Reflexive-based markers share a range of common properties in all Slavic languages, among which distinctive polyfunctionality seems to be the most common. A typological study of the polysemy of reflexive markers investigates not only common polysemous pattern established in the literature i.e.: reflexive-reciprocal, but also non prototypical patterns with less common concomitant meanings of which the antipassive is an example, (Nedjalkov 2007). Contrary to reflexive/reciprocal constructions, the patient argument of antipassives is not co-referred with the subject. It is either left syntactically unrealized or demoted to the oblique position.

This paper deals with a non prototypical type of polysemy in Slavic languages wherein a reflexive-based marker apart from the reflexive and/or reciprocal meaning acquires also the antipassive interpretation. It aims, first, at establishing a maximum range of syntactic structures from which the antipassive reading can be semantically derived. Second, it analyses semantic and/or pragmatic factors that triggers one or another or both meanings.

This study is based on data taken from a corpus of utterances elicited from native speakers, and expanded by examples from the literature. Ex. (1) - (3) illustrate a non prototypical polysemy of reflexive marker in Slavic languages, expressed on the same verb:

(1) *Proszę   pani,   a   on   **się**   drapie*
    Excuse me   Madam   but   he.NOM   REFL/AP   scratch.PRS.3SG
a. 'Madam, he is scratching himself.' (reference to a child sick with smallpox)   (Polish)
b. 'Madam, he is scratching [other children].'   (personal knowledge)

(2) *On   ruga-l-**sja**   s   plotnik-ami*
    he.NOM   swear.IPFV-PST-   with   carpenter-PL-
        REFL   INST
a. 'He and the carpenters were swearing at each other.'
b. 'He was swearing at the carpenters.'   (Russian, Knjazev 2007:686)

(3) *Bud'   ostrožen,   korov-y   boda-jut-**sja***
    be.IMP   careful.SG.M   cow-PL.NOM   butt.IPFV-3PL.PRS-REFL
a. 'Be careful, the cows butt each other.'
b. 'Be careful, cows are *in the habit of* butting [people].'   (Russian, Knjazev 2007 :681)

Building on Nedjalkov's analysis (2007), I propose that Slavic languages attest three types of syntactic structures that in addition to the reflexive and/or reciprocal reading give rise to antipassive interpretation also. The respective constructions have the reflexive and/or reciprocal reading as a permanent feature and the antipassive meaning appears only in a certain pragmatic context due to similar semantic conditions. In (1), the semantic overlap between the reflexive and antipassive interpretation pertains to the lexical meaning of the base verb. Depending on a discourse context, a zero-coded object is either understood as the anaphoric patient of the reflexive clause, (1a); or as a referential patient 'other children' of the antipassive, (1b). Ex. (2) illustrates a comitative construction with reciprocal (2a), and antipassive reading, (2b). The proper interpretation depends on whether the collective argument *carpenters* is conceptualised as an active (2a) or passive (2b) participant of the action. Ex. (3) illustrates a prototypical reciprocal construction that in certain pragmatic environment can admit also the antipassive interpretation. In the reciprocal use, the subject argument *cows* attributes both the agent and the patient role, whereas in the antipassive one, the same argument assigns only the agent role. The patient argument *people* removed from the syntax due to its irrelevance to the discourse context, though not from the semantics, refers to an unspecified group of individuals. Significantly, in Russian, almost all reciprocal and reciprocal-like constructions accept the antipassive reading.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

CREISSELS, Denis. *Syntaxe générale: une introduction typologique 1: Catégories et constructions*. Hermès Science, 2006. (Coll. Langues et Syntaxe).

GIVÓN, Talmy. *Syntax: An Introduction*. II. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2001.

HEATH, J. « Antipassivization: a functional typology ». *Proceeding of the second annual meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society,* 1976. Pages 202-211.

KEMMER, Suzanne. *The Middle Voice*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia : John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1993. (Coll. Typological Studies in Language 23).

NEDJALKOV, Vladimir P. « Polysemy of reciprocal markers ». In NEDJALKOV, Vladimir P. (ed.). *Reciprocal Constructions*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2007. (Coll. Typological Studies in Language, Volume 71). Pages 231-334.

POLINSKY, Maria. « Antipassive Constructions ». In HASPELMATH Martin, Martin S. DRYER, David GIL, Bernard COMRIE. *The World Atlas Of Language Structure*. Oxford University Press, 2005. Pages 438-439.

SAY, Sergey. « Antipassive *sja*-verbs in Russian: Between inflectional and derivation ». In DRESSLER U. Wolfgan, Dieter KASTOVSKY, Oskar E. PFEIFFER and Franz RAINER (ed.). *Morphology and its Demarcations*. Amsterdam/Netherlands : John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2005. Amsterdam Studies in the Theory and History of Linguistic Science IV: (Current Issues in Linguistic Theory (CILT) 264. Selected Papers from the 11th Morphology Meetings, Vienna, February 2004). Pages 253-275.

SAY, Sergey. « The pragmatic motivation of antipassive in Russian ». In: Piotr Cap (ed.). *Pragmatics today.* (Łódź Studies in Language, ed. by Barbara Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk. Vol. 12). Frankfurt/Main: Peter Lang. 2005. 421-440.

Abbreviations:

AP: antipassive	IMP: imperative	INST: instrumental	IPFV: imperfective	M: masculine
NOM: nominative	PL: plural	PRS: present	PST: past	REFL: reflexive
SG: singular				