1. Introduction

This paper concerns two types of Slavic constructions with datives and reflexive clitics illustrated in (1-2) and in (3a-b) respectively, which I argue differ in syntactic and semantic status.

(1)  \textit{Jankowi czytał się tę książkę z przyjemnością.}
\textit{John read NEU Refl this book ACC with pleasure}
\textit{‘John read this book with pleasure’}

(2)  \textit{Na Ivan mu se četjasa knigi.}
\textit{John DAT heDAT Refl read3PL books}
\textit{‘John felt like reading books’}

---
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(3) a.  \textit{Jankowi złamał się okulary.} P  
\hspace{1cm} \text{John\textsubscript{DAT} broke\textsubscript{FEM.PL} Refl glasses\textsubscript{FEM.PL}}

b.  \textit{Na Ivanu mu se šupixa očilata.} B  
\hspace{1cm} \text{John\textsubscript{DAT} he\textsubscript{DAT} Refl broke\textsubscript{3PL} glasses.the}

‘John broke the glasses involuntarily’

On the one hand, Rivero (1999) notes that the sentences in (1-2) traditionally known as involuntary state constructions\(^2\) display syntactic and semantic variation, and lack counterparts in Romance. Syntactic variation hinges on whether the reflexive clitic shown in bold from now on is indefinite as in (1), or passive as in (2). Semantic variation affects truth conditions, and hinges on whether the construction describes an eventuality, as in West Slavic (1), with dative as involuntary agent, or is a modalized statement as in South Slavic (2), with dative resembling an experiencer. The hypothesis that captures syntactic variation is that reflexive clitics signal a formally present external argument in both (1) and (2), which is explicit in the indefinite case in (1), and implicit in the passive case in (2). The hypothesis that captures semantic variation is that in logical form, procedures embodied under the label ‘Dative Disclosure’ bind the explicit / implicit argument to the dative in one way in West Slavic, and in another in South Slavic. As first noted by Rivero and Sheppard (2003), combining the two syntactic options with the two semantic options gives rise to a four way variation in Slavic. In Polish and Czech,

\(^2\) Another label that comes to mind is ‘quirky dative subject constructions’, since they partially resemble well-known so-called dative subject patterns in Icelandic. However, see later for important differences in analysis, and several other Slavic constructions that differ in properties, but also display apparent ‘quirky dative subjects’. In South Slavic, they have also been called ‘feel like constructions’ (Dimitrova Vulchanova 1996), and ‘dispositional constructions’ (Franks 1995). In the relational literature, they are known as ‘productive inversions’ (Dziwirek 1994, Moore and Perlmutter 2000 for references). For Rivero and Sheppard (2003), they are ‘Dative Existential Disclosure constructions’, a label whose content will become clear by §2.5.
for instance, involuntary state constructions display similar semantics but different syntax, thus these two West Slavic languages do not belong to exactly the same type.

On the other hand, the constructions in (3a-b), which lack traditional or generative grammar labels, do not display syntactic or semantic variation, have counterparts in Romance, and contain an inchoative / anticausative reflexive clitic. Following Rivero (to appear), I argue that such patterns lack an external argument in both syntax and semantics due to Argument Suppression (Reinhart 1996). Furthermore, the dative in such constructions is interpreted by an inferential procedure dubbed ‘Ethical Strategy’, which cannot manipulate formally present arguments, and results in vague readings.

Dative Disclosure in (1-2) and the Ethical strategy in (3) support the hypothesis that passives and anticausatives differ in argument structure. Namely, on the one hand, passives contain a formally represented external argument. On the other hand, anticausatives do not contain a formal external argument.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces four involuntary state construction types in Slavic and their analysis, taking as point of departure (Rivero and Sheppard 2003: §4). Section 3 examines the Ethical Strategy, taking as point of departure (Rivero to appear). Section 4 concludes the paper.

2. Involuntary state constructions
Rivero (1999) notices and Rivero and Sheppard (2003) argue in favor of two syntactic and two semantic types of involuntary state constructions, which crisscross each other. Syntactic types based on transitive verbs are introduced in §2.1, and semantic types are the topic of §2.2. §2.3 shows that semantic variation is also clear in involuntary state constructions with intransitive verbs equivalent to *work*, but syntactic variation is not. It goes on to argue that such Slavic intransitive constructions nevertheless fall into two syntactic types. In §2.4, it is shown that Romance lacks involuntary state constructions. §2.5 is for the syntactic and semantic analyses that
can capture the four-way variation in involuntary state constructions in Slavic.

2.1. Syntactic types

One formal type of involuntary state construction restricted to Polish and Slovenian is illustrated in (4b), which repeats (1), and (5b) respectively. Besides a dative considered in §2.5 an adjunct in an Applicative Phrase, such sentences contain as formal core the indefinite/impersonal reflexive construction in (4a) and (5a). In §2.5, it is argued that such indefinite syntactic core is an essential ingredient in the semantics of the construction.

(4) a. *Czyta* **sie** tę *ksiągę* z przyjemnością. 
readNEU Refl this bookACC with pleasure
‘People/one read this book with pleasure’

b. *Jankowi czyta* **sie** tę *ksiągę* z przyjemnością. 
JohnDAT readNEU Refl this bookACC with pleasure
‘John read this book with pleasure’

(5) a. *Jedlo se je jagode*. 
eatNEU Refl be3S strawberriesACC
‘People/one ate strawberries’

b. *Janezu se je jedlo jagode*. 
JohnDAT Refl be3S eatNEU strawberriesACC
‘John felt like eating strawberries’

The morphosyntactic characteristics of the formal core shared by Polish and Slovenian involuntary state constructions are: (a) an obligatory reflexive clitic, (b) no (overt) nominative NP, (c) an overt accusative NP (or genitive NP if the sentence is negative), (d) a V with default morphology (3SG verb or auxiliary, and/or a Neuter participle), and (e) an activity V that selects an Agent, not an Experiencer. Rivero and Sheppard (2003: §3) argue that the accusative NP in (4b) and (5b) is an internal argument, and the reflexive signals a syntactically projected argument that is (a) external, (b) nominative, (c) has no phi-features, and a human
feature, (d) cannot trigger verb agreement due to the absence of phi-features, and (e) counts as an indefinite pronoun reminiscent of English someone. On this view, the syntactic core of Polish and Slovenian involuntary state constructions is an impersonal active sentence whose ‘subject’ is an indefinite pronoun without gender, person, or number, and whose object is an ordinary NP.

Czech and Bulgarian are among Slavic languages with involuntary state constructions of the different formal type illustrated with transitive verbs in (6b) and (7b). Besides the dative, treated later as an adjunct in an Applicative Phrase, this second pattern contains as formal core the passive reflexive construction in (6a) and (7a). As (6c) illustrates, Czech contrasts with Polish and Slovenian in that it lacks indefinite reflexive constructions of the type in (4a-5a) (Bulgarian is similar to Czech, but is not illustrated).

(6) a. Ta kniha se četla dobře. C
   this bookNOM Refl readFEMwell
   ‘This book was read with ease’
   b. Ta kniha se Janovi četla dobře.
   this bookNOM Refl JohnDAT readFEMwell
   ‘John read this book with ease’
   c. *Tu knihu se četlo dobře.
   this bookACC Refl readNEU well

(7) a. Četjaxa se knigi B
   read3PL Refl books
   ‘Books were read’
   b. Na Ivan mu se četjaxa knigi.
   JohnDAT heDAT Refl read3PL books
   ‘John felt like reading books’

The morphosyntactic characteristics of the core shared by Bulgarian and Czech involuntary state constructions are: (a) an obligatory reflexive clitic, (b) an (overt) Nominative NP as logical object, (c) no Accusative NP, (d) a V that agrees with the
Nominative NP, and (e) an activity V that selects an Agent, not an Experiencer. Rivero and Sheppard (2003) argue that the reflexive in this type of construction signals an implicit external argument, more precisely, an argument that is existentially closed and is available in semantics but not syntax.

A difference between (6b) and (7b) immaterial for the aims of this paper is that the Bulgarian dative must be clitic doubled, while the Czech dative cannot be doubled, due to the absence of clitic doubling. Another immaterial difference is the clausal position of the reflexive clitic. Word orders other than those in (4b-7b) are also possible, with various information structure effects, which is also immaterial for our purposes.

On the sketched view, then, the core of the involuntary state construction in Czech and Bulgarian is passive, with an implicit logical subject and a nominative logical object triggering verb agreement.

In sum, syntactic variation in Slavic involuntary state constructions depends on patterns defined by the reflexive clitic. The core of such constructions when based on a transitive verb can be active as in Polish and Slovenian, and thus contain a ‘nominative’ indefinite reflexive clitic, a default V, and an Accusative as internal argument. Alternatively, such core can be passive, as in Czech and Bulgarian among other languages, and

---

3 Rivero (to appear) views nonactive morphology in Albanian as equivalent to passive se in Slavic, arguing that the passive construction in (i.a) is the core of the Albanian involuntary state construction in (i.b). It seems to have gone unnoticed that from a semantic point of view, Albanian belongs with South Slavic, as glosses indicate (and see Kalluli 1999 for an alternative analysis of these constructions with interesting discussion).

(i) a. Lexo-, _het_ një _libër_. Albanian
   read_{Non-act.3S} a book_{NOM}
   ‘A book is read’

b. _Ann_ _i lexo-_, _het_ një _libër_.
   Ann_{DAT} she_{DAT} read_{Non-act.3S} a book_{NOM}
   ‘Ann feels like reading a book’

Involuntary state constructions are not a Balkan characteristic, however, as they are absent in Greek and Rumanian (Rivero to appear), which is illustrated later in this paper.
contain a Nominative as internal argument, a verb that agrees with this NP, and an implicit argument indicated by passive se.

2.2. Semantic types
Independently of syntax and irrespective of word order, Slavic involuntary state constructions fall into two semantic types that differ in truth conditions, as first noted in (Rivero 1999), and examined in detail in (Rivero and Sheppard 2003). The semantic difference that distinguishes West Slavic from South Slavic is best observed in past affirmative patterns, and is less clear in negative, future, and generic sentences.

In West Slavic, involuntary state constructions in the past describe eventualities, as in P (8a) and C (8b), which partially repeat (4b) and (6b):

(8) a. Jankowi czytało się tę książkę z przyjemnością. P
   ‘John read this book with pleasure’
   b. Ta kniha se Janovi četla dobře. C
   ‘John read this book with ease’

Recall that (8a) and (8b) are not similar in syntax, since Polish contains the indefinite or active core and Czech the passive core introduced above. However, (8a) and (8b) are similar in semantics because they both speak of John as (involuntary) past reader. If a coda such as ‘…but he did not read it’ is added to these two sentences, they both result in contradictions along the lines of ‘John read this book with pleasure but he did not read it’.

By contrast with West Slavic, South Slavic involuntary state constructions in the past such as (9a-b), which partially repeat (5b) and (7b), are modal or dispositional and do not describe eventualities. These sentences differ in form but not in meaning, and if a coda such as ‘… but in fact he did not eat /read any’ is added to either of them, no contradiction ensues.

A difference that is immaterial for our purposes is that the Slovenian dative cannot be clitic doubled while the Bulgarian dative must be doubled.
2.3. Intransitive verbs
When involuntary state constructions with intransitive verbs are examined, semantic variation is clear in them, but syntactic variation is not, because they are identical in form throughout Slavic. However, the proposal here is that intransitive involuntary state constructions also fall into two syntactic types, with Polish and Slovenian on one side and other Slavic languages on the other side.

To this effect, consider the constructions with intransitive Vs in (10b) through (13b), which differ in meaning along the lines of §2.2. That is, in West Slavic they denote past eventualities, and in South Slavic past predispositions, so are open to the same semantic variation as their transitive counterparts in §2.2.

WEST SLAVIC: EVENTUALITIES

(10) a. Pracowało się dobrze. P
   Work НЕУ Refl well
   ‘People worked well’

   b. Jankowi pracowało się dobrze
   JohnDAT workНЕУ Refl well
   ‘John worked well’

(11) a. Pracovalo se hezky. C
   workНЕУ Refl nicely
   ‘People worked with pleasure’

   b. Jankovi se pracovalo hezky.
   JohnDAT Refl workНЕУ nicely
   ‘John worked with pleasure’
SOUTH SLAVIC: DISPOSITIONS

(12) a. *Danes dopoldne se je spalo.* S
today morning Refl be\textsubscript{3S} slept\textsubscript{NEU}
‘This morning people were sleeping’

b. *Janezu se je spalo danes dopoldne.*
John\textsubscript{Dat} Refl be\textsubscript{3S} slept\textsubscript{NEU} today morning
‘John felt like sleeping this morning’

(13) a. *Tuk se raboti mnogo.* B
Here Refl work\textsubscript{3S} much
‘Here people work a lot’

b. *Na Ivan mu se raboti mnogo.*
Ivan\textsubscript{DAT} he\textsubscript{DAT} Refl work\textsubscript{3S} much
‘Ivan feels like working a lot’

However, syntactic variation is not evident in these constructions, since (10b-13b) share the same form. Nevertheless, Rivero and Sheppard (2003: §3) give arguments that the impersonal reflexive constructions with intransitive verbs in (10a) through (13a) belong to two syntactic types. On the one hand, Polish (10a) and Slovenian (12a) contain an explicit nominative indefinite pronoun, which, for instance, can bind reflexive anaphors. On the other hand, Czech (11a) and Bulgarian (13a) contain an implicit argument, which differs from its Polish and Slovenian counterparts since it lacks the ability to bind reflexive anaphors, among other differences.\textsuperscript{4} Intransitive impersonal constructions are the core for intransitive involuntary state constructions, and define their formal characteristics: (a) an obligatory reflexive clitic, (b) a verb with default morphology, and (c) no accusative or nominative NP. If such reflexive impersonals belong to two syntactic types,

\textsuperscript{4} My proposal is similar in spirit to Dobrovie-Sorin’s (1998) for Romance, but my specific analysis differs considerably. She proposes that Italian intransitive constructions with reflexives are open to a double analysis. Namely, they may contain (a) the equivalent of my indefinite clitic, or (b) the equivalent of my passive clitic. In Rumanian, similar constructions contain the equivalent of the passive clitic, and the indefinite is not available; the contrast is captured by the traditional Binding Theory, not in terms of explicit and implicit arguments.
involuntary state constructions based on them must also represent two types. In sum, Polish (10b) and Slovenian (12b) contain an explicit indefinite, while Czech (11b) and Bulgarian (13b) contain an implicit argument, and the claim in §2.5 is that the dative is a binder for such an explicit/implicit argument.

Table 1 summarizes syntactic and semantic variation in the four mentioned Slavic languages. Bulgarian is representative of other South Slavic languages. In addition, Rivero and Sheppard show (2003: §4) that Slovenian has involuntary state constructions based on passive se, which I have not illustrated, and that their interpretation is also modal.

Table 1: Involuntary State constructions in Slavic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Polish</th>
<th>Czech</th>
<th>Slovenian</th>
<th>Bulgn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Synt</td>
<td>Indefinite</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes (not illustrated)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sem</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modal</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.4. No Involuntary State constructions in Romance

We just saw that involuntary state constructions are prevalent in Slavic. However, in this section I show that they are absent in Romance. Rumanian and Spanish share with Slavic many uses for reflexive clitics, and in particular they have similar impersonal se constructions, as (14a-15a) illustrate. These Romance languages

---

5 Albanian involuntary state constructions with intransitives are illustrated in (i.b). They are based on so-called ‘impersonal passivizations’, that is on a pattern without nominative, and a non-active verb in default or 3S form. In the Aorist tense in (i), clitic u is the morphological signal of the non-active voice.

(i) a. *U punua këtu.* Albanian
   Non-act.Aor work3S here
   ‘People worked here’
   b. *Anës i-u punua këtu.*
   Ann Dat sheDat-Non-act.Aor work3S here
   ‘Ann felt like working here’
are also rich in uses for datives that are not selected by the predicate of the sentence, and in particular, Dative Applicatives can be added to impersonal *se* constructions. However, in Romance, the impersonal reading of the construction is not affected, and the dative is interpreted as possessor/benefactive/malefactive, as (14b-15b) illustrates. As we will see later, the difference between Slavic and Romance is due to ‘Dative Disclosure’, which does not exist in Romance. In other words, Romance shares with Slavic the ‘Ethical Strategy’ introduced above in relation to (3a-b) and to be discussed in §3; this strategy applies in (14b-15b), and the dative is interpreted by inference as possessor or somehow interested participant (Rivero to appear for further discussion). What is missing in Romance, then, is the Slavic procedure called here Dative Existential Disclosure, which binds dative and reflexive clitic.

(14) a. *Se lucră în fabrică*. Rumanian
   Refl worked in factory
   ‘People worked in the factory’

b. *Lui Ion i se lucră în fabrică.*
   John\_DAT he\_DAT Refl worked in factory
   ‘People worked in the factory on John’s behalf’
   ‘People worked in John’s factory’
   NOT ‘John felt like working in the factory’
   NOT ‘John worked in the factory’

(15) a. *Aquí se trabaja mucho*. Spanish

---

6 Constructions with psychological verbs and datives have different properties, and do not differ crosslinguistically in the way involuntary state constructions do, so should not be grouped with them (Rivero to appear). In simple terms, Polish and Spanish can be very similar with psychological verbs and datives, but they differ radically with activity verbs combined with datives. One crucial difference between the two types of constructions is that in the psychological type the dative as experiencer is selected by, or is an argument of, the verb, so the different issue is how such argument structure is projected in syntax. The claim in this paper is that the dative of involuntary state constructions is not selected by the verb, so is an adjunct of the applicative type.
Here Refl works much
‘Here people work a lot’
b. A Juan se le trabaja mucho aquí.
John_DAT Refl he_DAT works much here‘
‘Here people work a lot on John’s behalf’
NOT ‘John feels like working a lot here’
NOT ‘John works a lot here’

2.5. Analysis: Dative Existential Disclosure
This section presents an analysis that captures the syntactic and semantic variation in Slavic depicted in Table 1.

The first general assumption is that the dative in involuntary state constructions is directly merged in the Spec of an Applicative Phrase in the general sense of (Pylkkännen 2000, McGinnis 2001). However, this type of dative identifies a new type of Applicative because it resides in a high phrase external to the clause, which takes the remainder of the structure, that is a finite TP, as its complement, as in (16). On this view, the dative is a syntactic adjunct, not an argument selected by the verb inside TP. Another assumption is that the dative has inherent case, and, in particular, does not check a structural case such as nominative.

(16) \[\text{AppP} \text{ Dative} \text{ [App' App [TP]]}\]

If the dative in (16) is called a ‘quirky subject’ for descriptive purposes, two differences immediately arise from the well-known ‘quirky dative subjects’ in Icelandic prominently discussed in the GB/ minimalist literature. On the one hand, I propose that the Slavic ‘quirky dative subject’ of (16) is an applicative adjunct external to the clause, while the usual hypothesis is that Icelandic dative subjects originate inside a VP that complements TP, and are external arguments of V that raise to TP to check features. On the other hand, I place the Slavic ‘quirky dative subject’ in (16) in an Applicative Phrase that takes TP as complement, so this dative is similar to a semantic subject of predication, not to a syntactic subject, and TP is its semantic predicate. In sum, I propose that
‘quirky dative subjects’ in involuntary state constructions in Slavic are ‘base-generated’ above TP and not in VP; they do not move, and some of them act as ‘controllers’, as we see next.

Continuing with the analysis, the second assumption concerns TP in (16). On the one hand, we saw that in Polish and Slovenian such a TP is an active sentence, which can constitute a well-formed independent construction without dative. Such independence is one reason to propose that the dative in (16) is not a primary argument of the verb. For Rivero and Sheppard (2002, 2003), the reflexive clitic contained in TP in (16) signals in Polish and Slovenian the syntactically projected external argument of the verb. This argument behaves like an indefinite pronoun in ways that parallel Italian *si* (Chierchia 1995a). On the other hand, we saw that in Czech and Bulgarian, TP is a passive sentence that can also function as a well-formed construction without dative; thus, the dative is not a primary or direct argument of the verb. For Rivero and Sheppard (2003), the clitic in this second case signals Argument Saturation in the lexicon, as in Chierchia (1989) and Reinhart (1996). In other words, the external argument of the verb is available in semantics, but not syntax. The proposed difference is depicted in (17), and accounts for the syntactic variation discussed in §2.1, which concerns case (accusative vs. nominative on overt NP) and agreement (default morphology or person/number/ (gender) on verb). (17a) stands for Polish and Slovenian indefinites, and (17b) for Bulgarian and Czech passives, among other languages.

\[ \begin{align*}
(17) \text{a. } & \left[ \text{AppP Dative } \left[ \text{App' Appo } \left[ \text{TP ReflNom} \right] \right] \right] \left[ \text{V } \text{NP}_{\text{Acc}} \right] \\
& \text{Explicit} \\
\text{b. } & \left[ \text{AppP Dative } \left[ \text{App' Appo } \left[ \text{TP Refl} \right] \right] \right] \left[ \text{V } \text{NP}_{\text{Nom}} \right] \\
& \text{Implicit}
\end{align*} \]

The third assumption in our analysis is that the arguments signaled by the reflexive clitic in (17a) and (17b) share a crucial similarity. On the one hand, the explicit argument in (17a) is an indefinite. In dynamic semantics (Chierchia 1995b, Groenendijk
and Stokhof 1991), indefinites contain an existential quantifier and a bound variable. As indefinites, then, the Polish and Slovenian reflexives in (17a) are intrinsically quantificational, hence consist of a quantifier and a bound variable: ∃x. On the other hand, Chierchia (1989) and Reinhart (1996) propose that argument saturation in the lexicon results in existentially closed arguments. Given that the implicit arguments indicated by passive se in Czech and Bulgarian in (17b) are the result of argument saturation, they also correspond to ∃x. Thus, on this analysis, the similarity between indefinite / impersonal reflexive clitics as explicit arguments in (17a) and passive reflexive clitics as implicit arguments in (17b) is that they both correspond to existentially quantified arguments in semantics, or consist in both ∃ and x.

Involuntary state constructions can also be based on intransitive verbs, in which case they lack the overt accusative or nominative NP depicted in (17a-b). In my view, the obligatory reflexive clitic with intransitives signals the only argument selected by the verb. This argument can be explicit or a syntactically projected indefinite pronoun as in Polish and Slovenian, as shown in (18a), or implicit as in Czech and Bulgarian due to Argument Saturation, as shown in (18b). In both situations, the result for semantics is an existentially quantified argument that consists in both ∃ and x.

(18) a. $\text{[AppP Dative [App' App$^0$ [TP \textbf{Refl}_{\text{Nom}} V ]]]}$
   Explicit

b. $\text{[AppP Dative [App' App$^0$ [TP \textbf{Refl} V ]]]}$
   Implicit

An intuition often expressed by traditional grammarians and generative linguists about Slavic and Romance is that passive and impersonal constructions with reflexive clitics have similar meanings. That is, the semantic difference between sentences with passive se /si, those with indefinite se/ si, and those with intransitive verbs sometimes labeled ‘impersonal passivizations’ in
the literature is unclear. One welcome result of the analysis in the
text is that it seems to capture this traditional intuition. The basic
idea is that passive and impersonal reflexives stand for either
explicit or implicit arguments so may differ in syntax, but their
semantics can be rather similar since they signal existentially
closed arguments.

The fourth assumption in our analysis of involuntary state
constructions is that the adjunct dative in (16-18) triggers in logical
form two operations grouped here under the general label of
‘Dative Disclosure’. One operation of ‘Existential Disclosure’ is
inspired by Dekker (1993) and Chierchia (1995a-b): it deletes the
quantifier ∃ in the explicit indefinite in Polish and Slovenian and in
the implicit argument in Czech and Bulgarian, resulting in a free
variable.

Another operation of ‘Dative Closure’ binds such free
variable to the dative, and comes in two varieties, which accounts
for semantic variation. In West Slavic including Polish and Czech,
binding or Dative Closure is direct with a resumptive effect. That
is, the variable of the explicit/ implicit argument is treated along
the lines of a resumptive pronoun in an ordinary Left Dislocated
construction. We can think of the binding procedure in West Slavic
in more familiar terms if we consider the head of the Applicative
Phrase in (16-18) topic-like, the dative as equivalent to a left
dislocated phrase, and the reflexive clitic as equivalent to a
resumptive pronoun coindexed with such phrase, as indicated in
(19). Intuitively, in West Slavic dative and reflexive clitic bear a
relation similar to the link between John and he in the left
dislocated construction As to John, he worked well.

(19) \[\text {TopP Dative}_i \text{Top [Top' Top [TP …Refl}_i \ldots\text{]]}\]

In South Slavic and Slovenian, binding is indirect or more
complex, with a modal effect. That is, the variable of the explicit/
implicit argument is treated like a controlled pronoun and the
dative as its controller. We can render more familiar the binding or
Dative Closure procedure of South Slavic by considering that the
head of the Applicative Phrase in (16-18) is an empty modal, the dative is the controller, and the reflexive pronoun is the controllee, as indicated in (20). Intuitively, in South Slavic the relation between dative and reflexive clitic is similar to the link between John and PRO in the structure of obligatory control John had the urge PRO to work well.

(20) \[ \text{MP Dative, } [M'\ M\ [TP \ldots \text{Refl, } \ldots]] \]

Contrary to what (19-20) might at first sight suggest, I do not think that the different interpretations of involuntary state constructions in Slavic should be encoded in different syntactic structures, as there are no syntactic signs of the semantic differences just discussed. I propose that the syntax of involuntary state constructions should be as in (16-18) in all Slavic languages. The compositional basis for the semantic contrast resides in one identical Interpretable feature in the syntax of the Applicative head in (16-18). Such Interpretable feature is the source of different operations in logical form, which result in different semantic effects that impinge on truth conditions. In other words, differences are not to be assigned to the syntax but to the semantics, and are as follows.

Dative Closure with a dislocation effect (LD Closure), which is representative of West Slavic, corresponds to (22) in the case of Polish (21), which is borrowed in simplified form from (Rivero 2002) (also Rivero and Sheppard 2003).

(21) \text{Jankowi się spało (dobrze).}  
\text{‘John slept (well)’}

(22) a. Refl (sleep) = ∃x [sleep (x)].

b. John.DAT Refl sleep.NEU

\text{⇒ DIS x ∃x[sleep (x)] (John).}

c. \text{λx [sleep (x)] (John).}
d. sleep (John).

Line (22a) is the logical form of the core impersonal/indefinite construction without dative *Spać się (dobrze)* ‘People slept (well)’, which contains an indefinite with an existential quantifier and a variable.

Speaking of the contrast between Polish, South Slavic and Romance, Rivero (2002) considers that the procedures in (22) are specific to Polish, which is an idea that needs correction. In this paper, I have taken into consideration a wider range of Slavic languages, and shown that (22) is applicable to Czech, so is not language specific. The difference between Polish and Czech is that the logical form of the sentence parallel to (21) contains in Czech an implicit or existentially closed argument due to Argument Saturation in the lexicon. However, such syntactic difference is irrelevant to the logical form procedures under discussion, which by assumption do not distinguish between explicit and implicit arguments, when they both are existentially closed and lack all phi-features. Line (22b) embodies Dative Disclosure on the core in (22a): the existential quantifier is eliminated by DIS(closure), which results in a free variable. The result is directly predicated of dative *John*, which binds or ‘closes’ the variable, and lends it lexical content. By the semantics of these operations, line (22b) is equivalent to line (22c), with no quantifier and the variable identified with *John*. Line (22d) is the simplified version of (22c) after lambda conversion. In sum, ∃ in an explicit or an implicit argument is deleted, and the free variable is coindexed with the dative, without affecting number of arguments or roles in a radical way. The indefinite propositional formula in (22a) is treated in (22b) as an open or incomplete sentence that as a property is assigned to an individual, the NP marked DAT. Another way of expressing the same idea is that the event described by the core construction in (22a), which is a traditional impersonal sentence, is assigned via the reflexive clitic to the individual described by the dative in (22b).
Interpretive procedures for Slovenian and South Slavic, (also Albanian), are more complex and involve a modal dimension reminiscent of Obligatory Control. Dative closure with a control effect (Control Closure) is as in (24) in the case of Slovenian (23) (Rivero and Sheppard 2003).

(23) Janezu se je spalo. S
   ‘John felt like sleeping’

(24) a. Refl (sleep) = ∃x [sleep (x)].
b. John.DAT Refl sleep.NEU
   $\Rightarrow$ M (John.DAT, DIS $\exists$ x [sleep (x)])
c. M (John, $\lambda$x [sleep (x)])

Line (24a) is similar to (22a), and is the logical form for the indefinite construction serving as core for the involuntary state construction. According to our assumptions, Slovenian $\exists x$ corresponds to an explicit argument, and in the parallel pattern in Bulgarian, $\exists x$ would be an implicit argument that results from lexical Argument Saturation. However, such syntactic distinction between Slovenian and Bulgarian is unimportant for the semantic procedures in (24), which do not distinguish between such explicit and implicit arguments since they are both existentially closed. When Rivero (1999) first speaks in passing of the semantic difference between Polish and South Slavic, she bases it on the syntactic difference between the indefinite and the passive uses of reflexive clitics, which needs correcting. Polish and Slovenian do not differ syntactically, that is, they both share the indefinite or explicit argument use of reflexive clitics, but they differ semantically. This then shows, that both implicit or passive and explicit or indefinite arguments can be subject to (22) or to (24). Line (24b) represents Dative Disclosure. As in (22b), Disclosure (DIS) eliminates the existential quantifier in the indefinite. The subsequent binding procedure is more complex in South Slavic because the formula with the disclosed variable equipped with the modal operator M forms a derived predicate applied to the dative,
and dative and variable are identified. By the semantics of disclosure, (24b) is equivalent to (24c), which is the formula for the semantics of obligatory control constructions (Chierchia 1995a) such as English *John had the urge to sleep*, with M corresponding to *have the urge*. Thus, constructions with Dative Disclosure in South Slavic are modalized statements. Their dative does not correspond to an (involuntary) agent because its semantic connection with the variable indicated by the reflexive clitic is not direct as in West Slavic, but indirect or mediated by M.

Recall that M in South Slavic is the semantic translation of an Interpretable feature in the null applicative head in the syntactic structure in (16-18). That is, the semantic contrast between West Slavic and South Slavic is not due to a monoclausal syntactic structure in the first case, and a biclausal structure in the second case, for which there is no evidence. The syntax of involuntary state constructions is always monoclausal in Slavic.

In conclusion, Dative Disclosure is the cover term for a variety of logical form procedures found in Slavic (and Albanian), but not in Romance. Dative Disclosure applies in so-called involuntary state constructions. It eliminates an existential quantifier in either the external or the only argument of a verb (existential disclosure), and binds the resulting free variable to a ‘quirky’ dative that is not an argument of the verb but an applicative adjunct (dative closure).

Dative Disclosure displays syntactic variation, which does not depend on the dative. It operates in transitive or intransitive constructions on formally represented existential arguments of two types: (a) explicit indefinites in Polish and Slovenian, and (b) implicit arguments that result from Argument Saturation in Czech and Bulgarian (and Albanian).

Dative Disclosure displays semantic variation that affects truth conditions, and is due to how datives and free variables are bound. On the one hand, binding can be direct with a left dislocation effect (LD closure), which is found in West Slavic, including Polish and Czech. On the other hand, binding can be
indirect with a control effect (Control closure), which is found in Slovenian and South Slavic (and Albanian).

Table 2 recapitulates the assumed variation. Bulgarian is representative of the South Slavic type, which covers Albanian as well. That is, passive se in South Slavic has the same syntactic and semantic characteristics as nonactive morphology in Albanian. In addition, Slovenian involuntary state constructions with passive se (i.e. an implicit argument) exist, but have not been illustrated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Synt</th>
<th>Polish</th>
<th>Czech</th>
<th>Slovenian</th>
<th>Bulgn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explicit</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implicit</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes (not illustrated)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LD C</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control C</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **Dative anticausative constructions**

This section examines the constructions first exemplified in (3a-b). It shows that they do not display syntactic or semantic variation in Slavic, and have counterparts with similar characteristics in Albanian and Romance. Main proposals are (a) that reflexive clitics in anticausatives indicate Argument Suppression, and (b) that datives in anticausatives are interpreted inferentially resulting in vague readings, not via rules of logical form or formal grammar resulting in fixed readings.

Dative anticausative constructions belong, without exception, to one unique syntactic and semantic type. Syntactically, their core always is the so-called anticausative/inchoative construction illustrated in (25) for Slavic, (26) for Albanian, and (27) for Romance (Greek discussed in (Rivero to appear) is not mentioned in this paper).

(25) a. Očilata se sčupixa. B
b. Brýle se zlomly. C
glasses Refl broken PL

c. Złamaly się okulary. P
brokenPL Refl glassesPL

d. Očala so se zlomila. S
glassesPL be3PL Refl brokenPL
‘The glasses broke’

(26) U thye dritarja. Albanian
Non-act.Aor break3S window.theNOM
‘The window broke’

(27) a. Se sparse fereastra. Rumanian
Refl break3S window.the
‘The window broke’

b. Se rompieron las gafas. Spanish
Refl break3PL the glasses
‘The glasses broke’

All the above constructions are formally characterized by (a) a reflexive clitic (in Albanian, non-active morphology), (b) a nominative NP and no accusative NP, (c) a verbal morphology in agreement with the nominative NP, and (d) a V that participates in the so-called causative alternation, illustrated here with English. John in John broke the glasses is arguably nominative and the glasses is accusative; the glasses broke corresponds to (24-27) with the glasses nominative.

Dative phrases can be merged with, or added to, the anticausative cores depicted in (25-27) in a way that lacks a counterpart in English, which results in parallel syntactic constructions illustrated in (28) with similar interpretations. One natural reading for (28) is with the individual denoted by the dative as owner of the object denoted by the nominative NP.
benefactive/malefactive interpretation establishes a looser connection between dative and nominative NP; this interpretation would be appropriate if John was responsible for packing some glasses in a suitcase, which later on were broken once the suitcase was opened. The causer reading emphasizes lack of responsibility; for instance, John could be a child who claimed innocence after repeatedly manipulating a pair of glasses until they broke.

(28) a. *Na Ivan musça přijdily očila.* B
JohnDAT heDAT Refl broke3PL glasses.the
b. *Janovi se zlomily brýle.* C
JohnDAT Refl broken PL glasses

c. *Jankowi złamały sie okulary.* P
JohnDAT brokenPL Refl glassesPL
d. *Janezu so se złomila očala.* S
JohnDAT be3PLRefl brokenPLglassesPL
e. *Anës i-u thye dritarja.* Albanian
AnnDAT sheDAT non-act.Aor break3S window.theNom
f. *Lui Ion isi sparse fereastra.* Rumanian
JohnDAT heDAT Refl broke3S window.the

g. *A Ana se le rompieron las gafas.* Spanish
AnnDAT Refl sheDAT broke3PLthe glasses

Possessor: ‘{Ann’s /John’s} {glasses/ window} broke’
Benefactive / malefactive: ‘{Ann/John} was affected by the {glasses/window} breaking’
Causer: ‘{Ann/ John} broke {the glasses / window} involuntarily’

Constructions of type (28) are widespread, and other languages with similar patterns could be added to our list, such as Serbocroat. However, many of their characteristics are unknown because they have attracted practically no attention in generative grammar. For instance, speaking of Romance, anticausative constructions as in

---

7 The Causer reading is less apparent in Bulgarian and Rumanian than in the other languages mentioned in this paper. See (Rivero to appear) for some speculations on the theoretical consequences of this variation, which is minimized in this paper.
(27) are general, but dative constructions of type (28) are missing in French, Italian, and Portuguese, perhaps because such languages have a limited use of nonselected datives. In Slavic, the type in (28) is quite general. However, Russian looks particularly interesting because it shares (rather restricted) involuntary state constructions of the type in §2 based on unselected datives, it exhibits anticausatives of the type in (27), but lacks dative constructions such as (28). Wayles Browne adds that the Russian construction corresponding to (28) displays a genitive instead of a dative: *U Ivana slomalos' koleso* Of Ivan broke-Refl wheel. I have been informed that such a Russian construction has a causer reading, and a possessor reading, but not a benefactive/malefactive reading.

Some syntactic differences in the paradigm in (28) without bearing on our proposals include the following. In clitic doubling languages such as Bulgarian, Albanian, Rumanian and Spanish, the dative must be necessarily doubled in (28). In such a case, the reflexive may follow or precede the dative clitic, depending on clitic templates in each language. If clitic doubling does not exist, as in Polish, Czech, and Slovenian, then the dative appears alone. Recall similar observations in the case of involuntary state constructions §2, it seems that ‘quirky subject constructions’ of different types require obligatory clitic doubling of datives in doubling languages. The location of the reflexive also varies due to the designated sentential slot for clitic pronouns in each language; for example, it must be second in Czech and Slovenian. The word order in (28) is unmarked, with information focus on the nominative NP in final position; however, other orders are possible with different information structures.

Some formal differences between the involuntary state constructions in §2 and the anticausatives with datives in this section are discussed in (Rivero and Sheppard 2003) and (Rivero 2001). For instance, involuntary state constructions are almost exclusively imperfective, while anticausatives are preferably perfective but can also be imperfective. As stated, all languages share under appropriate pragmatic circumstances the readings
called Possessor, Benefactive/Malefactive, and Causer in (28). Semantic differences with involuntary state constructions are clearest in South Slavic and Slovenian, as (28a) and (28d) altogether lack a modal reading along the lines of ‘John felt like breaking (the) glasses’. They are less clear with West Slavic.

Let us now list assumptions for the analysis of (28). The first assumption concerns the syntactic role of the dative. I propose that it is an adjunct merged or ‘base-generated’ in a slot attached to the anticausative construction; in this sense it is quite similar to the dative of the involuntary state construction. Since bare anticausative constructions as in (25-27) are well-formed, there is no reason to think of the dative in (28) as an external argument generated in the VP that raises to check features. The various readings shown in (28) also militate against movement. If the dative raised, it would have a direct and fixed connection with the argument structure of the verb, but what is observed is that several vague readings are in principle available in these sentences.8

The second assumption concerns the role of the reflexive clitic (or the nonactive morphology) in the anticausative core in (25-27). In my view, anticausatives undergo (lexical) Argument Suppression in the precise sense of Reinhart (1996). Suppression means that the external argument of the verb is totally eliminated, so is not projected in syntax, and is not available in semantics. On

---

8 Olga Fernández Soriano (1999) argues that in Spanish unaccusative constructions similar to the anticausatives in the text, datives move to the Spec of TP and check an EPP feature. If this idea, which needs to be explored, is adopted, the datives of §3 may differ structurally from the datives of §2, which by assumption are in a high Applicative Phrase with TP as complement. If the T-head does not contain a (relevant) interpretable feature comparable to the feature in the Applicative, then the dative in Spec-T checking EPP could receive no precise reading in logical form, and be interpreted inferentially at the interface with discourse grammar.

French, Italian, and Portuguese do not have procedures to interpret nonselected datives of any type, so they lack Dative Disclosure on a par with other Romance languages, and the Ethical strategy, which distinguishes them from Rumanian and Spanish. Russian has (limited) Dative Disclosure with intransitive verbs and with passives. However, as noted above, this language lacks the dative-cum-anticausative constructions, and uses a genitive instead. This could be because in Russian dative adjuncts are merged in an Applicative Phrase and cannot be merged/ moved to TP to check an EPP feature without interpretive impact.
this view, only one argument is formally present in (25-27): the NP
marked nominative. By contrast, it was argued in §2 that passive
and indefinite constructions with transitive verbs display two
arguments. One argument is the overt NP, which is internal and
can be marked accusative (Polish and Slovenian) or nominative
(Bulgarian and Czech). The other argument is external, and can be
explicit, that is projected in syntax and available in semantics
(Polish and Slovenian), or implicit, that is, not projected in syntax
and available in semantics (Bulgarian and Czech).

If the external argument has been eliminated, and the
reflexive signals its suppression in anticausative constructions such
as (25-27), then the dative in (28) cannot represent an external
argument that raises from the VP. Instead, the dative must play
another syntactic role, and I propose that it is an adjunct.

The third assumption concerns the semantic role of the
dative. As stated, the dative is an adjunct, not an argument of the
verb, and must somehow be interpreted. I propose that an
inferential procedure called Ethical Strategy connects it to the
anticausative core, so in all the languages the constructions in (28)
have similar vague readings under appropriate pragmatic
conditions.

An interesting feature of the Ethical Strategy that supports
its inferential nature is that it cannot manipulate formally
represented arguments or participants. To illustrate, if an explicit
possessor is added to (28) as shown in (29a-d) for Czech, Polish,
Rumanian, and Spanish, then the dative can no longer be
interpreted as possessor. In other words, in Slavic and Romance a
formally encoded possessor blocks the possessor inference. This is
because the Ethical Strategy cannot manipulate formally present
participants, so it has an antibinding or disjoint reference effect.

(29) a. Janovi se zlomily Mariiné brýle. C
    JohnDAT Refl brokenPL Mary’s glassesPL
b. Jankowi złamały się okulary Marysi. P
    JohnDAT brokenPLRefl glassesPL MaryGEN
c. Lui Ion i s-au spart ochelarii Mariei. Rumanian
In my view, the Causer inference seems licit in all languages, as shown in (28a-f) (but see fn. 7), because the anticausatives at the core of such dative constructions lack a formal external argument. Furthermore, the Bulgarian, Slovenian, and Albanian constructions in (28) have no modal reading because only the Ethical Strategy, and not Dative Disclosure can operate in them (Rivero to appear for further discussion). That is, Dative Disclosure as in §2 relies on the presence of an existentially closed argument and links it or binds it to the dative. We saw in §2, that in South Slavic, Slovenian, and Albanian, such linking is indirect, with a modal reading. Since the structures in (28) are anticausatives that altogether lack an existentially closed argument, Dative Disclosure cannot operate in them so the South Slavic modal meaning is absent. The only way to interpret a dative in an anticausative construction of this type is with the Ethical Strategy.

It is interesting to compare (29a-d) with involuntary state constructions in West Slavic that contain expressed possessors, as in (30a-b). The Czech adjective in (30a) and the Polish Genitive NP in (30b) do not affect Dative Disclosure. That is, the dative is interpreted as (involuntary) agent because the construction contains an existentially closed external argument. This argument loses its quantifier and is bound to the dative by the West Slavic resumptive procedure discussed in §2.

(30) a. Mariina kniha se Janovi četla dobře. C
    Mary’s book NOM Refl John_{DAT} read,FEM well
    ‘John read Mary’s book with ease’
b. Jankowi czytał się Marysi książkę z przyjemnością. P
JohnDAT readNEURefl Mary’s bookACC with pleasure
‘John read Mary’s book with pleasure’

In conclusion, the E-strategy is found in all language types, in contrast with Dative Disclosure, which is absent in Romance. The E-strategy does not display syntactic or semantic variation, in contrast with D-Disclosure. It cannot manipulate formal arguments, in contrast with D-Disclosure. It results in vague readings, so does not look compositional; in our terms, it is not based on an Interpretable feature, in contrast with D-Disclosure. The E-strategy allows in all languages an external argument or causer reading for datives in anticausatives, because anticausatives lack a formal external argument due to Argument Suppression.

4. General Conclusions
In this paper, I have examined two ‘quirky dative subject’ constructions with reflexive clitics, claiming that they have a rather different status in formal syntax and semantics.

The construction with the ‘involuntary state’ label involves Dative Disclosure as in §2, and exists in Slavic and Albanian, but not in Romance (or Greek). The other construction is more general but also has certain exceptions, and involves the Ethical strategy as in §3.

Dative Disclosure is restricted to passives and impersonals including intransitives, as it must operate on formally present existentially closed arguments. By contrast, the E-strategy is found most notably in anticausatives, and is blocked by formal arguments: i.e. it does not operate on formally present arguments/participants.

Dative Disclosure displays syntactic variation. It operates on existential arguments of two types: (a) explicit indefinites in Polish and Slovenian, and (b) implicit arguments in Czech and Bulgarian, which is a distinction found both with transitive and intransitive verbs. The E-strategy does not display syntactic variation.
Dative Disclosure is compositional and results in fixed readings based on an interpretable feature on the head of an Applicative Phrase. The E-strategy is not compositional or based on an interpretable feature in a designated structural position, and results in vague readings.

Dative Disclosure displays formal semantic variation, with an effect on truth conditions, which distinguishes at least West Slavic from South Slavic. The E-strategy may be altogether absent in some languages, but in the languages where it is found it does not display semantic variation, and looks inferential.

Since Dative Disclosure must manipulate an existentially closed argument, it cannot operate in anticausatives, which by hypothesis lack such argument. By contrast, the E-strategy is quite prominent in anticausatives, since those are rather poor in formal argument structure.
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