

Appears with minor corrections in Balkan Syntax and Semantics, ed. by O.Miseska-Tomic. Series *Linguistik Aktuell*. Amsterdam: Benjamins. 2004. Pp.237-267.

DATIVES AND THE NON-ACTIVE VOICE / REFLEXIVE CLITIC IN BALKAN LANGUAGES

MARIA LUISA RIVERO

University of Ottawa

Summary

This paper examines in Balkan languages two constructions combining Non-Active morphology / reflexive clitics with datives that are not part of the argument structure of the verb. The first construction is the so-called involuntary state or ‘feel like’ construction, which divides Balkan languages into two groups. Albanian and the South Slavic languages share this construction with similar characteristics, but in Greek and Rumanian it is absent. Involuntary state constructions contain a passive or impersonal core. This core contains an existentially closed or implicit argument due to Argument Saturation. The dative discloses and binds this implicit argument via a formal semantic procedure called Dative Disclosure. The second construction is found in all Balkan languages along parallel lines, and consists of an anticausative core coupled to a dative open to a variety of interpretations. It is proposed that datives in anticausatives are interpreted by an inferential procedure called the Ethical strategy, which differs from Dative Disclosure because it cannot operate on formally present arguments. In addition, Dative Disclosure cannot apply in anticausatives because those lack the appropriate formal argument due to Argument Suppression. In simple terms, involuntary state constructions are based on passive, not on anticausative structures.

1. *Introduction*¹

¹ Research for this paper was partially supported by Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada Research Grant 410-2000-0120. Preliminary versions were read at the Acme Balkanica Conference, April 27-29 2001, at Concordia University, Montreal, Canada, and at the Conference on the Balkan Sprachbund Properties, June 7-9 2001, Leiden, Holland. I am grateful to the audiences of these two conferences for many useful comments, and to Olga Tomi for inviting me to the Leiden conference. This version has benefited from the comments of Dalina Kallulli as reviewer, and an anonymous referee.

Special thanks go to Milena M. Sheppard for joint work on topics related to the proposals in this paper, and for Slovenian. For Albanian, I am indebted to Dalina Kallulli, who besides being one of the readers of the previous version of this paper is the source of earlier theoretical inspiration (Kallulli 1999), and help. For Bulgarian, I am very thankful to Olga Arnaudova for help beyond the call of duty through the years, and to Roumyana Pancheva, and Olga Tomi at the Leiden Conference. For Czech, I thank Denisa Lenertová. For Greek I am indebted to Cleo Condoravdi, to Angela Ralli, and to Athina Sioupi. For Polish I thank Anna Boron, Robert B. Borsley, Magdalena Gol˙dzinowska, Ewa Jaworska, Adam Przepi˙rkowski, and Ewa Willim, through the years. For Rumanian I am most grateful to Rodica Diaconescu, and for Serbocroatian to Danijela Stojanovi .

This section introduces the main constructions discussed in the paper, which all combine datives with the Non-Active Voice or a reflexive clitic, and sketches essential claims.

A first type of construction of interest to this paper that lacks a traditional label is illustrated in (1a-d). All the languages of the Balkans share sentences where a dative (or in Greek (Gre) a genitive) combines with a so-called anticausative construction, as in Albanian (Alb) *U thye dritarja*. ‘The window broke.’ or Gre *Kaike i supa*. ‘The soup burned.’. Such an anticausative core usually displays Non-Active morphology (Alb and Gre) or a reflexive clitic - in bold from now on-, and when combined with a dative / genitive receives several parallel interpretations. Under appropriate pragmatic conditions, the dative can be a possessor, a somehow affected participant such as a benefactive / malefactive, or very roughly speaking, a causer / involuntary agent, as the glosses indicate.²

- | | | | | | | | |
|-----|----|----------------|-----------|----------------------|-----------------------|------------------|-------------|
| (1) | a. | <i>Anës</i> | <i>i-</i> | <i>u</i> | <i>thye</i> | <i>dritarja.</i> | Alb |
| | | Ann.Dat | 3S.Dat- | Non-act. | break.3S | window.Nom.the | |
| | b. | <i>Na Ivan</i> | | <i>mu</i> | <i>se</i> | <i>ꝑupixa</i> | Bul |
| | | To Ivan | | he.Dat | Refl | broke.3PL | glasses.the |
| | c. | <i>Tu</i> | | <i>Ben tu</i> | <i>kaike</i> | <i>i supa.</i> | Gre |
| | | the.Gen | | Ben he.Gen | burnt. Non-act | the soup.Nom | |
| | d. | <i>Lui Jon</i> | <i>i</i> | <i>se sparse</i> | <i>ferestrea.</i> | | Rum |
| | | John.Dat | he.Dat | Refl broke.3S | window.the | | |

‘{Ann’s / Ben’s / John’s} {glasses/ soup/ window} {broke/burned}.’
 ‘{Ann/John/Ben} was somehow affected by the {glasses /soup/ window} {breaking/ burning}.’
 ‘{Ann /Ben/John} was the cause of/ responsible for the {glasses /soup/ window} {breaking/burning}.’
 ‘{Ann/ Ben/ John} {broke/burned} {the glasses/soup/window} involuntarily.’

A second type of construction of interest to this paper is illustrated in (2) through (5). In Balkan languages, a dative may combine with a passive core such as Alb *Lexohet një libër*. ‘A book is read.’ and Gre *Xtizete to spiti*. ‘The house is built.’, or with an impersonal core such as Alb *U punua këtu*. ‘One/people worked here.’ and Rumanian (Rum) *Se lucra în fabrică*. ‘One/people worked in the factory.’, which must display Non-Active morphology or a reflexive clitic. However, in this second instance an important semantic contrast separates Balkan languages into two groups, which are depicted in (2a-b) vs. (3) and (4) vs. (5). On the one hand,

²The causer / involuntary agent label corresponds to Kallulli’s ‘accidental causation’ (1999). The causer reading is found in languages as different as Albanian, Polish, Slovenian, and Spanish. However, in Rum it seems difficult to obtain, and for an anonymous reviewer it is absent in Bul. In §3.2, I speculate on the potential theoretical significance of crosslinguistic variation in this particular reading.

Alb and Bulgarian (Bul) (2) and (4) may receive a reading reminiscent of Obligatory Control, as in *Ann/John wished to read a book/ work.*, with the dative as controller. On the other hand, in Gre (3) and Rum (5) this particular reading is not found, and the dative is interpreted as a possessor or a benefactive. Thus, it is of interest to this paper that Alb and Bul pattern together and differ from Gre and Rum in the last case.

- (2) a. *Anës i lexo-het një libër.* Alb
 Ann.Dat 3S.Dat read-**Non-act.Pres.3S** a book.Nom
 Preferred interpretation : ‘Ann feels like reading a book.’
- b. *Na Ivan mu se çetjaxa knigi.* Bul
 To John he.Dat **Refl** read-**Imp.3PL** books
 Preferred interpretation: ‘John felt like reading books.’
- (3) *Tu Ben tu Xtize-te to spiti.* Gre
 the.Gen Ben he.Gen build- **Non-act.Present.3S** the.Nom house
 ‘The house is built on John’s behalf.’ ‘John’s house is being built.’
- (4) *Anës i- u punua (këtu).* Alb
 Ann.Dat 3S.Dat-**Non-act.Aor** work.3S (here)
 Preferred interpretation : ‘Ann felt like working (here).’
- (5) *Lui Jon i se lucra (în fabricâ).* Rum
 John.Dat he.Dat **Refl** worked (in factory)
 ‘One/ people worked (in the factory) on John’s behalf.’
 ‘One/people worked in John’s factory.’

This paper provides an answer for why passives and impersonals with datives as in (2-5) differ semantically in important ways that divide Balkan languages into two groups, while Balkan anticausatives with datives as in (1a-d) are similar. It proposes that the datives of (1) through (5) are nonselected, hence not intrinsic to the argument structure of the verb, and distinguishes between two interpretive procedures for such datives, one that is present in Alb and South Slavic and absent in Gre and Rum, and another one that is shared by all the mentioned Balkan languages, and exists elsewhere. The procedure that applies in (2a-b) and (4) dubbed ‘Dative Existential Disclosure’ (D-Disclosure) is assigned to formal grammar.³ As stated, in the Balkans, D-Disclosure distinguishes Alb and South Slavic languages from Gre and Rum. The claim is that in Alb and South Slavic, D-Disclosure applies in passives and impersonals but not in anticausatives, and connects in semantics a formally represented argument to the nonselected dative. The different procedure in (1a-d), (3), and (5) is dubbed ‘Ethical Strategy’ (E-strategy),⁴

³ Slavic patterns such as (2b) with the indicated reading are known as ‘dispositional’, ‘feel-like’, ‘involuntary-state’, or ‘stative’ constructions in the literature, and have attracted interest since Roman Jakobson. In current linguistics, they have received particular attention in Relational Grammar, where they are called ‘productive inversions’ (Moore and Perlmutter 2000 for references), and less attention in other frameworks. Descriptively, they resemble quirky subject constructions with a logical subject that is oblique, not nominative.

⁴ The ‘ethical’ label is inspired by traditional grammar. Traditional datives of interest / ethical datives bear some resemblance to our datives because they are not part of argument structure, and discourse oriented. However,

and considered inferential, so not part of formal grammar. The E-strategy applies to nonselected datives in all Balkan languages, so also in Alb and South Slavic. It is not as restricted as D-Disclosure, is particularly prominent in anticausatives, and may be found in certain unaccusative constructions, and also in passives and impersonals. In contrast with D-Disclosure in Alb and South Slavic, the more widespread E-strategy found not only in the Balkans but elsewhere cannot manipulate formally represented arguments.

A third type of construction relevant to this paper but mentioned only in passing here is illustrated in (6a-b): experiential sentences that combine psychological verbs and datives reminiscent of ‘quirky subjects’. The claim is that such psychological constructions formally differ from the constructions with the anticausative core in (1a-d) and those with the passive or impersonal core in (2-5) because their dative is a so-called experiencer argument selected by a mental predicate.

- (6) a. *Kenga i kujto-het* Anës. Alb
 Song.Nom 3S.Dat remember-**Non-act.Present.3S** Ann.Dat
 ‘Ann remembers the song.’
- b. *Na Ivan mu se privizlat mnogo nesa.* Bul
 To Ivan he.Dat **Refl** imagine.3PL many things
 ‘Ivan imagines many things.’

The Balkan constructions in (1) through (6) all combine the Non-Active Voice or the reflexive clitic with a dative, so their morphosyntax appears in the surface rather similar. From the point of view of this paper, their main differences derive from argument structure and logical form. Psychological patterns as in (6a-b) contain mental predicates that select (dative) experiencers. By contrast, anticausatives as in (1a-d) and D-Disclosure / involuntary state patterns as in (2a-b) and (4) contain activity verbs, and have nonselected datives interpreted by inference in the first case, and semantically connected in the second case to a formally present argument of the verb, which can be its external argument or its only argument. We shall see that Balkan languages offer particularly clear evidence for such hypothesized three-way distinction.

A first proposal in the paper, then, is that E-strategy constructions as in (1a-d), D-Disclosure constructions as in (2a-b) and (4), and Experiencer constructions as in (6a-b) have a different status in the overall grammar. A second proposal is that in the Balkans D-disclosure is not found in all languages, which results in the two groups of Table 1. Alb and South Slavic exhibit D-Disclosure restricted to passives and impersonals, and Gre and Rum do not exhibit D-Disclosure at all. A traditional way of expressing the hypothesized distinction is that the so-called Involuntary State Constructions of the Slavic tradition are also found in Alb, but not in Gre or in Rum, so Balkan languages divide into two groups.

traditional ethical datives are clitics often restricted to 1st / 2nd person as in Czech (i), so differ from our datives, which can be phrasal and display no person restrictions.

- (i) *Tohle stare kolo se ti jednou rozpadne.* Czech
 this old bicycle Refl you.Dat once fall-apart
 ‘This old bicycle will fall apart on you some day.’ (Toman 1986)

Table 1: **Balkan Dative Existential Disclosure in passives and impersonals.**

Yes	No
Albanian, South Slavic	Greek, Rumanian.

A third proposal is that D-Disclosure belongs to two semantic types. D-Disclosure constructions are found in all the Slavic languages, but according to Rivero (1999) they lack semantic homogeneity, and fall into a type later dubbed ‘Control’ or another one later called ‘Left Dislocation’ (Rivero and Sheppard 2001), as in Table 2. Here we see that the Control kind of South Slavic also covers Alb. We also see that such a Control type differs in truth conditions from the Left Dislocation kind found in Polish and Czech, among other languages.

Table 2:

Two Types of Dative Existential Disclosure

Control	Left Dislocation
Albanian, South Slavic	Elsewhere in Slavic

The difference between the two types of D-Disclosure is discussed by Rivero and Sheppard (2001). The Control type reports an attitude, not an activity. Thus Bul (2b) tells us about John’s past urge to read books, but does not imply that he read any so can be uttered truthfully without a reading event, and completed without contradiction as in (7).

- (7) *Na Ivan mu se etjaxa knigi, ... no njamase nikade.* Bul
 , ... but there.were nowhere
 ‘John felt like reading books, but they could not be found anywhere.’

The second type of D-Disclosure illustrated by Cze (8) is found outside of South Slavic.

- (8) *Ta kniha se Janovi ætla dobæ.* Cze
 this book.Nom.Fem Refl John.Dat read.Past.Fem well
 ‘John read this book with ease.’ ‘Somehow, it was easy for John to read this book.’ ‘Reading this book came easily to John.’

The Cze sentence in (8) has the same morphology and syntax as the Bul sentence in (7), but differs in meaning. It also denotes John’s attitude as in South Slavic, and also a past activity that implicates him as reader, so can be uttered truthfully if and only if John did some reading.

Summing up, there are two types of D-Disclosure with different truth conditions. The Control type is shared by Bul, Serbo-Croatian (SC), Slovenian (Slo), and Alb, and only speaks of a mental state regarding the dative. The Left Dislocation type, as in Cze, speaks of an activity coupled to some mental state assigned to the dative. One novelty in this paper, then, is to unify involuntary state constructions in South Slavic and Alb under ‘Balkan’ D-Disclosure, separating them from the experiencer constructions in (6a-b). Another novelty recapitulating earlier work is to distinguish via D-Disclosure two semantic types of involuntary state constructions with different truth conditions, which separates South Slavic from the rest of the family.

The E-strategy in (1a-d) is found in all the languages of the Balkans and elsewhere, as in Table 3, with the claim being that it cannot operate on formally represented arguments, and is inferential.

Table 3:
Ethical Dative/Genitive.

Albanian, South and Non-south Slavic, Greek, Rumanian, (Spanish, etc.)

The E-strategy has a wider syntactic distribution than D-Disclosure, is not intrinsically connected to Non-Active / reflexive morphology, nor limited to passives / impersonals. In languages with D-Disclosure such as Alb and Bul, the E-strategy is also possible in passives / impersonals, but is (sometimes strongly) dispreferred in such contexts. For instance, the D-Disclosure reading depicted in (2a-b) is the involuntary state interpretation discussed above, and is preferred. However, these Alb and Bul sentences also have an E-strategy reading shared by Gre and Rum sentences, where there is an implicit agent and a preferably benefactive dative: ‘A book is read for Ann (’s benefit) (by someone).’ for (2a), and ‘Books were read for John(’s benefit) (by someone).’ for (2b). Likewise, Bul (9) may display two alternative readings. In the involuntary state or D-Disclosure reading, the (implicit) agent of the verb is identified with the dative, which functions as the equivalent of an obligatory controller, as the English gloss suggests. The reading based on the E-strategy describes the activity of an implicit agent, and the dative is preferably a beneficiary that must differ from the agent.

- (9) *Na Ivan mu se stroi kâsta.* Bul
 To John he.Dat **Refl** build.Pres.3S house
 a. D-Disclosure: ‘John feels like building a house.’
 b. E-strategy: ‘A house is being built for John(’s benefit) (by someone).’

Passive constructions in Alb and Bul, then, may display readings consonant with either D-Disclosure or the E-strategy, and serve to illustrate their differences. One, the E-strategy resulting in the (9b) gloss does not link dative and formal agent, while D-Disclosure resulting in the (9a) gloss does. Two, the E-strategy in (9b) does not affect the activity reading (i.e. house-building) while Balkan D-Disclosure in (9a) eliminates this reading (no house-building is implied). Three, the E-strategy does not manipulate the (covert) agent since it does not link it to the dative, while D-Disclosure manipulates such agent by linking it to the dative. Four, the E-strategy need not involve the mental state of the participant(s) in the event, so no attitude is assigned in (9b) to beneficiary or agent. By contrast, Balkan D-Disclosure attributes a mental attitude to the dative as participant, as in (9a).

In this paper the E-strategy is considered inferential and not part of formal grammar, a characteristic that is salient in the anticausatives in (1a-d). Such constructions are found in many languages with a dative that receives under appropriate pragmatic conditions readings I consider vague, which include possessor, somehow affected or interested participant (benefactive / malefactive), or indirect cause / involuntary agent. In my view, such vagueness is due to the limited formal argument structure present in anticausatives. The idea is that the E-strategy cannot manipulate the arguments that are formally present in the sentence whether covert or overt. In such anticausatives, possessors, benefactives, and causers/agents are all formally absent, so the dative can, by inference, take such roles. By contrast, D-Disclosure must operate on a

formally present argument. In the case of (2a-b) and (4), this argument is the external argument or the only argument of the activity verb. Furthermore, D-Disclosure does not result in vague readings but in a fixed reading, which in South Slavic and Alb adds a modal dimension making the dative reminiscent of an obligatory controller.

D-Disclosure and the E-Strategy provide new evidence for a formal difference between passives / impersonals vs. anticausatives, so are interesting for UG. Namely, if the proposals in this paper are correct, passives and impersonals must have a formally represented external argument while anticausatives lack such an argument.

In this paper, the morphological, syntactic, and semantic characteristics of D-Disclosure and E-strategy constructions in the languages of the Balkans are captured via the hypotheses in (10-12). One idea is that D-Disclosure and the E-strategy differ as to how they manipulate argument structure in the fundamental way in (10). A second idea is that passives / impersonals and anticausatives differ in formal argument structure due to (11). The third idea is that the structure of passives/impersonals and anticausatives affects the two proposed dative procedures differently, as in (12).

- (10) a. D-Disclosure must manipulate a formal argument.
b. The E-strategy cannot manipulate a formal argument.
- (11) a. Passives and impersonals involve (lexical) Argument Saturation.
b. Anticausatives involve (lexical) Argument Suppression.
- (12) a. Argument Saturation feeds D-Disclosure, and bleeds (restricts) the E-strategy.
b. Argument Suppression bleeds (blocks) D-Disclosure, and feeds the E-strategy.

The effects of (10-12) discussed in §2 and §3 are sketched next. Following (11), passives / impersonals have an implicit argument absent in anticausatives, which has different effects on nonselected datives. Beginning with passives / impersonals, nonselected datives can be interpreted in two ways in them in the Yes-languages of Table 1, that is, in Alb and Bul. On the one hand, a dative in a passive can be connected by D-Disclosure to the implicit agent, which results in the reading *John felt like reading books*. in Bul (9). Argument Saturation provides the implicit argument to be connected to the dative, so feeds D-Disclosure in this instance. On the other hand, Bul (9) has a reading where the dative differs from the implicit agent, as in *Books were read for John's benefit*, which results from the E-strategy. This strategy cannot manipulate formally represented arguments so must 'avoid' affecting the implicit agent; thus, Argument Saturation in this instance 'bleeds' the E-strategy. D-Disclosure and the E-strategy, then, are sensitive to the implicit agent in passives in different ways. D-Disclosure pairs agent and dative, and the E-strategy keeps them distinct, reminiscent of a disjoint reference mechanism. The No-languages of Table 1, that is Gre and Rum, always use the E-strategy as they lack D-Disclosure, so in passives of type Gre (3) dative and agent can never be linked, and must identify different participants in the event; the implicit agent is equivalent to an indefinite, and the dative is the possessor or benefactive.

Anticausatives differ from passives, and altogether lack a formally represented agent. As a consequence, in the Yes-languages of Table 1 D-Disclosure does not find in anticausatives a

formal argument to manipulate, so their dative must be interpreted by the E-strategy. This is then why (12b) states that Argument Suppression bleeds, in fact totally blocks, D-Disclosure and feeds the E-strategy. Thus, datives in anticausatives are always interpreted with the E-strategy in all the languages of the Balkans, regardless of type, with Alb and South Slavic behaving in the same way as Gre and Rum.

The situation for the Yes-languages, Alb and those of the South Slavic regions, where both D-Disclosure and the E-strategy are available in principle is summarized in Table 4. This Table tells us that Saturation in passives and impersonals feeds D-Disclosure, and partially limits the E-strategy. By contrast, Suppression in anticausatives totally blocks D-Disclosure, and feeds the E-strategy, which remains the only interpretive option.

The hypotheses in (10-12) account for the similarities in Balkan anticausatives with datives, as in (1a-d) (and in other languages). To repeat, all languages are similar because only the E-strategy can be at work in anticausatives. These proposals also account for differences in passives / impersonals in Alb and South Slavic vs. Gre and Rum. To repeat, in Yes languages such as Alb and South Slavic, Argument Saturation may combine with D-Disclosure or the E-strategy. In No-languages such as Gre and Rum, Argument Saturation can only combine with the E-strategy, since D-Disclosure is not available.

To conclude, D-Disclosure topic of §2 is a rule of formal grammar that distinguishes Alb and South Slavic from other Balkan languages. It can manipulate the implicit argument of passives / impersonals, but not the suppressed argument of anticausatives. The E-Strategy topic of §3 is found in all the languages of the Balkans and elsewhere, cannot manipulate formal arguments, and seems inferential.

Table 4:
Languages with D-Disclosure and the E-strategy (Albanian and Slavic).

Lexical Operations:		
Dative Procedure:	Argument Saturation	Argument Suppression
D-Disclosure	Feeding	Bleeding (= blocking)
E-strategy	Bleeding (=limiting)	Feeding

2. *Dative Existential Disclosure*

The first part of this section introduces Balkan D-Disclosure constructions, and distinguishes them in passing from experiencer constructions, as in (6a-b). The second part recapitulates the two analyses of Slavic D-disclosure in (Rivero 2002, and Rivero and Sheppard 2001), and unifies Alb with South Slavic under the Control label.

2.1. Balkan D-Disclosure constructions

Two syntactic patterns involve D-Disclosure in the Balkans, and are also found in Slo. One is with transitive Vs and the other with intransitive Vs. The transitive type displays as formal core the ‘ordinary’ morphology and syntax of a passive construction, with a Nominative NP, a V that agrees with this NP, as in (13a-16a), and a dative as in (13b-16b). The argument structure of such transitive Vs does not include an experiencer-like participant, so the dative is nonselected, hence a syntactic adjunct.

- (13) a. *Lexo-het* *një libër.* Alb
 read-**Non-act.Present.3S** a book.Nom
 ‘A book is read (by someone).’
- b. *Anës i lexo-het një libër.*
 Ann.Dat 3S.Dat read-**Non-act.Present.3S** a book.Nom
 ‘Ann feels like reading a book.’
- (14) a. *Cetjaxa se knigi.* Bul
 read-**Imp.3PL** **Refl** books
 ‘Books were read.’
- b. *Na Ivan mu se çetjaxa knigi.*
 Ivan.Dat he.Dat **Refl** read-**Imp.3PL** books
 ‘Ivan felt like reading books.’
- (15) a. *Ova kniga se çita.* SC
 this book.Nom **Refl** read.3S
 ‘This book is read.’
- b. *Ova kniga mi se çita.*
 this book.Nom I.Dat **Refl** read.3S
 ‘I feel like reading this book.’
- (16) a. *Pila se je voda.*⁵ Slo

⁵ Slo shares with Polish a transitive pattern with a different morphology and syntax, which is illustrated in (i.b).

- (i) a. *Danes dopoldne se je jedlo jagode.* Slo
 today morning Refl be.3S eat.Neu strawberries.Acc
 ‘This morning one/people ate strawberries.’
- b. *Danes dopoldne se mi je jedlo jagode.*
 today morning Refl I.Dat be.3S eat.Neu strawberries.Acc
 ‘This morning I felt like eating strawberries.’

The above sentences display (a) an Acc NP, and (b) an invariable Aux/ V without agreement. Rivero and Sheppard (2001) argue that (i.b) contains a syntactic indefinite human pronoun with existential force. On this view, D-

Drunk.Fem **Refl** be.3S water.Nom.Fem
 ‘Water was drunk.’

- b. *Janezu se je pila voda.*
 John.Dat **Refl** be.3S drunk.Fem water.Nom.Fem
 ‘John felt like drinking water.’

The formal core of the intransitive pattern is an ‘impersonal’ construction (also called ‘impersonal passivization’) with a V in a fixed or default form without agreement, no Nom NP as in (17a-19a), and a nonselected dative as in (17b-19b).

- (17) a. *U punua (këtu).* Alb
Non-act.Aor work.3S (here)
 ‘People worked (here).’ ‘Working went on here.’
- b. *Anës i- u punua (këtu).*
 Ann.Dat 3S.Dat-**Non-act.Aor** work.3S (here).
 ‘Ann felt like working (here).’
- (18) a. *Tuk se raboti .* Bul
 Here Refl work.3S
 ‘Here people work.’ ‘Here work goes on.’
- b. *Na Ivan mu se raboti (tuk).*
 Ivan.Dat he.Dat Refl work.3S (here)
 ‘Ivan feels like working (here).’
- (19) a. *Danas se dobro spi.* SC
 today Refl well sleep.3S
 ‘Today people are sleeping well.’ ‘Today there is good sleeping.’
- b. *Danas mi se dobro spi.*
 today I. Dat Refl well sleep.3S
 ‘Today I feel like sleeping well.’
- (20) a. *Danes dopoldne se je spalo.* Slo
 today morning Refl be.3S slept.Neu
 ‘This morning people were sleeping.’
- b. *Janezu se je spalo (danes dopoldne).*
 John.Dat Refl be.3S slept.Neu (today morning)
 ‘John felt like sleeping (this morning).’

Both patterns illustrate that D-Disclosure operates on dative phrases and clitics, or a combination of both if there is clitic doubling. With D-Disclosure, the dative is not restricted in person, and can be 1st, 2nd, or 3rd person, which differentiates it from traditional datives of Interest or Ethical datives. A first crosslinguistic difference without consequences for D-Disclosure is morphology. D-Disclosure is found with a reflexive clitic in Slavic, and with the Non-Active Voice in Alb, which takes different shapes, (a) auxiliary in Perfects, (b) clitic *u* in non-perfect Admiratives / Optatives and Aorist as in (17b), or (c) affix in the remaining environments as in (1a) (Rivero 1990 for analysis and discussion).⁶ A second difference without import for D-Disclosure is clitic doubling. As stated, doubling languages display a clitic with the dative phrase as in Alb (17b) and Bul (18b). In languages without doubling, the dative phrase appears alone, as in Slo (20b). Clitic location is also unimportant. When the dative is a nontonic pronoun part of the clitic cluster, D-Disclosure is the same in languages with and without second position restrictions. It is also irrelevant if the reflexive is first in the clitic cluster, as in Cze, or follows other clitics, as in Bul and SC. All of this suggests that D-Disclosure applies at an abstract level of representation identified here as (semantic) logical form. Thus, it ignores considerable syntactic and morphological differences impinging on case and agreement such as those arising from the implicit /explicit contrast mentioned in fn. 5.

⁶ Concerning Non-Active / reflexive marking, verbs such Alb. *kollem* ‘cough’ and Slavic inherent reflexives such as Bul *smeja se* ‘laugh’ raise two interesting questions. The (traditionally deponent) Alb V appears to be unergative, necessarily displays Non-Active Voice as in (i.a), and participates in D-Disclosure, that is ‘inversion’ in the sense of Hubbard (1985:104), as in (i.b).

- | | | | | | |
|-----|----|-----------------------------|--|---|--------------------------------|
| (i) | a. | <i>Petriti</i>
Peter.Nom | <i>kollitet</i>
cough. Non-act.Pres.3S | <i>këtu.</i>
here | Alb |
| | b. | <i>Nuk</i>
Neg | <i>më</i>
I.Dat | <i>kollitet.</i>
cough. Non-act.Pres.3S | |
| | | | | | ‘I do not feel like coughing.’ |

Likewise, the Bul inherently reflexive verb *smeja se* ‘laugh’ mentioned by an anonymous reviewer also seems unergative, and appears in the D-Disclosure construction with only one reflexive, as in (ii). I should add that the phenomenon in (ii) seems panslavic.

- | | | | | |
|------|-------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|
| (ii) | <i>Smee</i>
laugh.3S | <i>mi</i>
I.Dat | <i>se.</i>
Refl | Bul |
| | | | | ‘I feel like laughing.’ |

On the one hand, if the verbs in (i.b) and (ii) are unergative, which seems reasonable, Non-Active Voice / Slavic reflexive clitics need not signal unaccusativity (see Kallulli 1999 for Alb, and our later discussion). On the other hand, these examples show that haplology applies along similar lines to Non-Active Voice and reflexive clitics. That is, the verb requires Non-Active / reflexive morphology, the involuntary state construction also requires such a morphology, and sentences are grammatical with just one morphological marker of the appropriate type, which serves for two (compatible) functions necessarily encoded in Non-Active in Alb or reflexive morphology in Bul: (a) traditional deponence/ inherent lexical reflexivity, and (b) ‘impersonal passivization’ = Argument Saturation. I propose to capture this situation in postsyntactic morphology. For the Bul case in (ii), I argue elsewhere (Rivero in prep.) that two *se*-clitics compete for the same Acc slot in the clitic template, but only one surfaces without ill effects because such clitics are non-person forms that can be deleted in postsyntactic morphology since their person content is recoverable. On this view, (i.b) and (ii) are like all other involuntary state constructions in syntax and semantics, and involve Argument Saturation.

The psychological / dative experiencer constructions in (6a-b) partially repeated in (21a-b) are often grouped together with the involuntary state patterns in (13b-20b). In relational grammar, for instance, they both count as similar ‘inversions’ (Hubbard 1985).

- (21) a. *Kenga i kujto-het Anës.* Alb
 ‘Ann remembers the song.’
- b. *Na Ivan mu se privizdat mnogo nešta.* Bul
 ‘Ivan sees many things in his mind.’

In my view, D-Disclosure is restricted to passives and impersonals with Vs that may count as activities (Kallulli 1999), and does not operate in the dative experiencer constructions in (21a-b), which are thus different. I now mention three contrasts justifying a distinction, before I return to D-Disclosure. The experiencer patterns in (21a-b), which have gathered a rich literature on many languages left unmentioned here, differ from (13b-20b). One difference stated above concerns selection. Psychological Vs include in their argument structure an experiencer, which in many languages can be dative, as in (21a-b). The crucial issue in their case is the projection in syntax of such lexical argument structure. By contrast, the Vs in (13-20) do not subcategorize for datives or select experiencers. A second difference resides in truth conditions. On the one hand, (21a-b) contain a mental state V connected to the dative as (involuntary) participant. Without dative as in *Kenga kujtohet*. ‘The song is remembered.’, the same mental state is assigned to an indeterminate animate participant. Experiencer constructions, then, denote the mental state indicated by their predicate, not an attitude about that state. By contrast, Balkan D-Disclosure constructions as in (13b-20b) contain a predicate that does not contribute a mental state *per se*, and the dative brings in the attitude glossed ‘feel like’, which affects truth conditions. If the dative is removed from the construction, the state is not conveyed, and a ‘bare’ passive or impersonal activity reading results, as in (13a-20a). In simple terms, (21a) tells us that Ann remembers, not that she feels like remembering, while (13b) tells us that she feels like reading. Balkan D-Disclosure datives are intrinsically attitudinal, while datives in (21a-b) fulfill selection requirements of mental predicates, and do not change the nature of the proposition. Thus, dative experiencers and Balkan Disclosure datives differ in important ways. The last reason for the distinction is contrastive. On the one hand, different language types can be established with the activity Vs in (13-20). One language type is with D-Disclosure as in Alb and Slavic, and another is without, as in Gre and Rum. The same Vs serve to divide the D-Disclosure group into two subgroups: the Control type, as in Alb and Bul, and the Left Dislocation type, as in Cze. On the other hand, dative experiencer Vs cannot be used to establish similar differences. Patterns with the morphology, syntax, and interpretation of (21a-b) can be found in typologically diverse languages, including Polish (Pol) as in (22a), and Spanish (Spa) as in (22b).

- (22) a. *Te samochody mi si " podobaja* Pol
 These.Nom cars.Nom I.Dat Refl please.Pres.3Pl
 ‘These cars please me.’
- b. *A Juan se le ocurren muchas ideas.* Spa
 To John Refl he.Dat occur. Pres.3Pl many ideas
 ‘Many ideas come to John’s mind.’

In my view, Pol is like Cze in having Left Dislocation D-Disclosure (Rivero 2002), and Spa altogether lacks D-Disclosure, so resembles Gre and Rum. However, looking at dative experiencer Vs in these languages, differences dissolve: Pol and Spa resemble one another, and they also resemble Alb and Bul, two of the languages with Control D-Disclosure. If as I propose, (21-22) contain a dative phrase or clitic, doubled or not, that is an experiencer selected by a mental V, and do not involve D-Disclosure, similarities and differences can be captured. On the one hand, similarities arise in psychological constructions such as (21-22) due to selectional properties of experiencer Vs, open to lexical variation. On the other hand, differences arise in passives and impersonals due to D-Disclosure in Alb and Slavic, but not in Spa.

Now let us continue with D-Disclosure with transitive and intransitive Vs. In this paper, I assume similar analyses for both transitives and intransitives, with (a) Argument Saturation in the lexicon, followed by (b) D-Disclosure in logical form. Intransitives are interesting because they support the idea that unaccusatives and unergatives should be formally identified in Balkan languages, as I argue next. As stated, the formal cores of the intransitive patterns in (17b-20b) are the impersonals in (17a-20a). In the Balkans, such impersonals are well formed with unergative Vs with a unique argument that is agent-like, as in (17a-20a), and with unaccusative Vs with a unique argument that is theme-like as in (23). This suggests that in Balkan languages, all intransitives belong to the same formal class (also Kallulli 1999).

- | | | | | | |
|------|----|--|---|-------------------------|-----|
| (23) | a. | <i>Në Austri</i>
In Austria | <i>jeto-het</i>
live- Non-act.Pres.3S | <i>gjatë.</i>
long | Alb |
| | | ‘In Austria one/ people live(s) long.’ (Kallulli 1999: 8c) | | | |
| | b. | <i>Njëërë</i>
Once | <i>vdis-et.</i>
die- Non-act.Pres.3S | | Alb |
| | | ‘One/ everyone/ people die(s) once.’ | | | |
| | c. | <i>Tuk</i>
Here | <i>lesno se</i>
easily Refl | <i>umira.</i>
die.3S | Bul |
| | | ‘One/ everyone/ people die(s) easily here.’ | | | |

For impersonals as in (23a-c), I assume Argument Saturation as in Reinhart (1996). That is, the unique argument of V is existentially closed in the lexicon, is not projected in the syntax, and remains available in the semantics (with an indefinite reading). On this analysis, Argument Saturation in the Balkans treats unergatives and unaccusatives as one class.

Now let us turn to dative or involuntary state constructions based on such impersonals. For some, they are restricted to unergatives as in (16b-20b), and always excluded with unaccusatives ((Hubbard 1985) for Alb, (Dimitrova-Vulchanova 1996) for Bul). However, others find Alb and Bul constructions with some unaccusatives and datives well formed, as in (24a-b) (D. Kallulli, p.c.) and (24c-d).

- | | | | | | | |
|------|----|-------------------------------------|--------------------|---|---------------------------------|-----|
| (24) | a. | <i>Anës</i>
Ann.Dat | <i>i</i>
3S.Dat | <i>jeto-het</i>
live- Non-act.Pres.3S | <i>në Austri.</i>
in Austria | Alb |
| | | ‘Ann feels like living in Austria.’ | | | | |

- b. *Ben-it i vdis-et.* Alb
 Ben.Dat 3S.Dat die-Non-act.Pres.3S
 ‘Ben feels like dying.’
- c. *Na men mi se zivee.* Bul
 I.Dat I.Dat Refl live.3S
 ‘I feel like living.’ (O. Arnaudova, p.c.)
- d. *Na Ivan mu se umira.* Bul
 Ivan.Dat he.Dat Refl die.3S
 ‘Ivan feels like dying.’
 (O. Arnaudova, p.c.; R. Pancheva and O. Tomi , Leiden
 Balkansprachbund Conference)

The source of the above disagreement seems in part pragmatic. Kallulli and Arnaudova independently suggest that examples like (24b) and (24d) sound odd since people do not usually have the urge to die. Arnaudova volunteers that a negation improves the pattern : *Ne mi se umira.* ‘I do not feel like dying.’. An anonymous reviewer mentions that some but not all Bulgarian unaccusatives sound grammatical in such constructions, which suggests an explanation not purely in pragmatics. Pending future research, I consider Balkan D-Disclosure constructions grammatical with unergatives and unaccusatives, but more appropriate with unergatives. In (17b-20b) and (24), Argument Saturation makes implicit a unique argument, like in ‘bare’ impersonals. D-Disclosure connects this argument to the dative. Argument Saturation is not sensitive to the difference between unergatives and unaccusatives, and D-Disclosure is not sensitive to the difference either.

To sum up, D-Disclosure operates on formal arguments, which can be agents or themes, implicit as in Alb or Bul, or explicit as mentioned in ft. 5 for Slo. In South Slavic and Alb, Argument Saturation provides in passives /impersonals an implicit argument that is connected to the dative by D-disclosure.

2.2. *The Analysis of D-Disclosure*

This section looks at how D-Disclosure operates in logical form, first offering a minimal sketch of the syntax needed for this purpose, leaving aside important syntactic details. The syntactic skeleton for D-Disclosure Passives / Impersonals such as (2a-b), (4), and (24) is (25).

(25)[_{ZP} John_{DAT} Z [_{YP} se/ Non-Act [_{VP(x)} read a book / work / die]]]]

It contains three basic layers of structure. ZP stands for an Applicative Phrase, YP stands for the (oversimplified) inflectional or propositional layer, and VP is the predicate-argument shell. The two essential ingredients in this skeleton are the upper layer with the Dative in the Spec of the Applicative, which corresponds to a syntactic adjunct not selected by V, and the lower layer, which is an ‘ordinary’ passive or impersonal YP without special morphosyntactic characteristics. Let us examine each in turn.

The Dative ZP is reminiscent of, but not identical to, what Pylkkänen (2000) and McGinnis (2001) respectively call High and Event Applicatives. In general, High /Event

Applicatives establish a relation between an individual and an event. This is also the case in D-Disclosure constructions, where the individual is the dative, and the event is the passive or impersonal YP. However, D-Disclosure constructions differ from the more familiar Applicatives discussed in the literature in the way individual and event are related, which in the Balkans is particularly interesting because it is reminiscent of Obligatory Control: John felt like [PRO working]. In my view, the compositional basis of D-Disclosure is the syntactic structure in (25). Z as null head of the Applicative takes as complement the inflectional YP, and contains two syntactic features, one Interpretable and the other Uninterpretable, as in (Chomsky 1995). The Uninterpretable feature is equivalent to EPP, and is checked in syntax by the dative merged in the Spec of ZP. The Interpretable feature need not be checked, and is similar to what Chomsky (1999) dubs INT; that is, its role is to encode an effect whose details belong in semantics. I propose that in D-Disclosure Applicatives, the INT feature of Z has two different translations in logical form, depending on language type. One such translation formalized below is found in Balkan languages, and the other is found elsewhere in Slavic. On this view, the Applicative Head contains in syntax the compositional core of D-Disclosure, which is given two translations in semantics.

The other ingredient in D-Disclosure is the YP – VP structure, an ‘ordinary’ passive or impersonal in Balkan languages. YP is a passive when it contains an overt Nom NP as theme or logical object, and a transitive V with Non-Active or reflexive morphology that agrees with this NP. YP is an impersonal when it contains no Nom NP, and an intransitive V with the default form with Non-Active or reflexive morphology (Third Person Singular (3S) in Alb, and 3S / Neuter in Slavic). I propose that such passives and impersonals involve Lexical Saturation in the sense of (Chierchia 1989a, Reinhart 1996). The external argument of a transitive V is existentially closed in the lexicon as depicted in (26a). It is not projected in syntax, but is available in semantics. The same operation affects the only argument of an intransitive, as in (26b).

- (26) a. Passive: $\exists x$ (read (x θ_2))
 Alb. *Lexo-het një libër* . Bul ...*se* *çetjaxa knigi*.
 $\langle - \rangle \exists x$ (x read (a) book(s)).
- b. Impersonal: $\exists x$ (work/die (x))
 Alb *U punua* . Bul *Umira se*. $\langle - \rangle \exists x$ (x work / die)

Detailed minimalist analyses of passives and impersonals await development and are beyond the scope of this paper. However, in passing I mention a consequence of Argument Saturation for Case (EPP is ignored). On the one hand, transitive Vs have two arguments. If one is saturated in the lexicon as I assume, the other is projected in syntax perhaps in an impoverished one-shell VP. This argument checks via either Agree (Chomsky 1999) or Move a Nom feature in the inflectional layer YP, as signaled by agreement on the verb. In ordinary passives, then, V agrees with the overt NP, which must be Nom. Passives with a dative are identical, since the nonselected dative linked to the implicit argument in logical form does not participate in checking operations in YP-VP.

On the other hand, intransitive Vs have only one argument, which if saturated as I assume is not projected in syntax. Thus, with Argument Saturation, no NP is projected in syntax, but one is available in semantics. This implies that YP has no Case feature in need of checking,

which is indicated via a V in default form without agreement. D-Disclosure Impersonals with a dative are identical, since the dative does not participate in checking operations in YP-VP.

Now let us turn to D-Disclosure in logical form. As first stated in (12) in §1, Argument Saturation in passives /impersonals provides D-Disclosure with the argument to manipulate. In (26), YP is a passive or impersonal with an existentially closed argument $\exists x$ available in logical form, which is connected to the dative by D-Disclosure with the following steps. The quantifier \exists is eliminated, x is ‘existentially disclosed’, which makes it equivalent to a free variable, and is then bound to the Dative.⁷ In Alb and South Slavic, such binding involves indirect predication, dubbed ‘Control’ in Table 2. The formula equipped with a modal operator forms a derived predicate. The disclosed variable in this complex predicate is applied to the Dative, as shown in (27b-c).

- (27) Control D-Disclosure:
- a. **se/ Non-act** (read a book/ work /die) = $\exists x$ [read a book / work /die (x)].
 - b. John.DAT **se/ Non-Act** read a book/ work/die
 \rightarrow M (John.DAT DIS $x \exists x$ [read a book/ work / die (x)])
 - c. M (John, λx [read a book/ work / die (x)])

(27a) is the semantics of an ordinary passive or impersonal, and (27b) is D-Disclosure in the context of the dative. The formula in (27c) is similar to Obligatory Control in (Chierchia 1989b), as in *John_i wished PRO_i to work*. Thus, the (null) M-operator forming the complex predicate is like *wish*. The Non-Active Voice / reflexive clitic signal a variable similar to PRO as ‘controlled’ item. The Dative is the ‘controller’ as subject of the indirect predication binding the variable. The result is a modalized statement, with the Dative reminiscent of an Experiencer, not an Agent. Recall that the semantic formula in (27b-c) derives its compositional basis from the syntactic structure in (25). Z as Applicative head has an INT feature, which translates in logical form as (27b). That is, in Balkan languages the Applicative holding a Dative corresponds in logical form or semantics to a M(odal) P(hrase). The Z head is equivalent in this case to a logical form Modal.

Slavic D-Disclosure constructions may belong to another semantic class mentioned in §1. Cze (8) partially repeated as (28a) denotes an activity of John as reader. The Cze intransitive pattern in (28b) displays similar semantics.

- (28) a. *Ta kniha se Janovi četla dobně.* Cze
 ‘John read this book with ease.’ ‘Somehow, it was easy for John to read this book.’ ‘Reading this book came easily to John.’
 (NOT just: ‘John felt like reading this book well.’)
- b. *Janovi se pracovalo hezky.*
 John.Dat Refl worked.Neu nicely

⁷ D-Disclosure is inspired in dynamic semantics (Dekker 1993, Chierchia 1995), was proposed by Rivero (2002), and further developed by Rivero and Sheppard (2001). In dynamic semantics, indefinites have an intrinsic existential quantifier that can be eliminated by an adverb of quantification that lends them force. D-Disclosure corresponds to the idea that Slavic reflexive clitics stand for two types of arguments with an intrinsic existential quantifier that can be eliminated by a dative: (1) implicit arguments in reflexive passives as in the text, or (2) explicit indefinite pronouns in impersonal constructions in Polish and Slo, as in fn 5.

‘John somehow worked well.’ (NOT just: ‘John felt like working well.’)

I propose that the syntactic structure of (28a-b) is also (25); Lexical Argument Saturation applies with the consequences discussed above. Thus, abstracting from the Dative Applicative, (28b) is as in (29a); this formula provides the saturated argument that is existentially disclosed in logical form, resulting in a free variable. The difference with South Slavic and Alb arises when the disclosed variable is bound to the Dative via direct predication as in (29b), borrowed from (Rivero 2002) (for more details (Rivero and Sheppard 2001)).

(29) Left Dislocation D-Disclosure:

- a. $se(\text{work}) = \exists x [\text{work}(x)]$.
- b. John.DAT *se* worked
 $\rightarrow \text{DIS } x \exists x [\text{work}(x)] (\text{John})$.
- c. $\lambda x [\text{work}(x)] (\text{John})$.
- d. *work* (John).

On this view, (28b) resembles in its semantics *John₁, he₁ worked well*. *Se* corresponds to the disclosed variable functioning as a resumptive. Dative *John* is the subject of the (direct) predication, with YP as predicate. Thus, the sentence denotes a past eventuality, and the dative is agentive. The INT feature on the Applicative Z head in (25) provides the syntactic basis for this reading, and translates in logical form as (29b). In Slavic languages outside of the South, then, the Applicative ZP corresponds in logical form to a Topic Phrase, and Z is comparable to a Topic head, not a Modal. In sum, the syntactic structure in (25) corresponds to two different logical forms, one for South Slavic and Alb, which thus can be called ‘Balkan’, and another one for other Slavic languages. The interpretable feature of applicative Z provides the basis for two readings, so in these languages the variation is ‘semantic’ and not ‘syntactic’.

To conclude, in Alb and Slavic D-Disclosure is general and productive. It operates in logical form on an existentially closed argument, by eliminating \exists , freeing x , and binding this variable to a nonselected Dative. In the Balkans, Argument Saturation provides the item affected by D-Disclosure. There are two types of D-Disclosure with different truth conditions in Slavic, which hinges on how dative and disclosed variable are connected in logical form. Dative and variable can be bound via indirect predication, with the variable reminiscent of a controlled pronoun, which is the Balkan option dubbed here ‘Control’. Alternatively, dative and variable can be bound via direct predication, with the variable similar to a resumptive pronoun, which is the Slavic option dubbed ‘Left Dislocation’.

Section §3 compares D-Disclosure to the E-strategy, and shows why D-Disclosure cannot apply in anticausatives, and why it is restricted to passives/impersonals.

2. The E-strategy

This section examines the E-strategy. The main aim is to point out how this strategy differs from D-Disclosure, leaving its precise analysis to future research. The crucial contrast is that D-Disclosure must manipulate a formally present argument and the E-strategy cannot manipulate

this type of argument, which has a variety of consequences. A first consequence is with passives / impersonals. We showed in §2 that Argument Saturation in passives / impersonals in Alb and South Slavic ‘feeds’ D-Disclosure with an appropriate formal item, which is the implicit external or only argument that is disclosed and linked to the dative. By contrast, below in §3.1 I argue that Argument Saturation restricts the E-strategy, which must avoid linking the dative to an implicit or explicit argument. A second difference is with anticausatives, which cannot involve D-Disclosure because they lack the appropriate formal argument for this procedure, and must as a consequence necessarily involve the E-strategy in all languages, including those that have D-Disclosure such as Alb and South Slavic, as discussed in §3.2. A third difference in §3.3 is the more general syntactic distribution of the E-strategy, attributed to the hypothesis that this strategy is not based on a formal argument. A last difference in §3.4 is that D-Disclosure is compositional, finding a semantic basis in an interpretable feature of the syntax, so results in fixed readings, while the E-strategy does not seem compositional or based on an interpretable feature of the syntax, which results in several readings called vague.

3.1. *The E-strategy and Argument Saturation (passives / impersonals)*

Recall that some Balkan languages such as Gre and Rum do not have D-Disclosure, so they must use the E-strategy in all constructions with unselected datives, providing excellent grounds to detect the properties of this strategy in contrast with D-Disclosure. Gre and Rum passives and impersonals can be used to motivate the claim that the E-strategy cannot manipulate formally present arguments. To this effect, compare the ‘bare’ Gre passive without a dative in (30a) and its dative counterpart in (3) partially repeated as (30b), or the Rum ‘bare’ impersonal in (31a) and its counterpart with a dative in (5) partially repeated as (31b), which both serve to illustrate the same point.⁸

- | | | | | | |
|------|----|---|----------------------|------------------------|-----|
| (30) | a. | <i>Xtize-te</i>
build- Non-act.Present.3S
‘The house is (being) built.’ | <i>to</i>
the.Nom | <i>spiti.</i>
house | Gre |
| | b. | <i>Tu Ben tu Xtize-te to spiti.</i>
‘The house is built on John’s behalf.’
‘John’s house is being built.’
(NOT ‘John feels like building the house.’ ‘John builds the house involuntarily.’) | | | |
| (31) | a. | <i>Se lucra (în fabricâ).</i>
Refl worked (in factory)
‘People/one worked (in the factory).’ | | | Rum |
| | b. | <i>Lui Jon i se lucra (în fabricâ).</i>
John. Dat he.Dat Refl worked (in factory)
‘People / one worked (in the factory) on John’s behalf.’ | | | |

⁸ Greek differs from other Balkan languages in lacking ‘impersonal passivization’. In my terms, in this language Argument Saturation cannot apply to one argument predicates, while in the other languages it can.

‘People/one worked in John’s factory.’
 (NOT ‘John felt like working in the factory.’ ‘ John worked in the factory involuntarily.’).

With the E-strategy, datives in passives and impersonals may be open to a variety of readings I consider vague, most notably as possessors, benefactives / malefactives, or somehow affected participants. However, in contrast with Balkan D-Disclosure in Alb and South Slavic, when the E-strategy is used in these or the other languages, such constructions retain their core interpretation as activities of an unspecified agent, which cannot be linked to the dative. Why is this linking not possible? The proposal in this paper is that the E-strategy cannot manipulate formal arguments, and (Balkan) passives and impersonals involve Argument Saturation. Thus, (30-31) contain an agent existentially closed in the lexicon, as in (26), which the E-strategy cannot affect. A different (inferential) role not based on the formally encoded argument structure is assigned to the dative, and appropriate options influenced by pragmatic considerations include past /present/ future possessor, and somehow affected participant, most likely beneficiary. Crucially, readings with the dative somehow linked to the external argument of the verb are excluded including the interpretation where the dative is an involuntary causer. If Control D-Disclosure as in South Slavic and Alb were possible in Gre and Rum, readings with dative and implicit argument linked would be ‘Ben feels like building a house.’ and ‘John felt like working in a factory.’. On this view, passives and impersonals in the No-languages of Table 1 such as Gre show that the E-strategy does not manipulate formal arguments and is ‘bled’ by Argument Saturation, which removes the accidental causer / involuntary agent option from the inference list. There are other languages without D-Disclosure with nonselected datives restricted to the E-strategy that are similar. To illustrate, the Spa *se*-passive and *se*-impersonal in (32a-b) both contain similar ‘bleeding’ agents, which makes the dative be interpreted as a benefactive or a possessor, not as a causer / involuntary agent.

- (32) a. *A Juan se le (re)construyen dos casas.* Spa
 John.Dat Refl he.Dat (re)build-**Pres.3PL** two houses.
 ‘Two house are (re)built on John’s behalf.’ ‘ Two houses of John are being (re)built.’
 NOT ‘John {feels like/is} (re)building two houses.’
- b. *A Juan se le trabaja en la fábrica.*
 John. Dat **Refl** he.Dat work.3S in the factory
 ‘People / one work(s) in the factory on John’s behalf.’ ‘ People/one work(s) in John’s factory.’
 NOT ‘John feels like/ is working in the factory.’

In sum, the E-strategy and D-Disclosure differ in two ways, and the contrast is clearest in passives and impersonals. One, D-Disclosure in Alb and South Slavic must manipulate a formal argument, which the E-strategy in the Balkans and elsewhere cannot do. Two, D-Disclosure is fed a formal external or only argument by Argument Saturation, and the E-strategy is bled or restricted by the same process, since it cannot manipulate formal arguments.

3.2. *The E-strategy and Argument Suppression (anticausatives)*

I propose that Anticausatives involve Argument Suppression, which can also serve to differentiate between the two dative procedures discussed in this paper. Argument Suppression feeds or adds an inference to the E-strategy, and bleeds or totally blocks D-Disclosure in the Yes-languages of Table 1, that is, Alb and South Slavic. To develop these ideas, let us begin by comparing the ‘bare’ or dativeless constructions in (33a-f) and their counterparts with nonselected datives in (34a-f), which partially repeat (1a-d).

(33)	a.	<i>U</i>	<i>thye</i>	<i>dritarja.</i>		Alb
		Non-act.Aor	break.3S	window.the.Nom		
			‘The window broke.’			
	b.	<i>Oçilata</i>	<i>se</i>	<i>çupixa.</i>		Bul
		glasses.the	Refl	broke.3PL		
			‘The glasses broke.’			
	c.	<i>Kaike</i>	<i>i</i>	<i>supa.</i>		Gre
		burnt. Non-act	the	soup.Nom		
			‘The soup burned’			
	d.	<i>Se</i>	<i>sparse</i>	<i>ferestrea.</i>		Rum
		Refl	broke.3S	window.the		
			‘The window broke.’			
	e.	<i>Naocale</i>	<i>su</i>	<i>se</i>	<i>sломile.</i>	SC
		glasses.Fem.PL	be.3PL	Refl	broken.Fem.PL	
			‘The glasses broke.’			
	f.	<i>Oçala</i>	<i>so</i>	<i>se</i>	<i>çломila.</i>	Slo
		glasses. Fem.Pl	be.3PL	Refl	broken.Fem.Pl	
			‘The glasses broke.’			
(34)	a.	<i>Anës</i>	<i>i-u</i>	<i>thye</i>	<i>dritarja.</i>	Alb
	b.	<i>Na Ivan</i>	<i>mu se</i>	<i>çupixa</i>	<i>oçilata.</i>	Bul
	c.	<i>Tu Ben</i>	<i>tu</i>	<i>kaike</i>	<i>i supa.</i>	Gre
	d.	<i>Lui Jon</i>	<i>i se</i>	<i>sparse</i>	<i>ferestrea.</i>	Rum
	e.	<i>Jovanu</i>	<i>su se</i>	<i>sломile</i>	<i>naocale.</i>	SC
	f.	<i>Janezu</i>	<i>so se</i>	<i>çломila</i>	<i>oçala.</i>	Slo

‘{Ann’s /Ben’s /John’s} {glasses/ soup/ window} {broke/burned}.’

‘Ann/John was affected {positively/ negatively} by the glasses/window/soup {breaking /burning}.’

‘{Ann/ Ben/ John} involuntarily caused {the glasses /soup/window} to {break/burn}.’

The semantic differences due to D-Disclosure in passives /impersonals with datives discussed in §2 and §3.1 can be used to distinguish in absolute terms between Alb and South Slavic on the one hand, and Gre and Rum on the other. However, such differences find no clear counterpart in anticausatives with datives, where all the languages seem rather similar. In anticausatives, datives may be interpreted in several ways, such as possessor, benefactive / malefactive, and perhaps with less ease as indirect cause /involuntary agent, the reading clearly excluded in the Gre passive in (30b) or the Rum impersonal in (31c). The readings depicted in (34) are not equivalent to Balkan Control D-Disclosure, which would result in modal interpretations of the type ‘Ann / Ben/ John felt like {breaking /burning} {the glasses / soup/ window}.’ Anticausatives outside of the Balkans such as Spa (35) also display the readings listed in (34), with Spa surprisingly similar to Alb in this area.

(35) *A Juan se le rompieron las gafas.* Spa
 John.Dat Refl he.Dat broke.3PL the glasses

Why is the causer/involuntary agent reading possible for datives in anticausatives in languages as different as Alb and Spa? I propose that anticausatives undergo Argument Suppression, and the E-strategy does not manipulate formal arguments, which can account for the causer/ agent-like reading in (34-35) as follows. The core of the anticausative construction is a two-argument predicate such as *break* in *John breaks the glasses*, which following Reinhart (1996) has its external argument totally eliminated in the lexicon, the syntax, and the semantics. In other words, the basic verb entry is (*break* (θ_1 θ_2)) and Argument Suppression eliminates θ_1 , resulting in an unaccusative intransitive (*break* (θ_2)) corresponding to Alb *U thye dritarja*, Rum *Se sparse ferestrea*. ‘The window broke.’, and so on. The dative/genitive in (34a-f) is not selected by the verb, and is interpreted by the E-strategy, which cannot manipulate formal arguments. In (34a-f), there is no external argument due to Argument Suppression, so the inferential option with the dative causer/ agent-like is licit. In sum, Argument Suppression ‘feeds’ the E-strategy because it removes an external argument from the formal structure of the sentence, which allows for a licit inference for the dative other than possessor, benefactive/malefactive, or somehow affected participant. By contrast, in passives / impersonals as in §3.1, there is an external or agent argument that is formally represented in the sentence, so the dative under the E-strategy can be a possessor or a benefactive, under the assumption that those roles are not formally present or implicit, but not a causer/ involuntary agent. In sum, datives in passives / impersonals in languages without D-Disclosure such as Spa or Gre must be interpreted with the E-strategy and when compared to datives in anticausatives show that the E-strategy does not manipulate formal arguments so is bled by Argument Saturation, which preserves a formal agent, and fed by Argument Suppression, which deletes the agent.

Dalina Kallulli suggests an alternative to the proposal sketched above, which is more in tune with her earlier approach to the relevant Alb constructions (1999). Oversimplifying, on Kallulli’s view the causer reading of anticausatives should not derive from the E-strategy, but

could constitute an instance in formal grammar of D-Disclosure of a causer. I add that D-Disclosure in this case would resemble the Left Dislocation type found in Polish and Czech, not the modal or control type found in South Slavic and Alb. This alternative involves an analysis of anticausatives with a formally represented causer that differs from an agent, so the E-strategy will not be able to identify such a formal causer with the dative. If the causer reading of anticausatives in Alb or Spa is not the result of the E-strategy, then a form of D-Disclosure could apply in formal grammar in these languages just in anticausatives, directly linking dative and implicit causer. This interesting suggestion, whose development and formal implementation I leave for future research, could account for a type of variation I have minimized in this paper, namely that the causer reading is difficult to get, or perhaps is absent, in anticausatives with datives in some of our languages. If anticausatives contain a formal causer, and languages like Bul differ from Alb in lacking D-Disclosure in anticausatives, then the cause reading cannot be derived in those languages. On this view, Balkan languages could divide into two groups depending on whether they display a causer reading in anticausatives with datives or not. Alb would be in a group that includes Spa with anticausatives with Left Dislocation D-Disclosure, and Bul would be in a group that perhaps includes Rum with anticausatives that altogether lack the mentioned formal procedure. Viewed this way, the difference is ‘semantic’ and not ‘syntactic’, as for the divisions established in §2. If the causer reading is obtained in formal grammar in the way just sketched, then it could also be that possessive and benefactive/malefactive readings rely on implicit categories ‘disclosed’ by nonselected datives (see Dekker (1993) on disclosure and relational nouns such as *sister*). The ‘E-strategy’ would not be inferential, as differences between the languages would reside on different types of formal ‘disclosure’ for datives. Clearly, datives with anticausatives and unaccusatives seldom discussed in the past raise many interesting questions.

After this aside, I continue with the inferential view of datives in anticausatives adopted in this paper. Anticausatives also serve to show that any type of formally encoded participant, not just a causer/ agent, ‘bleeds’ the E-strategy of inferential options. To this effect, consider (36a-b).

- (36) a. *Lui Jon i s-au spart ochelarii Mariei.* Rum
 John.Dat he.Dat **RefI** has broken glasses.the of.Mary.the
 ‘John broke Mary’s glasses involuntarily.’, etc. NOT: ‘John’s glasses broke.’
- b. *Tu Ben tu kaike i supa mu.* Gre
 the.Gen Ben him.Gen burnt.**Non-act** the soup.Nom mine
 ‘Ben burned my soup involuntarily.’ etc. NOT: ‘Ben’s soup burned.’

Rum is a language where the possessor reading seems most natural for non-selected datives in the E-strategy.⁹ However, such preferred reading is blocked if a possessor is present, as in (36a).

⁹ In both Bul and Rum, ‘Possessor Raising’ phenomena as in (i. a-b), from Pancheva (2001), who offers discussion and earlier references, are very general.

- (i) a. *Az im vidjax [DP novata kola].* Bul
 I they.Dat saw.1S new-the car
 ‘I saw their new car.’

This supports that the E-strategy cannot count as inference a role held by a formally encoded participant, irrespective of whether possessors are arguments of N or not. Likewise, the formal possessor in Gre (36b) blocks the possessive option for the genitive. Thus, the E-strategy does not manipulate formal participants whether they are explicit as above, or implicit as in passives.

We saw above that Argument Suppression may add one option to the E-strategy by eliminating an agent/causer, which allows the dative to be interpreted as an indirect causer. However, Argument Suppression blocks (Balkan) D-Disclosure. Consider Bul *Na Ivan mu se xpuxa ocilata.* in (34b) as representative of South Slavic. This example cannot be interpreted as ‘John felt like breaking the/his glasses.’, which indicates that (Balkan) D-Disclosure does not, in fact cannot, operate in Anticausatives. If Argument Suppression eliminates the agent/causer of *break*, D-Disclosure will not find in logical form a formal argument to manipulate. In other words, Argument Suppression bleeds D-Disclosure, so only the E-strategy is found in anticausatives. On this view, the interpretation of anticausatives with datives proceeds along parallel lines, and is open to vagueness in all Balkan languages, regardless of type.

To conclude, I have taken the position that the E-strategy cannot manipulate formally encoded participants, and D-Disclosure must find a formally encoded existentially closed argument to connect it to the dative, which leads to an important contrast between the two procedures in the case of anticausatives. The contrast is that if anticausatives undergo Argument Suppression, which eliminates an agent/causer, D-disclosure cannot apply in them because they have no existentially closed argument of any type, and only the E-strategy is applicable. The E-strategy thus assigns several vague readings to the dative, including the causer reading.

3.3. *The Syntactic distribution of D-Disclosure and the E-strategy*

The E-strategy has a more general syntactic distribution than D-Disclosure, which is also due to the essential contrast between the two procedures. D-Disclosure operates on an existentially closed argument. In the Balkans, this argument comes from Argument Saturation necessarily encoded in Non-Active or reflexive morphology. Thus, D-Disclosure or involuntary state constructions are inherently tied to a particular morphology, and thus limited to a passive or impersonal core. By contrast, the E-strategy relies on the absence of formally encoded arguments

-
- b. *I- am zârit [DP chipul] in time.* Rum
 3S.Dat - have.1S seen face-the in crowd
 ‘I saw her face in the crowd.’

In (i.a-b), the dative indicates a possessor in the DP, often the only reading, and most approaches in the literature assign such a relation to formal grammar, calling it syntactic binding or movement. The general nature of possessor raising phenomena in Rum could account for why the possessor reading is so prominent with the E-strategy. However, the E-strategy has a disjoint reference effect that does not appear based on either syntactic binding or movement, so differs from Possessor Raising. Spa also has Possessor Raising, usually restricted to inalienable possession as in (ii), so its scope is much more limited than in Bul and Rum. Possessive readings with the E-strategy in Spa exist, but are less favored than in Rum.

- (ii) *Le vi [la cara] a Juan.* Spa
 3S.Dat saw.1S [DP the face] Dat.John
 ‘I saw John’s face.’

as it cannot manipulate them, so is not tied to particular lexical operations or a fixed morphology, as shown next.

We already illustrated the E-strategy with Non-active / reflexive morphology in passives, impersonals, and anticausatives. Unaccusative constructions reminiscent of anticausatives also exist with Active Voice or no reflexive clitic with considerable lexical variation in the languages of the Balkans. However, irrespective of such variation in morphology, nonselected datives / genitives in unaccusative constructions receive several readings consonant with the E-strategy. In (1a) and (1b) I illustrated anticausative *break* with Non-Active/ reflexive morphology in Alb and Bul, but in Gre this verb displays Active Voice in the anticausative use, as in (37). Crucially, interpretations for the genitive remain as in (34) with Non-Active morphology; the Gen can be a possessor, affected participant, or causer.

- (37) *Tu* *Ben tu* *espase* *to parathiro.* Gre
the.Gen Ben he.Gen broke.Past.Act the window.Nom.

Gre *burn* is Non-Active if anticausative as in (1c), but Bul *burn* and *boil* are ‘active’ or lack a reflexive, as (38a-b) illustrate. Irrespective of this variation, the dative receives several readings consonant with the E-strategy in all these sentences. If it is assumed that the sentences in (38) do not involve Argument Suppression but contain unaccusative verbs with only one argument, then, under my assumptions, E-strategy interpretations rely on the absence of formally encoded argument structure, as in anticausatives.

- (38) a. *Na Ivan* *mu* *izgorjia* *kahstata.* Bul
 John.Dat he.Dat burned.3S house.the
- b. *Na Ivan* *mu* *izkipja* *mljakoto.*
 John.Dat he.Dat boiled.3S milk.the

The E-strategy with unaccusative Vs that do not participate in the causative alternation so are likely not to involve Argument Suppression can also be illustrated with Rum *bloom* as in (39), where the dative is also open to several interpretations.

- (39) *Lui Jon* *ii* *infloresc* *pomii.* Rum
 John.Dat him.Dat bloom.3PL trees.the
 ‘John’s trees bloom.’ ‘John benefits from the trees blooming.’ ‘John causes the trees to somehow bloom (i.e. he is a good gardener).’

Outside of the Balkans, there are parallels. The unaccusative use of *boil*, whether anticausative or not, is not reflexive in Spa, and Spa *bloom* is an unaccusative that does not participate in the so-called causative alternation, so Bul (38b) finds a counterpart in Spa (40a) and Rum (39) in Spa (40b), with the dative receiving various readings.

- (40) a. *A Juan* *le* *hirvió* *la leche.* Spa
 John.Dat he.Dat boiled.3S the milk

- c. *A Juan* *le* *florece* *los* *árboles.*
 John.Dat he.Dat bloom.3PL the trees

In sum, the E-strategy implements inferential options independent of morphology, so in the absence of a reflexive clitic, and is not tied to particular lexical operations such as Argument Suppression. Since unaccusative verbs formally encode limited argument structure, when they combine with datives they are suitable for the E-strategy.

To conclude, D-Disclosure must manipulate a formal argument that is existentially closed, and the E-strategy does not manipulate formally present arguments of any type. Thus, in Balkan languages D-Disclosure has a limited syntactic distribution essentially defined by Non-Active / reflexive morphology, which is a restriction that does not apply to the E-strategy.

3.2. *The E-strategy and compositionality*

Recall that D-Disclosure results in fixed readings and the E-strategy in vague readings. In §2, it was proposed that D-Disclosure is compositional due to an Interpretable feature in the null Applicative head, which in semantics can roughly correspond to a modal (the Balkan option), or to a topic (elsewhere in Slavic). By contrast, the E-strategy avoids roles played by formal participants, and results in relatively vague readings, which suggests that it is not based on an Interpretable feature in syntax, and is thus not compositional. This core idea can be implemented in a variety of ways left to future research, but I conclude sketching one option inspired by proposals of Fernández Soriano (1999).

Fernández Soriano argues that in unaccusative constructions that include anticausatives, datives are merged as external arguments below TP and raise to the Specifier of Tense to check an EPP feature. If this idea is adopted, then E-strategy datives are not part of a high Applicative like D-Disclosure Datives, but internal to the clause. Then it can be assumed that the Tense head does not contain a (relevant) INT feature for the semantics of the dative, which checks EPP, and is thus licensed in formal in syntax. If there is no INT in Tense, no precise semantics are assigned in logical form to the E-strategy dative in Spec-TP, in contrast to what I propose for D-disclosure datives. Instead of deriving from precise features, I suggest that E-strategy readings come about via inferential processes at the interface with discourse grammar, and are thus subject to vagueness. On this view, D-Disclosure respects compositionality, and the E-strategy does not, a difference that needs to be explored.

3. Summary and conclusions

This paper has examined in Balkan languages (and elsewhere) two procedures for nonselected datives with rather different properties. D-Disclosure found in Alb and South Slavic passives / impersonals but not anticausatives supports that the two constructions differ in formal argument structure, binds with a control effect an implicit argument to a dative, and belongs in formal grammar. The E-strategy with vague readings not based on formal arguments is found in all the languages of the Balkans, may apply at the interface with discourse grammar with different effects in passives/ impersonals, anticausatives, and other constructions, and it was suggested here that it is inferential.

References

- Chierchia, G. 1989a. *A Semantics for unaccusatives and its syntactic consequences*. Ms. Cornell University.
- Chierchia, G. 1989b. "Anaphora and Attitudes *De Se*". In *Semantics and Contextual Expression*. R. Bartsch, J. van Benthem & P. van Emde Boas (eds.), 1-31. Foris:Dordrecht.
- Chierchia, G. 1995. "The Variability of Impersonal Subjects". In *Quantification in Natural Language*. E. Bach & al. (eds.), 107-143. Kluwer:Dordrecht.
- Chomsky, N. 1995. *The Minimalist Program*. MIT Press:Cambridge, Mass.
- Chomsky, N. 1999. *Derivation by Phase*. Ms. MIT.
- Dekker, P. 1993. "Existential Disclosure". *Linguistics and Philosophy* 16: 561-88.
- Dimitrova-Vulchanova, M. 1996. *Verb Semantics, Diathesis, and Aspect*. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Trondheim.
- Fernández Soriano, O. 1999. "Datives in Constructions with Unaccusative SE". *Catalan Working Papers in Linguistics* 7: 89-105.
- Hubbard, P. L. 1985. *The Syntax of the Albanian Verb Complex*. Garland:New York.
- Kallulli, D. 1999. "Non-active Morphology in Albanian and Event (De)composition". In *Crossing Boundaries*. I. Kenesei (ed.) 263-292. Benjamins: Amsterdam.
- McGinnis, M. 2001. "Phases and the syntax of Applicatives". NELS 31.
- Moore, J. and D. M. Perlmutter. 2000. "What does it take to be a Dative Subject?". *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 18: 373-416.
- Pancheva, R. 2001. *Possessive clitics in the languages of the Balkans*. Paper read at the Conference on the Balkan Sprachbund Properties, Leiden, June 2001.
- Pylkkänen, L. 2000. "What applicative heads apply to". *Proceedings of the 24th Annual Penn Linguistics Conference*. Penn Working Papers in Linguistics 7.1.
- Reinhart, T. 1996. *Syntactic Effects of Lexical Operations: Reflexives and Unaccusatives*. UIL OTS Working Paper, Utrecht University.
- Rivero, M. L. 1990. "The Location of Nonactive Voice in Albanian and Modern Greek". *Linguistic Inquiry* 21: 135-146.
- Rivero, M. L. 1999. "On Impersonal *si* " in Polish: a Simplex Expression Anaphor". In press in *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 8.1 (2000 Volume).
- Rivero, M. L. 2002. "On Impersonal Reflexives in Romance and Slavic and Semantic Variation". In *Romance Syntax, Semantics and L2 Acquisition*. J. Camps & C. Wiltshire (eds.) 169-195. Amsterdam:Benjamins.
- Rivero, M. L. In prep. *Manuscript for Lingua Issue dedicated to Bulgarian*, A. Spencer (ed.).
- Rivero M. L. and M. Sheppard, 2001. "Indefinite Reflexive clitics in Slavic: Polish and Slovenian". In press in *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 21.1 (2003).
- Toman, J. 1986. "Cliticization from NPs in Czech and comparable phenomena in French and Italian". In *Syntax and Semantics 19: The Syntax of Pronominal Clitics*. H. Borer (ed.). New York: Academic Press.