

María Luisa Rivero and Milena Milojević Sheppard

Revisiting Involuntary State Constructions in Slovenian *

1. Introduction

In this paper, we address three questions concerning Slovenian (Slo) sentences such as (1), dubbed Involuntary State Constructions (ISCs) from now on.

- (1) *Janezu se spi.*
J_{DAT} Refl sleep_{PRES.3S}
“John {is sleepy/ feels like} sleeping.”

The first question (Q1) triggered by a recent debate is whether the syntax of ISCs consists of one clause (Rivero & Sheppard (R&S) 2003, Rivero 2003, 2004, 2005, among others), or two clauses (Marušič & Žaucer (M&Ž) 2004, in press). We argue in favor of monoclausal (2), and against biclausal (3).

- (2) [_{AppP} NP_{DAT} [_{App'} App (se) [_{TP} Tense [_{AspP} Aspect v_P[_V VP]]]]].
(3) [_{TP} NP_{DAT} [_{VP1} NP_{DAT} [_{VP1} se FEEL-LIKE ... [_{VP2} ...[V2]]]]]. (M&Ž)

The second question (Q2) related to the first concerns the source of intensionality/modality in ISCs, which lack clear intensional markers. Following Rivero (2005), we argue that modality in ISCs resides in an Operator that we dub **Asp^{Op}**, which sits in Aspect in (2), a location associated with Viewpoint Aspect in the sense of Smith (1991). The last question (Q3) is whether ISCs should be unified with Inchoatives whose datives are involuntary agents in (4), as proposed by Kallulli (1999, 2006) for Albanian (Alb). We argue that ISCs and such Inchoatives differ, which precludes a unified analysis for the two constructions in UG.

- (4) *Janezu so se z-lomila očala.*
J_{DAT} be_{3PL} Refl PF-broken_{PL} glasses_{NOM.PI}
“John broke the (seeing) glasses involuntarily.”

In sum, we argue that ISCs have a monoclausal structure with **Asp^{Op}** for modality, and differ from Inchoatives with datives. In §2, we introduce morphological patterns in ISCs, in §3 we address Q1 and Q2, and in §4 we answer Q3.

* Research for this paper was partially subsidized by Social Sciences Humanities Research Council of Canada Grant 410-2006-0150 to María Luisa Rivero.

2. Introducing Involuntary State Constructions

Alb, Slo, and the South Slavic languages share ISCs with similar syntax and semantics. In Slo, transitive ISCs show a morphological pattern absent in the other languages, which distinguishes them from Inchoatives of type (4), as seen in §4. Let us introduce ISCs with intransitive and transitive Vs (the language of examples not in Slo or English is indicated).

Intransitive ISCs contain dative logical subjects and Vs in default form (3S, Neuter) that can be unergative - (1) and (5a-b)-, or unaccusative - (6a-c), which becomes important in §4. Slavic ISCs must contain clitic *se*, and Alb ISCs a nonactive voice marker, which in (5b) is clitic *u*, and in (6c) is suffix *-het*.

- (5) a. *Na decata im se raboteše.* Bul(garian)
 P children.the 3_{PL.DAT} Refl work_{IMP.3S}
 “The children felt like working.”
- b. *Benit i u punua.* Alb
 B_{DAT} 3_{S.DAT} NAct work_{3S}
 “Ben felt like working.”
- (6) a. *Janezu se je umiralo doma.*
 J_{DAT} Refl be_{3S} die_{NEU} at.home
 “John felt like dying at home.”
- b. *Na men mi se živee.* Bul
 P 1_S 1_{S.DAT} Refl live_{3S}
 “I feel like living.”
- c. *Anës i jetohet në Austri.* Alb
 A_{DAT} 3_{S.DAT} live_{NACT.PRES.3S} in Austria
 “Ann feels like living in Austria.”

In addition to a dative and a reflexive / nonactive marker, transitive ISCs contain a nominative logical object in agreement with V, as in (7-9).

- (7) *Janezu se je pila voda.*
 J_{DAT} Refl be_{3S} drunk_{FEM.S} water_{FEM.S.NOM}
 “John felt like drinking water.”
- (8) *Na Ivan mu se četjaja knigi.* Bul
 P Ivan 3_{S.DAT} Refl read_{IMP.3PI} book_{PL.NOM}
 “John felt like reading books.”
- (9) *Anës i lexo-hen /*-het dy libra.* Alb
 A_{DAT} 3_{S.DAT} read_{NACT.PRES.3PI/*3S} two book_{PI.NOM}
 “Ann feels like reading two books.”

Slo has a transitive pattern for ISCs absent in the other languages, which proves important for the proposals in §4: an invariable / default V and an accusative logical object, as in (10).

- (10) a. *Janezu se je pilo vodo.*
 J_{DAT} Refl be_{3S} drunk_{NEU} water_{FEM.ACC}
 “John felt like drinking water.”
- b. *Janezu se piše pisma.*
 J_{DAT} Refl write_{3S} letter_{PL.ACC}
 “John feels like writing (the) letters.”
- c. *Janezu se na vrtu umiva sebe,*
 J_{DAT} Refl on garden wash_{3S} himself_{ACC}
ne pa dojenčka.
 not baby_{ACC}
 “John feels like washing himself in the garden, not the baby.”

3. Aspect as Modal Operator in ISCs: Answering Q1 and Q2

Having looked at the morphology of ISCs, let us turn to Aspect, which we propose is the source of their modal reading for several reasons. In §3.1, we identify syntactic and semantic similarities between ISCs and modal Progressives in English, which we attribute to Aspect. In §3.2, we briefly compare Slo and Bul and conclude that their ISCs show morphosyntactic variation, but always contain an aspectual operator for modality. In §3.3, we note formal differences between ISCs and Psych constructions, rejecting (3) and adding support to the skeleton in (2), where Aspect combines with a High Applicative.

3.1. Modifiers in modal aspectual contexts

Adverbs and Depictive Adjectives that should be in conflict but in fact are not, behave similarly in ISCs and English sentences that Copley (2002) calls “Futurate Progressives”, i.e. with a Progressive in a modal role as in Dowty (1979 and later work). We attribute such parallelism to the presence in ISCs of a modal aspectual operator we dub Asp^{Op} in the structure in (2). To motivate this idea, we begin by looking at ISCs with two Time Adverbs (Adv) of type (11).

- (11) *Zdajle se mi ne gre jutri domov.*
 now Refl I_{S.DAT} Neg go_{OPRES.3S} tomorrow home
 “Right now, I do not feel like going home tomorrow.” (M&Ž)

For M&Ž, (11) supports a syntactic structure for ISCs with a main and a subordinate clause, as in (3). By contrast, we consider such sentences monoclausal as in (2), with the first Adv taking scope over the aspectual operator, and the second under the scope of such an operator. Note that English constructions with a Progressive in a modal use such as (12a-b) allow the same

type of modification as (11), which we attribute to similar aspectual operators in the two cases (Rivero (2005) shows that Spanish sentences in the Imperfect Tense, which can function as modal operator (Cipria and Roberts 2000), can also hold two apparently conflicting Time Adv).

- (12) a. *Yesterday morning I was leaving tomorrow on the Midnight Special.* (Dowty 1979)
 b. *For two weeks, the Red Sox were playing the Yankees today.* (Copley 2002)

A characteristic of such modal patterns is that the first Adv must modify the feeling / plan, and the second the (intended) event described by V. The Manner Adv in (13) and (14) fit the same generalization. To repeat, if ISCs consist of one clause with Asp^{Op}, the observed parallelism with English (or Spanish) is expected.

- (13) *Ani se je skrivoma plesalo vsem na oĉeh.*
 A_{DAT} Refl be_{3S} secretly danced_{NEU} to.everybody on eyes
 “Ana secretly felt like dancing in plain view.”

- (14) *Nomar is secretly practicing in plain view tomorrow.* (Copley 2002)

The ISC in (13) is similar to English (14) in so far as Ana’s feeling about dancing in plain view and Nomar’s plan to practice in plain view are asserted to be secret respectively. Thus, Manner Adv can combine in ISCs without creating a contradiction, with the same syntactic and semantic characteristics as similar Adv in English Progressives (for M&Ž, ISCs do not tolerate Manner Adverbs, which seems contrary to fact).

Several other combinations of modifiers, which at first sight should conflict but in fact do not, share the noted properties. That is, ISCs parallel English Progressive sentences in so far as the first modifier composes semantically with the urge/ feeling/willingness, and the second with the intended event depicted by V. This is seen with double Degree Adv in (15a), and the Depictives in (15b) parallel to English (15c), which are sentences that for M&Ž support the biclausal hypothesis in (3).

- (15) a. *Zelo se mi je malo tarnalo.*
 very Refl I_{DAT} be_{3S} little whined
 “I very much felt like whining a little.” (M&Ž)
 b. *Jušu se treznemu ni kuhalo pijan.*
 J_{DAT} Refl sober_{DAT} Neg cooked drunk_{NOM}
 “Jush, (all) sober, didn’t feel like cooking drunk.” (M&Ž)
 c. *Nomar now all sober is not cooking completely drunk tomorrow.*

In such modal contexts, modifier order indicates semantic scope, so switching Time Adverbs in (11) and (12a-b) results in contradictions: (16a-b).

- (16) a. **Tomorrow I was leaving yesterday on the Midnight Special.*
 b. **Jutri se mi ne gre zdajle domov.*
 now Refl 1_{S.DAT} Neg g_{OPRES.3S} tomorrow home
 “*Tomorrow, I do not feel like going home now.”

Switching Manner Advs and Depictives results in different truth conditions. Copley (2002) tells us that English *Nomar is cleverly practicing stupidly tomorrow* refers to a clever plan. We add that *Nomar is stupidly practicing cleverly tomorrow* refers to a stupid plan, and parallel ISCs could be constructed in Slo. Depictives in (15b-c) contrast with (17a-b), with the feeling/plan assigned to a sober individual in the first, and a drunk one in the second.

- (17) a. *Jušu se pijanemu ni kuhalo trezen.*
 J_{DAT} Refl drunk_{DAT} Neg.be_{3S} cooked sober_{NOM}
 “Jush, drunk, did not feel like cooking sober.”
 a. *Nomar now all drunk is cooking completely sober tomorrow.*

The two possible locations for *spet* “again” and *pogosto* “often” in (18a-b) mentioned by M&Ž also illustrate semantic scope encoded in word order, with the first Adv outside the scope of the modal operator, as in the above sentences.

- (18) a. *Bobanu se spet pogosto kadi havanke.*
 B_{DAT} Refl again often smokes Havanas
 “Boban again often feels like smoking Cuban cigars.” (M&Ž)
 c. *Bobanu se pogosto spet kadi havanke.*
 B_{DAT} Refl often again smokes Havanas
 “Boban often feels like smoking Cuban cigars again.” (M&Ž)

To sum up, modality in ISCs and English Progressives is similar, which can be captured via parallel aspectual operators in a modal role in both constructions.

Before we conclude §3.1, we mention how to capture the syntactic / semantic behavior of double modifiers in the above modal contexts taken as monoclausal. Maienborn (2001) argues that there are three sites within one syntactic clause where modifiers of the same type can be merged: (a) **Internal** in the V-periphery, (b) **External** in the VP-periphery, and (c) **Frame-setting** in the C-domain (also (Tenny 2000), among others)¹. If we apply Maienborn’s views to ISCs with conflicting Advs / Adjs such as the above, it can be proposed that they contain a **Frame-setting** Adv/Adj modifying the High Applicative in (2), and an **External** Adv modifying the VP. Frame-setting Advs are not in the scope of Asp^{Op}, so not in the portion of the clause treated as a modal context in semantics;

¹ In an earlier proposal, Rivero (1992) distinguishes between Advs within VP that as Aktionsart modifiers may incorporate to V in Greek, and Advs outside VP that as aspectual modifiers cannot incorporate to V in Greek.

by contrast, External Adverbs are within the scope of Asp^{Op} (more details in (Rivero 2005)).²

3.2. Modal Aspectual Operators and parametric variation

Let us now turn from semantics to the morphology of Asp^{Op}. Slavic languages may differ in aspectual and temporal systems, which is the case with Slo vs. Bul. Such a variation affects the morphology of Asp^{Op} in ISCs, a topic we address in preliminary form in this section.

Rivero (2005) proposes that the category dubbed here Asp^{Op} (her atelic operator) displays three characteristics in Bul. It is (a) an overt morphological marker for imperfectivity, (b) in so-called Viewpoint Aspect, using this term as in (Smith 1991), (c) spelled out on the inflected V. Bul representatives of Asp^{Op} include the (bolded) Imperfect Tense inflection *-še* in (19), inceptive prefix *pri-* in (20a) in contrast with perfective *pro-* in (20b) -, and imperfective *-va-* on V in the analytic future in (21a), in contrast with the unmarked, thus perfective, inflected future V in (21b). Constructions without aspectual operator marking cannot be ISCs in Bul (except for some marginal instances of coercion).

- (19) a. *Na Ivan mu se čete-še knjigata.* Bul
 P Ivan 3_{S.DAT} Refl read_{IMP.3S} book.the
 “Ivan felt like reading the book.”
 b. [_{AppP} *Na Ivan* [_{App} *mu* (*se*) [_{TP} *Past* [_{AspP} ***Imp***^{Op} _{vP} [*čete- knjigata*]]]]].

² M&Z note ISCs with three Advs as in (i.a-b): what they call a frame Adv as in (Parsons 1990), and two conflicting Time Advs.

- (i) a. *Med vojno se mi je po vojni hodilo vsak dan na Triglav.*
 during war Refl 1Sg.Dat Aux after war go every day onto Triglav
 “During the war I felt like climbing Mt. Triglav after the war every day.”
 b. *Med vojno se mi je vsako dopoldne šlo naslednji dan na Triglav.*
 during war Refl 1Sg.Dat Aux every morning go following day onto Triglav
 “During the war I felt every morning like climbing Triglav the next day.”

Rivero (2005) notes that semantics, not syntax, defines which Adv sets the frame and which one the time in (i.a-b), which fits well with the approach to Advs we adopt (Rivero also points to similar combinations in Spanish Imperfect sentences in a modal use). The last Adv in (i.a-b) makes a fixed semantic contribution as time modifier, establishing a contrast with a higher Adv whose syntactic position is not fixed. In (i.a), initial *during the war* functions as the expression in conflict with *after the war*, so is not a frame Adv in the sense of Parson. This is reversed in (i.b), with initial *during the war* setting the frame, and *every day* establishing the time conflict with *the next day*. Maienborn tells us that Frame-setting Advs can reiterate, so we can assume that in (i.a-b), the first and second Advs are Frame-setting in the left periphery, while the third Adv with the fixed contribution is External in the VP-periphery. In ISCs, the topic is formally encoded in the High Applicative in (2) and must be modified by one of the Frame-setting Advs, but compositional principles determine the relative role of the two Frame-setting Advs in cases like (i.a-b). That is, the Frame-setting Adv that establishes a time conflict with the External Adv counts as topic modifier, while the other Frame-setting Adv provides a (more encompassing) frame, with order undetermined.

- (20) a. *Na Ivan mu se pri-jadoxa jabulki.* Bul
 P Ivan 3_{S.DAT} Refl come.to-eat_{AOR.3PL} apples
 “Ivan became hungry for apples.”
- b. **Na Ivan mu se pro-spa filma.*
 P Ivan 3_{S.DAT} Refl Perf-sleep_{AOR.3S} movie
 “*Ivan felt like sleeping during the whole movie.”
- (21) a. *Šte mi se hap-va shokolad utre.* Bul
 Fut 1_{S.DAT} Refl eat-**va**_{3S} chocolate tomorrow
 “I will feel like eating chocolate tomorrow.”
- b. **Šte mi se hapne shokolad utre.*
 Fut 1_{S.DAT} Refl eat_{3S} chocolate tomorrow
 “*I will feel like eating chocolate tomorrow.”

Slo has a poorer tense/aspect system than Bul, often using default marking for imperfectivity, so together with other Slavic languages offers a less clear situation. The combinatorial properties of tense / aspect in ISCs in Slo require future study, but it suffices to say that equivalents of Bul (20a) with an inceptive prefix are not well-formed ISCs in Slo. However, Slo ISCs cannot be plainly perfective, a first indication that they must contain Asp^{Op} like in Bul. As (22a) illustrates, Slo imperfective patterns are ambiguous between the relevant ISC reading, and an unrelated *se*-passive reading based on a ditransitive structure with a dative goal. By contrast, perfective patterns such as (22b) have a *se*-passive reading but no ISC reading, which we attribute to absence of Asp^{Op} ((in)definiteness of logical object plays no role).³

- (22) a. *Janezu so se pisala pisma.*
 J_{DAT} be_{3PL} Refl **0Asp^{Op}** written=imp letters
 “(The) letters were written to John.” Passive OK
 “John felt like writing (the) letters.” ISC OK
- b. [_{AppP} Janezu [_{App} App(se)]_{TP} Past [_{AspP} ImpOp [0] vP [pisala pisma]]].

³ Purely perfective ICS can be marginally acceptable in Slo if they contain intensifying adverbs and modalizing particles, as in (i.a) borrowed from M&Ž (in press) (their (79a)). However, perfective ISCs such as (23a) in the text and (i.b) are totally unacceptable when stripped of such additions (judgments are shared by several informants, and Slo linguists present at FSDL 6.5).

- (i) a. *Zdejle se mi pa ful prebere kakšen člank.*
 now Refl I.Dat PTCL so read.through.PF some article.ACC
 “Right now I so feel like reading through some article.”
- b. **Prebere se mi kakšen člank.*
 read.through.PF Refl I.Dat some article.ACC
 “*I feel like reading through some article.”

The noted contrast suggests that modal adverbs / particles (or negation) can marginally function as modal operators in ISCs, with points of contact with Asp^{Op}, not a new idea.

- (23) a. *Janezu so se na-pisala pisma.*
 J_{DAT} be_{3PL} Refl **na**-written=PF letters
 “(The) letters were written to John.” Passive OK
 “*John felt like writing (the) letters.” *ISC
- b. *_{[AppP Janezu [App’ App (se) [TP Past... PF... pisala pisma]]]}.

With some abstraction, then, Slo (22a) resembles Bul (19), (20a), and (21a), in so far as they all contain Asp^{Op}, essential for an ISC analysis. By contrast, Slo (23) is similar to Bul (20b) and (21b) as they all lack the necessary operator.

A second indication that Asp^{Op} triggers modality in Slo ISCs comes from secondary imperfectivization. Pattern (24) with V with a perfective prefix and secondary imperfectivization (infinitive *pre-piso-va-ti*) resembles (22a) in having both a *se*-passive and an ISC reading ((in)definiteness in the logical object plays no role). In view of (24), we reach two conclusions. On the one hand, the secondary imperfective marker *-va-* stands for Asp^{Op} in Slo ISCs. On the other hand, perfective prefixes do not have an intervention / blocking effect on the modal operator, so an ISC analysis may be viable in their presence. Rivero (2005) notes a situation similar to (24) with Bul Vs traditionally dubbed “Perfective Imperfects” (i.e. Imperfect Tense with a perfective prefix), as in (25).

- (24) *Janezu so se pre-pisovala pisma.*
 J_{DAT} be_{3PL} Refl **pre**-write_{IMP.3PL} letters_{ACC}
 “(The) letters were rewritten for John.” Passive OK
 “John felt like rewriting (the) letters.” ISC OK
- (25) *Na Ivan mu se na-pisvashe pismoto.* Bul
 P Ivan 3_{S.DAT} Refl PF-write_{IMP.3S} letter.the
 “Ivan felt like writing the letter completely.”

Tense / aspect variation in ISCs is a complex topic beyond the scope of this paper. Furthermore, the modal role of Aspect, which has attracted considerable attention in English and Romance, has not been studied in Slavic. However, a preliminary idea partially unifying the above Slo and Bul phenomena is as follows. If (24-25) contain Asp^{Op} in Grammatical Aspect in (2), then perfective markers will not c-command this item if they are in so-called Inner Aspect in a lower position (perhaps within vP), as roughly shown in (26). Structural factors could then be one reason for why perfective markers are not interveners for the modal effect of Asp^{Op} in ISCs.

- (26) [_{AppP} J [_{App’} App (se) [_{TP} Past [_{AspP} ImpOp [**va**] vP [...PF... pis...ala pisma]]]]].

3.3. ISCs vs. Psych constructions

In our view, ISCs are monoclausal as in (2) repeated in (27). For M&Ž, ISCs consist of two clauses as in (3) repeated in (28), with the main clause containing a null inherently reflexive class III psych V comparable to Italian *piacere* or Slo *luštati* in (29). We see three problems with the null verb in (28), and consider (27) with Aspect combined with a High Applicative in one syntactic clause a preferable analysis.

(27) [AppP NP_{DAT} [App' App (se) [TP Tense [AspP Aspect vP[V VP]]]]].

(28) [TP NP_{DAT} [VP1 NP_{DAT} [V1 se FEEL-LIKE ... [VP2 ... [V2]]]]]. (M&Ž)

(29) [*Janezu* [V1 *se lуста*] [V2 *delati*]
 J_{DAT} Refl like_{PRES} work_{INF}
 “John feels like working.”

A first problem with (28) is that it requires construction-specific processes of an unprecedented type blending two clauses into one. In addition, such an analysis requires clitic climbing and restructuring, which exist in Slo (Golden and Sheppard 2000, Golden 2003), but not Bul or Alb. If ISCs are monoclausal as in (27), no unusual processes are needed (Rivero 2005 for more details).

The second difficulty in (28) is that its null inherently reflexive psych V of class III poses a learnability problem in Slo. In this language, *luštati* in (29) - a German borrowing absent in some variants, and thus limited in geography and register- is the only **overt** lexical entry with the required characteristics. No (relevant) overt V is restricted to a dative frame in Slo, as they all alternate, which suggests that the modal reading in ISCs results from compositional semantics applied to (27), without pure “feel-like” Vs (or roots) in the lexicon. For instance, *ljubiti* “like, love” can appear in the Nom-Acc frame in (30a), or in the (30b) ISC frame defined by the main dictionary of Slo (SSKJ) as expressing the willingness of somebody to do something. Thus, (27) can provide the compositional basis for modality in an ISC when coupled to the contribution of (one) *ljubiti*.

(30) a. *Ana ljubi {Janeza/ plesati}.*
 A_{NOM} loves John_{ACC}/ dance_{INF}
 “Ana loves {John/to dance}.”

b. *Ani se je (ni) ljubilo plesati.*
 A_{DAT} Refl be_{PRES.3S} (Neg) love_{NEU} dance_{INF}
 “Ana {felt / didn’t feel} like dancing.”

Hoteti “want”, another potential candidate for overt “feel-like” status, also participates in two frames with different compositional semantics: a Nom-Acc one in (31a) and an ISC frame in (31b), which intuitively speaking corresponds to a strong urge. Thus modality in ISCs does not have exactly the same flavor in all instances, and seems to vary on the basis of the contribution of the particular V that enters the frame.

- (31) a. *Ana hoče (piti) vodo.*
 A_{NOM} wants (drink_{INF}) water_{ACC}
 “Ana wants (to drink) water.”
- b. *Ani se hoče (piti) vodo.*
 A_{DAT} Refl wants (drink_{INF}) water._{ACC}
 “Ana feels like drinking water.”

Dati “give”, another candidate for overt “feel-like” status, is multifaceted. It participates in a ditransitive frame (not illustrated), and a reflexive impersonal frame that expresses ability - *To se da narediti*. “This can be done.”-, which seems to contain an indefinite *se* that builds an ISC with a Dative Applicative, as in (R&S 2003).⁴ The ISC frame for this V in (32) is defined by the SSKJ dictionary as denoting a readiness or willingness to perform some activity, and ensues only with the dative combined with *se*, which adds support to the idea that the semantics of (32) arise compositionality from (27) in the way adumbrated in (R&S 2003). By contrast, the null V hypothesis in (28) suggests regression for (32), (30b) and (31b), with three clauses and abstract V in the matrix: [TPNP_{DAT} [V₁ se FEEL-LIKE [VP₂ *dalo* [VP₃ *delati*]]]].

- (32) *Ani se ni dalo delati.*
 A_{DAT} Refl not.is give_{NEU} work_{INF}
 “Ana did not feel like working.”

The third problem with (28) is that Psych constructions and ISCs formally differ. In Slo as in Bul (Rivero 2005), Psych constructions have nominalized counterparts but ISCs do not, as illustrated in (33a-b) with a dative experiencer V, in (34a-b) with an accusative experiencer V, and in (35a-b) with an ISC.

- (33) a. *Film ugaja Ani.*
 Film_{NOM} pleases A_{DAT}
 “The film pleases Ana.”
- b. *Ugajanje filma Ani ...*
 pleasing film_{GEN} A_{DAT}
 “Anna’s pleasure at the film... ”
- (34) a. *Ta film razburja Ano.*
 This film_{NOM} irritates Ann_{ACC}
 “This film irritates Ana.”
- b. *Anino razburjanje nad filmom ...*
 A_{POSS. ADJ} irritation over film_{INST}
 “Ana’s irritation over the film...”
- (35) a. *Janezu se je pilo vodo.*
 J_{DAT} Refl be_{3S} drunk_{NEU} water_{FEM.ACC}

⁴ R&S (2003) propose that impersonal/passive *se* is an indefinite that contributes a variable bound by the dative in ISCs, which is the analysis adopted in this paper.

- “John felt like drinking water.”
- b. *Janezovo pitje vode je bilo zabavno.*
 J_{POSS.ADJ} drinking water_{GEN} be_{3S} been amusing
 “John’s drinking water was amusing.”
 “*John’s urge to drink water was amusing.” *ISC

Rivero (2005) attributes the absence of nominalized ISCs to the High Applicative in (27), proposing that such a functional category takes a complement that must be a TP, which is not possible in nominalizations.

In sum, in §3 we motivated two elements of the ISC structure in (2=27): (a) Aspect, and (b) the High Applicative. On the one hand, ISCs must contain an imperfective component as modal operator. Therefore, they resemble English Progressives as to Adv modification, and Bul ISCs in so far as they cannot be purely perfective. On the other hand, ISCs differ from Psych constructions because they lack nominalized counterparts, since their High Applicative must take a TP-complement.

4. ISCs differ from Inchoatives with Datives: Answering Q3

In §3, we concluded that ISCs should not be identified with Psych constructions. In this section, we argue that ISCs should not be identified with Inchoatives with dative involuntary agents.

Alb, Polish, Spanish, and Slo are languages with Inchoatives that can be equipped with involuntary agents in the dative (Kallulli 1999, 2006, Rivero 2003, 2004, R&S 2003: §5.5), as in (36a) for Alb, and (36b) repeating (4) for Slo.

- (36) a. *Anës i- u thyen gotat.* Alb
 A_{DAT} 3_{S.DAT}- Non-act.Aor break_{3PL} glasses.the_{NOM.PL}
 “Anna broke the (drinking) glasses (involuntarily).”
- b. *Janezu so se z-lomila očala.*
 J_{DAT} be_{3PL} Refl PF-broken_{PL} glasses_{NOM.PL}
 “John broke the (seeing) glasses involuntarily.”

The Inchoative constructions in (36a-b) resemble ISCs with transitive Vs, as the comparison with (37a) repeating (9) and (37b) repeating (7) suggests.

- (37) a. *Anës i lexo-hen dy libra.* Alb
 A_{DAT} 3_{S.DAT} read_{NON.ACT.PRES.3PL} two book_{NOM.PL}
 “Ann feels like reading two books.”
- b. *Janezu se je pila voda.*
 J_{DAT} Refl be_{3S} drunk_{FEM.S} water_{FEM.S.NOM}
 “John felt like drinking water.”

Similarities include nonactive/reflexive markers in both, Vs in agreement with nominative logical objects, and animate dative logical subjects with a lack of control reading. Given such parallellisms, a question is whether the two

constructions should be unified in UG. In the literature, there are two different answers to this question. On the one hand, R&S (2003) and Rivero (2003, 2004) suggest that they should be kept apart, an idea we further motivate in this paper. On the other hand, Kallulli (1999, 2006), stressing characteristics of Alb, pursues a research program that unifies them.

Slo supports the hypothesis that ISCs and Inchoatives with dative agents differ in fundamental ways from two independent perspectives.⁵ On the one hand, we saw in §2 that ISCs with transitive Vs can appear in two different morphological patterns in this language. One Slo pattern for ISCs reminiscent of Inchoatives is in (37b) with a dative subject, and a nominative object in agreement with V. The other pattern contains an accusative object and a default V, as in (10a) now repeated in (38), so is quite different.

- (38) *Janezu se je pilo vodo.*
 J_{DAT} Refl be_{3S} drunk_{NEU} water_{FEM.ACC}
 “John felt like drinking water.”

As far as we can tell, Inchoatives with datives are limited to the pattern with a nominative logical object in agreement with V in all the languages under discussion. The above contrast is significant to show that unaccusativity is not essential to ISCs, contra Kallulli, and that transitive ISCs and Inchoatives cannot be unified on such a basis. The hypothesis that unaccusativity is crucial to ISCs is equally problematic with intransitive Vs, since we saw in §2 that both unaccusative and unergative Vs participate in such constructions. Under the unaccusativity approach, the role of *se* / NAct marking in ISCs with Vs such as *live* looks puzzling since they lack accusative case and an external role, so there is no need for suppressing either of them through morphological markers. This problem does not affect the analysis of R&S (2003), where *se* in ISCs signals a variable representing an argument of the predicate bound by the dative logical subject, whether V is unaccusative, unergative, or transitive.

On the other hand, Aspect is a second dimension that differentiates ISCs from Inchoatives in Slo, arguing against their unification in UG. Their interpretation makes clear that ISCs and Inchoatives do not display the same type of modality. The precise claim in this paper, however, is that ISCs depend on Aspect for modality, so must have some sort of imperfective-like ingredient, as discussed in §3. By contrast, Inchoatives with datives do not rely on Aspect, and can be either perfective or imperfective without conflict, as mentioned by R&S (2003).

The combination of Aspect with the two morphological patterns for transitive ISCs in Slo provides a sophisticated tool to distinguish between them and Inchoatives, given their complex web of similarities and contrasts.

⁵ Additional crosslinguistic evidence keeping the two constructions apart is that they need not cooccur in a given language. On the one hand, languages with Inchoatives with datives as involuntary agents such as Spanish altogether lack ISCs. On the other hand, languages with ISCs such as Bul may lack Inchoatives with datives as involuntary agents (Rivero 2004). Such gaps are unexpected if the two constructions belong to one unique type in UG.

Let us first look at patterns with a nominative object in agreement with V. When they are imperfective as in (39), such patterns are ambiguous between an ISC reading (39a), with a dative as an experiencer of a feeling about a non-occurring event, and an Inchoative reading (39b), with a dative as involuntary agent of an occurring event. The generic Adv in (39) is optional, without fundamental effect on either reading.

- (39) *Janezu so se (kar naprej) razbijali kozarci.*
 J_{DAT} be_{3PL} Refl (all-the-time) break_{IMP.MASC.PL} glasses_{MASC.NOM.PL}
 (a) “John felt like breaking glasses (all the time).” ISC OK
 (b) “John unintentionally broke glasses (all the time).” Inchoative OK

By contrast with imperfective (39), perfective frames with agreeing nominatives as in (40) have an Inchoative reading with a dative as involuntary agent, (40b), but lack an ISC reading: (40a). This confirms the conclusion in §3 that ISCs require imperfectivity as modal operator. It also confirms that Inchoatives, have no essential need for a modal operator, but can tolerate one, as in (39).

- (40) *Janezu so se razbili kozarci.*
 J_{DAT} be_{3PL} Refl break_{PERF.MASC.PL} glasses_{MASC.NOM.PL}
 (a) “*John felt like breaking (the) glasses” *ISC
 (b) “John unintentionally broke (the) glasses.” Inchoative OK

Turning now to the pattern with a default V and an accusative logical object in (41), imperfective frames of such a type have only an ISC reading, with dative as an experiencer of a feeling towards a non-occurring event: (41a). They lack an Inchoative reading: (41b). This confirms that Inchoatives with datives are essentially tied to unaccusative frames, while ISCs need not be.

- (41) *Janezu se je (kar naprej) razbijalo kozarce.*
 J_{DAT} Refl be_{.3S} (all-the-time) break_{IMP.NEU} glasses_{ACC.PL}
 (a) “John felt like breaking glasses (all the time).” ISC OK
 (b) “*John unintentionally broke glasses (all the time).” *Inchoative

Finally, perfective patterns with default Vs and accusative objects are not illustrated, but it should be clear that they cannot be ISCs because they are not imperfective, and cannot be Inchoatives with dative involuntary agents because they are not unaccusative.

To conclude §4, Aspect is essential for ISCs, which cannot be perfective. By contrast, Aspect does not contribute nor interfere with Inchoatives with dative involuntary agents. Unaccusativity is essential to Inchoatives with datives, but does not contribute nor interfere with ISCs, which can appear with accusative objects or with unaccusative frames. Given these two formal differences, coupled to the contrast in modality between the two constructions, ISCs and Inchoatives cannot be identified with each other in UG.

5. Conclusions

In this paper, we argued that ISCs derive intensionality from an aspectual operator in a modal/ “futate” role, thus linking them to English sentences in the Progressive, and distinguishing them from constructions with Psych Vs.

We also argued that ISCs contain a High Dative Applicative above TP, so do not nominalize, and that they rely on Aspect, not unaccusativity. Thus, ISCs must be imperfective, but may display accusative objects. ISCs thus differ from Inchoatives with datives as involuntary Agents, which exist in Slo, but rely on unaccusativity, not Aspect.

References

- Cipria, Alicia and Craige Roberts. 2000. Spanish *Imperfecto* and *Pretérito*: Truth Conditions and Aktionsart effects in a situation semantics. *Natural Language Semantics* 8:297-347.
- Copley, Bridget. 2002. *The Semantics of the Future*. MIT Ph.D. Dissertation.
- Dowty, David R. 1979. *Word Meaning and Montague Grammar*. Dordrecht: Reidel.
- Golden, Marija. 2003. Clitic placement and clitic climbing in Slovenian. *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* 56: 208-33.
- Golden, Marija and Milena Milojević Sheppard. 2000. Slovene pronominal clitics. In F. Beukema and M. den Dikken (eds.), *Clitic Phenomena in European Languages*, 191-207. Amsterdam:Benjamins.
- Kallulli, Dalina 1999. Non-active morphology in Albanian and event (de)composition. In I. Kenesei (ed.), *Crossing Boundaries*, 263-292. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Kallulli, Dalina 2006. Unaccusatives with dative causers and experiencers: a unified account. In D. Hole, A. Meinunger and W. Abraham (eds.), *Datives and Other Cases*, 271-301. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Maienborn, Claudia. 2001. On the position and interpretation of Locative modifiers. *Natural Language Semantics* 9:191-240.
- Marušič, Franc and Rok Žaucer. 2004. A Reanalysis of the Slovenian Dative-Reflexive Construction. *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics* 12: 293-312 .
- Marušič, Franc and Rok Žaucer. In press. On the Intensional FEEL-LIKE Construction in Slovenian: a case of a phonologically null verb. Forthcoming in *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*.
- Parsons, Terence. 1990. *Events in the Semantics of English*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Rivero, María Luisa. 1992. “Adverb Incorporation and the Syntax of Adverbs in Modern Greek.” *Linguistics and Philosophy* 15: 289-331.
- Rivero, María Luisa. 2003. Reflexive clitic constructions with datives: syntax and semantics. *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics* 11: 469-494.

- Rivero, María Luisa. 2004. Datives and the non-active voice/ reflexive clitics in Balkan languages. In O. M. Tomić (ed.), *Balkan Syntax and Semantics*, 237-267. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Rivero, María Luisa. 2005. Intensionality, High Applicatives, and Aspect in South Slavic: revisiting Involuntary State Constructions. Ms. U. of Ottawa.
- Rivero, María Luisa and Milena Milojević Sheppard. 2003. Indefinite Reflexive Clitics in Slavic: Polish and Slovenian. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 21: 89-155.
- Smith, Carlota S. 1991. *The Parameter of Aspect*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- SSKJ =Slovar slovenskega knjižnega jezika.1970-1991.Ljubljana: Državna založbe Slovenije.
- Tenny, Carol. 2000. Core Events and Adverbial Modification. In C. Tenny and J. Pustejovsky (eds.), *Events as Grammatical Objects*, 285-334. Stanford, Ca: Center for the Study of Language and Information.

María Luisa Rivero
Linguistics, University of Ottawa
Ottawa, K1N 6N5, Ontario. Canada
mrivero@uottawa.ca

Milena Milojević Sheppard
Department of English, Faculty of Arts
University of Ljubljana, Slovenia.
milena.sheppard@ff.uni-lj.si