

A Reanalysis of the FEEL-LIKE Dative-Reflexive Construction in Slovenian*

Franc Marušič (Stony Brook University)
Rok Žaucer (University of Ottawa)

1. Introduction

This paper proposes a biclausal analysis of the Slovenian construction exemplified in (1).¹

- (1) *Janezu se hribolazi.*
Janez_{DAT} REFL mountain-climb_{3P,Sg,Neu}
'Janez feels like mountain-climbing.'

The interesting aspect of the construction is that its meaning corresponds to a gloss with two verbal forms, i.e. *feel like* and *mountain-climb*, while its surface form only exhibits one verbal form, i.e. *mountain-climb*. The construction has been treated under labels such as the feel-like construction (Dimitrova-Vulchanova 1999), dispositional reflexive construction (Franks 1995), Dative Existential Disclosure construction (Rivero & Milojević Sheppard [R&MS] 2003). We will call it the *FEEL-LIKE construction*.

R&MS (2003) also discuss a semantically different but syntactically superficially similar Polish construction, (2).

- (2) *Jankowi czytało się tę książkę z przyjemnością*
Janek_{DAT} read_{3P,Sg,Neu} REFL this book_{ACC} with pleasure
'Janek read this book with pleasure.'

* This work was sponsored from the SSHRCC Grant 410-2003-0167 (to María-Luisa Rivero) and NSF Grant BCS-0236952 (Richard Larson, PI). We thank María-Luisa Rivero for suggesting this topic, Richard Larson, Barbara Partee, Marija Golden and the audience at FASL 12 for feedback, and Magda Gołędzinowska for Polish data.

¹ Many of the examples come from colloquial rather than standard Slovenian. Neutral intonation is assumed on examples throughout the paper.

R&MS assign (2) and the Slovenian FEEL-LIKE construction the same syntax. The difference in meaning, on their account, stems only from a different semantic operation at LF. We will argue against a syntactic unification of the two constructions.

In Section 2, we show that the FEEL-LIKE construction creates an intensional context, and—in the sententialist spirit—suggest a biclausal structure. In Section 3, we complement this semantic evidence with syntactic evidence such as non-agreeing adverbials (3.1), apparent violations of adverbial hierarchy (3.2), and double depictives (3.3). In Section 4, we develop our proposal and argue that the FEEL-LIKE construction has a biclausal syntax with two verbs, a covert matrix verb FEEL-LIKE and an overt embedded verb.²

2. Intensional semantics

Intensional contexts are standardly attributed three distinguishing characteristics (e.g. Larson 2002). One, substitution of co-referring terms in clausal complements need not preserve truth, so that the truth of (3a) does not entail the truth of (3b) (*B. Karloff* was the stage name of *B. Pratt*). Two, the presence of a non-referring or non-denoting term need not yield falsity, so that (4) can be true

² The FEEL-LIKE reading is available in Slovenian in two distinct dative-reflexive constructions, which R&MS (2003) label the impersonal dative disclosure construction, as in (i) (and (1) above), and the passive dative disclosure construction, (ii). While the former contains an accusative object and default agreement on the verb, the latter contains a nominative object and object agreement on the verb. Not all Slavic languages with the FEEL-LIKE construction have the impersonal variant, e.g. Bulgarian.

- (i) *Janezu se je pilo slivovko.*
 Janez_{DAT} REFL AUX drink_{3P,Sg,Neu} brandy_{ACC,Fem,Sg}
 'Janez feels like drinking plum brandy.'
- (ii) *Janezu se je pila slivovka.*
 Janez_{DAT} REFL AUX drink_{3P,Sg,Fem} brandy_{NOM,Fem,Sg}
 'Janez feels like drinking plum brandy.'

Here we only address the impersonal variant, though the general line of reasoning should extend to the passive variant as well (see Marušič & Žaucer (in prep.) for discussion).

even though the noun *werewolf* does not have a referent in our world. Three, indefinites in intensional contexts can be read non-specifically, so that *a famous actor* in (5) can refer to a specific or non-specific actor.

- (3) a. *Max believed* [_{CP} [*Boris Karloff*] *was in the movie*]
- b. *Max believed* [_{CP} [*Bill Pratt*] *was in the movie*]
- (4) *Max believed* [_{CP} [*a werewolf*] *was in his room*]
- (5) *Max believed* [_{CP} [*a famous actor*] *was in the movie*]

While these three characteristics are found in the clausal-complement constructions in (3-5), all three are absent in simple transitive constructions, (6-7).

- (6) *Max met* [_{DP} *Boris Karloff*] \implies *Max met* [_{DP} *Bill Pratt*]
- (7) $\#$ *Max met* [_{DP} *a unicorn*] (3, 5-7) from Larson (2002)

The observation of this correlation between intensionality and the type of grammatical structure has paved the way for one of the two major ways of analyzing intensionality, namely the *sententialist* approach, as opposed to the *intensionalist* approach. The *intensionalist* approach holds that "intensionality is more the norm than the exception for grammatical relations", that "intensions are centrally involved in the semantic interpretation of all or most grammatical relations" (Partee 1974: 81, 100). Intentionalism has been argued for, among others, by Montague (1974) and Kratzer (1981). Conversely, the *sententialist* approach—whose recent proponents include Larson & Ludlow (1993) and Larson (2002)—holds that intensionality does not arise just anywhere in language, in a wide range of constructions, but that it is rather intimately linked to a specific grammatical structure. This allows a more restrictive and thus theoretically stronger account of intensionality. Specifically, intensionality is argued to be restricted to clausal complements, be they overt or covert. As a result, if all intensional

contexts reduce to contexts of clausal complementation, a uniform semantic analysis—e.g. the Interpreted Logical Forms algorithm of Larson and Ludlow (1993)—can be used for all of them.

In the sententialist spirit, biclausal analyses with a covert clausal complement have been proposed for intensional transitive verbs such as *want* or *need* (McCawley 1979, den Dikken *et al.* 1996, Larson *et al.* 1997). A basic structure for intensional transitive verbs is in (8), where the covert embedded verb is *have*.

(8) *John will need* [PRO TO-HAVE *a bicycle*]

2.1 Intensionality of the FEEL-LIKE construction and a preliminary biclausal structure

The diagnostics from above show that the FEEL-LIKE construction exhibits intensionality effects. (9) shows that substitution of co-referring terms need not preserve truth (*M. Bor* was the pseudonym of *V. Pavšič*), the truth of (9a) does not entail the truth of (9b).

- (9) a. *Črtu se bere Mateja Bora.*
 Črt_{DAT} REFL read Matej_{ACC} Bor_{ACC}
 'Črt feels like reading (poetry by) Matej Bor.'
- b. *Črtu se bere Vladimirja Pavšiča.*
 Črt_{DAT} REFL read Vladimir_{ACC} Pavšič_{ACC}
 'Črt feels like reading (poetry by) Vladimir Pavšič.'

Further, (10) shows that non-referring terms in the FEEL-LIKE construction do not yield falsity. Sentence (10) can be true even though the name *Zeus* does not have a referent in our world.

- (10) *Maši se objema Zevsa.*
 Maša_{DAT} REFL hug Zeus_{ACC}
 'Maša feels like hugging Zeus.'

Finally, (11) clearly allows a nonspecific reading of the indefinite.

- (11) *Lankotu se pogovarja s partizanom.*
 Lanko_{DAT} REFL talk with Partisan_{INST}
 'Lanko feels like talking to a Partisan.'

In short, the FEEL-LIKE construction has intensional semantics. In the sententialist spirit, we take this as suggesting that the FEEL-LIKE construction may well have a (covertly) biclausal structure. In Section 3 we will support this claim with syntactic arguments. In anticipation of a more detailed discussion of the syntax of the FEEL-LIKE construction, we offer the preliminary structure in (12).

- (12) [TP Petru [VP se FEEL-LIKE [AspP [vP pleše]]]]
 Peter_{DAT} REFL dance_{3,Sg,Pres}
 'Peter feels like dancing'

The construction thus contains a covert FEEL-LIKE predicate, which takes a clausal complement. A biclausal analysis allows us to retain the more restrictive, sententialist approach to intensionality.³ The clausal complement is syntactically *Aspect Phrase* (see Section 4 below) and semantically a *proposition*. Note that Kratzer (1996) states that with a split Infl, it is left to be determined which functional projection forms the boundary of the proposition. We thus suggest that AspP is a possible proposition boundary.⁴

Note finally that such a construction, i.e. with a hidden predicate in the matrix clause, is the previously unattested logical possibility in the McCawley (1979) or Larson *et al.* (1997) analysis

³ Note that sententialism is a program yet to be fully worked out. Larson (2002) extends the sententialist account by providing similar clausal-complement analyses for some other intensional contexts, such as those introduced by adverbials like *allegedly*, *supposedly*, and by adjectives like *former*, *alleged*, etc. We leave the issue of other intensional contexts aside, and offer our paper simply as a sententialist attempt at providing a plausible biclausal analysis of the FEEL-LIKE construction.

⁴ We are referring to grammatical aspect (im-/perfectivity) not lexical aspect (a-/telicity).

3. Arguments for biclausality

3.1 Non-agreeing adverbials/adverbs

Non-agreeing adverbials are normally not acceptable within a single clause, (14).⁵

(14) **Tomorrow Jim will play basketball in two weeks.*

However, McCawley (1979) shows that sentences with intensional transitive verbs, e.g. *want*, do allow non-agreeing adverbials, (15).

(15) *Yesterday Jim wanted a new bike tomorrow.*

This is attributed to the fact that such sentences contain a covert predicate, HAVE, and so one adverbial modifies the 'wanting' and the other the 'having', (16). A very close parallel is thus drawn between sentences such as (15), with the structure in (16), and sentences with an overt verb *have* in the clausal complement, (17).

(16) *Yesterday Jim wanted* [PRO TO-HAVE *a new bike tomorrow*]

(17) *Yesterday Jim wanted* [PRO *to have a new bike tomorrow*]

Now, a paraphrase containing an overt verb meaning 'feel-like' easily admits non-agreeing adverbials, (18). One modifies the 'feel-like' event, the other modifies the event of 'going home'.

(18) *V petek se mi ni ljubilo [iti v torek domov]*
on Fri. REFL I_{DAT} neg_{AUX} feel-like_{Past} go_{INF} on Tues. home
'On Friday, I didn't feel like going home on Tuesday.'

⁵ Note that certain ordinary constructions do allow non-agreeing temporal adverbs, (i), but—crucially—not both referring to some future time, as shown by (14) above.

(i) *Today you are out of the hospital in a week.*

(ii) *Today it appears that you are out of the hospital in a week.*

Note further that we can paraphrase such sentences as in (ii), suggesting that (i) might involve a hidden predicate IT-APPEARS-THAT. A longer discussion of these constructions is taken up in Marušič and Žaucer (in preparation).

In the same manner, non-agreeing adverbials/adverbs can co-occur in the FEEL-LIKE construction. (19) contains two non-agreeing temporal adverbials, (20) two non-agreeing adverbs.

- (19) *V petek se mi ni šlo v torek domov.*
 on Friday REFL I_{DAT} neg-AUX go_{Past} on Tuesday home
 'On Friday, I didn't feel like going home on Tuesday.'
- (20) *Zdajle se mi ne gre jutri domov.*
 now REFL I_{DAT} not go_{Pres} tomorrow home
 'Right now I don't feel like going home tomorrow.'

This shows that the FEEL-LIKE construction contains two predicates related to two different event times.⁶

R&MS propose that in sentences such as (20), *se* is an indefinite pronoun combining an existential quantifier and a variable. The dative has two effects on this quantificational pronoun. It deletes the quantifier, which R&MS dub "existential disclosure", and it binds the variable. Note that R&MS (2003) state that the binding procedure between the dative NP and the clitic *se* that follows the existential disclosure of their indefinite pronoun *se* in the Slovenian FEEL-LIKE construction adds "a modal meaning reminiscent of control" (2003: 133), as in *John_i wished PRO_i to leave*, where the clitic *se* is comparable to the controlled PRO and the dative NP to the controller, i.e. *John*. Recall that a sententialist account may well postulate an abstract clausal complement containing precisely this, a control relation between the external arguments of the matrix and the embedded clause. An important difference between *John_i wished PRO_i to leave* and a structure with a Modal Phrase as in [_{MP} [_{CIP} [_{TP} [_{VP}]]]], however, is in the richness of structure. Restrictive theories of adverbial placement explain the unacceptability of non-agreeing adverbs with the claim that there

⁶ Note that examples containing a past or future FEEL-LIKE predicate (e.g. (19) and (33), respectively) clearly show that one cannot dismiss the FEEL-LIKE dispositional event as being merely a pragmatically derived attitude with contextual anchoring to speech time.

can be only one adverb of a certain type per clause (Cinque 1999, Alexiadou 1997). Assuming such a theory, it follows that if non-agreeing adverbs are possible, they must be in two clauses, providing room for two sets of functional projections. The monoclausal structure with a ModalP on top, however, will be predicted not to allow non-agreeing adverbials, given that it only has one set of functional projections, including various slots for adverbials.

Note further that examples like (19-20) cannot be dismissed with Parsons' (1990) distinction between temporal and frame adverbials, as in (21), where frame adverbials are defined as setting the context within which the rest of the sentence is interpreted.

(21) *During the war I ran every day in the afternoon.*

The FEEL-LIKE construction allows both two distinct frame adverbials, (22a), and one frame adverbial with two temporal adverbials in its scope, (22b).

(22) a. *Med vojno se mi je po vojni hodilo*
 during war REFL I_{DAT} AUX after war go

vsak dan na Rž.
 every day onto Rž

'During the war I felt like climbing Rž after the war every day.'

b. *Med vojno se mi je vsako dopoldne*
 during war REFL I_{DAT} AUX every morning

šlo naslednji dan na Rž.
 go following day onto Rž

'During the war I felt every day like climbing Rž the next day.'⁷

⁷ We split the 'feel like' predicate in the translation line with the temporal adverbial in order to disambiguate the association of the adverbial.

More generally, the acceptability of non-agreeing adverbials is not restricted to temporal (and/or frame) adverbials but rather extends to several types of adjuncts, such as location or manner adjuncts, as well as to frequency adverbs (event quantifiers), as in (23).

- (23) *Pogosto se mi teče bolj redko.*
 frequently REFL I_{DAT} run more rarely
 'I often feel like running more rarely.'

Observe finally that the placement of adverbials is restricted. In (24), the adverbial following the overt verb is necessarily associated with the event of 'going to Vienna'. Consequently, (24) is ruled out because of a clash between the time of 'going to Vienna', the event of the overt verb, and the adverbial *on Tuesday*, which modifies the FEEL-LIKE predicate. One cannot have a future disposition about a present event.

- (24) **Kok se mi v torek ne [gre ta moment na Dunaj].*
 how REFL I_{DAT} on Tues. not go_{Pres} this moment to Vienna
 'I so don't feel on Tuesday like going to Vienna right now!'

Assuming that temporal adverbials originate inside VP (Larson 1988, Giorgi & Pianesi 1997, Cinque 1999), a monoclausal analysis cannot explain this placement restriction. There seems to be no principled reason why the two temporal adverbials inside the same VP shell should be positioned in a specific order. The restriction on the relative placement in (24) thus suggests that there are two different VPs (in two different clauses).

To summarize, if there can be only one adverb of a certain type per clause (Cinque 1999, Alexiadou 1997), non-agreeing adverb doubling should be ruled out if the FEEL-LIKE construction only contains one syntactic clause. The data from this section thus suggest that there are two clauses with two sets of functional projections, which can host two sets of non-agreeing adverbials.

3.1.1 *Polish* The Polish impersonal dative-reflexive construction, (25) (= (2) above), has a superficially identical syntax to the FEEL-LIKE construction, but a crucially different interpretation. It denotes a past event with an "involuntary agent", not a past disposition.

(25) *Jankowi czytało się tę książkę z przyjemnością.*
Janek_{DAT} read_{3P,Sg,Neu} REFL this book_{ACC} with pleasure
'Janek read this book with pleasure.'

R&MS (2003) unifyingly assign (25) and the FEEL-LIKE construction a common (monoclausal) syntax (under the cover term "involuntary state constructions"). The (non-intensional) semantics of the Polish dative-reflexive construction does not seem to offer a principled reason for positing a biclausal structure. And indeed, Polish does not allow double non-agreeing adverbs (Magda Gołędzinowska, p.c.), which suggests that the structure of (25) is different from the Slovenian FEEL-LIKE construction, in particular, it does not exhibit evidence for a hidden matrix predicate.⁸

3.2 *Apparent violations of Cinque's (1999) adverbial hierarchy*

Alexiadou (1997) and Cinque (1999) argue that adverbs follow a strict linear order. Cinque locates adverbs in the specifier positions of various functional projections, which follow an inviolable (universal) hierarchy. This explains why adverbs can only appear in one linear order. Indeed, the Slovenian *običajno* 'usually' and *še vedno* 'still' can only appear in the order in (26a) and not in the reverse order of (26b). On Cinque's account, this is because the functional projection $Asp_{\text{habitual}}P$, where adverb *usually* sits, dominates $Asp_{\text{continuative}}P$, the functional projection of *still*.

⁸ See Rivero (2003) for a possible account of (25) (but not, in our view, of the FEEL-LIKE construction), where the dative is seen as a very high (clause-external) applicative that takes the finite TP as its complement.

- (26) a. *Ob tej uri Črt običajno še vedno raznaša pošto.*
 At this time Črt usually still delivers mail
 'At this time, Črt is usually still delivering mail.'
- b. **Ob tej uri Črt še vedno običajno raznaša pošto.*
 At this time Črt still usually delivers mail
 'At this time, Črt is still usually delivering mail.'

Since the adverbial hierarchy is inviolable, the only way to get the reverse order of adverbs would be to have two sets of functional projections, i.e. two clauses. Interestingly, the strict linear order can, in fact, be violated in the FEEL-LIKE construction, (27a-b).

- (27) a. *Janezu se običajno še vedno kupuje na tržnici.*
 J_{DAT} REFL usually still buy on market
 'Janez usually still feels like shopping at the market.'
- b. *Janezu se še vedno običajno kupuje na tržnici.*
 J_{DAT} REFL still usually buy on market
 'Janez still feels like usually shopping at the market.'

Since the hierarchy is inviolable but the reversed order of *usually* and *still* is nonetheless possible, the two adverbs in (27b) must be in separate clauses, each with its own set of functional projections.⁹

An analysis with two clauses is also suggested by the three-way ambiguity of (27a). The two sets of functional projections allow three different positionings of the two adverbs, while still respecting the inviolable linear order. The two adverbs can both be associated with either the matrix clause, (28a), the embedded clause, (28b), or they can be associated with distinct clauses, (28c).

⁹ There is disagreement in the literature whether Cinque's hierarchy is indeed universal. Note, though, that this does not affect the status of our argument. Crucially, the Slovenian *običajno* 'usually' and *še vedno* 'still' are not reversible in ordinary constructions, as shown in (26), while they are reversible in the FEEL-LIKE construction, as shown in (27). (Marušič & Žaucer (in preparation) defend the validity of this argument in more detail.)

- (28) a. *Janezu se običajno še vedno* FEEL-LIKE [*kupuje na tržnici*]
 'Janez usually still feels-like [buying in the market]'
- b. *Janezu se* FEEL-LIKE [*običajno še vedno kupuje na tržnici*]
 'Janez feels-like [usually still buying in the market]'
- c. *Janezu se običajno* FEEL-LIKE [*še vedno kupuje na tržnici*]
 'Janez usually feels-like [still buying in the market]'

No such ambiguity is exhibited in (27b). This is predicted; the only way to get the otherwise unacceptable order is to have the adverbs in two distinct clauses, where they refer to two separate events.

Adopting Cinque's (1999) strict linear order of adverbial placement, evidenced by (26), the data in (27) suggest a biclausal analysis rather than a monoclausal one.

3.3 Double depictive secondary predication

Further evidence for a biclausal syntax for the FEEL-LIKE construction comes from depictive secondary predicates. The FEEL-LIKE construction allows two depictives associated with two different events occurring at two different times, as in (29). Note that depictives in Slovenian always agree with their host in number, gender, and case (see Marušič *et al.* 2003), and given that the two depictives carry different case markings, sentences like (29) cannot be cases of depictive-stacking.

- (29) *Vidu se treznemu ne gre v šolo gol,*
 Vid_{DAT} REFL sober_{DAT} not go to school naked_{NOM},
(pijanemu pa že mogoče).
 drunk_{DAT} but PTCL maybe
 'When sober, Vid doesn't feel like [going to school naked]
 (but when drunk, he just might feel like it).'

The depictive that modifies the matrix, FEEL-LIKE predicate is thus in the dative, agreeing with the experiencer of the FEEL-LIKE predicate, and the depictive that modifies the embedded, 'going to school' predicate is in the nominative, agreeing with the covert subject of the embedded clause. Since depictives are temporally dependent on the main predicate, the property they express must hold of the denotation of their subject throughout the extent of the main event (Rothstein 2000). The availability of two non-stacked depictives, making reference to two different times, suggests that there must also be two main events with distinct time references.

Furthermore, assuming the standard syntactic analysis of depictives, where the depictive placed in a small clause adjoined to the VP (e.g. Bowers 2001), we can only explain the two depictives in (29) with two VP layers, that is, with two clauses. Even if one analyzes depictives differently, e.g. with a movement analysis as in Marušič *et al.* (2003), where the depictive is interpreted depending on the verb into whose argument position it is moved, one still needs two verbs with distinct argument positions.

As with non-agreeing adverbials, the data given in (29) above lead us naturally into drawing a parallel between the FEEL-LIKE construction and cases of two depictives in other types of clausal complementation, e.g. control sentences like (30), which involves two events overtly, with two overt verbs in two clauses.

(30) *Vid je pijan sklenil zadevo Joni razložiti trezen*
 V_{NOM} AUX drunk_{NOM} decided matter J_{DAT} explain_{INF} sober_{NOM}
 'Vid_i decided, when drunk_i, to explain the matter to Jona sober_i'

Finally, for the depictive to modify the event of the embedded clause of the FEEL-LIKE construction, the depictive must follow the overt verb. The reverse order of depictives of (30) is ruled out, as shown in (31) (cf. (24) above for the same effect with adverbs).

(31) **Meni se gol ne gre v šolo treznemu.*
 I_{DAT} REFL naked_{NOM} not go to school sober_{DAT}

To summarize, our data from depictive modification of the FEEL-LIKE construction argue for a biclausal analysis and pose a problem for a monoclausal account with a single verb.

4. The derivation of the construction.

We want to take the comparison between the FEEL-LIKE construction and its closest paraphrase, (32), seriously, and argue that (32b) has essentially the same structure as the FEEL-LIKE construction in (32a), but with an overt matrix predicate.

- (32) a. *Vidu se pleše* ==> FEEL-LIKE construction
Vid_{DAT} REFL dance_{3P,Sg,Neu}
'Vid feels like dancing.'
- b. *Vidu se hoče/ljubi/lušta plesati* ==> "paraphrase"
Vid_{DAT} REFL want/desire_{3P,Sg,Neu} dance_{INF}
'Vid feels like dancing.'

Like the FEEL-LIKE construction in (32a), the construction in (32b) has a dative experiencer subject. Note that it is far from unusual for an experiencer to be realized as a dative. So, the element that licenses the dative in (32b) can also act as the licenser for the dative of (32a). A similar parallel holds with respect to the gender/person/number inflection on the verb. The FEEL-LIKE construction, (32a), has non-agreeing morphology: neuter, 3rd person, singular. R&MS (2003) see it as default verbal morphology. Similarly, the default pattern is—on the overt matrix verb—also found in (33b). (As the FEEL-LIKE construction contains no overt matrix verb, its inflection gets realized on the only possible host, the lower verb; cf. below.)

Moreover, the REFLEXIVE clitic from the FEEL-LIKE construction also occurs in the construction with the overt matrix verb, (32b). We claim that the REFLEXIVE clitic in both (32a) and

(32b) belongs to the matrix verb, be it covert or overt, which has no agent θ -role and no accusative case to assign.^{10,11}

Unlike the affixal default morphology of the FEEL-LIKE construction, which is realized on the verb (cf. above), the REFLEXIVE morpheme is a clitic and thus does not need a verbal host. It gets realized in the usual position of the clitic cluster.

In a similar vein, the tense inflection realized on the lower verb in the FEEL-LIKE construction belongs to the FEEL-LIKE predicate, not to the overt verb. That is, future morphology on the verb in (33) signifies a future disposition (FEEL-LIKE event), not a present disposition towards a future 'coming out' event.

- (33) *Lini se še ne bo šlo ven.*
Lina_{DAT} REFL still NEG AUX_{FUT} come out
'Lina will still not feel like coming out.'
#Lina still doesn't feel like coming out in the future.'

The interpretation of tense morphology thus constitutes a further difference between the Slovenian FEEL-LIKE and Polish "involuntary agent" construction. In the FEEL-LIKE construction, (33), the tense on the verb modifies the covert matrix (FEEL-LIKE) predicate, while in Polish, (25), it modifies the only predicate, i.e. the one denoted by the verb where tense is actually realized. Again, this suggests different structures for the two constructions.

On the other hand, unlike tense inflection, aspect inflection in the FEEL-LIKE construction actually belongs to the overt verb,

¹⁰ Note also that the FEEL-LIKE construction and the paraphrase with an overt matrix verb behave on a par in terms of allowing non-agreeing adverbials.

¹¹ In the absence of the FEEL-LIKE construction, a construction like the Slovenian (32b) is the only way to express this meaning in Polish (R&MS 2003). Note that such a construction in Polish also allows non-agreeing adverbs (Magda Gołędzinowska, p.c.):

- (i) *Ojej, jak mi się nie chce teraz jechać jutro do Rzymu.*
gee, how I_{DAT} REFL not want now go tomorrow to Rome
'Gee, how I don't feel right now like going to Rome tomorrow.'

not to the FEEL-LIKE predicate. As shown in (34), the im-/perfective aspect inflection on the overt verb (in this case realized as vowel alternation) modifies the 'hugging' rather than the FEEL-LIKE event, so that (34a-b) differ in whether Maša feels like giving Peter a hug (perfective) or like holding him (imperfective).

- (34) a. *Maši se ful objame Petra.*
 Maša_{DAT} REFL very hug_{PF} Peter_{ACC}
 'Maša so feels like giving Peter a hug.'
- b. *Maši se ful objema Petra.*
 Maša_{DAT} REFL very hug_{IMPF} Peter_{ACC}
 'Maša so feels like holding Peter.'

Aspect is standardly placed below TP (e.g. Giorgi & Pianesi 1997, Dimitrova-Vulchanova 1999). With Tense morphology on the overt verb actually belonging to the FEEL-LIKE predicate, AspP thus represents the highest functional projection of the lower verb for which there is overt morphological evidence.

Based on the above, we propose the structure given in (35). Note that both the matrix and the embedded clause are in a way deficient. The matrix clause is deficient at the bottom, it has no active vP (it does not assign accusative); the embedded clause has no realized tense morphology and is deficient at the top, it has no CP and no TP.¹²

¹² In Marušič & Žaucer (in preparation), we follow Rivero (to appear) and analyze the REFLEXIVE clitic in the FEEL-LIKE construction as non-active morphology. Note that in a similar FEEL-LIKE construction in Albanian, the correspondent of the Slovenian REFLEXIVE is the non-active affix on the verb, (i) (Rivero, to appear).

- (i) *Më puno-het.*
 I_{DAT} work_{Non-act,3,Sg}
 'I feel like working.' (Kallulli 1999: 269)

The Albanian non-active affix, which belongs to the covert FEEL-LIKE predicate, is realized on the overt verb just as the affixal default morphology in the Slovenian FEEL-LIKE construction (while the Slovenian non-active clitic does not need a verbal host).

(35) [CP[TP NP_{DAT} [VP REFL ~~FEEL-LIKE~~ [AspP[_{vP}[VP V NP_{ACC}]]]]]]

Since the upper clause lacks an active *vP* and the lower one a CP, both of which represent strong phases (Chomsky 2001), there are no phases intervening between the lower V and the upper T. Consequently, given that the FEEL-LIKE construction has no upper verb available for affix attachment, the overt lower-clause verb is as accessible to the upper T as any verb in any ordinary construction. But if the matrix predicate is overt, as in (32b), then the verbal morphology surfaces on the matrix verb.

5. Conclusion

We discussed an apparently monoclausal construction whose intensional semantics suggests a possible biclausal structure (cf. the sententialist program as in Larson 2002). Rivero (2003: 485) actually raises the idea of a biclausal structure, but discards it with the claim that there is no evidence for it and instead provides a syntactically unifying account of the Polish and Slovenian "involuntary state constructions". However, we presented semantic and syntactic evidence for biclausality of the Slovenian FEEL-LIKE construction and proposed that it is best analyzed as containing a concealed matrix predicate. This allows us to preserve the stricter, sententialist view of intensionality. Our biclausal analysis comes close in spirit to the familiar sententialist account of intensional transitive verbs, for which we thus provided a previously unattested logical possibility—a covert matrix-clause verb.

References

Alexiadou, Artemis. 1997. *Adverb Placement: A Case Study in Antisymmetric Syntax*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

- Bowers, John. 2001. Predication. In M. Baltin & C. Collins (eds) *The Handbook of Contemporary Syntactic Theory*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell. 299-333.
- Chomsky, Noam. 2001. Derivation by phase. In M. Kenstowicz (ed.) *Ken Hale: A life in language*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press. 1-52.
- Cinque, Guglielmo. 1999. *Adverbs and Functional Heads*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- den Dikken, Marcel, Richard Larson & Peter Ludlow. 1996. Intensional "Transitive" Verbs and Concealed Complement Clauses. *Rivista di Linguistica* 8: 29-46.
- Dimitrova-Vulchanova, Mila. 1999. *Verb Semantics, Diathesis and Aspect*. Muenchen/Newcastle: LINCOM EUROPA.
- Franks, Steven. 1995. *Parameters of Slavic morphosyntax*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Giorgi, Alessandra and Fabio Pianesi. 1997. *Tense and aspect: from semantics to morphosyntax*. Oxford: OUP.
- Kallulli, Dalina. 1999. Non-active morphology in Albanian and event (de)composition. In I. Kenesei (ed.) *Crossing Boundaries*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 263-292.
- Kearns, Kate. 2000. *Semantics*. London: Macmillan.
- Kratzer, Angelika. 1981. The Notional Category of Modality. In H.-J. Eikmeyer & H. Rieser (eds) *Words, Worlds, and Contexts*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 38-74.
- Kratzer, Angelika. 1996. Severing the External Argument from Its Verb. In J. Rooryck & L. Zaring (eds) *Phrase Structure and the Lexicon*. Dordrecht: Kluwer. 109-137.
- Larson, Richard. 1988. On the Double Object Construction. *Linguistic Inquiry* 19.3: 335-391.
- Larson, Richard. 2002. The Grammar of Intensionality. In G. Preyer & G. Peter (eds) *Logical Form and Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 228-262.
- Larson, Richard, Marcel den Dikken & Peter Ludlow. 1997. *Intensional Transitive Verbs and Abstract Clausal Complementation*. Ms. Stony Brook University and CUNY.

- Larson, Richard and Peter Ludlow. 1993. Interpreted Logical Forms. *Synthese* 95: 305-355.
- Marušič, Franc & Rok Žaucer. in preparation. *The Intensional FEEL-LIKE Construction in Slovenian*.
- Marušič, Franc, Tatjana Marvin & Rok Žaucer. 2003. Depictive Secondary Predication in Slovenian. In W. Browne *et al.* (eds) *FASL* 11. Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publ. 373-392.
- McCawley, James. 1979. On Identifying the Remains of Deceased Clauses. In J. McCawley *Adverbs, Vowels and Other Objects of Wonder*. Chicago: CUP. 84-95.
- Montague, Richard. 1974. *Formal Philosophy; Selected papers of Richard Montague*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Parsons, Terence. 1990. *Events in the Semantics of English. A Study of Subatomic Semantics*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Partee, Barbara. 1974. Opacity and Scope. In M. K. Munitz & P. K. Unger (eds) *Semantics and Philosophy*. New York: NYU Press. 81-101.
- Rivero, María-Luisa. 2003. Reflexive clitic constructions with datives: syntax and semantics. In W. Browne *et al.* (eds) *FASL* 11. Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publ. 469-494.
- Rivero, María-Luisa. to appear. Datives and the Non-active Voice / Reflexive Clitic in Balkan Languages. In O. Tomić (ed.) *Balkan Syntax and Semantics*. John Benjamins.
- Rivero, María-Luisa & Milena Milojević Sheppard. 2003. Indefinite Reflexive Clitics in Slavic: Polish and Slovenian. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 21.1: 89-155.
- Rothstein, Susan. 2000. Secondary predication and aspectual structure. *ZAS Papers in Linguistics* 17: 241-264.

Franc Marušič: lanko.marusic@guest.arnes.si
 Rok Žaucer: rok.zaucer@guest.arnes.si