María Luisa Rivero   Milena M. Sheppard
University of Ottawa   University of Ljubljana

On Impersonal *se / się* in Slavic.

1.   Introduction.[*]

        All Slavic and Romance languages with a reflexive clitic share uses for this clitic called , among other labels, (a) reflexive/reciprocal, (b) middle/passive, (c) anticausative, and (d) inherent, as in Table 1. In such uses, the NP is Nom(inative) and V agrees with it in <u>phi</u>-features. With the exception of French, all languages share with many types of intransitive Vs (e) a use often called impersonal, without overt NP. These five uses are illustrated in (1) with Slovenian (Sl). Similar examples could be given in Bulgarian (Bl), Czech, Macedonian, Polish (P), Croatian and Serbian (SC), Slovak, and several Romance languages that include Italian, Rumanian, and Spanish.

(1)   a. *Janez*   ***se***   *oblači*.   "John dresses himself."
         b. *Ta knjiga* ***se***   *lahko*   *bere*.   "This book reads easily."
         c. *Veja*   ***se***   *je*   *zlomila*.   "The branch broke."
         d. *Marija*   ***se***   *boji*   *Janeza*   "Mary fears John."
         e. *Tukaj*   ***se***   *veliko*   *dela*.   "Here people work a lot."

TABLE 1

Uses shared by Slavic and Romance reflexive clitics

Refl/recipr	*Mid/pass*	*Anticaus.*	*Inherent*	*Intransitive*
Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	All but French

        The use called here <u>Subject Impersonal</u> in (2-3) separates Slavic and Romance into two groups, as in Table 2. This use is found in P, Sl (Italian, and Spanish), and, with restrictions, in some varieties of Croatian and Serbian. To our knowledge, it is totally absent from Bl, Czech, Macedonian, Slovak (French, and Rumanian).

TABLE 2
The Subject Impersonal

Slavic	Polish	+
	Slovenian	+
	Croatian/Serbian	?
	Bulgarian	–
	Czech/ Slovak	–
Romance	Italian	+
	Spanish , etc.	+
	French	–
	Rumanian	–

In this use, (i) the NP is Acc(usative) in affirmative clauses, and Gen(itive) in negative ones, and (ii) V is consistently 3S(ingular) in the Present, and Neu(ter) in the Past.

(2)   a. *Tę książkę*   *{czyta/ czytało}*   **się**   *z przyjemnością.*   (P)
       this   book$_{ACC}$ read$_{3S}$/$_{NEU}$ się   with pleasure
       "One {reads/read} this book with pleasure."

       b. *Tej książki*   *nie*   *{czyta/ czytało*   **się**   *z przyjemnością.*
       this   book$_{GEN}$ Neg   read$_{3S}$/$_{NEU}$ się   with pleasure.
       "One {does/did} not read this book with pleasure."

(3)   a. *Starše*   **se**   *{uboga/ je*   *ubogalo}.*   (Sl)
       parents$_{ACC}$ se   {obey$_{3S}$/ be$_{3S}$ obeyed$_{NEU}$}
       "One {obeys/(has) obeyed} parents."

       b. *Staršev*   **se**   *ne*   *uboga.*
       parents$_{GEN}$ se   Neg   obey$_{3S}$
       "One does not obey parents."

The use illustrated in (4) called here <u>Object Impersonal</u>, is shared by all the mentioned Slavic languages, and is not found in Romance.

(4)   a. *Marek*   **się**   *bije.*   (P)
       Mark$_{NOM}$ się   fight$_{3S}$
       "Mark fights (others)."

       b. *Učiteljica, Janezek*   **se**   *spet*   *{grize/ poriva}.*   (Sl)
       Teacher, Janezek$_{NOM}$ se   again   {bite/push$_{3S}$}
       "Teacher, Janezek is {biting/pushing} (others) again."

Following Rivero (1998,1999), we argue that the Subject and Object uses in (2-4) represent a new type of indefinite pronoun: a syntactic S(implex) E(xpression) anaphor as in (R(einhart) & R(euland) 1993). In the syntax, clitic *se/się* indicates a null NP on an argument position of the predicate : external in (2-3), and internal in (4). This NP has a human feature but no *phi*-features, so cannot be interpreted independently, and must raise to the clitic to repair its (a) formal and (b) referential deficiency. Movement allows the NP (a) to check structural Case (Nom or Acc/Gen) against the clitic, which removes its uninterpretable feature as formal imperfection. In addition, movement allows the NP (b) to acquire existential force, which repairs its referential imperfection, and permits it to be interpreted as an indefinite pronoun (Chierchia 1995) without *phi*-features. By contrast, the SE-anaphors mentioned by R & R, which include Dutch *zich,* are syntactic pronouns also without *phi*-features, but raise to I = Agr/Tense to inherit *phi*-features from the subject, as in *Max legt het boek achter zich* "Max puts the book behind him=Max". In brief, the Impersonal in (2-4) involves a chain with the syntax of a SE-anaphor of a new type, following Rivero, and the semantics of an indefinite pronoun restricted to humans, following Chierchia.

2.   The Subject Impersonal.

This section mentions important properties of the Subject Impersonal that distinguish P/Sl from other Slavic languages, and also reveal the mixed character of some varieties of Croatian / Serbian.

First, recall the morphology in (2-3), which motivates the assumption that *se/ się* is Nom, as in sect. 4.1. There is an Acc/Gen NP, and a 3S/Neut predicate. In other Slavic languages that share the middle-passive morphology, as in Bl (5a), patterns equivalent to this impersonal are ungrammatical, as illustrated with SC (5b).

(5) a. *{Jadat/*Jade}*   **se**   *jabâlkite.*   (Bl)
         {eat.$_{3P}$/*eat.$_{3S}$}   se   apples.the
         "The apples are eaten."

     b. **Tu knjigu*   **se**   *čita*   *sa*   *zadovoljstvom.*   (SC)
         this book$_{ACC}$ se   read$_{3S}$ with   pleasure

Croatian and Serbian constitute restricted exceptions to the above situation, in that, open to idiolectal variation, the pattern with a human NP with Acc may be grammatical:(6) (see Tilburg 1986 for geographical distribution in Croatia).

(6)   *Roditelje*   **se**   *poštuje.*   (grammatical for some) (SC)
      parents$_{ACC}$ se   obey$_{3S}$
      "One obeys parents"

Overall, then, P and Sl differ from other Slavic languages on morphological grounds.
       Second, the P and Sl impersonal can bind anaphors of several types: local reflexives, (7a-a'), possessive reflexives, (7b-b'), and long distance Nom possessives: (7c-c').

(7) a.   *Teraz*   **się**   *myśli*   *tylko*   *o sobie.*   (P)
          now   się   think$_{3S}$ only   of oneself
     a'. *Sedaj*   *se*   *misli*   *samo*   *na sebe.*   (Sl)
          now   se   think$_{3S}$ only   of oneself
          "Now one thinks only of oneself."
     b.   *Swoich*   *przyjaciół tak* **się**   *nie*   *traktuje.*   (P)
          POSS$_{GEN}$ friends$_{GEN}$ so   się   Neg   treat$_{3S}$ (Siewierska 1988)
     b'. *Svojih*   *prijateljev*   *se*   *tako*   *ne*   *tretira.*   (Sl)
          POSS$_{GEN}$ friends$_{GEN}$ se   so   Neg   treat$_{3S}$
          "One does not treat one's friends like that."
     c.   *Myśli* **się***, że swoje błędy są bardziej usprawiedliwiane niż innych.*
          think$_{3S}$się that POSS$_{NOM}$ mistakes are more justified than of.others   (P)
     c'. *Verjame se, da so svoje napake bolj upravičene kot napake drugih.*   (Sl)
          believe$_{3S}$ se that are POSS$_{NOM}$ mistakes more justified than of.others
       "People think their own mistakes are more justified than those of others.**"**

Possessive anaphors lead to clear contrasts between P / Sl and other Slavic languages. For instance, in Bl and SC, *se* cannot be a binder for this type: (8a-b). Local reflexives may be less symptomatic. In the general case, *se* in SC seems able to bind this type: (8c).

(8) a.   **Svoite*   *kartini*   **se**   *gledat s udovolstvie.*   (Bl)
          POSS   pictures   se   see$_{3PL}$ with pleasure
     b.   **Svoju decu*   *se*   *uvek*   *sluša*   *sa*   *pažnjom* (SC)
          POSS children$_{ACC}$se   always listen$_{3S}$ with   attention
     c.   *Sada*   *se*   *misli*   *samo*   *na sebe.*   (SC)
          now   se   think$_{3S}$ only   of oneself
          "Now one thinks only of oneself."

Third, the P/ Sl impersonal can control into adjuncts, which is well known, but also into complements that include passive sentences, which is less known: (9). It has been argued that the last type of control is by an argument present in the syntax (Jaeggli 1986).

(9) a.   *Chce*   **się**   *być*   *admirowanym.*   (P)
          Want$_{3S}$ się   to.be   admired$_{INS}$

b. *Vedno* **se** *želi* *biti* *občudovan*. (Sl)
   always se want$_{3S}$ to.be admired$_{NOM}$
   "One (always) wants to be admired."

Bl lacks infinitives, but *se* induces disjoint reference effects in subjunctives (i.e. absence of Control). In Serbian, the equivalents of (9) give rise to conflicting judgments. In Croatian similar patterns seem grammatical.

Fourth, the Subject Impersonal displays human denotation in all languages, so also in P and Sl. Rivero (1999) argues that P is among the languages that formally encode this aspect in morphology, syntax, and semantics (contra Kański 1986, 1992).

Fifth, it is known that the impersonal may display quantificational variability . It can be equivalent to roughly *someone* or *everyone* in past, present, or future sentences, and also display other quantificational flavors, as in 4.2. To account for this variability, Chierchia (1995) proposes that the (Italian) impersonal is an indefinite pronoun with intrinsic existential force, and can be optionally disclosed by adverbs of quantification that transmit it their force. This semantic proposal is compatible with our syntactic analysis in 4.1., and in 4.2 we apply it to P and Sl.

As noted in Rivero and Sheppard (1999), there are two differences between P and Sl. One, in Sl both *se*-passives as in (1b) and *se*-impersonals as in (2-3) are widely used, though the prescriptive tradition favors the first. Thus, Sl is interesting as a language with both options in its grammar. By contrast, in P impersonal *się* is robust, while passive *się* is disfavored, and now ungrammatical with animates (among others, Siewierska 1988). The second difference concerns predicate classes. The P impersonal is found in passive sentences, (10a), and with adjectives, (11a) (which makes P identical to Italian and Spanish). By contrast, judgments may vary in Sl, but the impersonal in passives, (10b-c), and with adjectives, (11b-c), is considered unacceptable or marginal.

(10) a. *Bywa* **się** *karanym* *przez* *przyjaciół*. (P)
        be$_{3S}$ się punished$_{INS}$ by friends
        "From time to time one is punished by friends."
     b. **Od časa do časa se je kaznovano od prijateljev.* (Sl)
        from time to time se be$_{3S}$ punished$_{NEU}$ by friends
     c. *?Kadar se je bilo sprejeto pri županu,*
        when se be$_{3S}$ be$_{NEU}$ received at mayor,
        je bilo treba nositi bele rokavice. (Sl)
        be$_{3S}$ be$_{NEU}$ must wear white gloves
        " When one was received by the mayor, one had to wear white gloves."

(11) a. *Kiedy* **się** *było* *młodym,* **się** *było szczęśliwym* (P)
        when się was$_{NEU}$ young się was$_{NEU}$ happy
        "When one was young, one was happy."
     b. **Ko* **se** *je* *bilo* *mlad,* **se** *je* *bilo srečen.* (Sl)
        when se be$_{3S}$ be$_{NEU}$ young se be$_{3S}$ be$_{NEU}$ happy
     c. *? Nikoli se ni srečen* (Sl)
        Never se not.be$_{3S}$ happy
        "One is never happy."

Thus, it seems that the Sl impersonal is excluded with stative predicates. This interesting situation that we leave unexplored makes Sl resemble languages without the impersonal, which systematically disallow *sa / se* in passive sentences, as illustrated with Bl (12) (this also applies in Serbian and Croatian, which may allow *se* with adjectives).

(12). ** Često se e predaden ot prijateli.* (Bl)

often   se   be_{3S}   betrayed   by friends

In sum, some important properties shared by the P/ Sl Subject Impersonal are:
a)   The same clitic characteristics as non-tonic pronouns.
b)   A distinctive morphology with Accusative (or Gen) on overt NP, and a predicate without *phi*-features, and no distinction as to animacy.
c)   Various semantic (Theta) roles otherwise held by an (overt) Nom subject. The Sl impersonal is more restricted that the P impersonal in this respect, and stativity seems to be a relevant factor.
d)   Binder for all types of anaphors: local and long distance.
e)   A syntactically present controller for complement clauses (and adjuncts).
f)   A syntactic argument with formally encoded human denotation, arbitrary reference, and no *phi*-features.
g)   Quantificational variability along the lines of indefinites.

3.   **The Object Impersonal**.

All the Slavic languages under consideration here display the Object Impersonal in (4), also illustrated in (13), which is colloquial and typical of child language. Rivero (1999) argues that the use glossed in (13) with *others* is the object counterpart of (2-3): an arbitrary deficient pronoun with a human feature and Acc (or, in negative sentences Gen), not Nom.

(13)   a. *Ivan   iska   decata   da   se   bijat*.   (Bl)
        Ivan   want_{3S} children.the   da   se   spank_{3P}
        "Ivan wants the children to spank others."

        b. *Nie   pchaj   się,   pan!*   (P)
         neg   push_{IMP.2S}   się,   man
         "Stop pushing others, sir!"

        c. *Deca   se   grle*.   (SC)
        children   se   hug_{3P}
        "The children are hugging others."

        d. *Pokaži   kako   se   poljubljaš*.   (Sl)
        show   how   se   kiss._{2S}
        "Show me how you kiss others."

What makes the Object Impersonal in (13) particularly interesting is its (a) human denotation, (b) lack of *phi*-features, and (c) quantificational variability, with existential/ universal-like readings that may include the speaker, as in (13b).
A fourth characteristic making this object use similar to the Subject Impersonal is sensitivity to aspect / generic time reference ((Cinque 1988) on the Italian subject impersonal). Sl (14) illustrates that imperfective Aspect/Aktionsart, as in (14a), brings to light the universal-like reading of this use suppressed with perfective Vs, as in (14b) (the other Slavic languages behave along parallel lines).

(14)   *Ko   je bil   majhen, se je Janez grozno {a. grizel / b.ugriznil}*   (Sl)
        when   is been little,   se is Janez terribly   {bitten   a. _{IMP/} b. _{PERF}}
        IMP: "When he was little, J. would bite {himself / others} horribly."
        PERF: "When he was little, J. bit himself horribly (once)."

Rivero (1999) suggests that the effect of Aspect in (14) belongs with quantificational variability. Imperfective aspect resembles an adverb of quantification such as *always*, which is not a new idea, and can provide (universal-like) force to the object impersonal as indefinite pronoun as proposed by Chierchia for the subject use, which is discussed in sect. 4.2.

4. The syntactic and semantic analysis of the Subject and Object Impersonal.

4.1. The Syntax: the Impersonal as Simplex Expression Anaphor.

Following Rivero (1999), Nom/{Acc/Gen} Impersonal in 2 and 3 is a S(implex) E(xpression) anaphor, or defective pronoun. This idea is implemented by assuming that the clitic is "base generated" / merged outside the VP, and attracts a defective (null) NP that is the external or internal argument of V. This movement hypothesis is coupled with (the spirit of) the binding theory of R & R (1993).

Let us begin with the analysis of the Subject Impersonal as in *Tę książke czytało się* "One read this book " in (2) and *Starše se uboga* "One obeys parents." in (3), proposing that the skeleton of these sentences is as in (15):

(15) ...[$_{ClP}$ [$_{Cl}$ se/ się] [$_{TP}$ [$_T$ Pres / Past] [$_{vP}$ NP1 V NP2]]]

V heads VP, which contains two NP arguments. The "arbitrary" NP1 as external argument is equivalent to a null defective pronoun, different from little *pro*: it has a human feature, (structural) Nom Case, but no *phi*-features (no gender, number, or person). The internal argument NP2 is the overt Acc object *this book* or *parents*. The T(ense) P(hrase) is headed by T(ense), which is defective in that it also lacks *phi*-features (no gender, number, or person). TP takes VP as complement and V checks features against T. Given that T is defective, V is either 3S or Neu, i.e. without *phi*-features. The other functional projection dubbed Cl(itic) P(hrase) is headed by *se/ się*. The core idea is that in (15), NP1, which is a syntactically projected argument of the predicate for all the reasons stated in sect. 2, must repair deficiencies by raising to ClP, checking structural Case against the clitic. Thus, NP1 in the Subject Impersonal construction contrasts with the null pronoun little *pro* of the ordinary null subject sentence, which is often assumed to check features with a non-defective T in TP.

The clitic, then, is directly merged in a functional slot outside of the VP (known as the "base generation" approach). That is, *se/ się* are functional entries of the lexicon. When merged into a phrase marker, they are similar to other clitic pronouns in heading a Functional Projection. The next question is why NP1 raises to ClP. Recall that Chomsky (1998) proposes two operations to check formal features: MOVE and a new operation AGREE, which is more economic. Oversimplifying, a category can MOVE to the Spec of a functional head to check features, or the functional head can check features with a category in its complement via AGREE, without the need for movement. The last operation is preferred. One important question in this framework, then, is why MOVE and not AGREE applies in the impersonal -- what forces the deficient NP in (15) to leave the VP. Another important question is why MOVE must target functional *se/ się*. Structural Case combined with the lack of *phi*-features can provide a formal answer to these questions. In (15), both NP1 and T lack *phi*-features, so they cannot establish an appropriate checking relation with each other. The required relation is established between NP1 and the clitic, when the first moves to the second. These categories are each equipped with a structural Case feature, which allows them to match for checking (for further discussion (Rivero 1999)). In brief, absence of *phi*-features, a prominent characteristic of the impersonal construction, makes the NP raise to CL to satisfy formal needs (feature checking for Case).

Now consider binding, the other dimension in our analysis. R&R (1993: sect.1) distinguish between Pronouns, SELF-anaphors, and SE-anaphors, with two features: Refl(exivizing function) and R(eferential Independence). Pronouns such as *him* in *John hates him* are not reflexivizers and contain *phi*-features, which allows them to be interpreted independently: [–Refl; +R]. SELF-anaphors such as *himself* in *John hates himself* are referentially defective, and reflexivizers [+Refl; –R]. SE-anaphors are like pronouns in not being reflexivizers, and like SELF-anaphors in not having a full specification of *phi*-features,

so cannot be interpreted independently: [–Refl ; –R]. The content necessary for their interpretation is obtained via movement, which makes them similar to a pronoun: [+R; –Refl]. Dutch *zich* is a SE-anaphor . It does not make a predicate reflexive when on one of its argument positions: *Max haat zich / Max hates SE-anaphor. It lacks *phi*-features but can obtain the content necessary for interpretation by movement. In *Max legt het boek achter zich* "Max puts the book behind him=Max", *zich* adjoins in LF to I (= T) to inherit subject features (1993:659), which results in a well formed A-chain that is +R and Case-Marked. The movement does not make the predicate *put* reflexive, but coindexes *zich* with *Max* as subject. In sum, for R&R a SE-anaphor is a defective pronoun that repairs deficiency by acquiring *phi*-features via a movement that coindexes it with the subject.

The impersonal use of the reflexive clitic is comparable to a SE-anaphor in three ways, with interesting differences. One, since it lacks *phi*-features the null NP in (15) does not project an argument that can be interpreted independently. Two, movement enables it to obtain the content for its interpretation. R&R'S SE-anaphors adjoin to I to inherit the *phi*-features of the subject, which makes them (a) "subject-oriented", and (b) interpretable as ordinary personal pronouns with a full set of *phi*-features. However, our defective NP repairs its deficiency by moving to CliticP with *se / się,* which lacks *phi*-features. The movement with the impersonal is thus different, but achieves the same syntactic result, which is to create a well-formed LF-chain that can serve as input for semantic interpretation. For R& R, an A-chain is well formed if it is +R and Case-Marked. In our case, the movement of the *phi*-less NP up to the clitic ensures that it can be considered +R. Since the NP checks Case , the chain is also Case-Marked. The similarity between the SE-anaphors of this paper involving a clitic as target and the Dutch SE-anaphors, which need not involve a clitic, is that movement of a *phi*-less NP on an argument position of a predicate results in a chain that is interpretable at LF. The third aspect that makes the impersonal like a SE-anaphor is the Binding Theory, highlighting its pronominal character: impersonal *se/ się* is a clear pronoun. SE-anaphors pattern with pronouns in that they occur on an argument position of a predicate without making this predicate reflexive. On this view, the defective null NP that serves as double for the clitic patterns like a pronoun. It fits in unproblematic ways traditional principle B (Chomsky 1981): a pronoun is free in its governing category. Alternatively, following R&R, it does not make the predicate reflexive when it occurs on one of its argument positions (external at this point/ internal immediately below). R&R propose no principle to prevent a SE-anaphor from being free, and we saw above that Dutch *zich* is coindexed with the subject not because of the binding theory, but due to the movement for *phi*-features. The impersonal uses of *se / się* behave like pronouns rather clearly. Intuitively speaking, they are"antecedentless" expressions. These uses, then, are pronominal as they indicate a SE-anaphor, which does not reflexivize the predicate (–Refl), and repairs referential deficiency by moving to *se / się* (in R&R's terms, it changes its value from [–R] to [+R]).

The analysis just proposed for the Subject Impersonal can easily extend to the Object Impersonal in (13). In this case, NP1 in (15) stands either for the overt nominative subject that checks features against T in TP, or for *pro*. T is not defective, and contains a complete set of *phi*-features. NP2 is the null item with the human feature, (structural) Acc Case, but no *phi*-features. It raises to ClP to check Case. Similar to an arbitrary subject, NP2 as object has the pronominal characteristics of a SE-anaphor, and raises to form a chain that is interpretable at LF.

The last question is why the clitic in (15) can attract for checking purposes the defective subject NP1 of sect. 2, or the defective object NP2 of sect. 3. Inspired by proposals in (Chomsky 1998), we assign to *se/ się* as target of the movement a structural Case feature that is unvalued. This feature can thus be used to check any structural Case feature, which may be either Nom, as on the defective external argument NP1 in sect. 2, or Acc /Gen, as on the defective NP2 in sect. 3 (for more details (Rivero 1999)).

In sum, *se/ się* with an unvalued Structural Case feature is merged in CL. NPs without *phi*-features cannot enter into an AGREE relation, and check structural Case by MOVING to

se/ się. This operation results in a LF-chain interpreted as an expression with a pronominal and a human character, which is the SE-anaphor.

4.2. The semantic analysis: the impersonal as indefinite pronoun (Chierchia 1995).

In 4.1, it was proposed that the movement of the NP in (15) bypassing TP to the "based-generated" clitic to check structural Case results in a well-formed chain interpretable at LF. This chain can thus serve as an appropriate input for later levels of semantic interpretation.

What are the semantics of the impersonal ? Chierchia (1995) argues that the Subject Impersonal in Italian is an indefinite pronoun. We see next that this proposal is quite compatible with the syntactic analysis of sect. 4.1, and captures important interpretive parallelisms shared by the P and Sl impersonals with their Italian and Spanish counterparts, which are not discussed here.

Some important features in Chierchia's proposal illustrated in this paper with P and Sl are as follows. First, the impersonal is an indefinite pronoun with a sortal restriction (i.e. human). This resembles our proposal in sect. 4.1 that it is a SE-anaphor with a formally encoded human feature. As pronoun ,the impersonal can antecede itself, as in (16). Thus, it does not fall under the Novelty Condition proposed by Heim (1982) for indefinites.

(16) a. *Jeśli*   **się**   *gra*   *źle,*   *przegrywa*   **się**.   (P)
         If   się   plays   badly,   loses   się

      b. *Če* **se**   *igra*   *slabo,* **se**   *izgubi*.   (Sl)
         If se   plays   badly, se   loses
         "If one plays poorly, one loses."

For Chierchia, the Novelty Condition at work in *If a player does not play well, {he /*a player} loses* is not independent, but a consequence of principle C for NPs (Chomsky 1981), which does not regulate pronouns. In this respect, the impersonal in (16) is comparable to little *pro*, which can also antecede itself, as in P *Jeśli gra źle, przegrywa*. "If he plays poorly, he loses."

Second, indefinites have intrinsic existential force, which is illustrated below in (19). This semantic aspect also fits well with our syntactic analysis. The movement hypothesized in 4.1. forms a chain whose head combines the raised NP with a human feature, and a clitic that can be seen as an operator providing existential force; the foot of this chain contains a trace (or copy) that can be considered a variable. From this perspective, the proposed syntactic chain shares A and A-bar characteristics, which captures syntactic and semantic aspects. On the one hand, it is a pronoun of the SE-anaphor type, or an A-chain involving the Case system and formal feature-checking, as in traditional NP-movement. On the other hand, it is an indefinite with quantificational force, or an A-bar chain involving variable binding, as in traditional Quantifier Raising.

Third, while intrinsically existential, indefinites may be disclosed by adverbs of quantification that come to bind them. In conditional sentences such as (17), the adverb may thus determine the quantificational force of the impersonal. That is, the impersonal coupled with *always* may be equivalent to *everyone*, as in (17a). When coupled to *usually,* it may be equivalent to *many people*, as in (17b), and when coupled to *seldom* it may be equivalent to *few people*, as in (17c).

(17) a. *Jeśli*   **się**   *gra*   *źle,*   *zawsze*   **się**   *przegrywa.* (P)
      a'. *Če* **se**   *igra*   *slabo,* **se** *vedno*   *izgubi*.   (Sl)
          "If one plays poorly, one always loses."
      b. *Jeśli* **się** *gra*   *źle,*   *zazwiczaj*   **się**   *przegrywa.*   (P)

b'. *Če* **se** *igra* *slabo,* **se** *navadno* *izgubi.* (Sl)
   "If one plays poorly, one usually loses."

c. *Jeśli* **się** *gra* *źle,* *rzadko* **się** *przegrywa.* (P)

c'. *Če* **se** *igra* *slabo,* **se** *redko* *izgubi.* (Sl)
   "If one plays poorly, one seldom loses."

From this perspective, the examples in (17) are roughly equivalent in truth conditions to the corresponding relatives in (18).

(18) a. *Wszyscy, którzy grają źle przegrywają.* (P)

a'. *Vsakdo, ki igra slabo, izgubi.* (Sl)
   "Everyone who plays poorly loses."

b *Wielu ludzi, którzy grają źle przegrywają.* (P)

b' *Veliko ljudi, ki igra slabo, izgubi.* (Sl)
   "Many people who play poorly lose."

c *Niewielu ludzi, którzy grają źle przegrywają.* (P)

c′ *Malo ljudi, ki igra slabo, izgubi.* (Sl)
   "Few people who play poorly lose."

Fourth, disclosure is optional, so the impersonal may retain its intrinsic character . In the conditional construction in (19), each impersonal clitic may preserve its own existential force, which gives rise to the disjoint reference reading: those who explain the problems or the theory and those who do not understand need not be the same.

(19) a. *Jeśli tłumaczy* **się** *ćwiczenia tak źle, zazwyczaj nie rozumie* **się** *ich.* (P)
      If explains się problems$_{ACC}$ so badly, usually not understands się them$_{GEN}$

   b. *Če se teorijo razloži tako slabo, se je navadno ne razume.* (Sl)
      If se theory$_{ACC}$ explains so badly , se it$_{GEN}$ usually not understands
      "If one explains {problems/ a theory} so badly, {they /it} {are/is} usually not understood."

Fifth, disclosure is reserved for adverbs of quantification such as *always*. It does not extend to quantifiers such as *every*. In (20), the person who invites and the host need not be the same. Since each occurrence of the impersonal clitic is existentially closed, different *se / się* are not semantically forced to covary.

(20) a. *Wszyscy,* *których* **się** *zaprasza* *na konferencję,* (P)
      Everybody who$_{ACC}$ się invites to conference,
      oczekuja *że* **się** *będzie ich dobrze traktować.* (P)
      expects that się will him$_{ACC}$ well treat

   b. *Vsakdo,* *ki* **se** *ga* *povabi* *na konferenco,* (Sl)
      Everybody that se him$_{ACC}$ invites to conference,
      pričakuje, *da* *se* *ga* *bo* *spoštljivo* *obravnavalo.* (Sl)
      expects that se him$_{ACC}$ will respecfully treat(ed).
      "Everybody who is invited to a conference expects to be treated well."

In sum, the semantic analysis proposed by Chierchia for Italian *si* can also account for the interpretative properties of P *się* and Sl *se,* and capture the important parallelisms of the Slavic and Romance impersonal.

4. Conclusions.

Impersonal *se/ się* is a syntactic Simplex Expression anaphor: a null expression whose defective interpretable content amounts to a human feature, and which raises to the clitic to repair formal and referential deficiencies. It repairs its formal deficiency by checking Case, and its referential deficiency by acquiring quantificational force (i.e.in R&R's terms, it forms a Case-marked chain, and goes from –Ref to +Ref), while remaining without *phi*-features. It can function as syntactic controller, syntactic binder of all types of anaphors, including the long distance type, and external argument of many predicates. As to predicate classes, the Sl impersonal is more restricted than its P counterpart, and seems excluded with stative predicates. The impersonal is a non-reflexivizer, so similar to a regular pronoun it can be free. Semantically, the impersonal is a human indefinite pronoun with existential force. As a pronoun, it can escape the Novelty Condition and antecede itself, which is not possible for indefinite NPs. The impersonal is existential but displays (optional) quantificational variability when adverbs of quantification disclose it and bind it. Thus the impersonal can be equivalent to *some* and *all* , as many in the past have noted, , but also to *many* and *few* , which is less known.

References.

Chierchia, Gennaro (1995). "The Variability of Impersonal Subjects" In Emmon Bach, Eloise Jelinek, Angelika Kratzer, and Barbara Hall Partee, eds. *Quantification in Natural Language*, 107–143. Kluwer, Dordrecht.

Chomsky, Noam. (1981). *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Foris, Dordrecht.

Chomsky, Noam. (1998). "Minimalist Inquiries: the Framework". Preliminary version in *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics 15*. To appear in R. Martin, D. Michaels, and J.Uriagereka, eds. *Step by Step: Essays on Minimalist Syntax in Honor of Howard Lasnik*. MIT Press, Cambridge.

Cinque, Guglielmo. (1988). "On *Si* Constructions and the Theory of *Arb*". *Linguistic Inquiry* 19.521–583.

Heim, Irene. (1982). *The Semantics of Definite and Indefinite Noun Phrases*. Ph. Dissertation, GLSA, Amherst, Mass.

Jaeggli, Osvaldo. (1986). "Passive." *Linguistic Inquiry* 17: 587–622.

Kański, Zbigniew. (1986). *Arbitrary Reference and Reflexivity: A Generative Study of the Polish pronoun się and its English equivalents*. Uniwersytet Slaski, Katowice.

Kański, Zbigniew. (1992). "Impersonal constructions as a Strategy for Second Order Predication". In M. Kefer and J. van der Auwera, eds. *Meaning and Grammar: Cross–Linguistic Perspectives*, 95–121. Mouton de Gruyter: Berlin.

Reinhart, Tanya and Eric Reuland. (1993). "Reflexivity". *Linguistic Inquiry* 24. 657–720.

Rivero, María Luisa. (1998). "On Impersonal SE in Romance and Slavic". Paper read at Going Romance. December 1998, Utrecht, Holland.

Rivero, María Luisa. (1999). "On Impersonal *się* in Polish: a Simplex Expression Anaphor." To appear in the special volume of the *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* on Polish syntax ed. by P. Banski and E. Willim.

Rivero, María Luisa and Milena M. Sheppard. (1999). "On Impersonal SE in Slovenian". Paper read at the Workshop on Pronouns in Generative Grammar, Societas Linguistica Europeae, July 1999, Ljubljana, Slovenia.

Siewierska, Anna. (1988). "The Passive in Slavic". In M. Shibatani, ed. *Passive and Voice*, 243-289. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Tilburg, Jose van. (1986). "South Slavic Accusative Objects accompanying 'Reflexive' SE". *Zbornik Matice Srpske*, 29/1, 91-101.