UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

Typically Russian

Keijsper, C.E.

DOI

[10.1023/B:RUSS.0000035584.67502.e9](https://doi.org/10.1023/B:RUSS.0000035584.67502.e9)

Publication date

2004

Published in

Russian Linguistics

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Keijsper, C. E. (2004). Typically Russian. *Russian Linguistics*, 28(2), 189-226.
<https://doi.org/10.1023/B:RUSS.0000035584.67502.e9>

General rights

It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations

If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: <https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact>, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

CORNELIA E. KEIJSPER

TYPICALLY RUSSIAN

INTRODUCTION*

In her exploration of links between language and culture, Wierzbicka (1992, 395–441) argues that four fundamental semantic themes shape the semantic universe of the Russian language (1992, 395):

“(1) Emotionality – the tremendous stress on emotions and on their free expression, the high emotional temperature of Russian discourse, the wealth of linguistic devices for signalling emotions and shades of emotions.

(2) “Irrationality” or “non-rationality” – the opposite of the so-called scientific world view officially promulgated by the Soviet regime; the stress on limitations of logical thinking, human knowledge, and human understanding, and on the mysteriousness and unpredictability of life.

(3) Non-agentivity – the feeling that human beings are not in control of their lives and that their control over events is limited; a tendency to fatalism, resignation, submissiveness; a lack of emphasis on the individual as an autonomous agent, “achiever”, and controller of events.

(4) Moral passion – the stress on the moral dimensions of human life, on the struggle between good and evil (in others and in oneself), the tendency to extreme and absolute moral judgments.”

Wierzbicka claims that all these themes of Russian culture and the Russian national psyche are reflected in the Russian language (1992, 398). The first theme is illustrated, among others, by the wealth of active emotion verbs and the wealth of “dative plus predicative” constructions referring to passive involuntary emotions. The second and third theme are considered to be reflected in *dativus cum infinitivo* constructions, in reflexive constructions of the type *Мне не спится* and *Мне вспомнилась эта ночь*, and in (other) impersonal sentences, among which the type *Его переехало трамваем*, and particles like *авось*. The fourth theme is illustrated by words expressing absolute moral condemnation and absolute moral enthusiasm.

Wierzbicka is, of course, aware of the dangerousness of her enterprise: “explorations of the link between language and culture in general, and language and “national character” in particular, have in the past suffered from friends as much

* I would like to thank dr. Adrie Barentsen and dr. Janneke Kalsbeek for corrections and suggestions that led to improvement of this article.

as (or more than) they have suffered from enemies” (Wierzbicka 1992, 441). She claims that her natural semantic metalanguage based on universal semantic primitives is a safeguard against false links in this area, because it provides us with “sharper methodological tools than those which were used by our predecessors” (ibid.).

Despite many valuable publications about what since 1992 has come to be called “cultural scripts” (more recent work about Russian includes Wierzbicka 1997; 1998; 2002) to my mind the “dangerous but vital and irresistible problems” of the kind that Wierzbicka (1992, 441) once more wanted to place on the linguistic agenda, do not become less dangerous by referring to the advantages of a metalanguage alone. It is also essential that one’s choice of linguistic data is not restricted to phenomena that seem to be convergent with the evidence coming from other than linguistic sources about culture and national psyche (cf. 1992, 398). Wierzbicka’s (1992) choice of data is, in my view, far from irreproachable in this respect. Thus, she correctly mentions an opposition under the heading Emotionality: Russian has both active and passive emotions; this enlarges the degree of Emotionality in favour of which Wierzbicka argues. But in the area of Rationality/Irrationality there is also an opposition: Russian encodes the difference between *Его переехало трамваем* and *Его переехал трамвай* (Wierzbicka 1992, 431). People who speak non-East Slavic languages may find the differentiation a bit exaggerated, of course (cf. Мразек 1990, 103; the construction in question is reported to occur in Polish dialectal speech – Siewierska 1988, 276). But the existence of the opposition does not plead in favour of the idea that Russian stresses irrationality but in favour of the idea that the language attaches relevance to the difference between rationality and irrationality, if one insists on such terms. The frequency of impersonal sentence models does not reflect a stress on irrationality either (cf. Wierzbicka 1992, 431), because it is crucially restricted by yet another opposition, one in the area of Agentivity/Non-agentivity, where the pertinent data show that Russian encodes the opposite of “a lack of emphasis on the individual as an autonomous agent”. True, the infinitive constructions discussed by Wierzbicka in this connection are cases where Wierzbicka’s agentivity formula does not apply (e. g. 1992, 415, 418) viz. “if I don’t want it, I will not do it” and “if I want it I will do it” (see section 1 below for a summary). But on the other hand impersonal and personal reflexive verbs with a dative referring to a human being are excluded in Russian in some cases where even other Slavic languages allow them, if the human being is an agent or simply acts: if he does, this fact cannot be abstracted from by making the finite verb form impersonal (although it can be embedded, as we will see, or removed from the verb’s referent). Also, in contrast to other Slavic languages, Russian does not use so-called impersonal passives for expressing “деконкретизация денотативного персонического субъекта”

(Мразек 1990, 34), despite the presumed high frequency of impersonal sentences in general, again because the presence of actors cannot be abstracted from by impersonalizing a finite verb form. Inspection of these additional data leads to the observation that Russian has very precise restrictions on what can and what cannot be expressed in a single finite verb form (both with and without a nominative subject). In Wierzbicka's original terms, to be modified in the sequel, this observation is that Russian encodes whether or not the formula "if I don't want it, I will not do it" and "if I want it I will do it" applies, i. e. the difference is important.

Because of all these oppositions, if a relation with a cultural theme must be indicated, perhaps Uspenskij's (Успенский 1994, 219–253) theme of "dual models" is a good candidate; it is not only reflected, then, in "the struggle between good and evil". However, the present article remains within the linguistic context where the restrictions on what can be encoded in a single finite verb form in my view belong (see section 4). Sections 2 and 3 discuss the relevant data. It appears that reflexive finite verb forms in Russian are excluded in the so-called syntactic uses of the reflexive element in Slavic languages where *se/siĕ* remained a separate particle; the affix character of the Russian reflexive element has a positive content as well: it introduces the possibility of layered reference. These at first sight trivial observations give rise to a lot of confusion when investigators speaking other Slavic languages discuss Russian. The confusion is directly related to the Agentivity/Non-agentivity opposition.

Among earlier reactions to Wierzbicka (1992), Zaliznjak and Levontina (Зализняк, Левонтина 1996, 237–238) say that Wierzbicka correctly started from an analysis of the semantics of a language's units rather than from a theory about a national character. Then they proceed to adduce further material that presumably supports the idea that "русский язык предоставляет говорящему на нем массу возможностей снять с себя ответственность за собственные действия" (1996, 239). This further material consists in an analysis of combinations of the type "personal vs. impersonal finite verb form plus infinitive" such as *Я собираюсь/постараюсь/успею (с)делать это* vs. *Мне удалось/посчастливилось сделать это* and *Так получилось, что ... /Так вышло, что ...* Some impersonal verbs without infinitive are also discussed (e. g. *Им повезло*). In my view this material shows that if one wishes to express that the acting person is not responsible for an entire event complex, that event complex cannot be expressed in a single finite verb form but must be split up into what can be expressed by a combination of finite verb form plus infinitive, where the personal or impersonal form of the finite verb differentiates additionally between responsibility vs. non-responsibility for the smaller event expressed in the finite verb form alone (if one insists on such terminology). This, again, shows that Russian attaches importance to differences in the area under consideration.

The wealth of possibilities to express differences is noted by Tarlanov (Тарланов 1998), who evaluates it as a positive (enriching) development in the Russian language. He also adduces some interesting statistical material based on proverbs: the frequency of impersonal sentences in XVII–XX century proverbs is only (? C. K.) 15% (1998, 68), and concepts like *душа*, *судьба*, *тоска* are far less prominently present in proverbs than Wierzbicka's (1992) choice of data could lead us to expect (1998, 73). On the whole, I fully agree with Tarlanov's objections against analyses of one language (Russian) in terms of another (English) (1998, 73).

Recently, Khajrov (Хайров 2003, full text) has warned us that myths about national character can easily lead to absurdities. I hope that my comparison between Russian and Slavic languages where *se/się* remained a separate element (sections 2 and 3 below) does not create such pitfalls but remains within the context of linguistic research (section 4).

1. RUSSIAN INFINITIVE: SUMMARY OF THE PRESENT STATE OF INVESTIGATION

Russian is characterized by an abundant use of infinitive sentences with a modal meaning. In the West and South Slavic area such sentences “занимают совершенно периферийное место” (Мразек 1990, 32).

Before Wierzbicka (1992) the study of the Russian infinitive had reached the point represented by Ebeling (1984). Ebeling gives an analysis of all syntactically different uses of the infinitive; in that context the “*dativus cum infinitivo*” is a single type of use. For interpretational differentiations within this single type of use Ebeling follows Veyrenc (1979, 39 ff.), who distinguished between “*pouvoir*” and “*devoir*” readings and who thought, to cite Ebeling's formulation (1984, 109), that “a thorough study of the semantic value of *he* and of the semantic effects of the various intonation contours in all kinds of contexts is needed before one can describe how precisely the combination of the meanings in question with the inf. meaning results in the respective interpretation”. Since Ebeling (1984), Wierzbicka (1992), Maurice (1995; 1996) and Fortuin (2000) discussed the data in question in a way which enables us to conclude that it was not negation and/or intonation that had to be studied so as to describe the various interpretations of the combination of dative and infinitive. Rather, we have to recognize that the infinitive sentences concerned are not sentences of the type “nominative subject plus finite verb in the indicative”. They signal that in some phase of the infinitive act the act does not proceed in accordance with the agentive act scheme which Wierzbicka calls “if I don't want it, I will not do it” and “if I want it I will do it” (e. g. 1992, 415, 418). (The formula precedes Wierzbicka's (1997, 125–155) more specific explication of language-specific meanings in the area of freedom, which is obviously related to the concept of agentivity.)

In an agentive act expressed by a nominative subject plus finite verb in the indicative, all phases of the act are performed by a single referent: intention (wish to perform), decision to perform, initiation of the act, performance itself, and its completion. Not all finite indicative verbs with nominative subject express agentive acts, of course, but other verb forms that can constitute sentences explicitly do not express such acts.

To give a simple example of a non-agentive case, both infinitive (*Открыть окно!*) and imperative (*Открой(те) окно!*), when used in the speech situation, can be a command (request): in that case one person has an intention, the other person is the intended performer. The difference between infinitive and imperative comes to light in questions: in *Открыть окно?* the person asking the question will perform if the other person wishes him to, and the decision whether or not he will perform is made by the other, wishing, person. In [*Может быть,*] *Открой(те) окно?*, in contrast, the person wishing the act leaves the decision whether or not to perform to the intended performer. The difference is reflected in the fact that the imperative form is usually considered to be more polite. This simple example illustrates the precision with which Russian encodes the “responsibility” for even separate phases of a single act. There are, to be sure, more complicated constellations, such as those signaled by aspect in the imperative (see Šatunovskij (Шатуновский 2002); these pertain to the temporal order of the decision to perform (“выбор”, in Šatunovskij’s terminology) and the “побуждение” to perform expressed by the imperative (or to not stop the performance), but in all cases the person “responsible” for the choice to perform is, in the imperative, the performer (Шатуновский 2002, 280–281).

Now, “dative plus infinitive” constructions also refer to non-agentive acts: at least one phase of the act cannot be executed in accordance with the agentive act scheme, and the precise interpretation depends on the phase of the act where non-agentivity applies. The dative referent is in circumstances where either 1. fate decides that the issue of free will cannot be raised at all (“fated infinitive”); or 2. a (potential) wish is overruled (or is already in the past): irrespective of will the act must be performed; or 3. given the intention to perform or to complete an act, to do so is impossible. Examples: 1. *Быть бычку на верёвочке* (Wierzbicka 1992, 110), 2. *Тебе машину вести* (1992, 423), *Мне сходить* (“I must, because I have already decided to act”), 3. *Ни пройти ни проехать* (1992, 417).

If the sentence contains a negation, either 1. fate decides that the infinitive act is not there (*Не видать тебе этих подарков*) (Wierzbicka 1992, 109), or 2. it is not the case that, irrespective of will, the act must be performed (“need not”), so that the default agentive circumstances are restored (*Завтра детям не идти в школу*). Since case 3 pertains to the impossibility to perform/complete an act in an agentive way, there is always a negation: Veyrenc’s “pouvoir” read-

ing is always impossibility, either overtly expressed by *не* or *ни*, or present in the situation, the latter mainly in questions of the type *Как (мне) дойти до вокзала?* If the person asking the question is understood to have the intention to arrive at the station (rather than as submitting himself to the wish of the other person, as in the “devoir” reading), he is understood to be unable to do so because of lack of information. If a correct answer follows the agentive circumstances are restored.

The rhetorical question type *Не сидеть же здесь целый день* is used in circumstances when an act (here sitting) will (continue to) be performed unless the agentive circumstances are restored: the speaker has a wish not to sit (not to continue sitting). In *Покурить бы*, finally, the speaker wishes to perform the infinitive act, but, again, the act cannot be performed in accordance with the agentive act scheme, in Wierzbicka's (1992, 419) terms: “It would be good if X could happen to me (us), I know I can't think: ‘if I want it, it will happen’”. In this way all possible occurrences of “(dative plus) infinitive” sentences can be explained.

Mrázek (Мразек 1990, 25) correctly observes that in Russian “богато развились архаичные славянские дативно-инфинитивные конструкции”. However, Russian is not archaic semantically: the modern use of the construction summarized here is not the same as in old Russian. And even since the XVIIIth century, the meaning of the infinitive has changed, as indicated in, for example, Vinogradov and Švedova (red.) (Виноградов, Шведова 1964, 393): “как построения с новым и активизирующимся значением отмечаются в это время (second half of the 18th – beginning of the 19th century. С. К.) инфинитивные предложения, обозначающие конкретное действие определенного лица, непосредственно обусловленное его внутренней активностью, желанием, волей” (i. e. agentivity which is inhibited in the way explained above). In the same period we see “по существу исчезающие предложения с индикативным значением и смыкающимся с ним значением постоянной возможности действия [...]” (ibid.). The latter, “permanent possibility” sense, the infinitive of some verbs other than *видать* and *слыхать* still had in the XV–XVII centuries, for example, *Сухимъ путемъ ходятъ на Дамаскъ градъ; и оттолѣ до Дамаскаго града три дни, а ходятъ на ослятѣхъ, а иди по заразамъ и по горамъ каменнымъ, а путь вельми труденъ* (see e. g. Борковский 1968, 167–170; Седельников 1968, 70). Since then, even “possibility on a specific occasion” and “near impossibility” not accompanied by an explicit negation have become rare (other than in questions for information). For example: *Полез Жилин в дыру, чтоб и Костылину пролезть* (Fortuin 2000, 402; Garde 1963, L. Tolstoj) would at present be expressed by, for example, [...] *чтобы и Костылин мог пролезть*, which lexicalizes the “possibility” sense. *Одежу*

самую лучшую дам: черкеску, и сапоги, *хоть* жениться (Fortuin 2000, 399; Тимофеев 1950, L. Tolstoj) would at present be expressed by [...] *хоть* женись, i. e. if you decide to you can even marry (see *Открыть окно?* vs. *Откройте окно?* discussed above). For example: *Они [мощи родителей Кутузова] неплохо сохранились, даже мундир с золотыми эполетами хоть сейчас надевай* (Огонек 17, 2003, 57). *Хоть бы* combined with an infinitive, in contrast, indicates impossibility in the given situation, as does the infinitive in questions for information: *Теперь уж было не до того, чтобы осину рубить, – изломался, промок. Хоть бы найти ее да дорогу запомнить засветло* (V. Belov). *Хоть бы глазом одним посмотреть Шухову на те ковры* (A. Solženicyn). Apart from *чтобы* and *хоть*, *едва* and *только* have meanings that are of interest in this connection (see Fortuin 2000, 384–408; Maurice 1996, 93 ff.).

Thus, the present boundaries of the set of appropriate referents of the meaning of the infinitive, viz. determined by the non-applicability of the agentive act scheme, are relatively recent (and in spoken language wider than in the literary language, see e. g. Красильникова 1988). The question type survived despite the absence in it of an explicit negation (*Как (мне/нам) дойти до вокзала?*), probably because it contains the same reversal as the “devoir” type plus negation (“need not”): the agentive situation is restored (is not non-applicable), in the question type by answering the question. In proverbs an older language situation may be fossilized, of course, but even there a “pouvoir” reading without a negation seems to be rare (see e. g. Небыкова 1969).

Other than so-called modal uses of the infinitive can be understood in the same terms (Ebeling 1984 used other terminology). For example, the combination with a nominative, viz. the *Царица хохотать* type, contains, in the nominative, reference to a “normal” actor. Yet, the use of an infinitive instead of a finite verb form in the indicative conveys that the intention/initiation phase of the act is not registered. As is well known, the interpretation of *Царица хохотать* is “Царица принялась хохотать” plus “интенсивный и внезапный приступ к действию” (Булыгина 1982, 76), i. e. the initiation is too fast and too unexpected to be registered. In *Как. Ты бунтовать?* the speaker protests against an agentive act of the hearer by conveying that he has not registered the hearer’s agentive behaviour, thereby questioning the legitimacy of that behaviour: according to the speaker the intention to act should not have been there in the first place (see e. g. Ермакова 1963).

A dependent infinitive of the type *Иван сел писать* constitutes a single larger event complex with the combining finite verb form. Here, again, the infinitive act does not contain all phases of an agentive act, now because it is part of a larger event complex involving only a single decision (if the finite verb is agentive). The same holds true for a series of instructions such as a recipe: only a single decision

to make the dish is needed and is implied in the situation; the whole series of acts ("What to do if you decide to make this dish") then follows "automatically", e. g. *Рис замочить за 3–4 часа до варки в подсоленной воде. Мякоть баранины нарезать кусочками по 10–12 г, посыпать солью, перцем и обжарить в сильно нагретом курдючном сале* (Золотова и др. 1998, 341, cited from a Кулинария).

We may conclude that the modal uses of the Russian infinitive (*dativus cum infinitivo*) studied since Ebeling (1984) in terms related to action logic (Goldman 1970), do not deviate from Ebeling's idea that e. g. *Нам вместе работать* refers to "a fact [...] characterizing a situation [...] as furthering the coming into existence of another fact in such a way that the furthering influence of the former fact affects us in such a way that we are the first (or only) participants in the latter" (1984, 108). We only have to add, to use the same terminology, that the fact "furthering" (leading up to, giving rise to, enabling to, creating an opportunity to) the infinitive fact is that what makes that the performer of the infinitive act is in some phase of the act not an agent. In questions for information and in the "need not" case of negation such a "furthering fact" is (as yet) absent.

2. IMPERSONAL AND PERSONAL REFLEXIVE VERB CONSTRUCTIONS

2.1 As I said in the introduction, the importance in Russian of whether or not the agentive act scheme applies can also be illustrated on the positive side: if there is an agent (or simply active person – see below), this fact cannot be abstracted from by using an impersonal verb: sentences such as *Я слушаю – Машка, – сказала в трубке и вздохнуло с облегчением* (Gerritsen 1990, 266, Zverev) are notoriously exceptional. Only vaguely perceived noises and movements can be referred to by a finite verb form without nexus (impersonal form), i. e. be predicated about the world at large without locating the event in the life of their producers (e. g. *стучит, зашевелилось*). One could call this a highly rational rule (cf. Wierzbicka 1992, 430–433).

The same holds true for reflexive forms: sentences such as Mrázek's (Мразек 1970, 170–171) Czech type *Šlo se* (impersonal reflexive) or *Šlo se rychle* (idem with qualitative-quantitative adverb) have no Russian equivalent. Mrázek translates them into Russian using a third person plural with a specified subject or with a zero subject, or with a nominalization: *Мы (они, люди, некоторые ...) или (быстро), Там se vzorně pracuje: Там образцово работают, U nás se dnes pere: У нас сегодня стирка*. A second person singular verb form with zero subject can also be an adequate translation. Indeed, Russian must retain the (segmentally expressed) nexus relation if there are actors, i. e. persons who have the act concerned as part of their lives, even if they are anonymous (as in *Там образцово работают*, with zero subject). Alternatively we can refrain from a

finite verb form, having recourse to intonational predication (a so-called Rheme) or intonational nexus (a so-called Theme plus Rheme) alone, as in *У нас сегодня стурка*. But segmentally expressed predication without nexus (i. e. an impersonal finite verb) is not available as a means of abstracting from agents. Even a request/invitation like *Jde se!* is related to persons in Russian (*Идемте, Идите* – Гребль 1967, 64), see further 3.1.

Unfortunately, this simple Russian semantic rule is obscured by a new tradition which ignores the difference between segmentally expressed predication/nexus and intonationally expressed predication/nexus, bringing them all under a heading such as “отношение предикативного признака к его носителю в плане времени, модальности и лица” (e. g. Золотова 1982, 99, 102–107). Within this new tradition it is impossible to bring to light the specifically Russian (East Slavic) use of the various predication and nexus types mentioned here. In sections 2.2 and 3.2 we will see that the term “agent” in the sense explained in section 1 is too strong for “referent having the act concerned as part of its life”. The latter is a better formulation of the relevant Russian rule (cf. also Тарланов 1998, 69). The rule does not exclude various simultaneous activities, of course.

The personal parallel to the *Šlo se (rychle)* type, viz. *Ta kniha se čte* or *Ta kniha se čte rychle* has quite another status in Russian than it has in Czech (see 3.2).

Mrázek’s (Мразек 1970, 171–172) types *Šlo se hezky* (with an adverb referring to an “отношение к действию”) and *Šlo se mi hezky* (idem plus dative) do not occur in Russian either (not to be confused with the type *Мне прекрасно работалось*, to be discussed in 2.2 below). Mrázek translates them with a *dativus cum infinitivo* construction: *Šlo se hezky*: Нам (им, людям, некоторым...) хорошо было идти, *Šlo se mi hezky*: Мне хорошо было идти. Indeed, there are, to the Russian mind, two smaller events involved, viz. Нам (им...) /мне было хорошо and Мы (они...) шли/я шел/шла; in the former event we/I have a passive (experiencer) role, in the second event we/I have an active role. Such a combination cannot be encoded in a single finite verb form in Russian. In languages where *se/się* remained a separate particle and where the dative has another meaning the circumstances are obviously different. The personal parallel to the construction, viz. *Ta kniha se čte hezky* or *Ta kniha se mi čte hezky* is alien to Russian as well. See further 3.4.

Of course, if an adverb can be understood both as qualitative-quantitative and as referring to an attitude the sentence has both readings mentioned so far: *V té továrně se dobře pracuje* (Мразек 1970, 171) means either (Люди) там хорошо работают or Людям там хорошо работать.

Finally, the South Slavic “volitional” type, e. g. Bulgarian *Пие му се* (Норман 1972, 67 ff.), Serbocroatian *Снава ми се* (Ивић 1961–1962, 147), is absent in Russian as well. It is usually translated as *Ему хочется пить*,

Мне хочется спать, as it is in West Slavic (e. g. Holvoet 1991, 154–155 for Polish, cf. 3.3 below). With a subject, viz. *Пие му се вода* (Норман 1972, 77), *Једу му се трешиње* (Ивић 1961–1962, 147), the same holds true, of course: **Ему пьется вода* is wrong because the water here enforces itself upon him; but an enforced “wish” is not a wish encodable in a single finite verb form; it must be lexicalized. Furthermore, the fact that the dative referent would be active during the subsequent phases of the drinking act excludes the use of a “dative plus finite verb form” even without enforced “wishes”. See further 2.2 and 3.3.

In short, the fact that in Russian the reflexive element has become an affix of the verb has the consequence that so-called syntactic functions, as opposed to so-called morpho-syntactic functions of *se/się* (terminology varies in the literature) do not occur in Russian (borderlines are discussed in section 3 below). The syntactic uses are more recent, according to Sjatkovskij (Сятковский 1963, 281, 292–293).

It is interesting to look into the confusion that can arise around this at first sight simple issue. Before we do so in section 3, let me recapitulate what related impersonal (2.2) and personal (2.3) reflexive types of sentence do occur in (standard) Russian. They show that the affix character of Russian *-ся/-сь* also has a positive side: it introduces the possibility of layered reference with overarched agency (activity).

2.2 Discussing the boundaries of the applicability of impersonal reflexive verbs, Gerritsen (1990, 160–201) distinguishes between “a feeling that V (the act expressed by the verb, C. K.) is present”, “a feeling that V has to be performed”, and “a feeling that V is performed in a positive or negative way”. The differentiation reflects the lexical meanings of the verbs used in the impersonal reflexive form. Only in the last mentioned case does the referent of the dative have an active role; in such cases Russian adds an additional layer of reference.

First, *(Мне) нездоровится* represents a few verbs expressing a feeling of sickness or emotional discomfort: apart from *нездоровится* we have *(Мне) недужится*, *(Мне) неможется*, *(Мне) взгрустнулось*, and occasional neologism like Evtušenko’s [*Живется гладко вам?*] *Вам не волнуется?* (Gerritsen 1990, 166). The fact that an experience (“feeling”) is referred to rather than an objective state of sickness appears from the following comparison:

Я чувствую себя хорошо, хотя я нездоров.

**Я чувствую себя хорошо, хотя мне нездоровится*
(Gerritsen 1990, 164).

The type is not productive: the experience of sickness or discomfort imposes itself upon the person, but it is the person who experiences discomfort, which is a role active enough to be associated with a subject in the nominative case, if we choose

a finite verb form (retention of the dative is combined with the use of a so-called predicative). As we saw in the introduction, Wierzbicka sees the use of active emotion verbs as a reflection of Russian Emotionality (Wierzbicka 1992, 398–403); in reality, the finite verb idea “the event is part of a life” has a much broader application than emotions alone (see also 3.2).

Next, the possibility of Russian *Мне рыгается* as a translation of Mrázek’s (Мразек 1970, 172) Czech type *Říhá se mi* shows that the initiation of an act can force itself upon the performer (Gerritsen’s “a feeling that V has to be performed”) and still be encoded in the same finite verb form as the performance during which the referent of the dative is active. But, in contrast to what Mrázek (ibid.) suggests, this “reflex act” type cannot be lumped together with the productive Russian type *Ему прекрасно работалось*; instead, the type is obsolete (Gerritsen 1990, 168–169), and only fossilized in expressions (Ожегов, Шведова 1992 give *Ему, наверное, сейчас икается* – “о том, кого вспоминают или заочно бранят, шутл.”). Elsewhere, the active role of the performer leads to personal sentences (*Он рыгает, икает*). So, even this type of two-directedness (the dative referent passive and active in subsequent phases) is against the semantic system of modern Russian. In contrast to the productive type to be discussed below the sentence contains no adverb of manner or negation as a defining feature. A classification that groups together the reflex type and some cases with a negation (e. g. *Мальчику не сиделось на месте*), instead of classifying the latter under the productive type that can have an adverb instead of a negation (*Сегодня мне хорошо/не спалось*) does not draw the correct borderline between obsolete and productive formations (e. g. Фичи Джусты 1993, 78–79; cf. Veyrenc 1978; 1980, 304–305 and 3.4 below).

Apart from obsolete cases and the productive type to be discussed below, “normal” modern Russian examples have a dative referent that is only passive (experiencer), as when images automatically appear in the mind (*О ком ей снилось*). These sentences mostly have an infinitive or dependent clause as subject, i. e. they are not really impersonal, e. g. *Мне помнится, что ...* etc. Alternatively, the dative referent does not really act but only has a tendency to do so (*Мне дремлет, зеваюсь*). But a conflict of directions in subsequent phases of an act, to the effect that the dative referent, apart from being a passive experiencer, is also active in some phase of the act, is excluded in the semantic system of modern Russian.

The type which is productive in Russian, viz. “a feeling that V is performed in a positive or negative way” (Gerritsen 1990, 173–190), does have an active dative referent, however, e. g. *Ему там прекрасно работалось*. In contrast to what is the case in reflex acts, the referent of the dative here does not lose its ability to decide whether or not to perform, nor does it lose its ability to perform. In such cases we are not dealing with differently directed phases of a

single act, but with two layers of reference: the sentence does not say whether or not performance is there, but that the referent of the dative experiences, simultaneously with his (potential) performance, the quality of that (potential) performance. The experienced quality need not affect the real quality of the performance: *Ему не работалось, а он все же работал не так уж плохо; Ему там прекрасно работалось, а работа получилась плохой* (Gerritsen 1990, 175, citing Veyrenc 1980), or *Ему сегодня почему-то не работается, но все-таки ему придется заставить себя работать; Ему сегодня почему-то не работается, но все-таки он сидит и работает* (Фичи Джусти 1993, 77).

Since it is, in Gerritsen's formulation, a feeling about how an act is performed that is expressed in this type of sentence, an adverb of manner or a negation is in principle present in the sentence. The adverb does not pertain to the way in which the (potential) act is performed but to the way in which the performance is experienced:

Он крепко спит.

**Ему крепко спится* (Фичи Джусти 1993, 77).

However, an adverbial component can also be implied; in that case the interpretation is "хорошо". The dative component, too, can be absent; if it is absent there is contextually understandable ellipsis or reference to "somebody like you and me" (Gerritsen 1990, 191–200). For example: *Я буду писать, пока мне пишется* (i. e. *хорошо*); *Чувствовался май, милый май! Дышалось* (i. e. *мне/нам*) *глубоко*; *Особенно продуктивно работается* (i. e. *мне, людям*) *с утра* (Gerritsen 1990, 191, 198, 199). The interpretation is not hindered by the absence of an adverb and/or a dative: it is the type of act denoted by the verb (the lexical meaning of the verb) that determines the interpretation (Gerritsen 1990, 195–196, 302–303). This may give rise to confusion among investigators who are unfamiliar with the Russian layered reference type (see section 3).

It is the simultaneity of the experience of how the act is performed and the (potential) performance itself which turns the experience into an overarching layer of reference rather than into a phase of the (potential) act itself, and that is why in Russian it can be encoded in a single impersonal finite verb form despite the different directions in the two layers: the active referent of the overarched act is in the dative because he/she has a passive (experiencer) role in the overarching event: agentivity (activity) is not abstracted from but overarched. Other Russian sentences with *-ся* forms obey the same semantic rule (see 2.3 and 3.2). The meaning of otherwise formally identical sentences in Slavic languages where *se/si* remained a separate element is different (see 3.4).

As has been mentioned in the literature, the verbs *думаться* and *вериться* can be construed both with an inactive and with an active dative referent:

Мне думалось о счастье и любви (only inactive, no overarching layer).

Анна Павловна любила ездить, потому что дорогой так хорошо думается (also active and hence with an additional layer) (e. g. Фичи Джусты 1993, 80–81; Guiraud-Weber 1984, 197–198 citing an example from Mamin-Sibirjak).

In combination with an infinitive or a dependent clause (e. g. *Ему мечталось учиться и писать*) the sentence is no longer impersonal. The infinitive act or the act mentioned in the dependent clause can, of course, be agentive if it is realized at some time (Gerritsen 1990, 140–151).

Note that the productive Russian type, because of the layer above the (potential) act, lacks a subject and an object: **Сегодня мне легко читается эту книгу/эта книга* cf. *Сегодня мне хочется читать эту книгу* (e. g. Фичи Джусты 1993, 78); this point may also lead to confusion (see 3.4).

Because of the aspectual character of the overarching layer, imperfective aspect is used; the only perfective examples have delimitative *по-*: *Сегодня на семинаре нам хорошо пофилософствовались* (Gerritsen 1990, 175, 181; Булыгина 1982, 79), *А вы могли попросить у товарища Сталина...? – Как-то не попросилось, – сказал Гусаров* (Veyrenc 1980, 308–309, К. Simonov).

Opinions on other restrictions vary. Of course, we are talking about acts that in principle are wished or not wished and, correspondingly, initiated or not initiated, by the performer. Otherwise, we would not have the overarching level: the verbs occurring in the productive type have what Bulygina (Булыгина 1982, 78) calls a “волевое начало”. It is also, of course, an act which can be experienced as proceeding well or badly (Gerritsen 1990, 178). For the same reason, if the dative has an inanimate referent that referent is personified: *Парижанки березы спрашивают, как шумится каштанам в Москве* (Gerritsen 1990, 178; Pariser 1982; Evtušenko; cf. Булыгина 1982, 78–80). As is well known, the type cannot be formed from reflexiva tantum (**Ему не боится*). Veyrenc (1980, 308) excludes what he calls “open” transitive processes (e. g. *нести, звать, уважать, аттестовать*), and, following Janko-Trinickaja (Янко-Триницкая 1962, 213–214), derived imperfectives such as *прочитывать, напевать, выпивать, съедать*, as well as verbs whose *-ся* form has another application (e. g. *готовиться, кусаться, стучаться*). The exclusion of transitive processes and the derived imperfectives mentioned shows that verbs that cannot be used intransitively (without an object) resist the overarching layer (because that layer excludes an object).

Fiči Džusti (Фичи Джусту 1993) has another opinion. In her analysis it is low transitivity types of meaning that occur in the construction (1993, 78). This is a consequence of the fact that she classifies cases with a negation, like *Ему не сиделось на месте*, with reflex acts. As I mentioned earlier, in my view this classification places the borderline between productive and unproductive formations in the wrong place (see further 3.4). Further Fiči Džusti mentions “предрасположенность и способность к действию” as meanings occurring in the type. It seems to me that these terms formulate the effect of the overarching layer rather than the meaning of the verbs occurring in the type. Of course, the overarching layer can only be recognized if cases with a negation are classified with cases where an adverb is used. Gerritsen’s (1990) proposal to do so indicates, in my view, that cases with a negation refer to a zero-amount of positive feeling about the (potential) act, and not, for example, to the absence of a feeling or to the absence of an act. Thus, Wierzbicka’s (1992, 424–426) explication of the meaning of *Не спится ей в постеле новой* (Пушкин) contains the phrase “I feel I can’t do it”; at least for modern Russian this should be, in my view, “I feel I can’t do it well”. The point is important for comparisons with other Slavic languages as well (see 3.4).

By the way we can note that the simultaneousness of the layers in the *Мне прекрасно работалось* type recurs in a restriction on reciprocal reflexive verbs (*целоваться, прощаться, здороваться* etc.): in that case referents must simultaneously be agent and patient; otherwise *друг друга* must be used (e. g. *проводить друг друга*). Other Slavic languages have a much wider application of reflexive verbs than the ca. 15 verbs recognized in this reciprocal meaning in modern Russian by Nedjalkov (Недялков 1991, 280).

In short, Gerritsen’s (1990) analysis summarized here disagrees with the idea that in the productive Russian formation an agent is coded as an experiencer; rather, the referent concerned has both roles simultaneously (cf. 3.4 below).

2.3 In sentences with a nominative subject the same semantic principle applies. First, the possibility of *Мне вспомнилась Москва* as a translation of Mrázek’s (Мразек 1970, 174) Czech type *Vybavila se mi Moskva* illustrates that images can arise in the mind without active participation of the referent of the dative (just as in the corresponding impersonal type). There is of course no overarching level in this case, because the dative referent is only inactive; compare, for example, the incorrect **Нам обсуждалось, когда лучшие уезжать*. Since there is no overarching layer, the type also occurs in the perfective aspect: *Мне вспомнилось это слово*, and, from an older source *Публике мамзель Бургоэн очень полюбилась, но царь и двор не обратили на нее особенного внимания* (Фичи Джусту 1993, 80–81, Vigel’). So Mrázek’s (Мразек 1970, 174–176) Czech type *Vybavila se mi Moskva* does exist in

Russian but is restricted to verb meanings combinable with a dative referent that is only inactive.

Turning to the personal layered type now, a sentence like *Книга хорошо читается* is a so-called potential passive. It cannot contain a dative or a locational adverb, and it does not involve a “feeling” component (Gerritsen 1990, 198); this point is problematic for speakers of Slavic languages where a dative can be present in such sentences (see 3.4). Instead, Russian “passive” reflexive verbs can be combined with an agent specification in the instrumental case (*Такие книги читаются многими*), which is different from non-East Slavic languages where *se* plus verb has a passive reading (see 3.3 below). The “passive” reflexive verbs again illustrate the Russian type of layered reference: the referent referred to by the instrumental case may wish, decide to perform, initiate, and completely perform individual acts of the type specified by the verb, i. e. be an agent, but this agentivity must be overarched, in this case by a larger temporal whole; an actual present interpretation of a present tense is consequently impossible (see Gerritsen 1988). Note that the use of the instrumental case instead of the earlier *от* plus genitive for agents in the reflexive passive (e. g. Боровский (ред.) 1968, 260) at first sight seems to be an exception to the general trend towards expansion of analytic features in Russian. It is explained by the rise of the layered type of reference: the layering makes it possible that agents not expressed in the nominative case have participant status (are contained in the valency of the verb) also in sentences other than with an *-и/-м* participle.

The aspect restriction (imperfective) that accompanies overarched agentivity (Gerritsen 1988) has recently been questioned by Percov (Перцов 2003). Percov indeed gives a type of example where overarched agentivity is compatible with perfective aspect (at least for some Russians, according to Percov). This pertains to examples of the type *Книга довольно быстро раскупилась публикой*: the overarching level is present as a consequence of the meaning of *рас-* plus *-ся* (the overarched acts, in contrast, are occurrences of *купить*) and of the collective *публика* (a referent consisting of individual agents but not itself a single agent). If there is a single agent the necessity to overarch individual agentive acts if the agent is specified in the instrumental case (a point missed by Percov) leads to the use of imperfective aspect: the meaning of *-ся* requires that the sentence retains an active hierarchy (see Gerritsen 1988; cf. Keijsper 2003, 180–188).

If a perfective aspect is needed, the referent concerned can only be mentioned in a prepositional phrase, e. g. *Русская наука обогатилась благодаря Ломоносову (*Ломоносовым)* (Чагина 1990, 136–139). In that case, as in *У меня потерялась ручка* (see 3.2), there is no layered reference because the prepositional phrase does not fill a valence of the verb (the reflexive verb in these examples is a so-called detransitive case, with one valence less than

the corresponding Nominative–Accusative sentences *Ломоносов обогатил русскую науку* and *Я потерял ручку*). As is well known, “Уже во второй половине 16 века страдательные глаголы совершенного вида имели сугубо книжный характер, воспроизводились в письменности по традиции и были непродуктивными, точнее отмирающими” (Parolková 1956, 94–95; Никифоров 1952).

In my view, Percov’s (Перцов 2003) nondifferentiation between reflexive “passives” with and without agent specification, and his proposal to even bring detransitive cases like *Песнь сама собой слагается в уме* (2003, 54) (without the crucial “agentive” valence even in the verb and hence without layered reference) under the broad heading “passive” (where he also places reflexive verbs of the “mental image” type accompanied by a dative) obscures rather than clarifies the issue of overarched agentivity that is so crucial in the Russian semantic system. The interpretational possibilities of sentences with a short form of an *-и/-т* participle, also discussed by Percov in the same context of broad passivity, is quite another issue, because they encode a passive hierarchy (see Keijsper 2003, 170–180). A case that illustrates the crucial difference between active and passive hierarchies without involving agents is discussed in Keijsper (2003, 181–184).

2.4 Yet another type of sentence with layered reference is *Корова бодается, Крапива жжется* etc. Here, too, only imperfective aspect is possible, and actual present interpretation is excluded. The overarching level excludes an object, although in every single occurrence of an act there is an affected referent (cf. 3.2).

Finally, aspectual differences between Slavic languages come to mind that also illustrate the importance of an overarching level of reference in Russian, and of the separate phases of a single act (see e. g. Петрухина 2000).

2.5 The rule that agents (actors, active referents) cannot be abstracted from by impersonalizing finite verb forms is an example of the importance attached in Russian to the difference between agentivity (activity) and non-agentivity (inactivity, passivity). As we saw, the language does have the possibility not to encode an agent (actor) as a nominative subject (apart from using a *-и/-т* participle, of course, with the possibility of expressing the agent in the instrumental case, and apart from not mentioning the agent when a *-ся* “passive” is used): either the referent concerned retains participant status and a second layer of reference is added (overarched agency/activity), or a verb’s valency is reduced to the effect that it contains no agent (actor) valence; the referent concerned can in that case be mentioned in a prepositional phrase. Overarched agentivity (activity) in general excludes perfective aspect and objects (and subjects, in the impersonal type). Detransitive verbs, i. e. without agent (actor) valence, can freely have both aspects.

3. COMMON SLAVIC CONFUSIONS

3.0 The so-called syntactic uses of *se/się* in Slavic languages where the reflexive element remained a separate particle tend to influence the way in which speakers of such languages discuss Russian: except for the separateness of *se/się*, the form of the sentences concerned in other Slavic languages sometimes resembles Russian. But semantically they do not conform to the principle discussed in section 2 above. Non-East Slavic languages use the reflexive element to abstract from agents and do not seem to have the typically Russian (East Slavic) type of layered reference. This section surveys the cases of confusion that can arise if such languages make contact with Russian.

3.1 Mrázek's Czech type *Šlo se (rychle)* has parallels in other Slavic languages, of course. Examples: Bulgarian: *Нали днеска е свети Григория – не се преде, не се шие* (T. Vlajkov), translated into Russian as *Сегодня ведь Григорьев день – не прядут, не шьют, На другая ден трябваше да се пере* (T. Vlajkov) translated into Russian as *На следующий день нужно было стирать* (Норман 1972, 64–65), *И днес няма да се пожъне, На изостаналите ученици трябва да се помогне* (Walter 1963, 797); Serbocroatian: *Srijedom se ide na sajam, U pustinji se jaše na devama* (Katičić 1991, 145), *Прича се, Иде се узбрдо* (Ивић 1961–1962, 146); Polish: *Nie mówi się takich rzeczy* (Holvoet 1991, 145), *Nie zawsze jest się usposobionym do żartów, Poszłoby się do kina, a tu deszcz pada i pada* (Wiese 1973, 630). (Bogusławski (1977, 119–121) seems to recognize still another type here, which seems superfluous to me); and a second source for Czech: *Napřed se mlátí, potom se platí; jde se tam dvě hodiny*; also perfective (in contrast to the dative plus adverb type of 3.4: *(do)šlo se tam pěšky* (Parolková 1967, 42, 35).

As is well known, when *se/się* of this type is combined with a transitively used verb, either a personal finite verb form plus nominative subject results (passive, e. g. *Ta kniha se čte (rychle)* (Мразек 1970, 173)), or an impersonal finite verb form plus accusative object (e. g. *Wodę czerpało się drewnianymi konwiami* (Brajerski 1979, 72); *się* is sometimes called subject), depending on the language (see further 3.2). Differences between Slavic languages which have the type are related to whether or not *se/się* is used in a passive reading and whether or not other related constructions are in use, for example, the Polish *Mówiono się* type (see e. g. Сятковский 1963; Puzynina 1993; Wiese 1973).

Since the type has a finite verb form and the situation referred to contains agents/actors, it is against the semantic system of Russian explained in section 2. Third person plural verb forms with zero, as in *He прядут, He шьют*, retain the segmental nexus relation and hence the reference to (anonymous) agents, which is correct. The same holds true for second person verb forms with zero subject.

Nevertheless, in the literature the following sentences are cited as Russian parallels of the type *Šlo se (rychle)*:

Много слышится, да мало сказывается (Dorosz 1975, cited from Siewierska 1988, 265).

Как аукнется, так и откликнется (Parolková 1967, 42).

Перемелется, мука будет (Parolková 1967, 42).

Dorosz, according to Siewierska, correctly mentions that Russian sentences of this type “occur only in a restricted range of circumstances, mainly in proverbs, with dependent infinitives and in parentheticals” (Siewierska 1988, 265). Equally correct, Parolková (1967, 42) remarks that the type is so exceptional that Galkina-Fedoruk (Галкина-Федорук 1958, 180–182) treats the few expressions in question (*говорится, спрашивается, предлагается, что под этим подразумевается*) as separate lexems.

The few examples mentioned are not without problems. *Перемелется, мука будет* can be treated as a contraction of *Все перемелется, мука будет*, which version also occurs (cf. *Дело доходит до > Доходит до*) (Guiraud-Weber 1984, 45). Except for the aspect *Как аукнется, так и откликнется* at least resembles the regular type *Ему там прекрасно работалось* (viz. in the form *Как работается*). Apart from that, there are, I think, two issues involved.

First, the boundaries of impersonality are not uncontroversial. Galkina-Fedoruk (Галкина-Федорук 1958, 180–182) among impersonal reflexive passives distinguishes between two groups relevant here: 1. verbs expressing “процессы, производимые субъектом в творительном падеже: говорится, делается, ведется, выясняется, выявляется, сочетается и др.”, and 2. verbs expressing “волю какого-то неопределенного, но определимого лица, направленную на лицо, тоже не указанное, но которое должно быть объектом воздействия выраженной воли, например: полагается, рекомендуется, приказывается, возбраняется, воспрещается, запрещается, предписывается кем-то и кому-то”. The first group frequently occurs in proverbs and sayings, e. g. *Словами скоро говорится, да не скоро делается; Доселева бывало, жена мужа бивала, а ныне ведется, муж жены блюдется* (Даль). Except proverbs Galkina-Fedoruk’s examples have a subject, for example, a dependent clause, infinitive or *много* (these also occur in proverbs, of course): *Вот, например, у нас уж исстари ведется, что по отцу и сыну честь* (Griboedov), *Отдавать ему долги считалось как-то не принятым, даже смешным* (Kuprin), *Ему дано много, много и взыщется* (Snegirev). Dorosz’ *Много слышится, да мало сказывается* is of this type, which, then, is not impersonal but passive.

Galkina-Fedoruk's second type, viz. "со значением долженствования" are "книжного характера, главным образом из сферы общественно-делового языка и употребляется чаще всего в постановлениях, юридических актах, научно-политической речи, так как этими глаголами выражаются общепринятые и признанные положения морали, этики и права или же диктуется чья-либо воля, например: *По траве ходить воспрещается; Предлагается зарегистрироваться у дежурного*". Galkina-Fedoruk regards sentences from the second group as subjectless (impersonal): "сказуемое выражается каким-либо пассивно-страдательным глаголом с примыкающим к нему инфинитивом дополнения, например: *Воспрещается громко говорить*". I agree with Guiraud-Weber (1984, 25) that the infinitive is subject here, and the examples, then, passive. (Guiraud-Weber (1984, 21–55) also discusses other boundary cases of (im)personality.)

Apart from the two types discussed here, Galkina-Fedoruk mentions the type *Становилось темно*, with an impersonal reflexive verb as copula, and with an adverb (predicative); I will return to this type in 3.4, because an application like *Ему сделалось плохо* may explain part of the confusion around the *Ему прекрасно работалось* type.

I conclude that it must be doubted whether there are real impersonal Russian parallels of the type *Šlo se (rychle)*. If there are, a second issue applies. The type of examples cited suggests that an older language phase is fossilized in the proverbs concerned. More specifically, examples tend to be at least as old as Havránek (1928). In favour of his proposal that Czech combinations of *se* plus, e. g. *jíti*, must be kept apart from impersonal reflexive verbs (e. g. *jíti se*), in, for example, *Šlo se tam dvě hodiny, ale šlo se pěkně; Píše se mně, abych zítra odjel – píše se mně pěkně*, Havránek (1928, 18) quotes Peškovskij (Пешковский 1914, 349, 354; here cited from the 1956 edition). Peškovskij presumably gave the Russian examples *У нас в доме говорится по-французски* and *(Мне) сегодня говорится*: only the latter has the sense "я в говорливом настроении" (i. e. the regular *Ему там прекрасно работалось* type). The same examples are cited again from Havránek in a much later discussion about Havránek's classification (Křížková (1962, 319), see also e. g. Parolková 1967). Probably because of the old examples, Křížková (ibid.) sees no difference between Peškovskij's distinction and Czech *Dnes se tančí venku* vs. *Dobře se mi tančí* or Czech *U nich se jen zpívá* vs. Russian *Мне поется*. Parolková (1967, 42) knows that the type *Как аукнется, так и откликнется*, of which Peškovskij's *У нас в доме говорится по-французски* presumably is an example, is rare, so she disagrees with Křížková about the classificatory issue in the discussion (see also 3.4). Note that neither *Мне сегодня говорится* nor *Мне поется* contains an adverb or a negation. I will return to that point below.

Now, Peškovskij did not actually give *Мне сегодня говорится* as an example (it is, at least at present, strange without a negation or an adverb) but as a paraphrase, viz. in his sentence “Мы имеем в виду такие глаголы как *говорится* (не в смысле “мне говорится”, т. е. я в говорливом настроении), *считается, делается, случается* [...]” The presumably opposing example *У нас в доме говорится по-французски*, which Peškovskij does give as an expression (выражение), seems strange to me (it has perhaps the reading “In our home one ought to speak French”); it suggests that an older language situation was not yet extinct in Peškovskij’s time. The example is unique: all other examples given by Peškovskij (Пешковский 1956, 348–357), including those on page 354 to which Havránek also specifically refers, are different: they contain a subject, fall within the borderlines discussed in section 2 (e. g. *Это ему так только представляется* – “mental image type”), are “normal” reflexive passives (e. g. *Недаром говорится пословица*), are passives with a subordinate clause as subject (e. g. *Недаром говорится, что дело мастера боится*), are of the type *Нам весело идти* with, incidentally, a reflexive infinitive (e. g. *Теперь уж мне влюбиться трудно* on the notorious page 354), are of the type *(Мне) сделалось грустно* (also on page 354; see 3.4), or do not pertain to our issue at all (belong to other types of impersonal sentences).

The suggestion that an older language phase is involved we owe to Guiraud-Weber (1984, 358; Гиро-Вебер 2001, 71), who found some XIX century examples of impersonal passives that were considered outdated or not in conformance with the modern norm by her native speakers, e. g. *О городах же говорить нечего. С самого начала польской истории в них говорилось по-немецки [...]* (Bakunin), *За военными действиями следилось жадно, и распускались самые выгодные для нашей армии слухи* (L. Tolstoj), *Значит, сзади было стреляно, свои стреляли* (Leonov). Gerritsen (1990, 200) adduces an example from Pasternak, which Janko-Trinickaja (Янко-Триницкая 1962, 217) interprets as a regular *Ему прекрасно работалось* type, but which may be a (questionable) example of impersonal reflexive passive: *Но все чаще и чаще игралось и вздорилось, нилось и елось в совершенно пустых, торжественно безлюдных комнатах*. At any rate, a present-day allusion to a proverb, as in the following example, seems to belong to the regular *Ему прекрасно работалось* type, despite the perfective (?) aspect:

Разом наклюнулись два славных юбилея – пятнадцать лет горбачевскому закону о кооперации и десять лет отставке гайдаровского правительства. И ужасно захотелось понять, отчего мы тужились-тужились, а так и не стали страной миллионов мелких частных собственников. И хорошо это или

плохо, что не стали. И во что это теперь выльется. И как дальше нам аукнется. И что мы такое вообще построили. Я не о том, каким словом с окончанием “изм” такую конструкцию можно обозвать. Лейбл навести – дело десятое. (B. Gordon in Огонек 49, 2002, 14)

Proverbs themselves can also be of this regular type, of course, e. g. *Хромому не прыгается* (Заичкова 1972, 17).

I conclude that the data cited by speakers of other Slavic languages who see Russian parallels to the type *šlo se (rychle)* are invalid, outdated, or fossilized. Guiraud-Weber (1984, 359) already concluded, in application to the Russian linguistic literature, “Mais, comme le vieillissement de ce modèle est, somme toute, très récent, la littérature linguistique reflète un certain embarras dans l’interprétation des faits”. The same holds true, we can add, for the linguistic literature produced by speakers of other Slavic languages.

A part of the impression that Russian has the type *šlo se (rychle)* is probably caused by the fact that, as we saw in 2.2, in the type *Ему там прекрасно работалось* the dative and/or adverb can be absent. In Russian this does not hinder interpretation, because it is the type of act referred to that determines the interpretation. The possibility of omitting the dative and/or adverb is an example of a more general phenomenon that falls outside the present discussion (cf. presence vs. absence of subject pronoun, of *свой* etc.). But speakers of Slavic languages without the Russian layered type of reference in this case do not see the difference between the type *Ему там прекрасно работалось* without dative and/or adverb and the “reflex act” type *Мне рыгается*, or the *šlo se (rychle)* type. Mrázek (Мразек 1970, 172–173) observes that omission of the dative (*Потом встал, не ложится; И верится, и плачется, и так легко, легко.* Lermontov) is more common in Russian than in Czech, where it is extremely rare (*Tak co, nechce se*). Křížková’s (1962) treatment of *Мне сегодня говорится* and *Мне поется* (without adverb or negation) is illustrative of the near-Russian Slavists’ Russian that figures in the literature. See further 3.4 below.

It remains to be explained, in my view, why the type *Об этом сообщалось в газетах/по радио* became or remained productive in the XXth century (Guiraud-Weber 1984, 350–360; Гиро-Вебер 2001, 70–72). After the disappearance, in the XIXth century, of *В доме о ней не было упоминаемо*, and after the decline and subsequent lexical restrictions on the type *В доме о ней не было упомянуто* (in the literary language, where the possessive perfect type *У меня убрано* was not liked) (Гиро-Вебер 2001, 71), one could have had exclusive recourse to *В доме о ней не упоминали*. But *В доме о ней не упоминалось* also remained, which at first sight runs counter to the disappearance

of an impersonal reflexive passive with implied actors but without layered reference. The sentences concerned “сообщают о наличии некоей информации, касающейся денотата синтагмы «о + предложный»” (Гиро-Вебер 2001, 70). I think that the solution is that the “transformation passive impersonnelle” is not *В газетах сообщали об этом* > *Об этом сообщалось в газетах* (Guiraud-Weber 1984, 356): why should one go against the general trend in this case? Rather, the necessary absence of an instrumental case (agent specification) (ibid.) suggests that the type is an application of the productive impersonalization device of using a prepositional phrase referring to a location instead of a nominative subject. Thus: *Об этом сообщали газеты* > *Об этом сообщалось в газетах*, just as *У меня закружилась голова* > *У меня закружилось в голове*.

According to Borčenko (Борченко 1977, 104, 109) the “синтаксический стандарт” of the type *Указывается, что ...*, (*где*) *говорится про ...*, *В заявлении отмечается, что ...*, which the author calls “комментабельные обороты”, is the most frequent type of “односоставная элементарная единица” in Russian, Ukrainian, and Bulgarian newspapers (at the time, viz. 1977), in contrast to Polish newspapers, where the impersonal type *-no/-to* (e. g. *Podano do wiadomości, że ...*) takes the first place, but these are mostly not “комментабельные”. Polish is characterized by the expression *doszło do ...*. As a typological peculiarity of Czech and Slovak newspapers Borčenko mentions the use of the third person singular or plural past tense: *konstatovaly, že ...*; *uvedl, že ...*; *uvedol, že ...*; *zdôraznil, že ...* (Борченко 1977, 110). The type *se praví, že ...*, parallel to Russian *говорится, что ...*, also occurs, of course, as it does in Serbian and Croatian newspapers (Борченко 1977, 110–111). As we saw, for Russian it is essential to keep this sentence type apart from the *Šlo se (rychle)* type. Borčenko gives comparable information about newspapers (ca. 1970) in West European languages. Interestingly, among the flective languages investigated Russian newspapers had the lowest “категориальная мера односоставности”, which Borčenko ascribes to the weaker flexion (“это связано с большей слабостью флексии”) as compared to other languages with flexion (Борченко 1977, 109); the point is not entirely clear to me.

We may conclude that in Russian the use of impersonal reflexive verbs so as to abstract from agents/actors, if it (still) exists, is marginal.

3.2 Even without turning to the dative impersonal type (3.4), the absence of the Russian type of layered reference in languages where *se/się* remained a separate particle already appears from the fact that in those of these languages where *se/się* plus verb forms have a passive interpretation, expression of an agent, if possible at all, requires a preposition. (But Mrázek (1979, 11) does not entirely exclude an instrumental case in Slovak, viz. *Zošity sa kontrolujú učiteľ'om*.)

Although, then, Czech *Zboží se vyrábí*, for example, may be translated into Russian as *Товар производится* (Parolková 1956, 204), it has quite another status: it is nowadays basically the personal version of the *Šlo se (rychle)* type, and hence always without an agent (not to be confused with an instrument, e. g. *Pole se orá traktorem* (Parolková 1967, 43; cf. Siewierska 1988, 251–254). Therefore, the Czech type is not restricted to the imperfective aspect usually accompanying the Russian overarched agency type of reflexive passive (see 2.3): ... *vzhledem k častým vyjžd'kám do společnosti se letos utratilo mimořádně mnoho a vznikl deficit* is a translation of *Нынешний год вследствие частых выездов было прожито больше, и был дефицит* (L. Tolstoj, *Anna Karenina*) (Parolková 1956, 94). If a specific agent is meant, even if it is not mentioned, Czech prefers not to use the reflexive passive at all: ... *lístek od bratra, v němž mu (Vronskému) oznamoval, že si s ním musí pohovořit* is a translation of ... *записка от брата, в которой говорилось [братом], что нужно переговорить* ... (L. Tolstoj, *Anna Karenina*). In old Czech, just as in old Russian, agent expression by means of *od* plus genitive was possible (Parolková 1956, 106), as it was in old Croatian, and still is in Bulgarian (*om*) and spoken Croatian (J. Kalsbeek, personal communication). The expansion of the instrumental case that took place in Russian, viz. used not only for instruments but also for agents with participant status (contained in the valency of the verb), is evidently restricted to the layered reference type.

Not surprisingly, the Czech reflexive (personal) “passive” is reported to be less “passive” than the alternative forms of the *-n/-t* participle (Parolková 1956, 103) (also possible in the imperfective aspect) so that a Russian reflexive passive verb is often translated by means of an *-n/-t* participle: *Французский обычай – родителя, решать судьбу детей – был не принят, осуждался* ... *Русский обычай сватовства считался чем-то безобразным* (L. Tolstoj, *Anna Karenina*) becomes *Způsob francouzsky, že totiž rodiče rozhodují o osudu dětí, přijat nebyl, byl zavrhován* ... *Ruský způsob starosvatů byl pokládán za cosi ohavného* (Parolková 1956, 104).

If, instead of a nominative subject or infinitive, a dependent clause fills the subject valence (Мразек 1970, 173) the resulting sentence is sometimes called impersonal, which may lead to the confusion discussed in 3.1 above.

An alternative to the addition of a nominative subject is, as is well known, the retention of an impersonal verb also in transitive cases, viz. with an accusative object, for example, Polish *Czyta się książkę* (Wiese 1973, 625); but *się* is sometimes called subject here. For Croatian, Katičić (1991, 146) now gives both *Zida se kuća* and *Zida se kuću*. The latter was earlier rejected in normative grammar but occurs in many dialects (independently of Polish) (see Tilburg (1986); cf. e. g. Růžicka (1986, 261–262, 265).

Interestingly, Holvoet (1991, 148–149) sees a relationship between the nominative/accusative differentiation and the Polish type *Sięgnęła po serwetkę, ale wyciągnęły się dwie*, in Holvoet's translation 'She reached out for a napkin, but pulled out two', or (the same type with a dative) ... *znałam przed laty pisarza, któremu na wstępie kariery pisarskiej napisała się książka heroiczna* (W. Gombrowicz) 'many years ago I knew a writer who, at the very start of his literary career, happened to write a heroic book'. (Holvoet insists that the type be kept apart from the type *Bielizna się dobrze uprała*, where a dative would be possessive: *Koszula mi się dobrze uprała* = *Moja koszula mi się dobrze uprała*. This distinction seems to be simply that between an effected and an affected subject. I take them together here.)

Holvoet suggests that Czech and Russian do not have this type of sentence because they retained the passive reading of the reflexive verb (1991, 150–153). But Czech linguists have no problem with the type discussed by Holvoet. For example, as an extension of *Vybavila se me Moskva*, which falls within the boundaries of the Russian possibilities (see 2.3), Mrázek (Мразек 1970, 175) mentions the (mostly) perfective type *Ztratilo se mi pero*, where the dative expresses a possessive relationship. Parolková (1967, 43) cites examples from spoken Czech (*Rozbilo se mi kolo*, *Utrhlo se mi poutko* etc.) and says that in Russian the type is less common. In fact, in Russian it is even impossible: even losing a pen is in Russian an event that is part of somebody's life and hence requires a finite verb with a nominative subject. Alternatively, if the inactive status of the person concerned is to be retained, the closest Russian parallel does not have a dative but a prepositional phrase, which ensures that the referent concerned does not have participant status (is not contained in the valency of the verb): *У меня потерялась ручка*. In that case there can be no conflict of directions: the latter can pertain only to information encoded in the finite verb form (as indicated by accompanying case forms without prepositions). Likewise, Gerritsen (1990, 304) cites Pariser (1982, 154), who gives examples like *Статья ему пишется* (with the dative referent as the presumed writer); they should be *Статья у него пишется* (or rather *У него пишется статья*). This type of sentence also allows perfective aspect, because there is no overarching layer of reference: ... *Я очень рад за тебя, что тебе пишется и с большим интересом жду того, что у тебя напишется* (*что тебе напишется) (Gerritsen 1990, 180, A. Tvardovskij).

The use of *y* plus genitive where other Slavic languages have a dative is, of course, a more general phenomenon. It has consequences for the meaning of the Russian dative (which led to Czech studies like, e. g. Mrázek, Brym 1962 and Заичкова 1972), and, more generally, reflects a difference in possibilities and impossibilities of using prepositionless case forms for referents without participant status.

So the reported Polish meaning of *Sięgnęła po serwetkę, ale wyciągnęła się dwie*, viz. 'the subject, doing A in order to produce a certain state B, actually produces a certain state C' (Holvoet 1991, 150) in itself is no problem in Russian. But the reflexive verb possible in Russian in this case (only without a dative) has a detransitive interpretation (it has one valence less than the corresponding verb without *-ся*, and has no overarching level). That use is restricted, of course, to verbs that are transitive without *-ся*. So there is no Russian reflexive parallel to the Polish intransitive application (the dative can, of course, be transformed into a nominative subject): [...] *przysunęłam krzesło do stolika i usiadłam na nim, jakoś niewygodnie mi się usiadło, znajome wygodne krzesło [...] twardniało podę mną z sekundy na sekundę* (I. Iredyński) 'I drew the chair nearer to the table and sat down on it; I somehow sat down in an uncomfortable way [...] the familiar chair seemed to get harder and harder under me every second' (Holvoet 1991, 149–150). The absence or presence of an adverb plays no role (the sentence type differs from that discussed in 3.4 below): *Dziadkowi zasnęło się przed telewizorem* 'Grandfather fell asleep in front of the television set' (Holvoet 1991, 150).

It seems to me that the suggested relation with passive reflexive verbs does not exist. The only relevant point seems to be that the meaning of e. g. *Naszej mamie zasnęło się przy telewizorze*, viz. 'Nasza mama zasnęła przy oglądaniu telewizji niechący i bezwiednie' (Brajerski 1979, 73) is in Russian insufficient reason to use an impersonal reflexive verb plus dative: it is mother who fell asleep and who sleeps (slept), an activity not directed towards mother but her activity (part of her life). So we see again that even performance of a non-agentive act is the actor's "responsibility", although one probably would not use such terminology outside a context of the type mentioned in the introduction. Compare: *У меня и в мыслях не было тебя попрекать. Само сказалось* (V. Rasputin). About this example Grigor'jan (Григорьян 2000, 97–98) observes "В последнем примере отрицается намерение, а возможно и контроль, но не само действие или собственное участие в действии". In my view, the latter is crucially not the case: *у меня* can perhaps be added, but not *мне* (or *мною*), which means that participation is only implied (because the act cannot have no performer), but is not contained in the verb's valency (cf. 2.1).

As I mentioned in 2.4, apart from the impersonal type *Ему там прекрасно работалось* (which gives rise to a confusion to be discussed in 3.4 below) and the personal "passive" *Такие книги читаются многими* discussed in the present section, a third example of the Russian type of layered reference is the type *Корова бодается, Крапива жжется, Комары кусаются* etc.: the cow has the property that it butts every now and then, but it has this property also when it does not butt. In every act of butting there is a referent that is butted (an object), but in the overarching layer there is none (no object is possible). Just as in the

other layered types, the overarching level in general excludes perfective aspect and actual present. Parolková (1967, 40) mentions that such Russian sentences are uncommon in Czech. She thinks that the object is omitted because it is obvious, and she does not separate them from cases with incorporated objects like *Курица несется* nor from possessive reflexives (*тратиться, строиться*). Instead, she compares them with Czech so-called reciprocal cases like *strkat se, prát se* ('толкаться, драться'), although she mentions that the Russian examples are not reciprocal. So again, the typically Russian layering is not recognized.

3.3 Before we turn to the "dative plus adverb" type, for the sake of completeness I repeat (see 2.1) the South Slavic (or Balkan: e. g. Löttsch et al. 1976 also include Albanian) volitional type *Пие му се* (Bulgarian), *Снава ми се* (the dative is obligatory: *Снава се* is an example of the type discussed in 3.1) (Serbocroatian, Ивић 1961–1962, 147). The volitional type sometimes is not kept apart from the "dative plus adverb" type that also occurs in West Slavic (to be discussed in 3.4).

According to Walter (1963, 798), Bulgarian *На Иван му се сни, На кучето му се пие, Не му се ходи*, etc. "bringen ein physisches oder psychisches Bedürfnis des durch den Dativ bezeichneten Lebewesens zum Ausdruck". Norman (Норман 1972, 77) speaks of a "независящее от воли лица (агенса) желание производить какое-либо действие". Evidently, the act that may follow the need or the non-self-initiated wish, or the fact that it follows, if it occurs, plays no role, so the issue of whether the dative referent has an active role in it does not arise. As we saw earlier, in Russian an imposed "wish" must be lexicalized (*мне хочется спать*). Evidently, then, the size of a Bulgarian event unit is smaller than a Russian one (here restricted to the uncontrolled wish), not entirely surprising for a language without infinitive (cf. 4 below). The wished acts are "конкретные и несложные функции живых существ" like *ям, пия, искам, правя, работя* etc. (Норман 1972, 77).

With a subject the same holds true, of course: Bulgarian *Пие му се вода* (Норман 1972, 77) to the mind of somebody accustomed to Russian makes the water active in forcing a wish upon the dative referent, whereas the latter is active in the phases of decision, initiation and performance; again, this idea would exclude a dative and cannot be encoded in a single verb form but must be lexicalized: *Ему хочется пить воду*. In Bulgarian this sense of conflicting directions evidently plays no role. According to Walter (1963, 797) in sentences like *Сирене му се яде/Сирене му се яде на Иван, Мястото не му се оставя/Мястото не му се оставя на Павел* "kommt der Wunsch des im Dativ enthaltenen Lebewesens zum Ausdruck, die Handlung am direkten Objekt des Kernsatzes auszuführen" (i. e. *Иван яде сирене, Павел оставя мястото*). The fact that the dative referent is active during the potential

subsequent act (is the subject of that act) evidently plays no role: they are not phases of a single act.

Now, interestingly, according to Norman (Норман 1972, 78), the type under discussion, which he calls “модальный пассив”, is relatively new. The congruence between subject and verb (e. g. *Ядам му се ябълки*) had not yet completely established itself in the middle of the XIX century, so that older examples can be found which lack congruence (e. g. *На козельт се нило вода*). Where the type appeared in Slavic there is variation between nominative and accusative. As an example of the latter Norman gives Polish *Dobrze się jadło kaszę*. Evidently, then, he does not distinguish between the South Slavic volitional type and the type (also) occurring in West Slavic because of a suggested common origin. In my view, at least the synchronous situation requires more detailed classifications.

Mrázek (Мразек 1970) (as e. g. Грепль 1967; Povejšil 1976) for Czech gives only adverbless *Ta kniha se čte* and *Ta kniha se čte rychle* (with a qualitative-quantitative adverb), but not ? *Ta kniha se mi čte* (without adverb but with a dative), i. e. the South Slavic type is absent. But then, discussing the type *Vybavila se Moskva*, Mrázek (Мразек 1970, 175) says that it had not earlier been given attention to by Czech investigators, and he regards the Serbocroatian type *Jedu mi se trešnje* as the “pure” semantic form of the model. This is also reflected in his classification, where Czech *Vybavila se Moskva* appears under the heading “отношение к действию” instead of under simply “действие” (Мразек 1970, 167). From a Russian point of view this is strange, of course: it confuses the type *Мне вспомнилась Москва*, without overarching layer (dative referent only inactive) with **Ему естся черешня*, which is impossible because the “wish” is imposed and therefore must be lexicalized, and because the dative referent is active in the eating phase.

Holvoet (1991, 154–155) explicitly denies the existence of the volitional type in Polish, viz. the type is translated by lexicalizing the imposed wish: *Chce mi się spać*, *Chce mi się pić*.

For further details of the volitional type see also, for example, Георгиев 1990 and Рожновская 1959; 1971 (to mention some literature in Russian).

3.4 Speakers of Slavic languages other than Russian and other East Slavic languages sometimes misconstrue Russian as having sentences of the type *Šlo se mi hezky* or, rather, the transitive or personal version thereof. For example, discussing the Polish type *Dobrze mi się czyta/czytalo tę książkę* ‘I find/found it pleasant to read this book’, Holvoet (1991, 150–151) says that sentences of this type are quite common in probably all Slavic languages, with nominative or accusative. His “Russian” example is *Мне эта книга хорошо читается* ‘I find this book pleasant to read’. Sjatkovskij (Сятковский 1963, 291) had

already made the mistake of identifying Russian potential passive *Книга хорошо читается* (only without a dative, possible with an instrumental case) with Polish *Książka [sic] czyta się przyjemnie*, Czech *Kniha se čte příjemně*, and Serbocroatian *Книга [књига] се чита пријатно*. Holvoet (1991, 146–147) mentions a variant of Polish “where the object acquires subject status” (i. e. *Ta książka się dobrze czyta* instead of *Tę książkę się dobrze czyta*), “but it seems to be more restricted in its occurrence and might well be a regional feature. It is not excluded that it occurs only in the variety of Polish where passive constructions of the type *Królowie chowają się na Wawelu* ‘Kings are buried on the Wawel’ are used.” “They seem to denote inherent qualities of the objects mentioned in them” (ibid.).

At any rate, Holvoet (1991, 148) himself sets out to explain the difference between Polish and Russian. The Polish type is factive: both *Pracuje mi się dobrze* and *Nie pracuje mi się dobrze* presuppose *Pracuję*. Holvoet correctly mentions that Russian *Мне сегодня не работается* is nonfactive, and he rejects Wierzbicka’s (1966a, 94) analysis implying that “the lack of symmetry between the Russian and the Polish constructions is only seeming, and that in Russian just as in Polish the group NP (Dat) + V (refl) represents a subordinate predicate functioning as the argument of an evaluating matrix predicate without a formal exponent in surface structure” (Holvoet 1991, 148). (Wierzbicka 1988, 219 calls the Polish type the construction of agent-experiencer.) Holvoet’s analysis is supported by the observation that in *Źle mi się słuchało muzyki* ‘I found it difficult to listen to the music’ the adverb does not qualify the state of the subject (i. e. the referent of the dative, but here stated in Holvoet’s terminology), as it does in *Źle mi było, gdy słuchałem muzyki* ‘I felt uncomfortable while listening to the music’. In Holvoet’s view, the adverb in the former qualifies the entire predicate *słuchało mi się* (Holvoet 1991, 147). Also, Holvoet (1991, 147–148) calls attention to Bogusławski’s (1977, 119) analysis of the thematic structure of the Polish sentences concerned: the dative and reflexive verb usually belongs to the Theme, while the adverb constitutes the Rheme. Translated into Russian this would give sentences like: *РаБОтал я хороШО, СЛУшал я с тРУДОМ* (or even *Я хороШО работал, Я с тРУДОМ слушал*). These sentences retain a personal finite verb form and adapt the linear-intonational hierarchy: the Theme interpretation of the verb is the closest approximation of factivity in linear-intonational hierarchy. As we saw, a Russian translation à la Mrázek is *Мне плохо/трудно было слушать музыку*.

Despite Holvoet’s description of the difference, the Russian layered type of reference that excludes a subject and an object, so that the “Russian” example *Мне эта книга хорошо читается* is wrong, evidently is too far removed from the Polish type to be recognized.

Many more examples could be adduced which lead to the same conclusion. For example, Mrázek (Мразек 1970, 174) translates his type *Ta kniha se čte hezky* as Людям (мне, тебе, ему, кому угодно, многим ...) эта книга хорошо читается, хорошо читать эту книгу. The former option, with a dative, is non-Russian Slavists' Russian. Also, the fact that Mrázek does not distinguish between *Říhá se mi* (Мне рыгается) and *Нам поется*, as well as his treatment of *Vybavila se Moskva* (Мне вспомнилась Москва) (Мразек 1970, 172, 174–175) show that the issue of whether the dative referent is only passive or also active plays no role for him (see also Mrázek 1971, 121). The relevance of a negation or an adverb in *Нам не поется/Нам хорошо работалось* in that case also remains unnoticed, of course, i. e. elliptic cases like *Нам поется* are taken as basic. Zajíčková's (Заичкова 1972, 18) idea that three-member "demipassive" sentences like *Мне вспомнились его слова* "по своему значению [...] ничем не отличаются от предыдущих", viz. from two-member "demipassive" sentences of the type *Мне не спится*, is comparable. (She translates the latter into Czech as *Nechce se mi spát* (Заичкова 1972, 78) and transforms the dative in the unlayered *Мне помнится этот день* into a nominative subject: *Pamatuji si na ten den* (ibid.).) Parolková (1967, 43) also mentions in one breath Russian *Мне снилась мать*, which falls within the Russian possibilities since the dative referent is only passive, and Czech *Dobře se mi tančí polka*, a type nonexistent in Russian.

Note that the existence of the *Ему прекрасно работалось* type in Russian cannot be used as support in discussions about whether only in *Jde se tam pěšky* we have a combination of *se* and verb (rather than a reflexive verb) or also in *Jde se (mi) dobře* (see 3.1): the Russian type, although sometimes formally identical (except for the affix status of *-ся*), has another meaning. More precisely, it is exactly this different meaning that pleads for a syntactic status of *se* in *Jde se (mi) dobře* (i. e. for the opinion that it is a combination of *se* and verb rather than a reflexive verb), but this point has remained unnoticed in the literature because the semantic difference has not been recognized.

The tendency to recognize too little types for an adequate analysis of the synchronous situation has two variants: either the presence vs. absence of an adverb is taken to be decisive (Mrázek 1971), or combinability with a negation is taken as the basis for distinguishing between types (Veyrenc 1978; 1980). Both lead to at least semantically inadequate groupings. Thus, Mrázek's (1971) classification on the basis of "personal vs. impersonal" and "adverb vs. no adverb" separates (Мне) (не) спится and *Мне работается* from *Как хорошо нам работалось* (and groups the former with *Říhá se mi*): elliptic Russian cases and obsolete Russian cases are taken as basic. Further, the South Slavic volitional type does not get a separate status, being grouped with *Vybavil se mu Londýn* and *Мне помнится этот день* (mental image type). The type discussed in the

present section, e. g. Czech *Ta kniha se (mi) čte dobře* (in South Slavic reported to be systematically represented only in Bulgarian, e. g. *Тази книга се чте лошо* (Mrázek 1971, 125)) is not separated from Russian reflexive verbs interpreted as “passive”, because “absence vs. presence of dative” is not considered to distinguish between types. Finally, the difference between Russian *Как хорошо нам работалось* and the intransitive counterpart of *Ta kniha se (mi) čte dobře*, viz. *Sedí se (mi) hezky* (about whose occurrence in South Slavic Mrázek (1971, 124) gives some additional information), does not come to light.

Veyrenc also (1978; 1980, 304–305) tried to sort things out and distinguished, on the basis of combinability with negation, (A) *Нам не работается*, (B) *Ему зевается*, (C) *Ей хочется и не хочется*, (D) *Она тебе помнилась или не помнилась*. He correctly observes that if in (A) we take an adverb instead of a negation, viz. (A') *Нам хорошо работалось*, the sentence still answers the question *Как вам работалось?* According to Veyrenc (ibid., citing Mrázek 1971, 122) Czech has (A') but not (A): *Spalo se mi dobře* vs. **Nespí se mi* (without an adverb, so that the issue of factivity is skipped). Moreover, the modality of the Russian type is absent in Polish and Czech (Veyrenc 1980, 305). According to Veyrenc, Serbocroatian has (A) but not (A'), and also in a positive form (ibid.): *Spava mi se*, *Radi mi se*, *Ne radi mi se*. Here Veyrenc seems to confuse the Russian *Нам не работалось* type with the South Slavic volitional type *Spava mi se* (cf. Russian *Ему хочется спать* etc.). On page 306 he indeed does not interpret the absence in Russian of the Serbocroatian type *Jedu mi se orahi* (*orasi*) (volitional with subject) as a signal that different types are involved. Veyrenc then states (1980, 308) “Il est remarquable aussi que les types (A) et (B), s'ils sont attestés ensemble en slave de l'est et en serbo-croate, ne coexistent pas nécessairement: le tchèque, le polonais, le slovène ne connaissent que le type (B)”. So if only (A') is found, as in Czech, this equals the absence of the type, according to Veyrenc: the (A) type is defined by the fact that it mostly contains a negation, and in languages with the factive type (A') groups with (B). This is indeed in accordance with Czech treatments of Russian, which apply this grouping to Russian as well (see above), missing by so doing the Russian point of whether or not the dative referent is also active. Finally, according to Veyrenc, Czech *Ta kniha se mi čte dobře*, and Serbocroatian *Čita mi se neki dobar roman* are modal, in contrast to Russian *Эта книга хорошо читалась* (i. e. a potential passive) (Veyrenc 1980, 306). (Mrázek (1971, 124) denies the existence of this type in Serbocroatian, but not in South Slavic in general: it occurs systematically in Bulgarian (*Добре ми се работи*), and marginally elsewhere (e. g. Slovene *Prijetno se hodi*, mostly without a dative).)

All this must, in my view, lead to the conclusion that semantically different phenomena are mixed up in (A/A'), which because of the partial formal resemblance that still exists have been treated as variants of the same phenomenon.

In my view, Holvoet's information suggests that the type *Dobrze mi się czyta/czytało tę książkę* is a step in a deverbalization series which in Russian is unavailable: in Russian, we have only the series "finite verb form – infinitive in infinitive sentences – gerund – participle long form – infinitive in nominal function – nominalization", with diminishing verbal properties. Abstraction from agents/actors, and factivity, is a logical step in such a series, but evidently only available where *se/się* remained a separate particle. The Russian type of layered reference has nothing to do with deverbalization. The latter stretches the possibilities of finite verb forms, according to Holvoet in connection with thematic structure (linear-intonational hierarchy).

When seen in this light, it becomes understandable that Havránek (1928) found support for his Czech distinctions on a page in Peškovskij (here cited from the 1956 edition) which contains only examples of the type *Нам весело идти*, incidentally with a reflexive infinitive (*Теперь уж мне влюбиться трудно*), and of the type (*Мне*) *сделалось грустно* (see 3.1). Indeed, what is the difference between *Мне сделалось грустно* and **Мне шлось весело* which makes that the latter must be replaced by, for example, *Мне идти было весело*, which is the standard translation of the *Šlo se (mi) hezky* type?

The correct *Мне сделалось весело* is of the type *Мне весело*, with a copula instead of zero. This means that the combination of *Мне* and *весело* constitutes an intonational nexus relation, to which the copula is subordinated. In **Мне шлось весело* the verb cannot have this subordinated status (because of its lexical meaning): here **Мне шлось* alone constitutes an intonational nexus relation. An adverb can only be subordinated to that, as in the correct sentence *Ему хорошо запомнилась эта песня*. Of course, the combination **Мне шлось* is wrong, because the act is agentive, so that a nominal subject is called for (*Я шел/шла*, or rather, with an evaluation and with the probably relevant linear-intonational hierarchy, *Шел/шла я веселый/веселая*). If we wish to retain the dative the act must be encoded in an infinitive, as in *Мне весело было идти*, where *Мне весело* introduces the intonational nexus relation. But now we must even become aware of the fact that **Мне шлось* is an intonational nexus relation (in contrast to the incomplete *Мне сделалось*): evidently, in non-East Slavic languages (at least in West Slavic) the reflexive particle can be used to suppress verbal features so as to make the fact that the act concerned is present nonnegatable and subordinated to its evaluation (comparable to *Мне сделалось весело* in Russian).

Finally, I think that this idea is indirectly supported by Wierzbicka (1966b, 184), who gives exactly this grouping for Polish: *Jak ci się dzisiaj pisze* together with *Zrobiło mu się słabo* (viz. with a copula) are opposed to *Mówi się, że ...* (viz. to the 3.1 type). Brajerski (1979, 70) rejects this grouping. The analysis to which Wierzbicka refers for *Jak ci się dzisiaj pisze* and *Zrobiło mu się słabo*,

viz. Wierzbicka (1966a, 94–95), is presented as an analysis of the Russian type *Мне хорошо работается*, which is presumably identical to Polish, an opinion with which Holvoet (1991, 148) does not agree, as we saw above. I think that Wierzbicka is right in the grouping (leaving aside further subclassifications), while Holvoet is right in restricting the analysis (stated in somewhat other terms) to Polish. Russian does not use segmental means for suppressing verbal properties in finite verb forms. Nor does the language need them, given the possibilities of linear-intonational hierarchy.

4. CONCLUSION AND FURTHER RESEARCH

In the foregoing I have suggested that the following parameters are relevant for the analysis of the differences between the Slavic impersonal reflexive sentences discussed in this article: is layered reference possible or not (associated form: is the reflexive element an affix of the verb or a separate particle), can imposition/uncontrolled arising of a wish/tendency to act be a separate event unit or not, and can the reflexive element be used to abstract from agents/actors while retaining a finite verb form or not (associated form: is the reflexive element a separate particle or an affix), and can this “abstracting from agents/actors” use of the reflexive element be applied as a phase of reducing verbal properties for the benefit of thematic structure (linear-intonational hierarchy). The personal type *У меня потерялась ручка* incidentally entered the discussion in 3.2, because other Slavic languages allow a dative case there, so that it tends to be discussed in the same context.

These findings are still to be placed in a broader context by future research, which could proceed along the following lines.

Relatively recently, study of the syntactic differences between Slavic languages has resulted in Mrázek (Мразек 1990). The peculiarities of East Slavic he summarizes as follows (1990, 34):

“(1) Номинативный строй предложения, с им. пад. подлежащего, не занимает монопольного положения. Таким образом, асимметричность предикативной основы велика; ее отчасти компенсирует аналитическая парадигма глагола, с обычной постановкой прономинального десигнатора.

(2) Поверхностно безглагольные образования, с глубинным глаголом *быть*, играют важную системную роль.

(3) Значительна функциональная емкость инфинитива, как и других именных форм (деепричастий, причастий).

(4) Семантика обладания, посиденции, обслуживается преимущественно глаголом *esse* в т. наз. адэссивной конструкции, вообще речь идет скорее об “*esse*-языках”.

(5) При деонкретизации денотативного персонического субъекта интранзитивных действий преобладают неактивные морфологические средства; деспецификация неодушевленного, предметного субъекта часто реализуется нулем подлежащей позиции.

(6) Узкая модализация высказывания осуществляется большей частью именными предикаторами или инфинитивными конструкциями”.

Mrázek’s first, third, fifth and sixth points directly pertain to the discussion in the foregoing. His other points add an important perspective to the issue of what can be encoded in a single finite verb form. Frequent use of sentences without a finite verb and frequent use of nominal forms, as well as *esse* expression of possession (Mrázek’s second, third and fourth point) are counterbalanced by an important role of linear-intonational hierarchy. In Russian almost any expression can be turned into an intonational, “actual” predication (a so-called Rheme) or intonational, “actual” nexus construction (a so-called Theme–Rheme combination), i. e. also if the segment concerned does not contain a finite verb (cf. Мразек 1990, 32–33). Elsewhere, too, Russian is characterized by a high degree of independence of linear-intonational hierarchy and segmentally expressed hierarchies (i. e. finite verb forms vs. condensations of various degrees (gerund etc.), paratactic vs. hypotactic relationships expressed by conjunctions, active vs. passive verb forms and other converse structures). The large excursions of pitch movements, or, more precisely, the distinctiveness of voice register variations, is at least one of the properties of intonation that make this independence possible (Keijsper 2003, 141–151, 188–205). Tarlanov (Тарланов 1998, 69 ff.), mentioned in the introduction, says the same in other terms: Russian has developed both members of a Subject – Predicate combination into separate sentence types (i. e. with intonational predication), viz. nominal sentences and, among others, impersonal sentences, so that a rich set of possibilities to express differences results. (On the history of the issue opinions vary, to be sure; cf. e. g. Эккерт 2000 and the literature mentioned there.)

Unfortunately, there is little research that would enable us to compare the voice register distinctions of Russian intonation, or Russian linear-intonational hierarchy in general, with comparable phenomena in other Slavic languages. From studies such as Penčev (Пенчев 1980) on Bulgarian, or Lehiste and Ivić (1986) on Serbocroatian, it can only be guessed that pitch excursions are smaller than in Russian (cf. Földi 1984; 1986 on Polish). This suggestion links up with Sawicka (2001, 117–125), who has reminded us of Nikolaeva’s (Николаева 1977, 262) distinction between “strong” and “weak” sentence intonation. Sentence intonation in Russian is strong in that it influences considerably the prosody of the word; it is linked with sandhi, fluency of articulation (слитность) and an accommodative type of pronunciation (Sawicka 2001, 117). Even in verse, the importance of sentence prosody as opposed to word prosody has grown (Keijsper 2003, 141–151).

Sentence intonation is weak if words are realized "one by one", which, according to Sawicka (2001, 117), is the case in (among others?) (West) Bulgarian, and in languages with word tones (references include Nikolayeva 1987; Николаева 1996; Николова 1987; Стоева 1987; cf. also Misheva, Nikov 1998). I would suggest that the number of finite verb forms used in a language (as opposed to forms with less properties of verbs) is directly related to the strength of sentence intonation. Considerable differences in this area can be expected not only between Russian and Bulgarian, with its high frequency of finite verb forms, but also between closer related languages such as Polish and Czech (Lotko 1986, 131–196), or Polish and Russian (Bogusławski, Karolak (1970, 23–24); Всеволодова (1997, 35); Sappok 1983; cf. Акимова in Колесов (отв. ред.) (1982, 85–121)), not to mention Czech and Russian (Růžička 1963).

For the time being, instead of jumping to the conclusion that encoding agents in the dative case, which non-East Slavic languages at first sight seem to do, reflects a lack of sense of responsibility, it is better, in my view, to place the semantic differences associated with the affix vs. particle character of the reflexive element in a broader linguistic context and to proceed to study probably related differences.

REFERENCES

- Bogusławski, A.: 1977, 'Polskie "się" – słowo nie do końca poznane', *International Review of Slavic Linguistics* 2/1, 99–124.
- Bogusławski, A., Karolak, S.: 1970, *Gramatyka rosyjska w ujęciu funkcjonalnym*, Warszawa.
- Brajerski, T.: 1979, 'O bezpodmiotowych zdaniach z orzeczeniami typu *mieszkało się i mieszkało mi się*', *Opuscula Polono-Slavica*, Wrocław, 69–78.
- Dorosz, A.: 1975, *Werbalne konstrukcje bezosobowe w języku rosyjskim i polskim na tle innych języków słowiańskich*, Wrocław.
- Ebeling, C. L.: 1984, 'On the meaning of the Russian infinitive', *Signs of Friendship, To Honour A.G.F. van Holk, Slavist, Linguist, Semiotician: Liber amicorum presented to André G.F. van Holk on the occasion of his 60th birthday, and in celebration of 20 years of Slavic studies under his direction at Groningen University*, J. J. van Baak (ed.), Amsterdam, 97–130.
- Földi, E.: 1984, 'The analysis of Polish intonation by synthesis', *Proceedings of the Tenth International Congress of Phonetic Sciences*, M. P. R. van den Broecke, A. Cohen (eds.), Dordrecht–Cinnaminson, 233–236.
- Földi, E.: 1986, 'The experimental-phonetic analysis of Polish intonation', *Hungarian Papers in Phonetics* 15, 103–139 (In Hungarian, with a summary in English).
- Fortuin, E. L. J.: 2000, *Polysemy or Monosemy: Interpretation of the Imperative and the Dative-Infinitive Construction in Russian*, Institute for Logic, Language and Computation (ILLC) Dissertation Series 2000-7, Amsterdam.
- Garde, P.: 1963, *L'emploi du conditionnel et de la particule by en russe*, Aix-en-Provence.
- Gerritsen, N.: 1988, 'How passive is "passive" -*sja*?', *Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics* 11, A. A. Barentsen, B. M. Groen, R. Sprenger (eds.), Amsterdam, 97–179.
- Gerritsen, N.: 1990, *Russian Reflexive Verbs, in Search of Unity in Diversity*, A. A. Barentsen, B. M. Groen, R. Sprenger (eds.) (= *Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics* 15), Amsterdam.
- Goldman, A. I.: 1970, *A Theory of Human Action*, Princeton, New Jersey.

- Guiraud-Weber, M.: 1984, *Les propositions sans nominatif en russe moderne*, Paris.
- Havránek, B.: 1928, *Genera verbi v slovanských jazycích I*, Praha.
- Holvoet, A.: 1991, *Transitivity and Clause Structure in Polish. A Study in Case Marking*, Warszawa.
- Katičić, R.: 1991, *Sintaksa hrvatskoga književnog Jezika. Nacrt za gramatiku*, drugo, ponovljeno izdanje, Zagreb.
- Keijsper, C. E.: 2003, 'Notes on intonation and voice in modern Russian', *Dutch Contributions to the Thirteenth International Congress of Slavists, Ljubljana: Linguistics*, J. Schaeken, P. Houtzagers, J. Kalsbeek (eds.) (= *Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics* 30), Amsterdam, New York, 141–214.
- Křížková, H.: 1962, 'K tzv. neosobnímu pasívu v slovanských jazycích', *Slavia* 31, 317–322.
- Lehiste, I., Ivič, P.: 1986, *Word and Sentence Prosody in Serbocroatian*, Cambridge (Mass.), London.
- Lotko, E.: 1986, *Čeština a polština v překladatelské a tlumočnické praxi*, Ostrava.
- Lötzsch, R., Fiedler, W., Kostov, K.: 1976, 'Die Kategorie des Genus verbi in ihrem Verhältnis zu einigen verwandten morphologischen Kategorien', *Satzstruktur und Genus verbi*, R. Lotzsch, R. Růžicka (Hrsg.) (= *Studia Grammatica* 13), Berlin, 63–94.
- Maurice, F.: 1995, 'Zur Verteilung von Möglichkeit und Notwendigkeit im russischen modalen Infinitiv', *Linguistische Beiträge zur Slavistik*, H. Dippong (ed.), München, 147–158.
- Maurice, F.: 1996, *Der modale Infinitiv in der modernen russischen Standardsprache*, P. Rehder (Hrsg.) (= *Slavistische Beiträge*, Bd. 340), München.
- Mishcheva, A., Nikov, M.: 1998, 'Intonation in Bulgarian', *Intonation Systems. A Survey of Twenty Languages*, D. Hirst, A. di Cristo (eds.), Cambridge, 275–287.
- Mrázek, R.: 1971, 'Slovanské konstrukce typu Rus. *Mne ne spitsja*', *Miscellanea Linguistica* (= *Acta Universitatis Palackianae Olomucensis*), Ostrava, 119–126.
- Mrázek, R.: 1979, 'Kontrastivní charakteristika syntaktického systému současné spisovné slovenštiny a češtiny', *Slavica Slovaca* 14/1, 3–22.
- Mrázek, R., Brym, J.: 1962, 'Sémantika a funkce ruského genitivu s předložkou "u" (Se zřetelem k češtině)', *Sborník prací Filozofické Brněnské Univerzity* A10, 99–118.
- Nikolayeva, T.: 1987, 'The typology of sentence intonation systems', *Proceedings of the Eleventh International Congress of Phonetic Sciences* (August 1–7, 1987, Tallinn, Estonia, USSR), Vol. 6, Tallinn, 106–109.
- Odé, C.: 1989, *Russian Intonation: A Perceptual Description* (= *Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics* 13), Amsterdam.
- Pariser, J. R.: 1982, *Dative-Reflexive Constructions in Contemporary Russian*, Diss. University of California, Los Angeles.
- Parolková, O.: 1956, 'Zvratná pasivní forma', *Kapitoly ze srovnávací mluvnice ruské a české I. Studie syntaktické*, Praha.
- Parolková, O.: 1967, 'K problematice zvrtných sloves a tzv. zvrtného pasíva v současné ruštině a češtině', *Slavia* 1, 33–46.
- Povejšil, J.: 1976, 'Zum reflexiven Passiv im Tschechischen und Deutschen', *Satzstruktur und Genus verbi*, R. Lotzsch, R. Růžicka (eds.) (= *Studia Grammatica* 13), Berlin, 125–129.
- Puzynina, J.: 1993, 'Die sogenannten "unbestimmt-persönlichen" Formen in der Polnischen Sprache', *Studies in Polish Morphology and Syntax*, G. Hentschel, R. Laskowski (eds.) (= *Specimina Philologiae Slavicae* 99), München, 31–61.
- Růžicka, R.: 1963, 'Zur syntaktischen Typologie moderner slawischer Literatursprachen', *Zeitschrift für Slavistik* 8, 833–860.
- Růžicka, R.: 1986, 'Typologie der Diathese Slavischer Sprachen in parametrischen Variationen', *Die Welt der Slaven* 31, 225–274.
- Sappok, Ch.: 1983, 'Die syntagmatische Gliederung der Äußerung im Russischen und im Polnischen', *Slavistische Studien zum IX. Internationalen Slavistenkongress in Kiev 1983*, R. Olesch (Hrsg.), Köln, Wien, 435–452.
- Sawicka, I.: 2001, *An Outline of the Phonetic Typology of the Slavic Languages*, Toruń.
- Siewierska, A.: 1988, 'The passive in Slavic', *Passive and Voice*, M. Shibatani (ed.) (= *Typological Studies, Language* 16), Amsterdam, 243–289.

- Tilburg, J. van: 1986, 'South Slavic accusative objects accompanying 'reflexive' se', *Зборник Материје Српске за филологију и лингвистику* 29/1, 91–101.
- Veyrenc, J.: 1978, 'Constructions régressives avec datif (Crdat.)', *Revue des études slaves* 51, 245–250.
- Veyrenc, J.: 1979, *Les Propositions infinitives en Russe*, Paris: Institut d'études slaves.
- Veyrenc, J.: 1980, 'Constructions régressives avec datif (Crdat.)', *Études sur le verbe russe*, Paris, 304–309.
- Walter, H.: 1963, 'Die Struktur der reflexiven Verben in der modernen bulgarischen Literatursprache', *Zeitschrift für Slawistik* 5, 793–805.
- Wierzbicka, A.: 1966a, 'Славянский dativus cum infinitivo', *International Journal of Slavic Linguistics and Poetics* 10, 82–102.
- Wierzbicka, A.: 1966b, 'Czy istnieją zdania bezpodmiotowe', *Język polski* 46, 3, 177–196.
- Wierzbicka, A.: 1988, *The Semantics of Grammar*, Amsterdam, Philadelphia.
- Wierzbicka, A.: 1992, *Semantics, Culture, and Cognition. Universal Human Concepts in Culture-Specific Configurations*, New York, Oxford.
- Wierzbicka, A.: 1997, *Understanding Cultures through Their Key Words. English, Russian, Polish, German, and Japanese*, New York, Oxford.
- Wierzbicka, A.: 1998, 'Russian Emotional Expression', *Ethos* 26, 456–483.
- Wierzbicka, A.: 1992, 'Russian Cultural Scripts: The Theory of Cultural Scripts and Its Applications', *Ethos* 30, 401–432.
- Wiese, E.: 1973, 'Zur Analyse polnischer syntaktischer Konstruktionen aus dem Bereich der "unpersönlichen" oder "unbestimmt-persönlichen" Sätze', *Zeitschrift für Slawistik* 5, 625–633.
- Борковский, В. И. (ред.): 1968, *Сравнительно-исторический синтаксис восточнославянских языков. Члены предложения*, Москва.
- Борковский, В. И.: 1968, *Сравнительно-исторический синтаксис восточнославянских языков. Типы простого предложения*, Москва.
- Борченко, Е. Д.: 1977, 'Синтаксический стандарт в газете', *Языковая норма и статистика*, Москва, 102–113.
- Булыгина, Т. В.: 1982, 'К построению типологии предикатов в русском языке', *Семантические типы предикатов*, О. Н. Селиверстова (отв. ред.), Москва, 7–85.
- Виноградов, В. В., Шведова, Н. Ю. (ред.): 1964, *Изменения в системе простого и осложненного предложения в русском литературном языке XIX века* (Очерки по исторической грамматике русского литературного языка XIX века), Москва.
- Всеволодова, М. В.: 1997, 'К вопросу о коммуникативной парадигме предложения', *Проблемы изучения отношений эквивалентности в славянских языках*, С. Сятковский, Т. С. Тихомирова (ред.), Москва, 28–44.
- Галкина-Федорук, Е. М.: 1958, *Безличные предложения в современном русском языке*, Москва.
- Георгиев, И.: 1990, *Безличные предложения в русском и болгарском языках*, София.
- Гиро-Вебер, М.: 2001, 'Эволюция так называемых безличных конструкций в русском языке двадцатого века', *Русский язык: пересекая границы*, М. Гиро-Вебер, И. Б. Шатуновский (отв. ред.), Дубна, 66–77.
- Грепл, М.: 1967, 'К сущности типов предложений в славянских языках', *Вопросы языкознания*, вып. 5, 60–68.
- Григорьян, Е. Л.: 2000, 'Значение ответственности в синтаксическом представлении', *Логический анализ языка. Язык этики*, Н. Д. Арутюнова, Т. Е. Янко, Н. К. Рябцева (отв. ред.), Москва, 97–100.
- Ермакова, О. П.: 1963, 'О некоторых синтаксических функциях инфинитива', *Известия Академии наук СССР, Серия литературы и языка* 22/5, 415–422.
- Заичкова, И. (Zajčková, J.): 1972, *Дательный беспредложный в современном русском литературном языке* (= Acta Universitatis Carolinae, Philologica, Monographia 42), Praha.

- Зализняк, А. А., Левонтина, И. Б.: 1996, 'Отражение национального характера в лексике русского языка (размышления по поводу книги: A. Wierzbicka: *Semantics, Culture and Cognition*, New York, Oxford 1992)', *Russian Linguistics* **20**, 237–264.
- Золотова, Г. А.: 1982, *Коммуникативные аспекты русского синтаксиса*, Москва.
- Золотова, Г. А., Онипенко, Н. К., Сидорова, М. Ю.: 1998, *Коммуникативная грамматика русского языка*, Москва.
- Ивић, М.: 1961–1962, 'Један проблем словенске синтагматике осветљен трансформационим методом (граматичка улога морфеме *se* у српскохрватском језику)', *Јужнословенски филолог* **25**, 138–151.
- Колесов, В. В. (отв. ред.): 1982, *Динамика структуры современного русского языка*, Ленинград.
- Красильникова, Е. В.: 1988, 'Инфинитив – имя существительное (к соотношению их функций в подсистеме русской разговорной речи)', *Проблемы структурной лингвистики* **19**, 1984, 112–124.
- Мразек, Р.: 1970, 'Модели чешских конструкций с возвратной глагольной формой', *Исследования по современному языку. Сборник статей, посвященный памяти проф. Е. М. Галкиной-Федорук*, Т. П. Ломтев (ред.), Москва, 166–176.
- Мразек, Р.: 1978, 'Типология славянского простого предложения', *Языкознание в Чехословакии, Сборник статей, 1956–1974*, А. Г. Широкова (ред.), Москва, 181–188.
- Мразек, Р.: 1990, *Сравнительный синтаксис славянских литературных языков, Исходные структуры простого предложения*, Впо.
- Небыкова, С. И.: 1969, 'Инфинитивные предложения и модальность (на материале "Пословиц русского народа" В. И. Даля)', *Научные доклады высшей школы (Филологические науки)* **4**, 42–53.
- Недялков, В. П.: 1991, 'Типология взаимных конструкций', *Персональность. Залоговость*, А. В. Бондарко (отв. ред.) (= Теория Функциональной Грамматики III), Санкт-Петербург, 276–312.
- Никифоров, С. Д.: 1952, *Глагол, его категории и формы в русской письменности второй половины XVI века*, Москва.
- Николаева, Т. М.: 1977, *Фразовая интонация славянских языков*, Москва.
- Николаева, Т. М.: 1996, *Просодия Балкан. Слово – высказывание – текст*, Москва.
- Николова, Л.: 1987, 'Реализация согласных при сандхи (на стыке клитик и знаменательного слова) в русском и болгарском языках', *Proceedings of the Eleventh International Congress of Phonetic Sciences (August 1–7, 1987, Tallinn, Estonia, USSR)*, Vol. 2, Tallinn, 438–442.
- Норман, Б. Ю.: 1972, *Переходность, залог, возвратность (на материале болгарского и других славянских языков)*, Минск.
- Ожегов, С. И., Шведова, Н. Ю.: 1992, *Толковый словарь русского языка*, Москва.
- Пенчев, Й.: 1980, *Основные интонационные контуры в болгарском изречении*, София.
- Перцов, Н. В.: 2003, 'Возвратные страдательные формы русского глагола в связи с проблемой существования в морфологии', *Вопросы языкознания*, вып. 4, 43–71.
- Петрухина, Е. В.: 2000, *Аспектуальные категории глагола в русском языке в сопоставлении с чешским, словацким, польским и болгарским языками*, Москва.
- Пешковский, А. М.: 1956, *Русский синтаксис в научном освещении*. Издание седьмое, Москва.
- Рожновская, М. Г.: 1959, 'Безличные предложения в современном болгарском литературном языке', *Вопросы грамматики болгарского литературного языка*, О. Б. Бернштейн (отв. ред.), Москва, 379–432.
- Рожновская, М. Г.: 1971, 'Производные безличные глаголы в болгарском литературном языке', *Исследования по славянскому языкознанию. Сборник в честь шестидесятилетия профессора С. Б. Бернштейна*, Москва, 227–234.

- Седельников, Е. А.: 1968, 'Инфинитивные предложения в древнерусском языке (по памятникам XI–XIV вв.)', *Научные доклады высшей школы (Филологические науки)* 3, 66–77.
- Стоева, Т.: 1987, 'Явления сандхи и ритмическая организация синтагмы в русском и болгарском языках', *Proceedings of the Eleventh International Congress of Phonetic Sciences (August 1–7, 1987, Tallinn, Estonia, USSR)*, Vol. 6, Tallinn, 128–131.
- Сятковский, С. И.: 1963, 'Неопределенно-личные предложения в современных славянских языках', *Славянская филология* (под ред. С. Б. Бернштейна и др.), 267–297.
- Тарланов, З. К.: 1998, 'Русское безличное предложение в контексте этнического мировосприятия', *Научные доклады высшей школы (Филологические науки)* 5–6, 65–75.
- Тимофеев, К. А.: 1950, 'Об основных типах инфинитивных предложений в современном русском языке', *Вопросы синтаксиса современного русского языка*, В. В. Виноградов (ред.), Москва, 271–301.
- Успенский, Б. А.: 1994, 'Роль дуальных моделей в динамике русской культуры (до конца XVIII века)', *Избранные труды, том 1. Семиотика истории. Семиотика культуры*, Москва, 219–253.
- Фичи Джусти, Ф.: 1993, 'О выражении носителя состояния в некоторых безличных конструкциях', *Русистика сегодня. Функционирование языка: лексика и грамматика*, Москва, 70–81.
- Хайров, Ш. (Khairov, Sh.): 2003, 'Славянская лингвистическая имагология сегодня: «образы языка» и способы их сопряжения с ментальностью и культурой', *Zbornik povzetkov. 1. del. Jezikoslovje*, 13. mednarodni slavistični kongres, Ljubljana, 15.–21. avgusta 2003, F. Novak (ed.), 285–286. Full text available via www.gla.ac.uk (search there: hdl.handle.net/1721.1/42).
- Чагина, О. В.: 1990, *Как сказать иначе? (Работа над синтаксической синонимией русского языка в иностранной аудитории)*, Москва.
- Шатуновский, И. Б.: 2002, 'Несовершенный vs. совершенный вид в императиве (к проблеме начала)', *Логический анализ языка, Семантика начала и конца*, Н. Д. Арутюнова (отв. ред.), Москва, 267–309.
- Эккерт, Р.: 2000, 'Именные средства выражения в славянских и балтийских языках (Nomina agentis вместо verbum finitum)', *Этимология 1997–1999*, 216–224.
- Янко-Триницкая, Н. А.: 1962, *Возвратные глаголы в современном русском языке*, Москва.

University of Amsterdam

c.e.keijesper@uva.nl