



Types of Modality in South Slavic Stative Reflexive-Dative Constructions

Типы модальности рефлексивно-дативных конструкций состояния в южнославянских языках

Liljana Mitkovska

FON University / Silesian University
Skopje, Republic of North
Macedonia / Katowice, Poland

Лиляна Митковска

Университет ФОН / Силезский университет
Скопье, Республика Северная Македония /
Катовице, Польша

Abstract

This paper analyses the constructions with a reflexive marker on the verb and a dative argument experiencing a state, such as necessity or craving/desire for something. They occur in all Slavic languages, with varied scope of distribution, but this research focuses on their use in South Slavic languages: Macedonian, Bulgarian and Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian (BCS), in which such constructions have a wide distribution. Although these types of clauses have been studied a lot, there are still contentious issues regarding their nature. Assuming that this particular combination of the reflexive marker with a dative argument represents a steady construction with specific formal properties we argue that its semantics cannot be computed from the meanings of the structures involved. The construction contains as part of its meaning a covert modal component of necessity, which cannot be explained as an inherited feature, neither from the reflexive, nor from the dative marker. Moreover, this component is of a more complex nature, ranging from a strong urge to inclination and craving. The main goal of

Citation: Mitkovska L. (2019) Types of Modality in South Slavic Stative Reflexive-Dative Constructions. *Slověne*, Vol. 8, № 2, p. 260–287.

Цитирование: Митковска Л. Типы модальности рефлексивно-дативных конструкций состояния в южнославянских языках // *Slověne*. 2019. Vol. 8, № 2. С. 260–287.

DOI: 10.31168/2305-6754.2019.8.2.10

this paper is to investigate the nature and the origin of this modality. Adopting a Construction Grammar approach we assume that the specific semantic-pragmatic features of the construction are a result of particular constraints operating on the morpho-syntactic and semantic features of the constituent components.

Keywords

reflexive, dative, diathesis, modality, construction grammar, grammatical construction

Резюме

В статье рассматриваются конструкции с глагольным рефлексивным показателем и дативным аргументом, который обозначает лицо, испытывающее состояние потребности или желания чего-то. Эти конструкции встречаются во всех славянских языках с различной степенью распространенности, но в южнославянских языках они отличаются широким набором функций. В настоящей работе исследуется специфика данных конструкций в македонском, болгарском и сербском/хорватском/боснийском языках. Хотя рефлексивно-дативные структуры со значением состояния достаточно хорошо изучены в литературе, все еще существуют теоретические разногласия, связанные с их сущностью. Полагая, что особая комбинация рефлексивного маркера с дативным аргументом образует устойчивую конструкцию с определенными формальными свойствами, автор статьи доказывает, что значение конструкции не представляет сумму значений ее составляющих. Семантическая структура конструкции содержит скрытый модальный компонент, который нельзя рассматривать как унаследованный от рефлексивного или дативного маркера. Значения этого семантически сложного компонента движутся от физиологической потребности до склонности и желания. Главная цель статьи заключается в выявлении природы этой модальности и причин ее возникновения. Применяя теоретические принципы Грамматики конструкций, автор выдвигает предположение, что характерные семантико-прагматические свойства конструкции представляют собой результат воздействия определенных ограничений на морфосинтаксические и семантические свойства составляющих данной конструкции.

Ключевые слова

рефлексив, датив, диатеза, модальность, грамматика конструкций, грамматическая конструкция

1. Introduction

This paper examines a particular type of construction that consists of a reflexive marker on the verb and a dative argument. The sentences in (1) to (4) represent some typical examples. These constructions contain an activity verb in the base, but the composite meaning designates an internal state of the participant expressed in the dative. For this reason they are called Stative Reflexive-Dative Construction (SRDC) in this study.

- (1) Spava mi se. (BCS)¹ 'I feel like sleeping./I need to sleep.'
 sleep.3SG pron.1SG.DAT refl.
- (2) Ми се Гледа филм. (М) 'I feel like watching a film.'
 pron.1SG.DAT refl. watch.3SG film.SG.NOM
- (3) Не Му се влизаше вътре. (В) 'He had no desire to get in.'
 not pron.3SG.DAT refl. enter.3SG.PAST inside [Иванова 2016: 359]
- (4) Marku se piје kafa. (BCS) 'Marko feels like having
 Marko.SG.DAT refl. drink.3SG coffee.SG.NOM some coffee.' [Ilić 2013: 43]

This research focuses on its use in the South Slavic languages: Macedonian, Bulgarian and Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian. It is based on an analysis of examples collected from various sources (literature, press and interactive internet forums) in all three languages as well as on the data presented in works on this topic.

Various terms are used in the literature to name this pattern in South Slavic languages. In Bulgarian the traditional term is *желателни* 'volitional' [e. g., Пенчев 2001; Ницолова 2008; Джонова 2008; Иванова 2016; Иванова, Петрова 2017], but other terms are encountered as well, e. g., *оптативни* 'optative' in Димитрова [2015] or *импулсивни конструкции* in Савова [2018]. In Serbian linguistics they are often referred to as *модалне дативне конструкции* 'modal dative constructions' [e. g., Стипчевић 2015]. Works in English employ more complex terms reflecting a particular semantic or formal facet of the construction: Rivero [2004] calls it *Involuntary state construction*, Kallulli [2006] *Dative unaccusative construction—involuntary state reading* and Ilić [2013] *Dative anticausatives—modal necessity meaning*. Ivanova [2014] applies the term *Reflexive-with-Dative Construction* for both Russian and the formally similar Bulgarian construction. Similarly, in Pali [2010], focusing on Bosnian, the general term *Neizdiferencirane konstrukcije* 'non-differentiated constructions' (with a full verb) is used.

The paper is organised as follows: the next section presents the theoretical assumptions the analysis is based on, section 3 reports briefly on some previous studies of the construction, section 4 outlines the overall inner and outer properties of the SRDC and discusses the contributions of the two components, the reflexive and the dative, and section 5 focuses on types of modality along the continuum. Section 6 offers insights into some expansion tendencies of the construction, before finally the concluding remarks are presented in section 7.

¹ Examples are marked, depending on the language, with (B) for Bulgarian, (BCS) for Bosnian, Croatian or Serbian (as there is little difference in these languages regarding this construction) and with (M) for Macedonian. The sources for cited examples are given at each item; its absence means that the source is the author.

2. Theoretical background

SRDCs are found in a broad range of uses in all South Slavic languages, while in North Slavic there is a limited application of constructions that formally and functionally correspond to these South Slavic structures [e. g., Wierzbicka 1986; 1988, for Polish and Russian; Ivanova 2014; Иванова 2016, for Russian). The focus here is on the common characteristics in all considered languages, since they show similar tendencies in the development of the construction, even though there may be differences in the frequency of occurrence of particular extensions. The focus of this investigation is on the modal meaning(s) associated with this construction. We aim to determine the contribution of the component parts to the composite meaning of the SRDC and to explain the variability within the construction. To achieve this, we look at the syntactic constraints and the ways they are overridden, which clarifies the semantic extensions within the construction and helps understand their paths.

Following the principles of cognitive linguistics, more precisely the cognitive Construction Grammar views [as proposed by Goldberg 1995; Fried, Östman 2004; Fried 2007; Goldberg 2006; Langacker 2008; Hilpert 2014; Fried 2017, among others], we assume that SRDC represents a grammatical construction. In Construction Grammar, a “grammatical construction” represents the basic unit of grammatical analysis. It is understood as “a complex, multidimensional sign, not in the traditional sense of a syntagmatic string of words” [Fried 2017: 243]. Constructions are viewed as units of generalisations that speakers make across a number of encounters with linguistic forms [Hilpert 2014: 9]. Fried [2017: 248] also concludes that they are abstract linguistic units, “cognitive entities that articulate, in a schematic way, how a given pattern is typically produced and interpreted, while allowing for the fact that these ‘blueprints’ can be stretched in various ways, leading to permanent language variability and on-going change.” These conventionalised form-function units are based on general cognitive (categorising, attention allocation, inferencing, association, etc.) and communicative principles (relation between participants, subjective attitudes, face-saving strategies, information flow etc.).

As a construction, SRDC has specific formal properties and its semantic and discourse-pragmatic features cannot be computed as a simple sum of the meanings of the structures involved.² However, the constituent parts of a construction bring in characteristic features into the newly formed complex. Thus we claim that the syntax-semantic properties of SRDC can be explained as deriving from the combination of a relatively autonomous event, a meaning imposed by the reflexive marker *se*, with the component of affectedness, incorporated in the dative object, in combination with a particular set of features.

² Goldberg [1995: 4] defines them as form-meaning pairs, some aspects of which are not predictable from the component parts.

The non-canonical distribution of the participant roles along the syntactic positions, combined with the specific constraints on the verb and the participants involved in the situation, give rise to the special type of modality as the most significant feature of the SRDC. Such constraints also reveal the construction's relations to the formally identical neighbouring constructions.³

It should be noted that this modal component of SRDC is not of a uniform type. But how can the variation within the construction and its expansion tendencies be explained? Constructional analysis facilitates the understanding of variability within constructions. It deals with structural variation by acknowledging prototype organisation of categories and their ability to include elements the properties of which do not fit tightly in the formal scenario of the construction by imposing a characteristic interpretation on them, as explained for example in Fried [2007: 736]. The predicates entering the construction get adjusted to the meaning of the construction, some of their features being suppressed or changed, i. e., they are coerced towards the construction meaning [Hilpert 2014].⁴ However, the frequent use of certain type of predicates that do not fully match the construction meaning causes modification in the construction semantics thereby extending their interpretation in a certain direction [cf. Fried 2007: 736; Hilpert 2014⁵]. In this paper we set off to examine the continuum of modal meanings expressed by SRDC in South Slavic by applying the explained principles. We look at their formal and functional feature clusters in order to determine the extension tendencies of this construction. Before embarking on an analysis, a brief overview of some previous studies of this phenomenon is presented.

³ Each construction is usually part of a network of constructions with which it shares formal and semantic properties. As both the reflexive marker and the dative enter in a wide range of structures, there are many constructions that superficially display the same form as the SRDC, but differ from it in the type of predicates they allow and/or their basic argument structure, the role and/or semantics of the expressed argument and other structural and pragmatic properties. Though such relations are important for distinguishing the construction, this is beyond the scope of this paper and merits a separate investigation.

⁴ Explaining this phenomenon, Hilpert [2014: 17] cites Michaelis's definition of the principle of *coercion* as follows: "If a lexical item is semantically incompatible with its morphosyntactic context, the meaning of the lexical item conforms to the meaning of the structure in which it is embedded." Further on he gives examples of such adjustments at different levels arguing that "[t]hese examples indicate that speakers sometimes stretch the limits of what a constructional schema typically allows, thereby creating words that are not quite prototypical of a construction, but nonetheless licensed by it" [Hilpert 2014: 77]. Compare Goldberg [2006: 22].

⁵ Hilpert [2014: 196] uses the term 'host-class expansion' (following Himmelmann). It refers to the following process: "Over time, speakers may use a construction with a new meaning that is extended from an older one, as in the case of sentence-adverbial *hopefully*."

3. Previous studies

The stative reflexive-dative construction raises a number of complex questions from both structural and functional perspective. It has been studied within different linguistic theories and for different purposes. For instance, Rivero [2004] and Kallulli [2006] examine it as a Balkan and South Slavic feature from a formal point of view, pointing out its distinction from reflexive constructions of the type *Mi se isturi mlekoto* (M) ‘The milk spilled on me’ (meaning: I accidentally spilled the milk). They notice correctly that the latter construction expresses activity events marked as accidental, while SRDC has a modal, stative meaning. Ilić [2013] looks at the same two constructions in Serbian: *Marku se prosula kafa* ‘Mark accidentally spilled the coffee’ and *Marku se pije kafa* ‘Mark is craving coffee’, but her goal is to prove that causation and modality can arise in the same environment by providing “a principled, unified account of modality and causation in Serbian dative anticausatives using a typological, cognitive approach” [Ilić 2013: v]. This study is especially concerned with the origin and nature of the modal meaning in the stative construction.

Ivanova [Ivanova 2014; Иванова 2016: 358–367] compares what she calls ‘želatel’naja konstrukcija’ in Bulgarian (found also in other South Slavic languages) with the formally equal Russian reflexive-with-dative construction *Mne pri zakrytoj fortočke ploxo spitsja*. ‘My sleeping goes badly with the window closed’ [Ivanova 2014: 429], characteristic also of Polish and Czech. Though the two constructions considered share “the semantic component relating to the involuntary and inexplicable nature of the inclination towards the action” [Ibid.: 428], the author identifies a number of differences at all levels:⁶ crucially, the Russian construction contains a temporal component implying that the activity is currently going on, while the Bulgarian one is “related to the forthcoming action” [Ibid.: 428]; the Russian construction is subject to many formal restrictions, including the requirements on the type of predicates allowed, while the Bulgarian one is much less constrained. Nevertheless, Ivanova [2014: 430] finds points of overlap between the Russian and the Bulgarian constructions. In certain environments the Russian construction “in the discussed model can convey a desiderative meaning, along with its main meaning of the continuous action, that is, the meaning of an inclination of a human body towards the expressed action, similarly to Bulgarian *dreme mi se* ‘I am sleepy’, *plače mi se* ‘I feel like crying’.” In certain environments, as in example (5) from Ivanova [2014: 430], even other types of predicates can acquire a desiderative component. This is indicative of the possible developmental paths of the South Slavic SRDC.

⁶ The division between South and North Slavic regarding the use of the Reflexive-with-Dative dispositional construction is also discussed in Rivero [2004].

- (5) *Ženščiny ne vseгда ljubjat, kogda mužčinam ne streljaetsja, ne pišetsja, ne ljubitsja, ne stroitsja.* (V. Al'binin)
 'Women are not always approving of (the situation when) men do not feel like shooting, writing, loving, building.'

We find some broader and narrower approaches in the literature, i. e., the scope of the structures claimed to be similar to our SRDC varies depending on the authors' perspective, as do the criteria for determining specific construction properties and connections to the related constructions. Due to its dual nature there is also no general agreement how it should be treated: some authors present structures of the type of SRDC as a functional variety of the dative case [e. g., Антонић 2005; Минова-Ћуркова 1994: 192], while others treat them as a verbal morphosyntactic category, i. e., a type of reflexive constructions [e. g., ГСБКЕ 1983: 241–242, Тополињска 2008: 129].

In dative functions accounts, constructions of the type *spava mi se* (BCS) 'I feel like sleeping' are grouped with the experiencer dative uses. Sometimes, though, their relation to the similar constructions is not stated clearly, whether the authors take a global approach [Тополињска, Буžаровска 2011] or the structures are presented with a lot of granularity [Антонић 2005]. An exception is Palić [2010], who adopts a cognitive approach in his comprehensive study on Bosnian dative and presents the structure corresponding to SRDC as a member of the hierarchically organised network of constructions that contain a dative argument. Such treatment highlights the relations between the closely related constructions, as well as their specific formal and functional features that set them apart. SRDC is shown to be part of the experiencer-dative sub-category, closely related to other constructions of uncontrollable psycho-physiological processes and states. What makes it distinct from the other members of this group is the fact that the dative referent is a receiver of impulses the source of which is unknown [Palić 2010: 224], unlike those which can indicate the source of the state (e. g., *Dopada mi se ta knjiga* 'I like that book').⁷ But our SRDC is only one type of those constructions that express psycho-physiological processes and states of unidentified origin, so Palić [2010: 224] claims that they are distinguished chiefly by their semantic component of "predisposition/indisposition of the dative referent towards some activity or state".

When included within verb categories, this construction is considered a type of diathesis.⁸ In fact, the categories of case and diathesis are mutually

⁷ Palić [2010: 200, 221] calls the former 'neizdiferencirane konstrukcije' (non-differentiated constructions) and the latter 'izdiferencirane konstrukcije' (differentiated constructions).

⁸ The concept of diathesis was defined and thoroughly investigated in Russian linguistics, especially by Khrakovskii and Kholodovich [e. g., Храковский 1978, Холодович 1979,

related, as pointed out by Тополињска [1996], who defines diathesis as “the communicative hierarchy of propositional (predicate-argument) constructions in correlation with the surface form” [Ibid.: 6]. She argues that the term should be used broadly for various types of redistribution of event participants along the syntactic positions, i. e., to render different changes of the communicative hierarchy of arguments [Ibid.: 7]. Accordingly, examples such as *Pije mi se čaj* (BCS) ‘I feel like having a cup of tea’; *Spava mi se* (BCS) ‘I’m sleepy’ should be considered a way of demoting the primary human argument, which is usually the subject, to the dative position. She does not mention, though, that this demotion is usually accompanied by a semantic modification of the whole clause.

In traditional approaches, it is common to treat the SRDC basically as an impersonal construction⁹ [e. g., Гуржанов 1988; Иванова 2016], though it is admitted that there are also examples with an expressed subject, which is semantically an undergoer. Ницолова [2008: 240, 246], on the other hand, distinguishes between ‘*želatelni pasivni konstrukcii*’ and ‘*želatelni bezlični konstrukcii*’, noting their semantic closeness [Ibid.: 246]. However, as pointed out in Митковска [2011: 96], from a functional point of view such a distinction is not justified.

In some recent Bulgarian studies of the SRDC the focus shifted onto identifying its formal and functional features [Джонова 2008; Димитрова 2015; Савова 2018], with special emphasis on the constraints at all levels that regulate the use of the construction. The analysed attested examples give evidence for the widespread use of this construction in Bulgarian, but most of the features that reflect its complexity can more or less be attributed to the SRDC in the other South Slavic languages [cf. Palić 2010; Стипчевић 2015 for BCS], except for Slovenian [Uhlik, Žele 2018]. Relying on their findings as a starting point for our analysis and adopting a cognitive constructional approach this investigation tries to provide new insights into the use of SRDC by scrutinising the properties of its modal semantics. Despite their functional orientation, the mentioned authors rely partly on traditional views. For instance, Димитрова [2015: 26–27] claims that what she calls ‘optative construction’ is a result of a transformation of the complex clause with the verb *iskam* ‘want, wish’ (*Iskam da četa* ‘I want to read’) through the so called process of passivisation

Храковский 1981]. Khrakovskii [1981: 5] defines it as follows: “Each syntactic use of a lexeme is characterised with a particular correspondence of the ‘roles’ (=of the participants) of that lexeme and the arguments of the predicate wordform of the presented lexeme. For this correspondence the term diathesis has been adopted.” Geniušienė [1987] applies the principles of diathesis analysis in her typological study on reflexive constructions, adding a referential level.

⁹ This term refers to sentences without an expressed subject, the members of this class being determined on purely formal grounds. Thus it comprises quite a varied selection of structures.

signalled by the clitic *se*. The author rightfully notes that the construction is characterised by specific semantics which is not to be located in any of its components, but arises from the combination itself, which distinguishes it from all other structures that share the same form. However, the paraphrase strategy with *iskam* used to determine the scope of the construction is inappropriate for two reasons: first, different forms are always connected to difference in construal of a situation and may exhibit all kinds of semantic and discourse-pragmatic distinctions; second, it ignores the inevitable variability within each construction.

Another study that suggests some insightful solutions is Савова [2018], who also explains the constructions by a transformation procedure, but does not rely on a specific paraphrasing. She notes that the predicates used in SRDC (which she calls *impulsivni konstrukcii* ‘impulsive constructions’) may be of several types, ordered on a scale depending on the main participant’s control over the named activity, which also affects the type of the implied modality, called *želanie* ‘desire, craving’. On one end of the continuum are the physiological needs that arise from the actor’s body, but he/she has only a limited control over them (*hodi mi se do toaletnata* ‘I need to go to the toilet’) or they are totally uncontrollable (*kiha mi se* ‘I need to sneeze’).¹⁰ Next on the scale are the predicates denoting activities subject to minimal control (*pie mi se* ‘I’m thirsty’; *spi mi se* ‘I’m sleepy’). The other end of the scale is occupied by fully controlled activities (*hodi mi se na kino* ‘I feel like going to the cinema’), but the construction still presents a state of necessity attributed to the dative participant as independent of his/her will. The author notes that, though the source of the necessity remains obscure, the type of the inner state changes from one to the other end of the continuum in the sense that the participant gains control on its fulfilment. Савова [2018] also sets out to define the constraints that govern the use of the construction and comes to the conclusion that it is not easy to give a categorical answer, as the degree of acceptability of a predicate is often contingent on the context.

4. The construction

As already pointed out above, we consider SRDC an established construction in South Slavic languages with clearly defined formal and functional properties that distinguish it from other constructions with the same basic surface form. Constructions are complex units that display a cluster of features at each pole, which together make up the characteristic profile of the pattern. To analyse the SRDC we look in turn at its internal and external properties, trying

¹⁰ She includes here some verbs which express feelings, such as *gadi mi se* ‘I feel nauseated’ or *vie mi se svjat* ‘I am dizzy’, but no necessity or disposition. These are reflexive verbs that require a dative object, such as *dopada mi se tova* (B) ‘I like it’.

to identify the contribution of each component to the specific modal meaning typically associated with the construction. We will use the presentation conventions outlined in Fried [2017; 2007] and Fried, Östman [2004].

4.1 Overall features

The overall basic internal and external characteristics of the construction are summarised in Diagram 1. The internal structure comprises two elements: the reflexive construction and the dative argument. These are obligatory components.

The reflexive construction consists of a head verb which is constrained by aspect (only imperfective verbs expressing an ongoing, unbounded, atelic activity are permitted)¹¹ and the obligatory presence of an animate agent (preferably human) in its lexical-semantic frame. The reflexive clitic *se* functions here as a marker of some kind of redistribution of the typical arrangement of the arguments in the valence of the verb (more precisely, the verb agent is not expressed in subject position), but the reflexive construction itself does not receive an independent specific interpretation in this construction. Its schematic meaning is materialised only when it is paired with the dative argument. Thus the dative argument, predominantly human, is obligatory and is interpreted as an experiencer.

		Stative Reflexive-Dative Construction	
<i>pragmatics</i> <i>semantics</i>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ downtoning, softening/moderating the expression; ▪ activity event construed as a modal state, an attitude towards the expressed event; modal projection of the event named in the verb: necessity for the event's realisation; 	
<i>syntax</i>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ perceived actor of the verb event presented as experiencer of the state; experiencer is exposed to a need/urge of inexplicable origin having no control over it; ▪ experience _{DAT}, (theme _{NOM}) 	
		Reflexive Construction	Dative Argument
<i>syntax</i>	head V transitive/intransitive	<i>phonology</i>	clitic SE
<i>semantics</i>	imperfective activity agent human >> anim	<i>syntax</i>	diathesis marker
		<i>semantics</i>	agent suppression
		<i>syntax</i>	B & M: Dat. clitic; (na+NP/ Dat. Pron)
		<i>semantics</i>	B/C/S: Dat. clitic/Dat.NP or Pron experiencer, no control human >>animate

Diagram 1. General properties of the Stative Reflexive-Dative Construction

¹¹ Prefixed verbs with phasal meaning are also possible, but the prefix operates on the construction, not on the verb. They code beginning or end of the modal state of necessity. For example *Mu se pripuši* (M)/*Pripušilo mu se* (BCS) means that the person has started feeling the need to smoke and *Othodi mi se* (B) means that I have stopped feeling like going. In fact, most of these prefixed verbs are not used out of the construction, there is no independent verb *pripuši* (M) / *pripušiti* (BCS) or *othodja* (B).

Thus syntactically the construction consists of a diathetically marked verb and a dative object expressing an experiencer.¹² The subject position is optionally realised, depending on the transitivity of the verb (cf. *mi se puši* (M) ‘I feel like smoking’; *mi se pie kafe* (M) ‘I feel like drinking coffee’), but the agent is blocked from it. Subject realisation plays no crucial role in the semantics of the overall structure. Accordingly, there is an obvious discrepancy between the syntax-semantic features of the head verb and predicate realisation in the construction: the reflexive marker on the verb has a deagentivising function, suppressing the agent (initiating argument of the verb) which results in a reduction of its valence; on the other hand, the dative constituent is not represented in the lexical-semantic frame of the verb. It does not feature in its base. This mismatch between the argument structure of the base verb and the event structure of the construction results in a specific meaning, which cannot be predicted from either of the constituent parts. Together they produce the characteristic semantic-pragmatic effects. We discuss further the relevant features that the SRDC inherits from the reflexive and from the dative markers and how they work together to give rise to its modal meaning.

4.2 The reflexive construction inheritance

All South Slavic languages considered have a range of *se*-constructions designating different degrees of suppression of the agent present in the lexical-semantic frame of the verb. This network is quite complex and fluid, hence the classifications vary a lot depending on how the authors treat the reflexive markers. In the comprehensive study on the Macedonian *se*-constructions in Митковска [2011], we claim that the diathetic marker *se* signals various degrees of departure from the canonical transitive event. It originates in the reflexive construction which represents a two-argument structure with co-referential participants (*Se vide (sebesi) vo ogleдалoto* (M) ‘She saw herself in the mirror’). “The separate classes of the Macedonian *se*-constructions represent different phases of the process of grammaticalisation of the reflexive pronoun: from an independent lexical item (in direct reflexive constructions) to a grammatical marker (in the reflexive passive constructions). They mark various types of diathesis, differentiated according to the semantic role of the subject referent.” [Ibid.: 198] In what follows, subclasses are briefly described in the order they occupy on the grammaticalisation chain from the active to

¹² In all South Slavic languages other constructions with such a basic form are encountered, but they are never confused by the native speakers, as each of them is characterised with a particular cluster of structural, semantic and pragmatic features. For instance, the sentence *Šćupihā mi se očilata* (B) ‘My glasses broke’ is interpreted as an accidental event, since SRDCs are incompatible with bounded events. However, ambiguity can in some rare cases occur, and then the interpretation depends on the wider context, as in the following example: *Dneska nekak ćupjat mi se ćinii* (B) ‘Today somehow I break dishes’ or ‘Today somehow I feel like breaking dishes’.

the passive pole.¹³ Bulgarian and BCS *se*-constructions display very similar properties.

Subject reflexive constructions represent several different types, in which the subject referent has an active role in the event, but it is also the entity which undergoes the effects of the event. Unlike in direct reflexive constructions, these two aspects of the initial participant merge in one complex semantic role. The degree of participant differentiation varies depending on the lexical meaning of the verb and the nature of the referent, from more noticeably distinct: *se kape* (M) ‘bathe’, *se podgotvi* (M) ‘prepare’, to completely indistinguishable roles: *se svrti* (M) ‘turn round’, *se raduva* (M) ‘rejoice’.

Decausatives (other terms usually used are Anticausative or Unaccusative) express the event as occurring autonomously, the agent participant being completely absent from the profile of the construction, though it is part of the usual semantic frame of the base verb: *Vratata se otvori* (M) ‘The door opened’, *Zemlja se trese* (BCS) ‘The earth is shaking’. Decausatives profile the final phase of the designated event, abstracting the causal phase, or, as Fried [2007: 739] puts it (regarding the corresponding construction in Czech), they “recast a transitive event as a spontaneous change of state that is independent of any agent”. The participant in subject position is clearly an undergoer and typically inanimate, but it is nonetheless felt as controlling the autonomous event.

Agent defocusing (*se*-passive) constructions code the full chain of events, but demote the agent by not placing it in subject position. Though usually unexpressed it is always present in the semantics of the construction and thus can be added: *Mnogu zgradi se izgradija vo centarot na gradot od somnitelni firmi* (M) ‘Many buildings were built in the centre of the town by dubious companies.’ This construction puts emphasis on the event itself, much like the decausatives, but here the event is not presented as a spontaneous occurrence. They are similar to passive constructions and share many properties with them, so we suggest that the term *se*-passive or reflexive passive (which is sometimes used) is suitable.

In the transitional zone between decausative and reflexive passive constructions we find a range of constructions (known as **pseudo-passive or quasi-passive *se*-constructions**) in which the subject referent cannot be construed as acting spontaneously because they code activities that require human agent involvement. As a result, the predicate is reanalysed as a property. These implications combine with the imperfective aspect and result in

¹³ Reciprocal situations are also coded with a reflexive marker, but they are not part of the same cline. They involve typically two (and sometimes more) participants who are in symmetrical relation to one another and display a range of different degrees of participant distinguishability (*se mrazat megu sebe* (M) ‘they hate each other’; *razdelija* (M) ‘they parted’).

various types of modal interpretations: potential (*Flekite od vino se čistat* (M) ‘Wine stains can be removed’), normative (*Tuk ne se puši* (B) ‘Smoking is not allowed here’) or simply generalising, bordering on *se*-passive (*U vreme posta riba se jede tokom vikenda* (BCS) ‘During fasting fish is eaten for the weekend’).

This short overview shows that *se* on the verb is associated with some non-canonical argument distribution: the agent is downgraded, while the subject (if present) is not interpreted as a causer. Since the verbs licensed by the SRDC code activities that require a human agent, the use of *se* on the verb signals that the construction cannot be interpreted in the canonical meaning of the head verb. In fact, it is related to some of the other reflexive constructions, which has often been noted in the literature. For instance, some authors consider the SRDC as a type of decausative (anticausative/unaccusative) construction [cf. Kallulli 2006; Ilić 2013], while others relate it to the *se*-passive [e. g., Димитрова 2015; Rivero 2004]. I suggest that the SRDC are neither a type of the unaccusative/anticausative, nor of the passive *se*-constructions, though they are close to both; instead they belong to the intermediate zone between the two, just like the pseudo-passive reflexive constructions (PPRC). Indeed, they share many properties:

- Both refer to generalisations over events, but not to actualised events;
- Both are typically used with verbs that require human agents;
- In both constructions head verbs of continuous activities are typically used, characterised by unboundedness, atelicity and durativity;
- Both constructions evoke some type of modal interpretation:
 - PPRC can express possibility, necessity, generality, depending on the lexical meaning of the verb and the situation with much ambiguity among the three, while
 - SRDC expresses need, urge, desire, disposition or a blend of these meanings, depending on the combination of the verb meaning with contextual and pragmatic features.

4.3 The dative case inheritance

The constituent marked by the dative case is used in a variety of contexts in Slavic languages (in fact, in many other European languages). In cognitively oriented accounts all distinct uses of a linguistic form are viewed as a network of more or less related constructions which are linked under a common schema.¹⁴ There have been a number of attempts to pinpoint the specifications of

¹⁴ We use the term ‘schema’ in the sense it is used in cognitively oriented theories. Langacker [2008: 17] explains this phenomenon in this way: “By schematization, I mean the process of extracting the commonality inherent in multiple experiences to

the dative schema in various Slavic languages. It is agreed that the prototypical role of the dative is a receiver and that its main extension is the so called 'free dative', which "includes beneficiaries of actions, possessors of objects and even interlocutors" [Janda 1993: 82]. Even though the free dative is not one of the core arguments, unlike the receiver, it codes the experiencer of the verb activity or state, which makes it again an affected entity. Another feature shared by all dative functions is a lack of control. Wierzbicka [1986: 419], regarding the use of the Polish dative, suggests that "the use of the dative implies a situation which is not controlled by a person Z, but which is likely (though not certainly) to have an effect on him". Similarly, Rudzka-Ostyn [1996: 355] claims that one of the most important functions of the dative is to mark the participant as an "unintended affective endpoint". According to Dąbrowska [1997], as well, the dative case is the grammatical exponent of the Target Person, a participant wh.o is affected by the actions and processes in his/her personal zone. This study on the Polish dative has influenced the scholarship on the dative in South Slavic [Pali 2010; Matovac, Tanacković Faletar 2010].

In view of this characterisation of the dative in Slavic it could be concluded that the dative contributes to SRDC the features of unintentionality, lack of control, and affectedness, which are incorporated in the composite meaning of the construction.

4.4 The composite meaning

The features incorporated in the reflexive verb form (agent suppression) and those in the dative constituent (unintentionality, lack of control, and affectedness) work together to form the characteristic meaning of the SRDC. It expresses an internal emotional state of the dative referent which is perceived as being caused by some inexplicable force. This is consistent with the basic meaning of the dative, which indicates that this emotional state is not controlled by the referent, who is exposed to it and cannot stop it¹⁵. As a result, an implicature arises that the referent has no responsibility for this state. On the other hand, the dative referent is the one that is supposed to carry out the activity designated in the verb. This implicature arises due to a conflicting relation between the verb semantics and its use with the reflexive marker *se*. The reflexive verb form indicates a generalised activity, without profiling an

arrive at a conception representing a higher level of abstraction." Thus a schema is an abstract sum of features that characterise a category and all members comply with it, but the members individually display specificities that elaborate the schema in different ways.

¹⁵ Similar statements have been made by other authors. For instance, Palić [2010: 198–235] maintains that this construction implies that there is no outside stimulus or force. It expresses emotional states the source of which cannot be distinguished from the experience. The dative is not, however, the initiator or instigator, the instigator remains undefined (if it exists at all). The experiencer is reduced to locus of the state.

initiator/agent while the verb designates activities that are normally carried out by people. Due to these lexical-semantic properties, the verb cannot be construed as an autonomous event (unlike causative predicates such as *skrši* (M) ‘break’). Prototypically referring to a human argument the dative is the best candidate in that environment to whom the activity can be ascribed. However, the incompatibility of the lexical meaning of the verb with the lack of control in the dative argument creates a claim of necessity which is reflected as a need, with various levels of intensity, imposed on the dative referent to carry out the activity designated in the verb.

The way a modal meaning arises in the SRDC is comparable to the attainment of modal meaning in pseudo-passives [cf. Митковска, Бужаровска 2011]. It is also caused by similar conflicting relations. Pseudo-passives, too, do not express an actual realisation of the event, but only some precondition for its realisation. As in the SRDC, the deagentivised predication is related to the only available argument (e. g., the place in *Tuk ne se puši* (B) ‘Smoking is not allowed here’ or the wine stains in *Fleki od vino se čistat* (M) ‘Wine stains can be removed’), but since it has no potential to carry it out, the predication is conceived of as its property through some modal assertion: this is such a place where one should not smoke; wine stains are not problematic as they can be removed. This interpretation is supported by the following claim by Ilić [(2013: 16)]: “I conclude that modal assertions, which make a statement about conditions for the event actualisation, arise as some kind of last resort interpretation, when no other assertion that makes a statement about the actual occurrence of the event can be made.”

It has been suggested by Davidse and Heyvaert [2007: 37] that the English pseudo-passive construction (they use the term ‘middle’) “can be interpreted as subjectification of the agentive-patientive relation between the lexical verb and the sole participant in an ergative intransitive clause.” We believe that this explanation can be applied for the corresponding structures in South Slavic languages as well. The predication is ascribed to the subject referent as its permanent attribute; if this referent is involved the speaker uses the construction to express possibility or necessity for the occurrence of an event. Moreover, the subjectification¹⁶ interpretation can also be applied to the SRDC. Since the predication is not interpreted as an activity carried out by the referent expressed in the dative, but as something to which this referent is compelled and may or may not fulfil it, this construction expresses the speaker’s assessment of the used verb agent’s internal need, urge or disposition to carry out the

¹⁶ This term is used in the sense suggested by Traugott [1995: 31]: “‘subjectification’ refers to a pragmatic-semantic process whereby ‘meanings become increasingly based in the speaker’s subjective belief state/attitude toward the proposition’, in other words, towards what the speaker is talking about.”

activity. This is a typical example of covert modal semantics [Abraham, Leiss 2012], which is concerned with the speaker's opinion or attitude towards the proposition and "the status of the proposition that describes the event" [Palmer 2001: 1]. The proposition in SRDC is definitely not factual, it provides information not about the named event, but about the referent's state in relation to the event.¹⁷ Thus we believe that the basic composite meaning of this pattern in South Slavic is the modal meaning of agent-oriented¹⁸ necessity, which cannot be ascribed to any of its constituents, i. e., neither the reflexive marker nor the dative are by themselves markers of necessity, but is implied by the pattern as a whole. Other authors have expressed similar opinions regarding the South Slavic SRDC. Shibatani [1999: 72–73] cites the Croatian sentence *Pilo mi se pivo* 'I felt like drinking beer' to show that an expression can have a meaning component that is not derivable from any word or morpheme it contains. In the same vein, Димитрова [2015: 27] states that "[t]he expression of the meaning 'desire that the denoted activity be completed' cannot individually be ascribed to any of the component elements of the optative construction."¹⁹ The same opinion regarding the source of the modal component in Serbian SRDCs is expressed by Стипчевић [2015: 178].²⁰ Thus we cannot agree with Palić [2010: 222] who attributes the modal semantics to the reflexive particle *se*: "Modality is in these constructions most often grammatically signalled by the modal particle *se*, which is not part of the verb lexeme, but is added later (during the generation of the construction)."²¹ There are *se*-constructions in all South Slavic languages, with or without a dative argument, which express no modality whatsoever.

¹⁷ "Modality is a linguistic category referring to the factual status of a proposition. A proposition is modalised if it is marked for being undetermined with respect to its factual status, i. e., is neither positively nor negatively factual" [Narrog 2012: 6].

¹⁸ According to Bybee, Perkins, Pagliuca [1994: 177], "[a]gent-oriented modality reports the existence of internal and external conditions on an agent with respect to completion of the action expressed in the main predicate." This also corresponds to what Narrog [2012: 9–10] calls 'participant internal modality (ability, physical necessity)': "a proposition is marked as necessity or ability with respect to someone's dispositions." He notes that ability expressions are far more commonly attested in languages than the necessity ones, explaining this by the fact that "the number of events that can be unambiguously understood as internal necessities are limited."

¹⁹ "Изразяването на семантиката 'желание да се извърши означеното действие' не може да се припише самостоятелно на нито един от елементите на опативната конструкция" [Димитрова 2015: 27].

²⁰ "Модалној семантици једнако доприноси и обавезни дативни номинал и обавезна речца *се*, која је овде маркер деагентивности" [Стипчевић 2015: 178].

²¹ "Modalnost je u ovakvim konstrukcijama najčešće i gramatiški obilježena prisustvom modalne čestice *se*, koja nije deo glagolske lekseme, nego je naknadno (prilikom oblikovanja konstrukcije) dodata [Ivić 1953], a usto ova čestica u konstrukcijama ove vrste ima i ulogu kvazitransitivatora" [Palić 2010: 222].

5. The continuum of control and necessity

We now turn to explaining the semantic variability displayed in SRDCs in South Slavic. The modal component of necessity is a distinguishing feature of this construction, but the mode of the modal component is viewed differently, contingent upon the type of event expressed in the predicate/base verb. It depends on the level of control a person can have over the realisation or non-realisation of the actual event, as noted by Савова [2018: 3–4] for Bulgarian. We claim that similar variability is at work in the other languages considered. Accordingly, the constructions can be placed on a continuum from most compelling physiological needs to activities that the person can freely choose to engage in, as shown in Diagram 2.

uncontrollable activities		fully controllable activities
<i>Physiological needs/impulses</i>	<i>Psycho-physiological urges</i>	<i>Psychological disposition/craving</i>
(6) Повръща ми се. (B) 'I feel sick.'	(8) Ми се жаде. (M) 'I'm hungry.'	(10) Pleše mi se. (BCS) 'I'd like to dance.'
(7) Marku se piški. (BCS) 'Marko needs to pee.'	(9) Пуши ми се. (B) 'I feel like smoking.'	(11) Не ми се гледа филм. (M) 'I don't want to watch a film.'

Diagram 2. The continuum of modal meanings in SRDC

At the beginning of the continuum are such bodily activities for which the person does not have much choice and has to react immediately. They represent regular physiological activities performed by the body as a reaction to internal impulses, so the dative referent is objectively put in a compelling situation (examples 6 and 7). SRDCs with such verbs inform about a pressing, unconditional need for a future action which comes from some inner source that the dative referent cannot control. In that way the experiencer is void of responsibility for the physiological state. Consequently, this construction has a downtoning effect, since people are not comfortable to talk about such states. Bodily functions that are performed fully subconsciously, such as *krvavi* (M) 'bleed', *se poti* (M) 'sweat', *se ligavi* (M) 'drool', *raste* (M) 'grow', *diše* (M) 'breathe' do not normally occur in this construction, since they exclude human intervention. However, in certain contexts these verbs are acceptable, as in the following example by Савова [2018: 7]: *душа ми се чист въздух* (B) 'I crave for clean air', where the object makes the activity controllable—one can act willfully in order to be exposed to clean air.

Sometimes the expressions of certain bodily states, such as *mi se (z)gadi*, *mi se (s)maci* (M) 'I feel nauseous/sick', *mi se (s)vrti vo glavata* (M) 'I feel dizzy' (i. e., something happens in my head that makes me dizzy), are also included in

this group because they express uncontrollable events. However, they are both semantically and structurally different. Most importantly, unlike SRDCs, they are devoid of modality as they express feelings which are part of the lexical meaning of the verb, but no urge or need for future action. They are reflexive verbs that require a dative object whose role is rather patientive.²²

In the next stage, the verb semantics is associated with a physiological or psychological necessity, but the person can choose to opt out to some degree. The verbs used range from less to more controllable activities: compare the expressions in (12) with those in (13).

- | | |
|---|--|
| (12) Ми се спие/јаде. (М) | 'I feel like sleeping/eating; |
| Пије ми се нека добра кафа. (BCS) | 'I'd like some nice coffee.' |
| Смее/Плаче/Живее/Умира ми се. (В) | 'I feel like laughing/crying/
living/dying.' |
| Не ми се брза. (М) | 'I'm not in a hurry.' |
| (13) Не ми се работи/седнува/станува. (М/В) | 'I don't feel like working/
seating/standing up.' |
| Trči/Viče/Svađa mi се. (BCS) | 'I feel like running/shouting/
quarrelling.' |

The clause informs of an urge the dative referent experiences, presenting it again as a kind of compulsion that comes from an inexplicable source in his/her body and out of the referent's range of control. Indefinite adverbs often reiterate such implicature (14).

- (14) На мен нешто не ми се работи днес. Не знам зашто. (В)
'I somehow don't feel like working today. I don't know why.'

As a consequence, the referent is presented as a passive experiencer, unintentionally exposed to the need for the head verb activity. Such implicatures tone down the subject's responsibility for the expressed urge and make this construction an effective pragmatic strategy. It is often used as a prompt for the interlocutor to help the experiencer satisfy the need (a request as in 15) and/or serves as an unassuming suggestion (example 16).

- | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|
| (15) А: Баш ми се пие кафе. | Б: Веднаш ќе направам. (М) |
| 'I really feel like having a cup of coffee.' | 'I'll make you some immediately.' |
| (16) А: Једе ми се. | Б: Идемо на ручак. (BCS) |
| 'I am hungry.' | 'Let's have lunch.' |

²² For a similar view cf. Rivero [2004: 247–248].

Furthermore, this construction is used to express an urge or craving for activities which are by no means physically or emotionally compelling, as the expressions in (17).

- | | |
|--|--|
| (17) Ми се чита/шета/зборува за тоа. (M) | 'I feel like reading/walking/
talking about that' |
| Не ми се напуска родината. (B) | 'I don't feel like leaving my
country' |
| Играе ми се тенис. (B) | 'I feel like playing tennis' |
| Не пишу ми се поруке. (BCS) | 'I don't feel like writing emails' |
| Не чека ми се више. (BCS) | 'I don't feel like waiting' |

Those are activities the need for which is subjective and people choose to do them willingly. Савова [2018: 4] correctly notes that verbs recruited in this subclass code activities that the agent consciously engages in for pleasure and satisfaction or willingly refuses to do so. This state is therefore interpreted as a desire or craving on the part of the experiencer. Nevertheless, even in such situations, by using this construction the speaker presents the desire as coming from some irresistible, inexplicable force from inside the person. Савова [2018: 4] equally claims that “in constructions of the type *hodi mi se na kino* the very need is a conscious subjective desire for experiencing pleasure that is controlled by the experiencer’s will, but is presented as deagentivised and objective by means of the construction “verb + *mi se*.”²³ This inference makes the semantic-pragmatic nature of the wish expressed by a SRDC quite different from an explicit expression with a verb of volition (*sakam* M, *iskam/šta* B, *hteti* BCS),²⁴ which is presented as conscious and intentional and thus could be interpreted as demanding and intrusive. The two varieties of the same proposition in examples in (18) would be appropriate in different situations.

- | | |
|--|---|
| (18) Сакам да одам на одмор во Грција. | Ми се оди на одмор во Грција. (M) |
| Hoću da idem na odmor u Grčku. | Ide mi se na odmor u Grčku. (BCS) |
| 'I want to go to Greece on holiday.' | 'I feel like going to Greece on holiday.' |

Distancing the experiencer from the source of the necessity/desire and attributing it to an uncontrollable inner force SRDC can serve as a pragmatic means

²³ “при конструкции от типа на *ходи ми се на кино* самата потребност е осъзнато субективно желание за изпитване на удоволствие, което е контролирано от волята на експериментатора, но е представено като деагентивно и обективизирано чрез конструкцията ‘глагол + *ми се*.’” [Савова 2018: 4].

²⁴ The use of these verbs in SRDS is also worth discussing, but it will divert our attention from the main point of this paper. They are the only way SRDS can be used in Russian and Polish, for instance, to express less compelling necessity, but in South Slavic they are extensively used only in Bulgarian: Димитрова [2010; 2015] finds that *iska mi se/šte mi se* are the most frequent SRDC tokens in her data, while Palić [2010: 226] claims that *hoće mi se* is rare in Bosnian.

of shifting the proponent's responsibility to some outside force and thus avoiding imposition. Despite the common indeterminacy implicature, SRDC with verbs/predicates of the third subclass are clearly distinct from those in the other two groups as the referent, though presented as a passive bearer of the urge/need, still has some control over the satisfaction of the need.²⁵

This overview shows that a wide range of predicates can participate in the South Slavic SRDC, varying in the level of control the initiating participant of the base can exhibit. The continuum of predicates along which the experiencer gains control over the realisation of the named activity correlates with variation at the semantic pole of the construction. As the compelling nature of the activity eases up, the forceful necessity is modified to an urge, then to craving, desire or inclination. This conceptual continuum indicates that SRDC may have started as a means for expressing unconditional physiological needs and then spread by analogy to less compelling physiological and psychological needs but retained the initial meaning of an inner, inexplicable and uncontrollable source. This conclusion is supported by the fact that the more compelling activities are felt as more usual for SRDC and are the first to come to mind,²⁶ used also in other Slavic languages and varieties that do not accept the construction with the type of verbs at the right end of the continuum.²⁷

Another indication for such development may be the increase in subjectivity along the continuum. In works on grammaticalisation and language change such processes are known as subjectification, as defined by Elizabeth Closs Traugott. In her early works she explains the process in this way: "Over time, meanings tend to come to refer less to objective situations and more to subjective ones (including speaker point of view), less to the described situation and more to the discourse situation." [Traugott 1986: 540] The first part of this explanation refers to the semantic change of an expression from presenting the situation objectively (as is the real internal necessity with bodily impulses in SRDC) to presenting it from the speaker's perspective (as when using SRDC for implying inexplicable, forced necessity in expressions of will). The second part indicates that the newly acquired subjective implicatures may be employed in the discourse to indicate meanings that are not contained in the structure (such as suggestions or requests). This process was later termed

²⁵ "Следователно при конструкциите 'глагол + ми се' от тази група потребността (желанието) се представя като независима от експериентора, но удовлетворението на желаното действие не е независимо от неговата воля и възможности" [Савова 2018: 8].

²⁶ Стипчевић [2015: 180] assigns a prototypical status to the construction with verbs expressing physical and psychological needs.

²⁷ In Slavic languages where SRDC has a restricted use (e. g., Russian, Polish, Slovenian), only the first two subclasses are encountered, in many South Slavic regional dialects as well. The third phase seems to be a more recent development.

intersubjectification, to refer to “new encoding of meanings that express such types of speaker attention to addressee as consideration of face” [Traugott 2012: 558]. As discussed above, even in its basic uses SRDC serves as a pragmatically softening strategy. The inclusion of more varied predicates brings in more subjectivity in the construction meaning, thereby increasing its exploitation for discourse-pragmatic purposes. Thus it can be supposed that controllable events, giving rise to SRDCs at the higher level of subjectivity, enter the construction as a conceptual extension of SRDCs expressing less controllable events.

6. Coercion and extension—where is the construction going?

We noted in Diagram 1 that the aspect of the head verb of the SRDC is limited to activities characterised with unboundedness and atelicity [Kallulli 2006; Пенчев 2001]. Иванова [2016: 363–364] claims that “[f]or the Bulgarian construction, contrary to Russian, the feature “durative” appears to be irrelevant, as the whole structure refers to a future and not contemporaneous action. Consequently, predicates of momentary actions in imperfective are allowed: *Pribira mi se veče v k štī* (B) ‘I now feel like getting home.’” This is the case in all languages considered. Nevertheless, momentary events used in imperfective are coerced to activities, as observed by Kallulli [2006: 291]: “Specifically, I assume that imperfective morphology is an event functor that invariably shifts the event type of a predicate into a process.” Thus it is natural that such events adjust to the construction semantics.

Иванова [2016] further notes that non-durative verbs that are not permitted in SRDC usually lack control, intentionality, (e. g. *zaboravjam* ‘forget’ **Не ми се забравяше повече*. (B) ‘I didn’t feel like forgetting any more’). Even though such verbs are not usually encountered in SRDC, they are used in some contexts, as in (19) and (20).

(19) *Забравя ми се за всичко и всички.* (B)

‘I feel like forgetting everything and everybody.’

http://narisuvanaaa.blogspot.com/2013/06/blog-post_19.html

(20) *Zaboravlja mi se sve ružno.* (BCS)

‘I want to forget all bad things.’

<https://www.scribd.com/document/342817664/stvari-koje-mi-se-rade-docx>

It seems that when momentary and stative verbs are used in this construction, they have a durative interpretation; often the context directs the interpretation to the corresponding meaning. For instance, emotions, which the person cannot control, are interpreted as emotional reactions which one can restrain to some degree. Compare the following examples.

- (21) Като ти се тъгува и реве, прави го. (B)
 ‘If you feel like being sad and crying, do it.’
<https://www.bg-mamma.com>
- (22) и ако ти се нервира оди замарај се со [...] глупи [...] професори. (M)
 ‘And if you feel like being irritated, go on and bother yourself with [...] stupid [...] professors.’ forum.kajgana.com
- (23) Kad ti se ljuti, ljuti se! (BCS)
 ‘If you feel like being angry, be angry.’
unutra-vani.blogspot.com/2017/04/tako.html

Савова [2018: 10–11] notes the importance of context in this process of re-interpretation. For instance, she finds that in the structure *Štom/Ako/Kato ti se P, P!* (B) ‘When/If you feel like P, P!’ many verbs that usually would not be expected to be felicitous in this construction, sound quite acceptable. This is confirmed by our data. It seems that the ‘encouragement to action’ discourse function of such expressions helps stative, non-intentional verbs gain in dynamicity and intentionality. Савова [2018: 16] offers a similar interpretation, i. e., that states can be accepted “in contexts that invite a semantic nuance of a mental activity and making an effort.”²⁸

It appears that reinterpretation in particular contexts enables the use of some sensations and processes in the human body that are usually considered unacceptable in SRDC. Димитрова [2015: 32–33] observes that “[v]erbs such as *boleduvam* ‘be ill’; *mrážna* ‘freeze’; *treperja* ‘shiver’, which are marked with the feature [-control] and denote activities which are not realised wilfully, can occur in optative constructions.”²⁹ She gives the following examples:

- (24) Не пия лекарства, боледува ми се по-дълго, мързи ме да работя. (B)
 ‘I don’t take any medications, I feel like being sick longer, don’t feel like working.”
- (25) Вземам антибиотик, не ми се боледува дълго. (B)
 ‘I’m taking antibiotics, I don’t feel like being sick a long time.’ (don’t intend to)
- (26) Взехме такси, не ни се мръзнеше и не ни се трепереше повече на спирката. (B)
 ‘We took a taxi, had no intention to freeze and shiver at the bus stop any more.’

²⁸ “когато в семантиката на глагола се появи и сема за извършване на ментално действие, за полагане на усилие” [Савова 2018: 16] This is true for both affirmative and negated constructions, not just for the latter as Савова claims.

²⁹ “Глаголи като *боледувам*, *мръзна*, *треперя*, маркирани с признак [-контрол] и означаващи действия, които не се осъществяват по волята на човека, могат да образуват оптативни конструкции.”

- (27) И какво—губят ти се пари в казиното тази вечер? (B)
 ‘And what—you feel like losing money in the casino tonight?’

Иванова [2016: 364] offers the following explanation for such behaviour of these verbs: “The introduction of other uncontrollable processes into the Bulgarian “volitional” construction usually seems to be carried out in a preventive context, i. e., in cases where the subject of the discourse/experiencer takes some controlled action to prevent an undesired uncontrollable situation. (See examples 24 and 26 above, L.M.) [...] With a positive form, the whole situation is presented as controlled: the speaker is going to make an effort to enable the desired uncontrollable situation to take place (as in example 25 and 27 above, L.M.).”

The described phenomenon demonstrates the process of adjustment between the semantics of the new predicates that enter the construction and the semantics of the construction. As noted above, it goes in both directions: the predicate’s meaning gets coerced to fit in the construction’s requirements, but as more such predicates become customary the construction meaning may expand in a certain direction and develop new senses. It is obvious that SRDCs in examples (24–27) express no pressing urge or desire, but determination on the part of the experiencer. If the meaning of the unintentional predicate cannot be modified to resemble a controllable event, the modal meaning of necessity is directed not towards the referent’s urge to engage in the named event, but towards taking an action so that it is realised or, more often, not realised. The less frequent occurrence of such interpretations in the SRDCs, the need for more contextual clues and the lower level of acceptability by the speakers indicate that such meanings are of a more recent origin. Often the need for preventing negative effects is stronger and it is the negating contexts that take the forefront in the development of this construction in the described direction. Both Савова [2018] for Bulgarian and Стипчевић [2015] for Serbian note that the number and semantic diversity of the predicates used in negated SRDCs is higher than in the non-negated ones.

7. Concluding remarks

To sum up, the discussion in this paper shows that SRDC in the South Slavic languages considered exhibits modal semantics which cannot be attributed to any of its constituents, as neither the reflexive marker, nor the dative argument are by themselves modality exponents. It was shown that the described modal senses arise from the interplay of the properties of these parts and a cluster of specific structural and pragmatic features. It is also evident that this is a productive construction capable of accepting many different predicates. Its modal meaning is also adaptable. Depending on the context and co-text

of use, it is interpreted with various modal nuances from necessity and urge through need, craving, desire, inclination to determination. The meaning of the construal changes from more objective (genuine bodily impulses) to more subjective views on the dative participant's state. As the construction gets more subjectivised its pragmatic functions expand. Given that the analysis presented in this paper is based on introspection and observation of collected data, the conclusions about the direction of the expansion of SRDC's specific features in South Slavic languages should be considered hypotheses that can serve as the basis for future empirical research.

Bibliography

Abraham, Leiss 2012

Abraham W., Leiss E., Introduction, W. Abraham, E. Leiss, eds., *Covert Patterns of Modality*, Cambridge, 2012, 1–25.

Bybee et. al. 1994

Bybee J., Perkins R., Pagliuca W., *The evolution of grammar: tense, aspect, and modality in the languages of the world*, Chicago, 1994.

Dąbrowska 1997

Dąbrowska E., *Cognitive Semantics and the Polish Dative*, Berlin, New York, 1997.

Davidse, Heyvaert 2007

Davidse K., Heyvaert L., On the middle voice: An analysis of the English middle, *Linguistics*, 1 (45), 2007, 37–83.

Fried 2007

Fried M., Constructing grammatical meaning: Isomorphism and polysemy in Czech reflexivization, *Studies in Language*, 4 (31), 2007, 721–764.

——— 2017

Fried M., Construction grammar in the Service of Slavic Linguistics, and Vice Versa, *Journal of Slavic Linguistics*, 2 (25), 2017, 241–276.

Fried, Östman 2004

Fried M., Östman J-O., Construction Grammar: A thumbnail sketch, M. Fried, J-O. Östman, eds., *Construction Grammar in a cross-language perspective*, Amsterdam, 2004, 11–86.

Geniušienė 1987

Geniušienė E., *The typology of reflexives*, Berlin, New York, 1987.

Goldberg 1995

Goldberg A. E., *Constructions: A construction grammar approach to argument structure*, Chicago, 1995.

——— 2006

Goldberg A. E., *Constructions at Work: The Nature of Generalization in Language*, Oxford, 2006.

Hilpert 2014

Hilpert M., *Construction Grammar and its Application to English*, (= Edinburgh Textbooks on the English Language), Edinburgh, 2014.

Ilić 2013

Ilić T., *Modality and Causation in Serbian Dative Anticausatives: A Crosslinguistic Perspective* (A dissertation submitted to the graduate division of the University of Hawai'i, Manoa, 2013).

Ivanova 2014

Ivanova E., Reflexive-with-Dative construction in Russian and Bulgarian, D. Howard, T. Volodina, Y. Zhang, R. Green, eds., *ICELAIC 2014 Proceedings of the International Conference on Education, Language, Art and Intercultural Communication*, Zhengzhou, 2014, 427–431.

Janda 1993

Janda L., *A Geography of Case Semantics: The Czech Dative and the Russian Instrumental*. Berlin, 1993.

Kallulli 2006

Kallulli D., Unaccusatives with dative causers and experiencers: A unified account, D. Hole, A. Meinunger, W. Abraham, eds., *Datives and Other Cases: Between argument structure and event structure*, Amsterdam, 2006, 271–300.

Langacker 2008

Langacker R. W., *Cognitive grammar. A basic introduction*, Oxford, 2008.

Matovac, Tanacković Faletar 2010

Matovac D., Tanacković Faletar G., Semantička uloga efektora kao determinatora dativnih dopuna u neraščlanjenim jednostavnim rečenicama, M. Birtić, D. Brozović Rončević, eds., *Sintaksa padeža: Zbornik radova znanstvenog skupa s međunarodnim sudjelovanjem Drugi hrvatski sintaktički dani*, Zagreb, 2010, 163–178.

Narrog 2012

Narrog H., *Modality, subjectivity and semantic change: A crosslinguistic perspective*, Oxford, 2012.

Palić 2010

Palić I., *Dativ u bosanskome jeziku*, Sarajevo, 2010.

Palmer 2001

Palmer F. R., *Mood and modality*, 2nd ed., Cambridge, 2001.

Palmer 1998

Palmer F. R., *Mood and modality*, Cambridge, 1998.

Rivero 2004

Rivero M. L., Datives and the non-active voice. Reflexive clitics in Balkan languages, O. M. Tomić, ed., *Balkan syntax and semantics*, Amsterdam, 2004, 237–267.

Rudzka-Ostyn 1996

Rudzka-Ostyn B., The Polish dative. W. van Belle, W. van Langendonck, eds., *The Dative, 1: Descriptive Studies*, Amsterdam, 1996, 341–394.

Shibatani 1999

Shibatani M., Dative subject constructions twenty-two years later, *Studies in the Linguistic Sciences*, 29, 1999, 45–76.

Topolińska, Bužarovska 2011

Topolińska Z., Bužarovska E., The Balkan Dative revisited, *Studies in Polish Linguistics*, 6, 2011, 139–150.

Traugott 1986

Traugott E. C., From polysemy to internal semantic reconstruction. *Proceedings of the Twelfth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, 12, 1986, 539–550.

——— 1995

Traugott E. C., Subjectification in grammaticalisation, S. Dieter, S. Wright, eds., *Subjectivity and Subjectification*, Cambridge, 1995, 31–54.

——— 2012

Traugott E. C., Pragmatics and language change, K. Allan, K. M. Jaszczolt, eds., *The Cambridge Handbook of Pragmatics*, Cambridge, 2012, 549–566.

Uhlik, Žele 2018

Uhlik M., Žele A., Brezosebne zgradbe v slovenščini: kontrastiva z drugimi južnoslovanskimi jeziki in ruščino, *Jezikoslovni zapiski*, 24, 2018, 99–112.

Wierzbicka 1986

Wierzbicka A., The meaning of a case: A study of the Polish dative, R. D. Brecht, J. S. Levine, eds., *Case in Slavic*, Columbus (Ohio), 1986, 386–426.

——— 1988

Wierzbicka A., *The semantics of grammar*, Amsterdam, 1988.

Антонић 2005

Антонић И., Синтакса и семантика падежа. Датив, П. Пипер, ур., *Синтакса савременога српског језика. Проста реченица*. Београд, 2005, 176–195.

ГСБКЕ 1983

Стоянов С., ред., *Граматика на съвременния български книжовен език. 2. Морфология*. София, 1983.

Гуржанов 1988

Гуржанов Г., Безличните реченици во македонскиот јазик во споредба со рускиот, *Македонистика*, 5, 1988, 3–69.

Джонова 2008

Джонова М., Аргументната структура на изреченијата, содржачи предикат с непряко дополнење експериментер од типот *спи ми се*, *Bulgaristica—Studia et Argumenta. Festschrift für Ruselina Nitsolova zum 65. Geburstag*, München, 2008, 230–239.

Димитрова 2010

Димитрова М., Българските опативни конструкции в езика и речта: някои набљудения, *XV Державинские чтения: Современные и исторические проблемы болгаристики и славистики Материалы XXXIX Международной филологической конференции, 16–18 марта 2010 г., Санкт-Петербург*, 2010, 25–34.

——— 2015

Димитрова М., Опативните конструкции в съвременния български език: свобода и ограничения в образувањето им, *Български език*, 3, 2015, 25–37.

Иванова 2016

Иванова Е. Ю., Безличните предложения с обязательным местоименным выражением экспериментера в болгарском языке, А. В. Циммерлинг, Е. А. Лютикова, ред., *Архитектура клаузы в параметрических моделях: синтаксис, информационная структура, порядок слов* (= *Studia Philologica*), Москва, 2016, 332–368.

Иванова, Петрова 2017

Иванова Е. Ю., Петрова Г. М., Българские возвратные клитики *се* и *си*: омонимия, полисемия, синтаксис, *Вопросы языкознания*, 1, 2017, 74–104.

Минова-Ѓуркова 1994

Минова-Ѓуркова Л., *Синтакса на македонскиот стандарден јазик*, Скопје, 1994.

Митковска 2011

Митковска Л., *Македонските се-конструкции и нивните еквиваленти во англискиот јазик*, Скопје, 2011.

Митковска, Бужаровска 2011

Митковска Л., Бужаровска Е., Псевдо-пасивните рефлексивни конструкции во македонскиот јазик од типолошка перспектива, *Прилози*, 36, 1–2: *Прилози посветен на академик Зузана Топољска*, 2011, 211–234.

Ницолова 2008

Ницолова Р., *Българска граматика. Морфология*, София, 2008.

Пенчев 2001

Пенчев Й., Едносъставни изречения, С. Коева, съст., *Съвременни лингвистични теории: Помагало по синтаксис*, Пловдив, 2001, 86–93.

Савова 2018

Савова Д., Синтактични конструкции с логически субект “глагол + *ми се*” в българския език, *Slavia Meridionalis*, 18, 2018, 1–21, DOI: 10.11649/sm.1652.

Стипчевић 2015

Стипчевић Б., Два типа модалних дативних конструкција с речцом *се*, *Српски језик*, 20, 2015, 173–193.

Тополињска 1996

Тополињска З., Падеж и глаголски род—две стратегије граматикализације између предиката и његових аргумената, *Јужнословенски филолог*, 52, 1996, 1–9.

——— 2008

Тополињска З., *Полски—македонски. Граматичка конфронтација*, 8: *Развиток на граматичките категории*. Скопје, 2008.

Холодович 1979

Холодович А. А., *Проблемы грамматической теории*, Москва, 1979.

Храковский 1978

Храковский В. С., ред., *Проблемы теории грамматического залога*, Ленинград, 1978.

——— 1981

Храковский В. С., ред., *Залоговые конструкции в разноструктурных языках*, Ленинград, 1981.

References

Abraham W., Leiss E., Introduction, W. Abraham, E. Leiss, eds., *Covert Patterns of Modality*, Cambridge, 2012, 1–25.

Antonić I., Sintaksa i semantika padeža. Dativ, P. Piper, ur., *Sintaksa savremenoga srpskog jezika. Prosta rečenica*. Beograd, 2005, 176–195.

Bybee J., Perkins R., Pagliuca W., *The evolution of grammar: tense, aspect, and modality in the languages of the world*, Chicago, 1994.

Dąbrowska E., *Cognitive Semantics and the Polish Dative*, Berlin, New York, 1997.

Davidse K., Heyvaert L., On the middle voice: An analysis of the English middle, *Linguistics*, 1 (45), 2007, 37–83.

Dimitrova M., Bulgarskite optativni konstruksii v ezika i rechta: niakoi nabliudeniia, *XV Derzhavinskie chteniia: Sovremennye i istoricheskie problemy bolgaristiki i slavistiki. Materialy XXXIX Mezhdunarodnoi filologicheskoi konferentsii*, 16–18 marta 2010 g., Sankt-Peterburg, 2010, 25–34.

Dimitrova M., Optativnite konstruksii v suvremennii bulgarski ezik: svoboda i ogranicheniia v obrazuvaneto im, *Bulgarski ezik*, 3, 2015, 25–37.

Dzhonova M., Argumentnata struktura na izrecheniata, sudurzhashchi predikat s nepriako dopulnenie eksperientser ot tipa *spi mi se*, *Bulgaristica—Studia et Argumenta. Festschrift für Ruselina Nitsolova zum 65. Geburstag*, München, 2008, 230–239.

Fried M., Constructing grammatical meaning: Isomorphism and polysemy in Czech reflexivization, *Studies in Language*, 4 (31), 2007, 721–764.

Fried M., Construction grammar in the Service of Slavic Linguistics, and Vice Versa, *Journal of Slavic Linguistics*, 2 (25), 2017, 241–276.

Fried M., Östman J.-O., Construction Grammar: A thumbnail sketch, M. Fried, J.-O. Östman, eds., *Construction Grammar in a cross-language perspective*, Amsterdam, 2004, 11–86.

Geniušienė E., *The typology of reflexives*, Berlin, New York, 1987.

Goldberg A. E., *Constructions at Work: The Nature of Generalization in Language*, Oxford, 2006.

Goldberg A. E., *Constructions: A construction grammar approach to argument structure*, Chicago, 1995.

Gurzhanov G., Bezlichnite rechenitsi vo makedonskiot jazik vo sporedba so ruskiot, *Makedonistika*, 5, 1988, 3–69.

Hilpert M., *Construction Grammar and its Application to English*, (= Edinburgh Textbooks on the English Language), Edinburgh, 2014.

Ivanova E. Yu., Bezlichnye predlozheniia s obiazatel'nym mestoimennym vyrazheniem eksperientsera v bolgarskom iazyke, A. V. Zimmerling, E. A. Lyutikova, eds., *Clause Architecture in the Parametric Models: Syntax, Information Structure, Word Order*, (= Studia Philologica), Moscow, 2016, 332–368.

Ivanova E. Yu., Petrova G. M., Bulgarian reflexive clitics *se* and *si*: Homonymy, polysemy, syntax, *Voprosy jazykoznanija* 1, 2017, 74–104.

Ivanova E., Reflexive-with-Dative construction in Russian and Bulgarian, D. Howard, T. Volodina, Y. Zhang, R. Green, eds., *ICELAIC 2014: Proceedings of the International Conference on Education, Language, Art and Intercultural Communication*, Zhengzhou, 2014, 427–431.

Janda L., *A Geography of Case Semantics: The Czech Dative and the Russian Instrumental*, Berlin, 1993.

Kallulli D., Unaccusatives with dative causers and experiencers: A unified account, D. Hole, A. Meinunger, W. Abraham, eds., *Datives and Other Cases: Between argument structure and event structure*, Amsterdam, 2006, 271–300.

Kholodovich A. A., *Problemy grammaticheskoi teorii*, Moscow, 1979.

Khrakovsky V. S., ed., *Problemy teorii grammaticheskogo zaloga*, Leningrad, 1978.

Khrakovsky V. S., ed., *Zalogovye konstruksii v raznostrukturykh iazykakh*, Leningrad, 1981.

Langacker R. W., *Cognitive grammar. A basic introduction*, Oxford, 2008.

Matovac D., Tanacković Faletar G., Semantička uloga efektora kao determinatora dativnih dopuna u neraščlanjenim jednostavnim rečenicama, M. Birtić, D. Brozović Rončević, eds., *Sintaksa padeža: Zbornik radova znanstvenog skupa s međunarodnim sudjelovanjem Drugi hrvatski sintaktički dani*, Zagreb, 2010, 163–178.

Minova-Gurkova L., *Sintaksa na makedonskiot standarden jazik*, Skopje, 1994.

Mitkovska L., Bužarovska E., Pseudo-Passive Reflexive constructions in Macedonian from a typological perspective, *Contributions*, 36, 1–2: *Prilozi posveteni na akademik Zuzana Topolińska*, 2011, 211–234.

Mitkovska L., *Makedonskite se-konstruksii i nivnente ekvivalenti vo angliskiot jazik*, Skopje, 2011.

Narrog H., *Modality, subjectivity and semantic change: A crosslinguistic perspective*, Oxford, 2012.

Nicolova R., *Balgarska gramatika—Morfologia*, Sofia, 2008.

Palić I., *Dativ u bosanskoj jeziku*, Sarajevo, 2010.

Palmer F. R., *Mood and modality*, 2nd ed., Cambridge, 2001.

Palmer F. R., *Mood and modality*, Cambridge, 1998.

Penchev J., Mononuclear sentences, S. Koeva, ed., *Suvremenni lingvistični teorii: Pomagalo po sintaksis*, Plovdiv, 2001, 86–93.

Rivero M. L., Datives and the non-active voice. Reflexive clitics in Balkan languages, O. M. Tomić, ed., *Balkan syntax and semantics*, Amsterdam, 2004, 237–267.

Rudzka-Ostyn B., The Polish dative. W. van Belle, W. van Langendonck, eds., *The Dative, 1: Descriptive Studies*, Amsterdam, 1996, 341–394.

Savova D., Syntactic structures with logical subject (of the type 'verb + *mu ce*') in the Bulgarian language, *Slavia Meridionalis*, 18, 2018, 1–21, DOI: 10.11649/sm.1652.

Shibatani M., Dative subject constructions twenty-two years later, *Studies in the Linguistic Sciences*, 29, 1999, 45–76.

Stipčević B., Dva tipa modalnih dativnih konstrukcija s rečom se, *Srpski jezik*, 20, 2015, 173–193.

Topolińska Z., Padež i glagolski rod—dve strategije gramatikalizacije između predikata i njegovih argumenata, *Južnoslovenski filolog*, 52, 1996, 1–9.

Topolińska Z., *Polski—makedonski. Gramatička konfrontacija. 8: Razvitok na gramatičkite kategorii*, Skopje, 2008.

Topolińska Z., Bužarovska E., The Balkan Dative revisited, *Studies in Polish Linguistics*, 6, 2011, 139–150.

Traugott E. C., From polysemy to internal semantic reconstruction. *Proceedings of the Twelfth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, 12, 1986, 539–550.

Traugott E. C., Pragmatics and language change. K. Allan, K. M. Jaszczolt, eds., *The Cambridge Handbook of Pragmatics*, Cambridge, 2012, 549–566.

Traugott E. C., Subjectification in grammaticalisation, S. Dieter, S. Wright, eds., *Subjectivity and Subjectivication*, Cambridge, 1995, 31–54.

Uhlik M., Žele A., Brezosebne zgradbe v slovensčini: kontrastiva z drugimi južnoslovenskimi jeziki in ruščino, *Jezikoslovní zapiski*, 24, 2018, 99–112.

Wierzbicka A., The meaning of a case: A study of the Polish dative, R. D. Brecht, J. S. Levine, eds., *Case in Slavic*, Columbus (Ohio), 1986, 386–426.

Wierzbicka A., *The semantics of grammar*, Amsterdam, 1988.

Лилјана Митковска, доктор,

редовен професор

ФОН Универзитет

ул. Киро Глигоров бр. 5, 1000 Скопје

Република Северна Македонија / Republic of North Macedonia

liljana.mitkovska@fon.edu.mk

Received August 19, 2019