRES SE I.DAT go.INFIN   on river
      'I don't feel like going on the river.'

(92) ??Petru   se je   hotelo   rigati.
      Peter.DAT SE AUX.3SG   want.PCP.SG.NEUTER belch.INFIN
      '??Peter felt like belching (involuntarily).'

---

[9] Across languages, the dative in sentences like (88) and (90) is analysed as inherent case typically associated with the θ-role of Experiencer (Anderson 1990: 257, Marušič & Žaucer 2004: 25).
[10] The original example taken from the Slovene corpus is as follows:

(i) Če bi   bilo   po starem, bi   moral   ob teh   poplavnih
     if would   be.PCP.SG.NEUTER   as usual, would must.PCP.SG.MASC   in these   flood
     vodah biti   prvi   na reki. Toda ne   gre   se mi   na vodo.
     waters be.INFIN   the-first on river. but   NEG   go.3SG.PRES   SE I.DAT on water
     'Normally, I should be the first on the river in these floods. But I don't feel like going on the water.'

In (90) this example is adapted to avoid ambiguity when taken out of the context. Its syntax and semantics, however, are preserved.

Despite this semantic contrast, sentences like (88) and (90) are normally treated under a single heading. There are several terms used by researchers to refer to this construction, depending on which features they want to highlight, e.g. constructions expressing involuntary actions (Herrity 2000), dative existential disclosure construction (Rivero & Milojević Sheppard 2003), the intentional feel-like construction (Marušič & Žaucer 2004), dispositional reflexive construction (Franks 1995, for Russian), desideratives (Harris 1981, for Georgian).

Below I will consider in more detail two recent accounts of the Slovene construction with *se* and a dative Experiencer NP, namely by Rivero & Milojević Sheppard (2003) and Marušič & Žaucer (2004). I hope to show that their analyses can only account for the sentences expressing intention or desire, but not for those expressing involuntary events. Marušič & Žaucer even treat sentences like (88) and (90) as two distinct constructions, although their data comprise sentences that can have both interpretations. I argue that the difference between the two types of sentences is only pragmatic in nature and that their interpretation depends on the context. Accordingly, I will suggest that there is no need to assume two analyses for the construction in question, and propose an alternative unified approach.

Rivero & Milojević Sheppard (2003:97-98, 131-139) refer to sentences with *se* and dative NPs, such as (88) and (90), as dative existential disclosure constructions. They argue that these constructions have the same morphology and syntax as sentences (42) and (43), termed impersonal middles in this paper (see section 3.3.2). Therefore the morpheme *se* in all of these sentences is treated in the same way, as an indefinite (defective) nominative pronoun with a human interpretation, functioning as the subject in an active sentence. The only formal difference between the two sets of sentences is the presence of an additional dative in (88) and (90), which Rivero & Milojević Sheppard (2003: 134) analyse as a syntactic adjunct, rather than indirect object; therefore not as part of the verb's argument structure. The dative is also supposed to be the source of the semantic difference, namely the lack of indefinite readings in (88) and (90). According to Rivero & Milojević Sheppard, the dative triggers two semantic operations on the nominative indefinite *se*. First, it deletes the existential quantifier contained in the indefinite pronoun, and then establishes a connection between the dative and the indefinite pronoun, so that *se* no longer gets the indefinite interpretation. These two operations together represent the so-called dative existential disclosure.

However, as I have pointed out in section 3.3.2, *se* in sentences with no nominative does not need to be analysed as a nominative subject pronoun because Slovene sentences can be subjectless with no nominative element. Furthermore, the analysis of *se* as a nominative pronoun is rather problematic if we take into account that Slovene *se* is formally a reflexive clitic, which has no nominative form (Table 1). So I assume that there must be an alternative explanation for the subjectlessness of constructions with *se* and dative NPs, and suggest that it is the result of demotion of the underlying subject to the indirect object.

Furthermore, Rivero & Milojević Sheppard (2003: 139) draw a parallel between sentences like (90) and their overt paraphrases like (91), assigning the same syntax to both. They argue that Slovene constructions with *se* and dative NPs have an additional Modal Phrase, which has an empty head in examples like (90), while in their paraphrases verbs like *hoteti* 'want' are the overt instantiations of the modal head.

This approach accounts for sentences expressing intention, but I argue that it cannot account for sentences expressing involuntary events like (88), since they are

incompatible with the notion of intentionality. We can of course assume that sentences like (88) are distinct constructions with different syntactic and semantic structure, but then sentences like (93) prove problematic because they can be interpreted as expressing either an involuntary event or intention (Rivero & Milojević Sheppard 2003: 137), and their interpretation is determined solely by the context.

(93) Janezu   se spi.
     Janez.DAT   SE sleep.3SG.PRES
     'Janez is sleepy. / Janez feels like sleeping.'

Rivero & Milojević Sheppard (2003: 137) observe that when sentence (93) has an overt modal *hoteti* 'want' it is judged marginal by some Slovene speakers, as shown below. Rivero & Milojević Sheppard attribute this to the fact that the modal must seem redundant if the sentence already contains an empty modal head.

(94) (?)Janezu   se hoče   spati.
     Janez.DAT   SE want.3SG.PRES   sleep.INFIN
     'Janez is sleepy. / Janez feels like sleeping.'

I argue, however, that (94) can be paraphrased by *hoteti* 'want', but only when it means *Janez feels like sleeping*. By contrast, when speakers interpret it as *Janez is sleepy* or *Janez is falling asleep (involuntarily)*, it cannot be paraphrased by *hoteti* 'want' because the notion of intentionality is incompatible with an involuntary event. So it is the fact that the sentence has two interpretations that seems to be responsible for the varying judgements from native speakers. The important point that examples like (94) illustrate is that a successful analysis of this construction should be able to account for sentences expressing intention and those expressing involuntary events, since the semantic difference does not seem to depend on any particular structure.

Another problem with Rivero & Milojević Sheppard's account, which they also point out, is that it cannot be applied cross-linguistically (2003: 98). Under their analysis, nominative indefinite pronouns are not found in all Slavonic languages (e.g. Bulgarian, Czech), while constructions with the reflexive morpheme and a dative NP like (88) and (90) are. Rivero & Milojević Sheppard attribute this to variation and propose that in languages without indefinites the reflexive morpheme stands for an implicit argument instead. So they assume two different syntactic analyses for constructions that share the same semantic properties and surface structure. Contrary to this view, I argue that across languages these constructions contain a demoted argument.

By contrast, Marušič & Žaucer's (2004: 1-4, 24) analysis of constructions with *se* and dative NPs, which they term the feel-like construction, assumes a biclausal structure with a hidden matrix predicate, that is a null verb FEEL-LIKE, in their terms. Like Rivero & Milojević Sheppard, they draw a parallel between the feel-like construction and its closest paraphrase with an overt verb meaning *feel-like*. However, on their view, the difference between the two variants lies in the overtness/covertness of the matrix verb. Thus in sentences like (91) the overt matrix verb like *dati* 'give' fills the same position as a null verb/lexical item FEEL-LIKE fills in sentences like (90).

We can see from the above that Marušič & Žaucer's analysis can explain constructions expressing intention, but not those expressing involuntary events, such as (88), which they exclude from their analysis. However, their data include examples with the verbs *zaspati* 'drop off (to sleep)' and *zadremati* 'doze off', which like (93)

can express either a feel-like event or an involuntary event. In fact, it seems to me that their most natural interpretation would be that of an involuntary event. I do not agree with Marušič & Žaucer that the best translation for sentence (95) below is *He felt like starting to sleep*, implying that the subject of the sentence wanted to go to sleep (2004: 44). I propose that (95) should be translated as *He dropped off*, implying no volition on the part of the subject.

(95)   Zaspalo   se mu   je.
        drop-off.PCP.SG.NEUTER SE he.DAT   AUX.3SG
        'He felt like starting to sleep. / He dropped off.'

Therefore sentences like (95), which Marušič & Žaucer term the feel-like constructions, but are more naturally used to express involuntary events, demonstrate that it is not possible to make a clear distinction between sentences expressing intention and those expressing involuntary events, so I suggest that we need an analysis which could account for both.

Furthermore, Marušič & Žaucer (2004: 39) argue that Slovene imposes fewer restrictions on the derivation of the feel-like construction compared to other languages that display the comparable construction. They claim that with regard to types of complement that the FEEL-LIKE head allows in a particular language, Slovene seems highly productive, as it admits unergative, transitive (imperfective and perfective) as well as modal verbs in the complement clause. The Slovene feel-like construction with transitive verbs can even display two variants, according to Marušič & Žaucer (2004: 2); the so-called "active" with accusative NPs (example (96)), and "passive" with nominative NPs (example (97)).

(96)   Janezu   se je   pilo   slivovko.
        Janez.DAT   SE AUX.3SG drink.PCP.SG.NEUTER   plum-brandy.ACC.FEM.SG
        'Janez felt like drinking plum brandy.'

(97)   Janezu   se je   pila   slivovka.
        Janez.DAT   SE AUX.3SG drink.PCP.SG.FEM   plum-brandy.NOM.FEM.SG
        'Janez felt like drinking plum brandy.'

However, examples like (96) and (97) above do not seem to be attested in Slovene. If we adopt Marušič & Žaucer's biclausal analysis for a moment, we can see from the available attested data that in Slovene, the null FEEL-LIKE head only allows intransitives in the complement clause, mostly verbs describing actions that can occur involuntarily (e.g. *rigati* 'belch', *kolcati* 'hiccup', *zehati* 'yawn', *spati* 'sleep', *dremati* 'drowse', *sanjati* 'dream', *blesti* 'rave') and very few other lexical verbs (e.g. *iti* 'go'). By contrast, the overt feel-like head (e.g. *dati* 'give', *ljubiti* 'love', *hoteti* 'want') appears to allow a wider variety of verbs in the complement clause, but still only intransitives, as shown below.

(98)   Tisti dan   se mu   ni   ljubilo   ne
        that day   SE he.DAT   AUX.NEG.3SG love.PCP.3SG.NEUTER   neither
        jesti   ne   piti.
        eat.INFIN   nor   drink.INFIN
        'That day he didn't feel like eating or drinking.'

(99) Ni   se mu   hotelo   misliti.
     AUX.NEG.3SG SE he.DAT   want.PCP.SG.NEUTER think.INFIN
     'He didn't feel like thinking.'

Marušič & Žaucer themselves admit that their claims about the Slovene feel-like construction are rather controversial (2004: 1), and that their conclusions are based on examples from slang spoken by younger generation in a geographically restricted area, which older speakers, especially those from other regions, find ungrammatical or less natural (personal communication). What is needed for future research, then, is more attested data, on which different approaches and analyses could be tested.

In short, the above two approaches appear to be successful in accounting for sentences with *se* and dative Experiencer NPs which express volition. However, they do not seem to take into account that some sentences with *se* and dative Experiencers, such as (93) and (95), can express either volition or involuntary events. Such sentences present a problem for these approaches, especially for the one which assumes a different syntactic structure for sentences expressing involuntary events, because the two interpretations are only contextually determined. Therefore I suggest that sentences with *se* and dative NPs expressing intention and volition as well as those expressing involuntary events need a semantic and syntactic analysis that would account for both.

In fact, the semantic property that all Slovene sentences with *se* and dative Experiencer NPs seem to have in common is a kind of compulsion or inner force which causes Peter to belch in (88), and which causes the speaker not (to have a desire) to go on the river in (90). The semantic interpretation of this construction, at least in Slovene, seems to involve a cause coming from within, therefore an internal, rather than external cause.

This view can be supported by several proposals in the literature. First, the distinction between internal and external causation has also been pointed out by Levin & Rappaport Hovav (1995: 106). Their claim is that cross-linguistically those verbs which describe internally caused events that occur spontaneously (e.g. *laugh*) tend to have the transitive form morphologically marked. By contrast, those verbs which describe externally caused spontaneous events tend to have the intransitive form morphologically marked, as we have seen in preceding section dealing with anticausatives. In line with this I argue that Slovene constructions with *se* and Experiencer datives are used to describe internally caused events (arising from internal properties of the arguments (Levin & Rappaport Hovav 1995: 91)), where the transitive variant of the verb, the one containing the cause, is morphologically marked by the morpheme *se*.

This assumption leads to Markman (2003) who, following Pylkkanen's (2002) typology of causatives, suggests that the comparable desiderative construction in Russian, illustrated in (100), should be analysed as a causativised unergative without an Agent, since it is clearly non-agentive (does not allow control into purpose clauses) yet, it requires a causing event.

(100) Mne   xorosho   igraet-sja   (*chtoby vyigrat') / (*samo po sebe).
      me   well   play.3SG.PRES-SJA   (*to win) /   (*all by itself)
      'Playing goes well for me / Playing feels well to me (*in order to win) / (*all by itself)'

(Markman 2003)

36

Her claim is that like causatives across languages, Russian example (100) involves a causative head which introduces an event argument, but involves no external argument. Assuming her proposal, I therefore propose that Slovene sentences expressing internally caused events display a similar structure; they are causatives which require an internal causer argument but disallow an Agent.

The question of their derivation however remains open. One could consider Harris's (1981: 137 in Marušič & Žaucer 2004: 4) suggestion that equivalent constructions in Georgian involve Inversion – a rule in Relational Grammar which demotes the subject to an indirect object. The idea of demotion being involved in the derivation of reflexivised sentences with Experiencer datives is also implied in Rivero & Milojević Sheppard's (2003) proposal that this construction involves an implicit argument in languages which do not display nominative indefinites. If future research shows that *se* in these constructions can be cross-linguistically analysed as being in some way associated with a demoted argument, then we will have to provide an explanation of which argument gets demoted and how, and also whether this process is lexical or syntactic.

In sum, therefore, Slovene constructions with *se* and dative Experiencer NPs seem to present and interesting case of causation being expressed in a language. Proposals so far have assumed they have a monoclausal structure with a Modal Phrase, which can have its head empty or filled with an overt verb. Alternatively, they could be analysed as biclausal structures with a matrix predicate FEEL-LIKE, which can be covert or overt. However, in order to account for sentences that express intention as well as involuntary events, I propose the idea that these constructions are causatives derived by a process which involves demotion of the external argument and introduction of the causer argument to the semantics of the sentence. As such, they may be seen to resemble anticausatives, which also involve demotion of the external argument and introduction of a causer argument. The difference is that anticausatives involve deletion of the Agent from the syntax and introduction of an external cause, while internal causatives seem to involve demotion of the subject of the inflected verb (modals, verbs interpreted as *feel like*, or other lexical verbs) to the indirect object position, and introduction of an internal cause. The similarities and differences between these two constructions with *se* are summarised in Table 3.

Table 3 Comparison between anticausatives and internal causatives in Slovene.

	Demotion of the external argument	**Causer argument introduced to the semantics**
Anticausatives	Deletion of the Agent	External cause
Internal causatives	Demotion of the Agent to an indirect object	Internal cause

The question therefore arises whether Slovene anticausatives and constructions expressing internally caused events group together into a larger class of (derived) causatives. The fact that anticausatives always involve detransitivisation of the verb, while internal causation constructions are said not to, could imply that they represent two distinct classes of construction. Therefore, more research and more attested data are needed to ascertain if Slovene constructions expressing internally caused events really can be derived from transitive verbs (as suggested in the literature), and particularly if they remain transitive and can retain accusative objects.

4. Conclusion

In this paper I have attempted to provide an overall treatment of Slovene sentences with the morpheme *se*, which seem almost identical, but reveal different syntactic and semantic properties on closer inspection. The main argument of the paper was that constructions with *se* can be divided into four groups with regard to the role of the morpheme *se*, using only two factors as the criteria for distinction. First, the uses of *se* are divided into those representing an argument (reflexive/reciprocal *se*, inherent *se*) and those marking demotion of an argument (middle *se*, anticausative *se*). Second, they are divided according to whether *se* is attached to the verb in the syntax (reflexive/reciprocal *se*, middle *se*) or the lexicon (inherent *se*, anticausative *se*). The main aim of the paper, however, was to describe and analyse each type of *se* systematically in order to find evidence in support of the above classification. I have shown that for each type of *se* we can identify at least one distinctive property that is not shared by any other type, namely the ability to be replaced by a full pronoun or NP for reflexive/reciprocal *se*, the lack of semantically related non-*se* base forms for inherent *se*, the marking of demotion of a human argument for middle *se*, and the marking of demotion of an Agent and introduction of a causer argument for anticausative *se*. This is set out in the table below.

Table 4 Distinguishing properties of the four major types of Slovene *se*

	Replaced by a full pronoun or NP	No related non-*se* base forms	Demoted human argument	Demoted Agent, implied cause
Refl./recip. *se*	✓	✗	✗	✗
Inherent *se*	✗	✓	✗	✗
Middle *se*	✗	✗	✓	✗
(Anti)causative *se*	✗	✗	✗	✓

Moreover, we have seen that only when *se* is associated with an internal argument can it correlate with the dative *si*, thus providing more evidence in support of the claim that it is a syntactic argument (reflexive/reciprocal *se*) or derives historically from one (inherent *se*).

In the paper I have also discussed some of the constructions with *se* which are more difficult to classify due to their unique properties, such as sentences expressing delimited excessive events and reciprocal events with a prototypical argument, which seem to display inherent *se*, and sentences expressing internally caused events, which seem to group together with anticausatives, forming a class of causatives (as implied in Table 4). A number of issues raised by these constructions remain to be explored, for instance the question of their derivation and the exact role of *se* in each of them, especially those expressing internal causation. These will require a significant amount of further study to determine exactly how they can be incorporated into the present classification.

In addition, I have pointed out that several semantic and aspectual properties of predicates, such as the category of [+human], external and internal causation, spontaneous occurrence of an event, delimitedness, excessive nature of an event, symmetrical human behaviour and involuntary actions, may play an important role in argument linking in Slovene. The future research will have to thoroughly investigate the interaction between these properties and the syntactic behaviour of predicates with *se* in order to determine their role in argument mapping. The analysis of constructions with *se* has also raised a few questions which need further investigation, the main one

being whether the demotion-marker *se* can be viewed as a functional element in the lexicon projecting its own phrase in the syntax and if so, which information in the lexicon that is syntactically relevant combines with *se* at the level of syntactic structure.

The great diversity of Slovene constructions with *se* and the wide variety of their syntactic and semantic relations can prove an invaluable source of data for determining the full range of uses of the reflexive morpheme and their interaction within a single language.

References

Anderson, S.R. (1990). The Grammar of Icelandic Verbs in -*st*. In J. Maling & A. Zaenen (eds.), *Syntax and Semantics 24: Modern Icelandic Syntax*. Academic Press. pp. 235-273.

Bajec, A. et al. (eds.) (1997). *Slovar slovenskega knjižnega jezika*. Ljubljana, SAZU, Inštitut za slovenski jezik Frana Ramovša: DZS.

Blevins, J.P. (2003). Passives and Impersonals. *Journal of Linguistics* **39.3**: 473-520 (URL: http://www.cus.cam.ac.uk/~jpb39/papers/jl39.pdf – accessed 07/07/2004).

Bolta, M. (1988). Enodelni glagolski stavek v vezalno-navezovalni teoriji. *Zbornik 4. konference Računalniška obdelava jezikovnih podatkov*. Portorož: Institut Jožef Stefan in Društvo za uporabno jezikoslovje Slovenije. pp. 119-135.

Browne, W. (1993). Serbo-Croat. In B. Comrie & G.G. Corbett (eds.), *The Slavonic Languages*. London: Routledge. pp. 306-387.

Chomsky, N. (1981). *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Dordrecht: Foris.

Dowty, D.R. (1991). Thematic Proto-Roles and Argument Selection. *Language* **67.3**: 547-619.

Fagan, S.M.B. (1992). *The Syntax and Semantics of Middle Constructions: A Study with Special Relation to German*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Franks, S. (1995). *Parameters of Slavic Morphosyntax*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Grevisse, M. (1961). *Le bon usage: Grammaire française avec des remarques sur la langue française d'aujourdhui* (7th ed.). Belgium: J. Duculot, Paris: Paul Geuthner.

Grimshaw, J. (1990). *Argument Structure*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.

Hale, K. & Keyser, S.J. (1993). On Argument Structure and the Lexical Expression of Syntactic Relations. In K. Hale & S.J. Keyser (eds.), *The View from Building 20: Essays in Honor of Sylvain Bromberger*. MIT Press. pp. 53-109.

Harris, A. (1981). *Georgian Syntax: A Study in Relational Gramma*r. Cambridge: CUP.

Herrity, P. (2000). *Slovene: A Comprehensive Grammar*. London, New York: Routledge.

Keyser, S.J. & T. Roeper (1984). On the Middle and Ergative Constructions in English. *Linguistic Inquiry* **15**: 381-416.

Levin, B. & M. Rappaport Hovav (1995). *Unaccusativity: At the Syntax–Lexical Semantics Interface*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.

Markman, V.G. (2003). Causatives Without Causers and Burzio's Generalization. NELS 34 (abstract) (URL: http://www.ic.sunnysb.edu/Clubs/nels/abstracts/markman.pdf – accessed 07/07/2004).

Marušič, F. & R. Žaucer (2004). On the Intensional FEEL-LIKE Construction in Slovenian: A Case of a Phonologically Null Verb. Stony Brook University (URL: http://www.ic.sunysb.edu/Stn/fmarusic/pub/FEELLIKE_Draft_June_2004.pdf – accessed 07/07/2004).

Nelson, D. (2003). Passives were Analysed: Finnish as a Case Study. Paper presented at Department of Linguistics and Phonetics Research Seminar Series, University of Leeds.

Priestly, T.M.S. (1993). Slovene. In B. Comrie & G.G. Corbett (eds.), *The Slavonic Languages*. London: Routledge. pp. 388-451.

Pylkkanen, L. (2002). Introducing Arguments. PhD Thesis, MIT.

Ramchand, G.C. (1998). Deconstructing the Lexicon. In M. Butt & W. Geuder (eds.), *The Projection of Arguments: Lexical and Compositional Factors*. Stanford: CSLI. pp. 65-96.

Reinhart, T. & E. Reuland (1993). Reflexivity. *Linguistic Inquiry* **24**: 657-720.

Rivero, M.L. (2000). On Impersonal *się* in Polish: A Simplex Expression Anaphor. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* **8, 1-2**: 199-237 (URL: http://aix1.uottawa.ca/~romlab/2PDF-JSL.pdf – accessed 16/07/2004).

Rivero, M.L. & M. Milojević Sheppard (2001). On Impersonal *se / się* in Slavic. In G. Zybatow et al. (eds.) *Current Issues in Formal Slavic Linguistics*. Peter Lang. pp.137-147.

Rivero, M.L. & M. Milojević Sheppard (2003). Indefinite Reflexive Clitics in Slavic: Polish and Slovenian. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* **21**: 89-155.

Schwartz, L. (1988). Thematic Relations and Case Linking in Russian. In W. Wilkins (ed.), *Syntax and Semantics 21: Thematic Relations*. Academic Press. pp. 167-189.

Siewierska, A. (1988). The Passive in Slavic. In M. Shibatani (ed.), *Passive and Voice*. Typological Studies in Language **16**. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. pp. 243-289.

Stroik, T. (1999). Middles and Reflexivity. *Linguistic Inquiry* **30**: 119-131.

Tenny, C. (1994). *Aspectual Roles and the Syntax-Semantics Interface*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Toporišič, J. (2000). *Slovenska slovnica*. Maribor: Založba Obzorja.

Wehrli, E. (1986). On Some Properties of French Clitic *se*. In H. Borer (ed.), *Syntax and Semantics 19: The Syntax of Pronominal Clitics*. Academic Press. pp. 263-283.

Sabina Grahek
Department of Linguistics and Phonetics
University of Leeds
Leeds LS2 9JT

sgrahek@hotmail.com