THE SYSTEM OF DIATHESES IN BULGARIAN AND THE STATIVE PREDICATES

Svetla Koeva

**Institute for Bulgarian Language Prof. Lyubomir Andreychin,
Bulgarian Academy of Sciences**

svetla@dcl.bas.bg

Abstract: The investigation is intended to provide a clear distinction between the category of grammatical voice in Bulgarian (grammatical diatheses) and lexical diatheses by analyzing grammatical facts and by applying semantic criteria. The category of (grammatical) voice is used to describe a wide range of phenomena. Only the lexical diatheses are presented in more detail: *se* passives, impersonal passives, middles, anticausatives, lexical reciprocals, optatives, impersonal optatives, property of "oblique" subject. The semantic and grammatical characteristics (arguments and semantic roles, verb aspect, transitivity, and morphological categories of the verb lemma) of the source and derivative diatheses are studied, compared, and described. A large number of the source diatheses affect imperfective verbs that may express activities or states; in such cases, the alternations may lead to one of the following configurations: activity – activity; activity – state; state – state. We trace the correlation between the diathesis type and the eventuality type in the context of the ontological description of the state predicates proposed in this study.

Key words: *diathesis, stative predicates, passives, middles, anticausatives, reciprocals, optatives*

1. Introduction

The present study of diatheses has two objectives. First, it is intended to provide an overview of the category of **lexical diathesis** in Bulgarian. Second, it seeks to present lexical diatheses in the context of particular types of predicates, specifically the stative predicates.

The **diathesis** of a word is the correspondence between its semantic actants (arguments) and deep syntactic actants (abstract generalizations about the surface syntactic structure, regardless of the specific syntactic realization in a given language (Mel'čuk 2006: 187). The following definition can be interpreted as closely related to the study of I. Mel'čuk and A. Xolodovič (Mel'čuk, Xolodovič 1970): **diathesis** refers to any specific mapping of semantic roles (notions like agent, patient, etc.) onto grammatical roles (notions like subject, object, etc.) (Zúñiga, Kittilä 2019: 10).

Following the approach of F. Zúñiga, S. Kittilä (Zúñiga, Kittilä 2019: 10) we work with the generalized semantic roles: agent-like, patient-like and theme-like, here simply called **agent**, **patient** and **theme**, supplementing them with the role of **experiencer**. The grammatical roles needed for our analysis are **subject**, **object**, **prepositional object** (the last two are also called complements), and **adjunct**.

Voice is defined as an inflectional category whose grammemes (members) represent modifications of the underlying (source) diathesis of the lexical unit that do not affect its propositional meaning (Mel'čuk 2006: 191). More general is the view that voice defines diatheses as mappings of the roles of the semantic arguments of predicates onto grammatical relations in clauses and that voices are diatheses formally marked on predicates (Zúñiga, Kittilä 2019: 10). In the present work, we transfer the formal description of voice to the alternations that change the proposition (and the meaning of the predicate) and call such phenomena **lexical diatheses**, using the term **diathesis** both for the category and for its members. In other words, we are interested in systemic alternations where there is a change in the meaning of the predicate, which is associated with a change in the number and/or type of the semantic relations between the predicate and the arguments, which in turn leads to a change in the syntactic and morphological structure of the derived predicate[1]. Therefore, we make a distinction between **grammatical diathesis** (voice) and l**exical diathesis** (systemic alternations in verb meanings) and can generalize that grammatical diathesis affects sentences (for example, periphrastic passive in Bulgarian), while lexical diathesis affects predicates (for example, impersonal passive in Bulgarian).

As stated (Mel'čuk 2006: 195), there are three possibilities for modification of the prototypical basic (grammatical) diathesis – the diathesis with two semantic and two deep syntactic actants (arguments):

By permutation of the deep syntactic actants (arguments) against the corresponding semantic actants (arguments).

By suppressing a deep syntactic actant (argument), so that its syntactic appearance in the sentence is impossible, the corresponding semantic actant (argument) loses its syntactic realization.

By referential identification of semantic actants (arguments) with suppression of one or both deep syntactic actants (arguments).

The strategies that are used in Bulgarian to alter predicates' meaning may arise from:

– changing the semantic relations (roles) of the arguments to the predicate;

---

[1] It was stated that alternations like active – passive, traditionally classified as voice, are a small subset of the systematic alternations found in human language. However, the lexical representation of argument structure (diathesis) together with the systematic alterations of a verb's source diathesis are seen as an integral part of the grammatical system of a given language (Babby 1998: 1). Consequently, we distinguish between grammatical and lexical diatheses, the first one operating only at the grammatical level, and the second one both at the lexical and grammatical level.

– reduction in the number of arguments, which is reflected both semantically and syntactically (Коева / Koeva 2022a: 81).

The study provides a clear distinction between the category of grammatical voice in Bulgarian (grammatical diathesis) and lexical diathesis by analyzing grammatical facts and applying semantic criteria. Grammatical voice (grammatical diathesis) is manifested by the alternation of the verb morphology (person, number, aspect, compound structures) and the syntactic status of arguments (their category and grammatical role) in the related sentences, while the semantic roles of arguments remain unchanged. Lexical diathesis is manifested by the same morphological and grammatical means: changes in verb morphology and the syntactic status of arguments; however, the related sentences differ either by the number of (semantic) arguments and/or by the semantic roles of the (semantic) arguments to the predicate.

The hallmark of the study is that we present the diathesis phenomenon in Bulgarian in terms of semantic criteria, such as alternation in (semantic) argument structure and decreasing the number of semantic arguments (Коева / Koeva 2006; Koeva 2007; Коева / Koeva 2022a). We supplement this type of semantic analysis by integrating it in the aspectuality domain (in the sense of Zeno Vendler's verb aspectual classes). Last but not least, we pay attention to morphological and syntactic alternations accompanying the semantic shifts[2].

We trace how lexical diatheses are combined with morphological changes in verbs in Bulgarian and which of the main situation types of predicates are affected by them, identified according to Zeno Vendler's classification (Vendler 1957). A large number of the source diatheses are sentences with imperfective verbs that may express activities or states; in such cases, the alternations may lead to one of the following configurations: activity – activity; activity – state; state – state. Of special interest are the last two configurations, and especially the last one, which has a relatively limited manifestation and has not received particular attention so far. We place the correlation between the diathesis type and eventuality type[3] in the context of the ontological description of the state predicates that we propose.

The category of (grammatical) voice is used to describe a wide range of phenomena across languages, such as causatives, applicatives, passives, antipassives, middles, and some others (Mel'čuk 2006; Zúñiga, Kittilä 2019). Only the ones that meet the conditions for lexical diathesis in Bulgarian are presented in the study with more detail: *se* passives, impersonal passives, middles, anticausatives, lexical reciprocals, optatives, impersonal optatives, and property of "oblique" subject.

---

[2] This study does not aim to reveal argument linking (or *argument realization*) (Levin, Rappaport Hovav 2005).

[3] Further, we use the term eventuality (type) following Emmon Bach (Bach 1981) and Hana Filip (Filip 1999). It is shown that the term is both theoretically and ontologically the most neutral term used in the domain of 'aspectual phenomena' in a broad sense (Filip 1999: 15).

2. Stative predicates

In many theories, the distinction of eventualities is based on how a situation relates to its reference time. In particular, Partee (1984) claims that a stative predication includes its reference time, while a dynamic predication is included within its reference time (Michaelis 2011: 1361). In other words, a given state exists at a given moment without any indication as to when the state has begun or when it has ended (if it has ended at all), and the sentence expressing a state presents just a part of the situation – the portion which falls within the limits of the referential time (Michaelis 2011: 1361).

One of the fundamental traits of various classifications of eventuality types is that they depend on semantic features, the relationships between which are not always obvious or formally stated. These characteristics can be linked to general semantics that apply to every member of a specific group, such as verbs that signify existence, perception, experience, etc. (Van Valin, LaPolla 1997: 115).

Other classifications are based on a set of properties and how they are expressed in a particular eventuality type. According to David Dowty, the fundamental distinction between the eventuality types is based on the property **change of state** (Dowry 1979: 185). He offers a classification based on the following temporal properties: momentary and interval predicates; predicates entailing definite or indefinite change, and those entailing no change; definite change of stative predicates and activity predicates or indefinite change of stative predicates; singular change predicates and complex change predicates; and agentive and non-agentive predicates (Dowty, 1979: 184). In this way, predicates are divided into states, actions, complex change (accomplishments or activities), and singular change (achievements). David Dowty distinguishes among three classes of statives: **interval stative predicates** (e.g., *sit, stand, lie*)**, momentary stage-predicates** (e.g. *be on the table, be asleep),* and **object-level stative predicates** (e.g., *know, like, be intelligent,* etc.). The last two classes can be true at moments and are true at an interval if and only if they are true at all moments within that interval (Dowty, 1979: 180).

The opposition between predicates corresponds to the distinction between stage-level and individual-level stative predicates (Carlson 1977: 170–171). Individual-level states are constantly related to their arguments irrespective of time, atemporally. Stage-level states are episodic, spatio-temporal intervals.

Donald Davidson (Davidson 1967: 92–93) assumes that events have an additional hidden event argument through which the event can be characterized in relation to the manner, place, and time in which it takes place. In such an interpretation, a transitive verb introduces not a two-place but a three-place relationship involving a subject, an object, and a hidden event argument (whose variable can be realized in the form of adverbial modifiers that characterize the event). Davidson's analysis is extended to all eventuality types (Parsons 1990). Sentences with event predicates and sentences with stative predicates have different logical representations: in the former case, there are three arguments, one of which is a hidden argument for eventness, while in the latter there are

only two arguments (Katz 2003: 461). Angelika Kratzer (Kratzer 1995: 128) analyzes the difference between stage-level and individual-level predicates within the opposition: predicates with a hidden event argument and predicates without a hidden event argument.

On the basis of prior theoretical constructs (Kim 1976), it has been demonstrated that individual-level states do not succumb to the analysis of Donald Davidson. Claudia Maienborn divides stative predicates into two types: predicates, represented by such verbs as *sit, stand, lie, sleep* and *shine*, which denote eventualities in the sense of the theoretical constructs of Donald Davidson (Davidson states, D-states) and predicates, represented by verbs and adjectives such as *know, weighs, have* (*possess*)*, nice,* and *blond,* which do not represent eventualities in the sense of Donald Davidson (Kimian states, K-states) (Maienborn 2019: 2). The first group are stage-level stative predicates, while the second – individual-level stative predicates.

It was summarized that Davidsonian eventualities, which comprise events (Vendler's accomplishments and achievements), processes (Vendler's activities), and D-states (states), are particular spatio-temporal entities with functionally integrated participants (Maienborn 2019: 64). Their ontological properties are that eventualities are perceptible, they can be located in space and time, they have a unique manner of realization, they are not closed under complementation, they are causally efficacious, and they involve participation (Maienborn 2019: 64). K-states are characterized with the following ontological properties: they are not accessible to direct perception, they have no location in space and no unique manner of realization, they can be located in time, they are reified entities of thought and discourse, they are closed under complementation, they are not causally efficacious, and they do not involve participation (Maienborn 2019: 47).

The following diagnostics for the identification of hidden event arguments (which logically is used for differentiating between stage-level and individual-level stative predicates) has been offered (Maienborn 2019: 30). Stage-level stative predicates can be infinitival complements to verbs of perception (in English). Individual-level stative predicates cannot appear in such an environment. Stage-level stative predicates can be combined with locative adverbial expressions, in contrast to individual-level stative predicates. The diagnostic is reliable for differentiating between the two basic types of states: stage-level stative predicates (Davidsonian states) and individual-level stative predicates (Kimian states)[4].

2.1. Ontology of stative predicates: defining properties

We classify the stative predicates subsumed under the main division D-states and K-states. We adopt an approach of offering a set of properties that relate to the prioritized argument, for which we introduce the term **topical argument**: a notion that

---

[4] The tests relating to compatibility with manner adverbials are not as categorical, since manner adverbials constitute a diverse set and different subsets of manner adverbials combine with different verbs depending on their semantic compatibility.

refers to the semantic subject of the predicate, regardless of its syntactic realization or whether it is animated or not. The semantic subject can be either the **agent**, the **experiencer**, the **patient,** or the **theme** (if no **agent** or **experiencer** is involved) within the semantic argument structure.

Most generally, the topical argument can be characterized in relation to whether it is realized by an **animate** or **inanimate** entity. Animated participants that express the topical argument may be characterized by generalized properties such as **agent**, **experiencer,** and **patient**. Various definitions have been provided for the semantic role **experiencer**, for example: an animate being that undergoes internal experiential states such as perception, cognitive processes, and emotions (Van Valin, LaPolla 1997: 85). Such a broad understanding is appropriate for our purposes and provides grounds for the individuation of a semantic property **psychological experience**, which is applicable in all cases where the topical argument perceives, thinks, desires, experiences, etc., whatever experiences fall within the property **animate**. In addition, we recognize the property **physical experience** in order to construct a further class of stative predicates when the topical argument is concerned with bodily experiences.

The inability of the topical argument of stative predicates to be associated with agentivity, in our opinion, is one of its most distinctive properties. Nevertheless, with predicates such as *sit*, *stand, and lie*, the topical argument, without being an **agent**, is characterized by a **conscious participation** in the eventuality. Actually, it has been pointed out that when predicated of humans, verbs such as *sit, stand,* etc. are typically **volitionally controlled** (Dowry 1979: 176).

A prerequisite for the three properties that are introduced: **psychological experience**, **physical experience** and **conscious participation** is the **animacy** of the topical argument. On the other hand, the three properties: psychological experience, physical experience and conscious participation, are mutually exclusive.

2.2. Ontology of stative predicates based on their topical argument

The hierarchy of properties characterizing the topical argument is as follows: [entity [animacy [psychological experience] [physical experience] [conscious participation]] [inanimacy]] (Koeva 2022b: 383). Some examples are presented below.

2.2.1. Individual-level states

Topical argument psychological experiencer
1.a. Някой: *знае | чувства* нещо
Someone *knows | feels* something

b. Някой: *желае (иска) | мрази | обича | помни | харесва* някого | нещо
Someone *wants (desires) | hates | loves | remembers | likes* someone | something

c. Някой: *жадува за (копнее за) | вярва в | безпокои се за | тревожи се за | надява се на | радва се на | разчита на | гордее с | вълнува се от | срамува се от | страхува се от* някого | нещо

Someone craves (yearns for) | believes in | is bothered by | worries (about) | hopes | enjoys | relies on | is proud of | is excited about | is ashamed of | is afraid of someone | something

d. Някой: *се нуждае от* нещо
Someone needs something

e. На някого му *се струва* | *се вижда* | *тежи* нещо
To someone: something seems | looks | feels like a burden

Topical argument physical experience
2.a. Някой: *боледува от* (*страда от*) нещо
Someone is ill with (suffers from) something

b. Някого го: *боли* | *сърби* нещо
Something hurts | itches someone

c. На някого му: *се гади* | *се повдига*
Someone feels nauseous | feels like vomiting

Animate topical argument
The following verbs are characterized by the presence of a topical argument with the characteristic **animacy** but lacking all of the following characteristics: psychological experience, physical experience or conscious participation:

3.a. Някой: *има* (*притежава*) нещо
Someone has (possesses) something

b. Някой: *изглежда като* някого | нещо
Someone resembles (looks like) someone | something

c. На някого му: *върви в* | *спори в* нещо
Something comes easy to | goes smoothly for someone

d. Някой: *отсъства* | *присъства* | *съществува* някъде
Someone is absent | is present | exists somewhere

Inanimate topical argument
4.a. Нещо: *си струва*
Something is worth it

b. Нещо: *тежи* | *гласи* | *наброява* | *обозначава* | *съдържа* нещо
Something weighs | reads (says) | numbers | designates | contains something

c. Нещо: *води до* | *подхожда на* | *основава се на* | *зависи от* | *обуславя се от* | *различава се от* | *характеризира се с* | *граничи с* нещо
Something leads to | fits | is based on | depends on | is conditioned by | differs from | is characterized by | borders on something

d. Нещо: *липсва* | *лежи* (*се намира)* | *отсъства* | *присъства* | *преобладава* | *съществува* някъде

Something is lacking | lies (is positioned) | is missing | is present | predominates | exists somewhere

2.2.2. Stage-level states

Topical argument conscious participation
5.a. Някой: *бди* | *будува* | *лежи* | *стои* | *седи* | *спи* някъде
Someone keeps watch | stays awake | lies | stands | sits | sleeps somewhere

b. Някой: *гледа* | *слуша* нещо
Someone watches | listens to something

Inanimate topical argument
6. Нещо: *аленее* | *блести* (*лъщи*) | *зеленее* | *искри* | *сияе* | *киселее* | *сладни* | *вони* | *мирише* | *ухае*

Something looks red | shines (glistens) | looks green | sparkles | irradiates | tastes sour | tastes sweet | smells | exudes a pleasant odor

This ontological representation provides the grounds for the following conclusions:

Only individual-level stative predicates license for a topical argument with the properties **psychological experience**, **physical experience,** or **animacy**. With predicates attaching a topical argument with the property **psychological experience** or **animacy**, the topical argument is realized syntactically as a subject or an obligatory prepositional object[5]. With predicates associating a topical argument with the property **physical experience,** the topical argument is realized syntactically as a subject or an obligatory complement (either an object or a prepositional object)[6]. Individual-level stative predicates do not license a topical argument with the property **conscious participation**, in contrast to stage-level stative predicates, which license such an argument, and its syntactic realization is always that of a subject. The stative predicates with a topical argument that has the property **inanimacy** can be either stage-level or individual-level, and the topical argument is always a subject.

The semantic classification offered here is internally non-contradictory and can serve as the starting point for a full semantic and syntactic description of stative predicates that express a state lexically.

We will review the lexical diatheses (if such can be formed) for the established groups of stative predicates distributed in accordance with them being individual-level or stage-level predicates and according to the semantic properties of their topical argument: expressing psychological experience, physical experience, intentional participation, animacy, and inanimacy.

---

[5] A dative clitic is always added to the prepositional object or takes its place.
[6] The object is always doubled or replaced by an accusative clitic; the prepositional object is doubled or replaced by a dative clitic.

3. Bulgarian passives

The syntactic valency (the number of semantic arguments) in a **prototypical**[7] **passive** is reduced by one in comparison to the active diathesis (e.g., the verb is monovalent while its active counterpart is bivalent); its subject corresponds to the non-subject **patient** (object) of the active voice; the peripheral, and optional, argument corresponds to the subject **agent**[8] of the active voice; and the passivization is formally coded on the predicate complex (Zúñiga, Kittilä 2019: 83). Thus, although the semantic roles of arguments are not changed, the semantic and syntactic status of one of the arguments is changed from semantic argument to adjunct and from syntactic argument – to syntactic adjunct.

Strict morphological passives are the passives formed by suffixing, prefixing, and some other morphological means (Keenan and Dryer 2006: 333). To this group we assign the Bulgarian passive with the passive marker *ce* (se, oneself). The derived passive verb is a compound verb with a reduced paradigm of the category person (third-person singular and plural)[9] (Коева / Koeva 2004: 208–209) (7.b.).

7.a. *Декларaторът **притежава** недвижим имот.*
The undersigned person **possesses** a housing property.

b. *Недвижимият имот **се притежава** от деклараторa.* (*se* passive)
The housing property **is possessed** by the undersigned person.

The passive marker is the reflexive in the form of the particle *se*[10] which is not a suffixation morpheme[11]; however, the Bulgarian *se* passive forms correspond to Spanish passives coinciding with the reflexive constructions (and to passives in some other languages), which are considered strict morphological passives (Keenan and Dryer 2006: 334).

Periphrastic passives consist of an auxiliary verb plus the strict morphological function of a transitive verb (Keenan and Dryer 2006: 334). Such is the Bulgarian

---

[7] A particular phenomenon is considered *prototypical* if it conforms to a prototype, which is defined as striking a balance between capturing cross-linguistic regularities and departing from mainstream terminology as little as possible (Zúñiga, Kittilä 2019: 10). The prototypical passive is a construction where the patient is clearly the subject, the agent is at most minimally integrated into the syntax of its clause, and the construction is marked in terms of voice (Comree 1988: 21).

[8] As we shall see, **experiencer** subjects also participate in passivization.

[9] Some scholars accept first- and second-person *se* passive forms, but it's important to note that these are grammatical forms of the autocausative, and the passive subject is always inanimate, which restricts the forms of the verb to the third-person.

[10] Different views have been expressed for the nature of markers *ce* (*se*, oneself) and *cu* (*si*, oneself) (Коева / Koeva 1995; Пенчев / Penchev 1995; Петрова / Petrova 2008)

[11] Some scholars restrict passive forms in Bulgarian only to past participial passive since the grammatical meaning is expressed morphologically by the verbal inflection (Куцаров / Kutsarov 2007: 241).

passive formed with the auxiliary verb: *съм* (sâm, be), *бъда* (bâda, be) or *бивам* (bivam, be) and the past passive participle (Куцаров / Kutsarov 2007: 342; Ницолова / Nitsolova 2008: 237, among others) (7.c.).

7.c. *Недвижимият имот* **е притежаван** *от декларатора*. (past participial passive)
The housing property is possessed by the undersigned person.

The Bulgarian participle passive has a full paradigm of the category person, and there is a coincidence of the forms in resultative and non-resultative categories (Ницолова / Nitsolova 2008: 238, among others).

If passives are viewed as morpho-syntactic means for building passive verb phrases from transitive active verb phrases, the following general principle is valid: *the semantic interpretation of derived structures depends on* (*is a function of*) *the meanings of what they are derived from* (Keenan, Dryer 2006: 340). On the other hand, if passives were thought of as a way of deriving sentences from sentences, no regular semantic relationship between the derived structure and what it is derived from could be (always) given (Keenan and Dryer 2006: 340), for example: *No student slapped John* will not entail *John was slapped* and *Every cake was stolen* does not entail that some individual *x* stole every cake (Keenan, Dryer 2006: 339).

We can generalize that the sentence-to-sentence interpretation is true for Bulgarian paraphrastic passives; however, **the Bulgarian *se* passives can be viewed as paraphrases between predicates, thus as a lexical diathesis.**

3.1. Personal passives

The conditions for the formation of passive diathesis in Bulgarian are the following: the basic diathesis involves personal transitive perfective or imperfective verbs[12]. In the derived grammatical diathesis (past participial passive), the semantic roles of the subject and the complement to the predicate do not change, but there are changes in their syntactic category and grammatical role. In the derived lexical diathesis (*se* passive), the semantic roles of the subject and the complement to the predicate do not change (although the agentive subject is transformed into an agentive adjunct), but there are changes in their syntactic category and grammatical role. The *se* passive can be regarded as a lexical diathesis since, in addition to the passive alternations, it is distinguished by the restricted paradigm of the verb to the third person and the selective restriction of the subject to inanimate entities.

A further generalization of the semantics of passives claims that the distinct basic passives are likely to differ semantically with respect to aspect and/or degree of

---

[12] Intransitive verbs, verbs with an inherent reflexive form, and verbs with an intrinsic reflexive or reciprocal meaning are excluded as sources for the two types of passive diatheses (Коева / Koeva 2004: 209).

subject affectedness in languages with more than one passive construction (Keenan and Dryer 2006: 340). Regarding Bulgarian, the periphrastic passive usually has a resultative meaning (Ницолова / Nitsolova 2008: 240) and the expression of stative or activity eventuality type usually depends on the eventuality type of the source predicate. The same correlation of source–derived eventuality types applies to the Bulgarian *se* passives, although *se* passives show some restrictions for perfective predicates and perfective verbs' categories.

In general, the Bulgarian strict morphological passive derived from an imperfective eventive predicate[13] such as *Книгата се чете* (The book is read) might have two interpretations: the book is read at the moment by somebody (activity) and the book is very popular and many people would like to read it (state). The first interpretation relates to the option for an explicit use of the source **agent,** while the second one blocks such an option, or the derived *от* (ot, by) phrase should only have an indefinite or general interpretation. The Bulgarian periphrastic passive derived from an imperfective source predicate expressing activity such as *Книгата е била четена* (The book has been read) might also have ambiguous interpretations in resultative forms: as an activity or as a state, while with non-resultative forms such as *Книгата е четена* (The book is being read) only a stative interpretation is available[14]. Some aspects of the different usage and meaning of both passives in Bulgarian according to different temporal categories they express have been studied (Баракова / Barakova 1978: 3–12; Иванова / Ivanova 1983: 249–254; Джонова, Михайлова / Dzhonova, Mihaylova 2021). However, it has not yet been thoroughly discussed how passive diatheses in Bulgarian might be interpreted as either an activity or a state depending on the verb's temporal categories and usage in a given context.

3.1.1. Eventuality types of source and derived predicates

The following generalization is also true for Bulgarian: *If a language has passives of stative verbs* (e.g., *lack*, *have*, etc.), *then it has passives of verbs denoting events* (Keenan and Dryer 2006: 331). The generalization presupposes that there are some limitations in forming passives from stative verbs, which will be examined.

3.1.1.1. Source individual-level states

Provided that the condition for transitivity has been met, the participle passive can be formed from **individual-level states** expressing a topical argument with an inherent property **psychological experience**.

---

[13] Many activities (and some accomplishments and achievements) have a ''derived'' stative sense (Vendler 1957: 152). The state of being able to walk is necessary for the activity of walking, and the state of being able to see is necessary for the activity of seeing (Vendler 1967: 156). Based on this reasoning, we limit the focus to stative verbs, whose meaning cannot be considered a prerequisite for the performance of an activity (Коева / Koeva 2022b: 368).

[14] Strictly speaking, the alternation in eventuality type from activity to state is a lexical diathesis, which means that the diathesis can be subdivided based on the change of state.

8.a. *Момчето **желае** | **обича** | **мрази** | **харесва** | **помни** тази книга*.
The boy **wants** | **loves** | **hates** | **likes** | **remembers** this book.

b. *Тази книга **е желана** | **е обичана** | **е мразена** | **е помнена** | **е харесвана** от момчето*. (past participial passive)
This book **is wanted** | **is loved** | **is hated** | **is remembered** | **is liked** by the boy.

In the derived *se* passive diathesis, the source subject is usually not expressed, and if it is, a definite reference is dispreferred.

c. *Тази книга **се желае** | **се обича** | **се мрази** | **се помни** | **се харесва** (от хората | от всички момчета)*. (*se* passive)
This book **is wanted** | **is loved** | **is hated** | **is remembered** | **is liked** (by the people | by all boys).

d. *Тази книга **се желае** | **се обича** | **се мрази** | **се помни** | **се харесва** (*от Иван | ?от това момче)*. (*se* passive)
This book **is wanted** | **is loved** | **is hated** | **is remembered** | **is liked** (*by Ivan | ?by this boy).

There are also restrictions in building *se* passives from verbs with animate objects (Koeva 2004: 209).

9.a. *Момчето **желае** | **обича** | **мрази** | **харесва** | **помни** това момиче*.
The boy **wants** | **loves** | **hates** | **likes** | **remembers** this girl.

b. *Това момиче **е желано** | **е обичано** | **е мразено** | **е помнено** | **е харесвано** от момчето*. (past participial passive)
This girl is wanted | is loved | is hated | is remembered | is liked by the boy.

c. **Това момиче **се желае** | **се обича** | **се мрази** | **се помни** | **се харесва** от момчето*. (*se* passive)
This girl **is wanted** | **is loved** | **is hated** | **is remembered** | is **liked** by the boy.

Many verbs denoting the evocation of emotions can form only past participial passive: *смайвам, въодушевявам, удивявам, изненадвам* (amaze, enthuse, astound, surprise). The corresponding verbs with *се* (se) have an independent, non-passive general meaning referring to the experience of a given emotional state.

10.a. *Подобни реакции ме **удивяват** | **смайват** | **въодушевяват** | **изненадват***.
Such reactions **astound** | **amaze** | **enthuse** | **surprise** me.

b. *Аз **съм удивен** | **съм смаян** | **съм въодушевен** | **съм изненадан** от подобни реакции*. (past participial passive)
I **am astounded** | **am amazed** | **am enthused** | **am surprised** by/at such reactions.

c. *Аз **се удивявам** | **се въодушевявам** | **се смайвам** | **се изненадвам** от подобни реакции*. (active verbs with different meaning)
I **get astounded** | **get amazed** | **get enthused** | **get surprised** by such reactions.

Diatheses as in the examples in 11. are called **conversive** voice (Kulikov 2011: 379) and are similar to the non-promotional passive but represent a case of complete **patient** promotion together with incomplete **agent** demotion.

11.a. *Бурята плаши момчето.*
The storm frightened the boy.

b. *Момчето се плаши от бурята.*
The dog was frightened by the storm.

Such constructions differ from anticausatives because they are arguably semantically bivalent and are limited to verbs of perception and emotional states (Zúñiga, Kittilä 2019: 88).

No passive can be formed from verbs expressing **individual-level states** with a topical argument identifiable by the inherent property **physical experience** as: няко-го *боли | сърби* нещо (something hurts | itches someone). The reason is that the complement is an experiencer (Grimshaw 1990: 112), which postulates yet another restriction in the formation of passive diathesis: the source complement should not be an experiencer.

Individual-level states with a topical argument, identifiable by the inherent property **animacy**, but lacking characteristics such as: inner experience, physical experience or conscious participation, form passive diatheses, if other conditions have been met.

Some of the verbs expressing **individual-level states** with a topical argument, identifiable by the inherent property **inanimacy,** easily tolerate a noun phrase, which, however, is not in a complement position: нещо *тежи | гласи | наброява* нещо (something weighs | reads | amounts to something), and consequently do not yield to passive diathesis (the test confirming this is the impossibility to substitute the noun phrase with a personal pronoun clitic). With other verbs from the group, all conditions are met: нещо *обозначава | съдържа* нещо (something identifies | contains something).

12.a. *Комисията обозначава всеки продукт.*
The committee **identifies** every product.

b. *Всеки продукт е обозначен от комисията.* (past participial passive)
Every product **is identified** by the committee.

c. *Всеки продукт се обозначава от комисията.* (*se* passive)
Every product **gets identified** by the committee.

3.1.1.2. Source stage-level states

S**tage-level states** with a topical argument having the inherent property **conscious participation** build passive diathesis, if the condition for transitivity has been met (the source verbs are of imperfective aspect): *някой гледа | слуша нещо* (someone **watches** | **listens** to something). The source subject is usually not expressed

in the derived passive diathesis of this group of verbs, or if it is expressed, it has an indefinite reference.

13.a. *Момчето **слуша** песента*.
The boy **listens** to the song.

b. *Песента **е слушана*** (?*от момчето*) (*от много хора*). (past participial passive)
The song **is listened** to (?by the boy) (by many people).

c. *Песента **се слуша*** (?*от момчето*) (*от много хора*). (*se* passive)
The song **is listened** to (?by the boy) (by many people).

Actually, when the appearance of the *om* (ot, by) phrase is prohibited, a different type of diathesis is realized, corresponding to a source transitive verb attaching an adjunct, and after the alternation, a reduction of source subject is accomplished[15].

14.a. *Те **са слушали** легендарната песен на Куин 1,5 милиарда пъти*.
They **have listened** to Queen's legendary song 1.5 billion times.

b. *Легендарната песен на Queen **е слушана** 1,5 милиарда пъти* (*от тях). (past participial passive)
Queen's legendary song **has been listened** to 1.5 billion times (*by them).

c. *Легендарната песен на Queen **се е слушала** 1,5 милиарда пъти* (*от тях). (*se* passive)
Queen's legendary song **has been listened** to 1.5 billion times (*by them).

From **stage-level states** with a topical argument identifiable by the inherent property **inanimacy** no passive diathesis can be formed since none of these verbs is transitive.

To summarize, the eventuality type of the passive diathesis is the same as the eventuality type of the source diathesis, except for the case of converses, where activity predicates are transformed into stative predicates. When the source verb is a perfective activity verb, the derived passive cannot be interpreted as a state. As for the imperfective verbs, the stative interpretation of the derived passive is analogous to the stative interpretation of the source imperfective activity verb (the activity meaning assumes the existence of the stative one). We can infer that every imperfective activity verb has an imperfective stative derivate expressing the subject's capacity to perform the action, and that every imperfective passive verb may have both an activity and a stative meaning (in many cases, this depends on other grammatical categories expressed by the verb). It is possible to think of the stative interpretation of passive as a reversed one; generally, it expresses characteristics of the subject that result from an activity (the activity meaning assumes the existence of the state).

---

[15] Some personal passives that do not demote the surface agent but actually suppress it are usually labeled as **agentless** passives (Zúñiga, Kittilä 2019: 84).

3.2. Impersonal passives

It was stated that passives from intransitives are the clearest examples of passives that lack the characteristics of prototypical passives (Keenan and Dryer 2006: 332). Passives from intransitives generally employ the same morphology as the one used with basic passives, and they normally eliminate an argument, the agent (Keenan and Dryer 2006: 332). In Bulgarian, passives from intransitive verbs are always impersonal. However, impersonal passives are not limited to lexically intransitive verbs in Bulgarian[16].

The periphrastic passives (past participial passives) and the strict morphological passives (*se* passives) in Bulgarian correlate with impersonal past participial passives and impersonal *se* passives. The source diathesis is formed from personal transitive or intransitive verbs (Ivanova / Ivanova 1983: 255), which are imperfective and lexically non-reflexive or non-reciprocal (Коева / Koeva 2004: 211).

Impersonal passives illustrate the reduction of the semantic roles of both the **agent** and the **patient** (**theme**). The derived diathesis is a third-person imperfective intransitive verb in the singular, which does not allow a *by* phrase. The Bulgarian impersonal passive (irrespective of the eventuality type of the source predicate) expresses states. The impersonal passive, which originally expressed a dynamic eventuality, has been changed into a stative predicate, and there is no longer any agentive (or conscious) interaction between the subject and the predicate.

15. a. (те) ***Палят*** *фенерите* (*в обора*). ʻправя нещо да гориʼ
(They) light the lanterns (in the barn). ʻto make something burnʼ

b. *Палено е* (*в обора*). ʻнещо, без да се определя какво, е горялоʼ (impersonal past participial passive)
Something has been lit (in the barn). ʻsomething, without specifying what, was burningʼ

16. a. (той) *Дестилира вода с тази апаратура.* ʻизвършвам дестилацияʼ
(He) distills water with this apparatus. ʻto carry out distillationʼ

b. *С тази апаратура **се дестилира**.* ʻнещо е предназначено за дестилацияʼ
(impersonal *se*-passive)
This apparatus distills. ʻsomething is intended for distillationʼ

The impersonal passive forms morphologically coincide with the basic passive forms with one difference: the restriction to the third-person singular. In both the active and passive structures, there may be complements that are not involved in the transformation. On the other hand, if the source diathesis does not attach other

---

[16] R. Nitsolova suggests an impersonal voice together with active and passive; however, she proposes that the impersonal voice should include both lexically impersonal verbs and impersonal passive diathesis (Ницолова / Nitsolova 2008: 244–345) and, as such, cannot be considered a homogenous category.

complements, the derived diathesis is normally realized with some adjuncts, providing a context for the stative situation.

17.a. *Момчето пуши **в стаята***.
The boy is smoking in the room.

b. ***В стаята** е пушено*. (impersonal past participial passive)
Someone has smoked in the room.

c. ***В стаята** се пуши*. (impersonal *se* passive)
One can smoke in the room.

In some languages, prepositional objects can be promoted to the subject position, and the derived structure is often called **prepositional passive** (18.) (Zúñiga, Kittilä 2019: 89). In Bulgarian, personal passives whose subject corresponds to the source prepositional object are not observed. When passivization occurs with intransitive verbs, the only option for a derived diathesis is the impersonal passive diathesis.

18.a. *They can rely on William.*
Те могат да разчитат на Уилям.

b. *William can be relied on.*
На Уилям може да се разчита.

The Bulgarian example in 18.b. illustrates impersonal *se* passive in an embedded clause with a prepositional complement attached to the lexically impersonal verb in the main clause.

3.2.1. Eventuality types of source and derived predicates

Impersonal passive diathesis in Bulgarian is derived from activity source predicates. The examples below illustrate how stative predicates could correlate to derived impersonal passives.

3.2.1.1. Individual-level states

Individual-level states with a topical argument, identifiable by the inherent property **psychological experience,** do not form impersonal passive diathesis since the subject has the properties of an **experiencer**.

Individual-level states with a topical argument expressing the inherent property **physical experience** do not form impersonal passive diathesis since the complement that is attached to them is an **experiencer** (Landau 2010).

Individual-level states with an **animate** topical argument (which is not a psychological or physical experiencer or a conscious participant) do not form impersonal passives. The impersonal predicates (which are also part of this group) do not form impersonal passives either: на някого *му върви в | спори в* нещо (something comes easy to | goes smoothly for someone).

Individual-level states with a topical argument, identifiable by the inherent property **inanimacy,** do not form impersonal passives since this group of verbs is characterized by a very close subject-predicate relationship and the meaning cannot be expressed if there is no indication of the subject.

3.2.1.2. Stagel-level states

Stage-level states with a topical argument that has the property **conscious participation** build impersonal passive diathesis.

19.a. *Момчето лежи | седи | стои | спи на леглото.*
The boy is lying | sitting | standing | sleeping on the bed.

b. *На леглото е лежано | седяно | стояно | спано.* (past participial passive)
Someone has lain | sat | stood | slept on the bed.

c. *На леглото се лежи | седи | стои | спи.* (*se* passive)
One can lie | sit | stand | sleep on the bed.

The impersonal passive diathesis is not observed with stage-level states with a topical argument, identifiable by the inherent property **inanimacy,** because the general meaning of this group of verbs contains the premise that there is something that emits light, sound, smell, etc., and this component cannot be omitted.

To summarize, individual-level state predicates do not have a corresponding impersonal passive diathesis. Stage-level state predicates build impersonal passive diathesis if their subjects have the inherent property **conscious participation**. A strong correlation between the experiencer and impersonal passive diathesis is observed. Both source structures with an **experiencer** subject and experiencer object do not form impersonal passive diathesis. The periphrastic passives are Davidsonian states, while the strict morphological passives can be interpreted as either Kimian or Davidsonian states depending on the context.

4. Middles

Despite the fact that the category of voice has been extensively researched, there is still disagreement over its nature, as well as the number and traits of its members. For example, the following language constructions are listed as non-active voice: anticausatives, reflexives (reciprocals), dispositional middles (*This book sells well),* mediopassives (in comparison to passives, in mediopassives the external argument is neither understood nor expressed) and passives (Alexiadou, Doron 2012: 3), and even more categories are classified within the general term middles (Guglielmo 2021). Other authors include in the narrow definition of voice passives, antipassives, and reflexives, but exclude reciprocals and middles as composite constructions that show complex features (Mel'čuk 2006, among others).

Elaborating on the definition of mediopassive, we might say that the mediopassive is characterized as a passive voice in which the verb has stative meaning, and the

agent is not expressed. R. Nitsolova describes the mediopassive in the following way: "an inanimate object that is affected by the action is present as an actor, or more precisely, as a pseudo-actor, while the real initiator of the action is not indicated due to some reasons" (Nitsolova 2008: 236). Such definitions limit the mediopassive forms to middles and anticausatives. In our interpretation, only the past participial passive is a member of the category voice in Bulgarian (representing a grammatical diathesis), while reflexives and grammatically built reciprocals represent syntactic means for the representation of lexical anaphora (such an interpretation is similar to the view that reflexives and reciprocals preserve the semantic roles but allow some operations on them (Kulikov 2013) and follows the theories that exclude reflexives and reciprocals from the system of voices (Haspelmath, Müller-Bardey 2004). Lexically built reflexives, middles, and anticausatives, on the other hand, display in our model properties of lexical diatheses.

A small number of authors see the middle as a fundamentally different kind of voice from the passive and antipassive and view the reflexives and the reciprocals either as (non-core) meanings of the middle forms (Klaiman 1991) or as values that are on a par with and in opposition to them (Givón 2001).

4.1. Dispositional middles in Bulgarian

The term **middle** is usually used to denote a form of the verb, as in the English sentence *Bread cuts easily*. Several studies introduce the middle voice (Geniušienė 1987, among others) and provide description of its semantic and syntactic properties. In some languages, such as English, active verbs and the so-called middle verbs (dispositional middles) share the same morphology, whereas the passive is morphologically (and syntactically) marked. In some other languages, middle verbs can be marked as passive (Alexadou, Doron 2012: 1). Such a language is Bulgarian, in which the forms of middle verbs morphologically coincide with the forms of *se* passive verbs. Middle diathesis is also called quasi passive (Guentchéva, Rivière 2007: 570).

Middle diathesis expresses a stative eventuality, which is characterized by a lack of specific time reference (Levin 1993: 26) and by an understood but unexpressed agent. A particular characteristic of middles is that they often include an adverbial expression for manner (Levin 1993: 26) which distinguishes them from the anticausatives.

20.a. (тя) *Реже* (*нарязва*) *месото на парчета с големия нож*. 'правя нещо цяло на части'
(She) cuts (is cutting up) the meat into pieces with the big knife. 'to make something whole into parts'

b. *Месото се реже* (*се нарязва*) *лесно*. 'нещо притежава свойството да става на части по определен начин'

The meat cuts (cuts up) easily. 'something has the property of breaking into parts in a certain way'

The semantic role of the source subject is reduced, while the semantic role of the source object is changed. The derived verb is built in Bulgarian with the middle marker *ce* (*se,* oneself) (Guentchéva, Asenova 2006) and its forms are reduced to third-person singular and plural. The source verbs are imperfective transitive two-place predicates with a human subject (an agent) and a noun phrase (inanimate) complement that is affected by the action of the verb. The derived diathesis represents a stative eventuality type, which determines that only imperfective verbs can participate in the alternation. The derived predicate is a one-place predicate with an inanimate subject (a **theme**).

A middle marker is defined as a construction with the following characteristics: i) it occurs with bi- or ii) multi-valent verbs to encode one or more of the following valency changing operations: passive, anticausative, reflexive, reciprocal, antipassive; the same construction is also obligatory with some (at least monovalent) verbs that cannot occur without a middle marker; the semantics of (at least some of) the verbs in (i) does not match that of those in (ii) or vice versa (Guglielmo 2021: 4). Such a definition perfectly matches the Bulgarian data: the marker *ce* (*se,* oneself) is a verb building particle that appears with *se* passive, impersonal *se* passive, lexical reciprocals, dispositional middles, anticausatives, autocausatives (which do not fall in the scope of the study as neither the source nor the derived diathesis is stative), optatives, and impersonal optatives.

Only stage-level states with a topical argument that has the property **conscious participation** can build middles, namely "impersonal" middles. Similarly to impersonal passives, impersonal middles can be derived from intransitive imperfective verbs. In addition to the adverbial modifier for manners, another location or time modifier can be easily attached to the derived structure.

21.а. (*тя*) *Спи в това легло*.
She is sleeping in this bed.

б. *В това легло се спи удобно*.
It is comfortable to sleep in this bed.

4.2. Bulgarian anticausatives

The anticausative diathesis is also called inchoative, causative-inchoative (Levin 1993: 27), or ergative diathesis.

The conditions for the occurrence of anticausative diathesis are: a source predicate – an imperfective verb denoting an activity, with two arguments: an agentive subject and an object affected by the described activity (the **patient**). In the resulting diathesis, the semantic role of the source object is changed, and the semantic role of

the source subject is reduced[17]. In contrast to the anticausative, the passive implies the existence of a person or thing bringing about the situation (Comrie 1985: 326). The anticausative compound verb is built with the marker *ce* (*se* oneself) and is restricted to the third-person in the singular and plural.

22.a. *Рибарите чупят леда с греблата*. ʻправя нещо твърдо да стане на късове, като използвам инструмент'

The fishermen break the ice with their oars. ʻto break something solid into pieces by using a tool'

b. *Ледът се чупи*. ʻнещо има свойството да е на части, на късове'

The ice is breaking ʻsomething has the property of being in parts, in pieces'

A significant similarity between the anticausative and the agentless passive is that both involve a promotion of the source object (patient) and a demotion of the source subject (agent), which explains why they have similar comparable morphological marking in many languages (Kulikov 2011: 392), including in Bulgarian.

The reason for separating the anticausatives from middles is that in the derived structure, the emphasis is on what happens to the subject, and the causer of the action is either not conceptualized or is present as an abstraction (Славчева / Slavcheva 2010: 58). A stative eventuality is expressed by the derived structure.

In particular, the inchoative construction does not necessarily have an understood **agent**, may have a specific time reference, and does not have to include adverbial or modal elements. Verbs that display the causative/inchoative alternation are found in the middle construction, but not vice versa (Levin 1983: 26).

It can be summarized that the middle diathesis (comprising dispositional middle and anticausative) operates at the lexical level (predicate to predicate) and does not involve stative predicates as a source; however, the derived predicate is always stative. Thus, middles in Bulgarian affect only imperfective verbs expressing activity (with an exemption for stage-level states with an argument experiencing **conscious participation,** which build an "impersonal dispositional middle"). This conclusion is in compliance with the fact that the same event can be described in different ways using the passive and active voices, while the anticausative refers to an entirely different event compared to its source diathesis (Zúñiga, Kittilä 2019: 43). The derived predicates are different types of states; dispositional middles are Kimian states, while anticausatives are Davidsonian states, and this is another reason to describe dispositional middles and anticausatives separately.

---

[17] The direction of the diathesis has been discussed either as causativization or as detransitivization (Alexiadou 2010: 178). In our approach, the direction of all types of diatheses is from a structure with more (or the same number) of arguments that is not grammatically marked to a structure with fewer (or the same number of) arguments that is grammatically marked.

5. Bulgarian reciprocals

The reciprocals exemplify a diathesis in which the semantic role of the subject to the predicate does not alter, but there is a change in the semantic role of the complement (Koeva 2022: 83). The reciprocal diathesis is also called **with preposition drop alternation** (Levin 1993: 44) and it occurs with a small number of verbs that involve potentially reciprocal actions (verbs of social interaction, such as "meet" verbs, "marry" verbs; "correspond" verbs, such as *agree*, *argue*; "chitchat" verbs and "talk" verbs)[18]. The reciprocal diathesis is realized between intransitive verbs joining a prepositional phrase headed by the preposition *with* and the corresponding transitive verbs (Levin 1993: 44). We assume that the source structure is the structure without reciprocal meaning, insofar as in it the form of the verb is not complex (in Bulgarian without the marker *se*) and transitivity is not blocked (Koeva 2022a: 83).

23.a. *Той срещна момичето.* ʻкато се движа, виждам някогоʼ
He met the girl. ʻwhile moving I see someoneʼ

b. *Той се срещна с момичето.* ʻкато се движа, се виждам с някогоʼ
He met with the girl. ʻwhile moving I see someoneʼ

A two-place source predicate with a subject noun phrase and a complement noun phrase alternates with a two-place predicate with a subject noun phrase and a complement prepositional phrase (more arguments or adjuncts can occur with some predicates but they do not take part in the diathesis, for example *срещам се* [*с някого*] [*на улицата*] – ʻto meet with someone on the streetʼ). At the syntactic level, the alternation is manifested by the change of the syntactic category and the grammatical role of the source complement (from noun phrase to prepositional *c* (s, with) phrase, and at the morphological level in Bulgarian – by the addition of the reciprocal marker *se* to the source lemma, which also leads to transitivity loss. As a result, a new predicate is built, expressing reciprocal meaning.

It was pointed out that reciprocal semantics can be expressed (if the potential for reciprocity exists) by plural subjects (*The boys met / agreed*), conjoined subjects (*John and Fred met / agreed)* or as paired noun phrases arranged in different configuration (*John met Fred, John agreed with Fred)* (Fillmore 1970: 255). The last option describes the semantically derived reciprocal diathesis (resulting in a new predicate), while the first two represent the syntactic constructions expressing reciprocity (the reciprocal semantics is expressed at the morphological and syntactic level, the verb paradigm is reduced to plural, the verb lemma is derived with the marker *ce / cu* (se / si, oneself), the *c* (*s, with*) prepositional phrase is not allowed, instead a reciprocal

---

[18] The lexical classes of verbs are described as: verbs of competition: *fight*, *quarrel*, *negotiate*, *argue*; verbs of joint action: *communicate*, *play chess*, *consult*; verbs of connecting: *combine*, *unite, acquaint, compare, mix*; verbs of dividing: *separate, distinguish*; predicates of (non-)identity: *match* (Haspelmath 2007: 2104).

phrase *един друг*; *един* (*предлог*) *друг* 'one another; one (preposition) another' or the reciprocal adverb *взаимно* 'each other, mutually' can appear; however, the meaning of the predicate does not change) (Коева / Koeva 2004: 195–196).

There are syntactically derived reciprocals which may not need a syntactic marker in Bulgarian (*един друг* 'each other', etc.): *Те се разлюбиха* (They fell out of love with each other) (Penchev 2007: 615).

Some predicates may be regarded as taking noun phrases in identical roles, which contradicts the generally accepted assumption that no simple sentence requires the occurrence of more than one noun phrase in a given role (Fillmore 1970: 256) and that there do seem to be some differences in the conjoined subject as opposed to the distributed noun phrase versions of symmetric predicate sentences, although for many of these the difference does not need to be seen as basic (Fillmore 1970: 256). The unequal status of the two arguments is emphasized: the agentive argument is the topic or focus of the utterance, and the prepositional argument has the semantic role of **comitative** and can rarely be a topic or focus; the prepositional argument may remain implicit (Ницолова / Nitsolova 2008: 243); however, the implicit option is valid only for reciproca tantum verbs, not for derived reciprocal diathesis. Generally speaking, in the derived reciprocal diathesis, the semantic role of the source subject with the predicate does not alter, while the role of the source complement changes to the **reciprocal agent**. It should be pointed out that some scholars believe that the source relation of the subject also changes to **reciprocal agent** (Коева / Koeva 1995: 161). Or more precisely, if the original semantic roles are **agent** and **theme**, then the derived roles could be described respectively as **reciprocal agent** and **theme** and **reciprocal theme** and **agent**[19].

The diathesis can also occur with potentially reciprocal activities, allowing a change in the semantic role of a prepositional object. The same conditions apply, with the difference that the source verb is intransitive and the reciprocal marker is *си* (si, oneself).

24.a. *Пиша писма на разни хора от Европа.* 'съобщавам информация на някого посредством писма'
I write letters to various people from Europe. 'to provide information to someone through letters'

b. *Пиша си писма с разни хора от Европа.* 'обменям информация с някого посредством писма'
I correspond with various people from Europe. 'to exchange information with someone through letters'

In Bulgarian, there are verbs with reciprocal semantics called **reciproca tantum verbs** that do not correlate with source verbs without reciprocal meaning: *боксирам се*

---

[19] Actually, one of the arguments should have the semantic role of an **agent**, but there are no general requirements for the semantic role of the second argument; the requirements are that both arguments can be presented by the same individual. Thus, it is not necessary for the second argument to express a **theme**.

c (to box with someone), *състезавам се с* (to compete with), *взаимодействам си с* (to interact with), etc. (Koeva 2004: 195; Penchev 2007: 627). Such verbs share the same morphological, syntactic, and semantic properties with the derived reciprocal diathesis: compound verb built with a *se* or *si* reciprocal marker; two arguments realized respectively by a noun phrase and a prepositional *c* (s, with) phrase, allowing for an interchange in the arguments' positions; reciprocal semantic roles of the two arguments with respect to the predicate. The existence of lexically reciprocal verbs (either independently or paired with non-reciprocal verbs) is widely observed across languages, and it is claimed that all languages have lexically reciprocal (atelic) predicates (Haspelmath 2007: 2105).

The term **mutual** was proposed for the semantic plane of reciprocity, while the term **reciprocal** is kept for specialized expression patterns that code a mutual situation (Haspelmath 2007: 2087), similarly to the terminological distinction, proposed by other authors, between **symmetric** for meanings and **reciprocal** for forms. A **mutual situation** is defined as a situation with two or more participants (A, B, ...) in which, for at least two of the participants, A and B, the relation between A and B is the same as the relation between B and A (Haspelmath 2007: 2088). This is a very wide definition aiming to describe all types of mutual situations: implicit, explicit, divided into free expressions and specialized: grammatical constructions which can be expressed by multiple or one clause, and among the latter: lexical reciprocals (atelic) and grammatical reciprocals, with the type of lexical reciprocal being our focus.

Lexical reciprocals are defined as predicates that express a mutual configuration by themselves, without necessary grammatical marking (Haspelmath 2007: 2088). "These are words with an inherent reciprocal meaning" (Nedjalkov 2007: 14). For Bulgarian, there are some non-marked predicates: *приличам на* (to resemble), reciprocal predicates with a reciprocal marker whose base form does not occur without this marker – reciproca tantum verbs such as *състезавам се с* (to compete with), and reciprocal predicates whose base form occurs without the reciprocal marker – the derived reciprocal diathesis: *срещам някого – срещам се с някого* (to meet somebody – to meet with somebody).

The verbs that are involved in the reciprocal diathesis, both in the original structure and in the derived one, are activity predicates with arguments that are only allowed to be people or, in some situations, animate. Rarely, stative verbs attaching inanimate arguments may be a source for reciprocal diathesis. Such verbs (*cross, intersect, meet, touch*, etc.) are described as verbs of contiguous location (Levin 1981: 37), and both the source and the derived diatheses are stative predicates.

25.a. *Линията среща* (*пресича, допира*) *другата линия в точка А.* 'нещо допира нещо в една точка'

The line meets (crosses, touches) the other line at point A. 'something touches something at one point'

b. *Линията се среща* (*се пресича, се допира*) *с другата линия в точка А.* 'нещо се допира с нещо в една точка'

The line meets (crosses, touches) with the other line at point A. 'something touches with something at one point'

To summarize, new verbs are created in Bulgarian as a result of derived reciprocal diathesis (where the reciprocal meaning is expressed at the lexical level in the singular and plural). The alternation does not change the eventuality type: an activity predicate derives a reciprocal activity predicate, and a stative predicate derives a reciprocal stative predicate. Both source and derived stative diatheses are individual-level predicates (Kimian states) with an inanimate topical argument. The verbs involved in the reciprocal diathesis are perfective and imperfective verbs expressing the activity eventuality type (although some stative verbs also undergo the diathesis if their meaning is derived from potentially reciprocal source verbs).

Based on the classification of Haspelmath (Haspelmath 2007: 2090), we may assert for Bulgarian that monoclausal reciprocals are divided into **grammatical reciprocals** (built at the morphological and syntactic level) and **lexical reciprocals**, which in turn are divided into **reciproca tantum verbs** and **derived reciprocal diathesis**, the last one affecting both activity and state source predicates without a change in the eventuality type.

5. Bulgarian optatives

We use the term optative verbs for verbs 'expressing a wish or desire' (Bybee et al. 1994: 179). It is known that expressing a wish or a desire can be achieved in a different way across languages: by a word form in the inflectional category optative mood (not present in Bulgarian); by lexemes such as *искам* (to want), *желая* (to wish), *пожелавам* (to desire), *надявам се* (to hope), etc., and their complements expressing the object of desire; by some grammatical structures that express optative semantics (observed in Bulgarian), for example, constructions with conditional sentences and sentences with *ако само* (if only), *да можех да* (if I could), etc., and by optative diathesis, which is typical with various Bulgarian verb classes.

5.1. Personal optatives

The optative diathesis is characterized by the following general properties: the semantic role of the subject to the predicate is altered, while the semantic role of the object is not.

In general, optatives are defined as an utterance that expresses a wish, regret, hope or desire without containing a lexical item that means *wish, regret, hope or desire* (Grosz 2012: 17). This definition, in fact, covers Bulgarian optative diathesis, although the specific features of the diathesis are not outlined. A prototypical optative has the same number of semantic arguments as the source diathesis (i.e., it is bivalent), and the semantic role of the source subject shifts from agent to **experiencer**. Its subject is derived from the source object, its prepositional object (the **experiencer**) is

expressed by a personal pronoun dative clitict. As a result, although there are still the same number of semantic roles, the semantic and syntactic status of the arguments is altered, changing the agent into an **experiencer**, the subject into a prepositional object, and the object into a subject. At the morphological level, the optative is characterized by a reduction of the verb paradigm to the third-person singular and plural and by compounding the verb lemma with the marker *ce* (*se*, oneself). The optatives are a result of a predicate-to-predicate alternation, they do not refer to a real situation but express a desire to perform a given activity or state, thus their eventuality type is stative. The source agentive subject must satisfy the selectional restrictions of person (animate), and the object – the selectional restriction of inanimate (Koeva 1998: 150; Коева / Koeva 2005: 121–123).

26.a. ***Студентът*** *пише* ***поезия***. ʻсъздавам, сътворявам в писмен вид произведение на науката, художествената литература и под.ʼ
The student writes **poetry**. ʻto create in writing a work of science, fiction, etc.ʼ

b. *Пише* ***му се*** (***на студента***) ***поезия***. ʻизпитвам желание да създавам, сътворявам в писмен вид произведение на науката, художествената литература и под.ʼ
The student feels like writing **poetry**. ʻto feel a desire to create in writing a work of science, fiction, etc.ʼ

There are Bulgarian compound verbs that do not express optative meaning, but their structure follows the syntactic model of the optative diathesis. Such verbs are called reflexiva dativa tantum (Коева / Koeva 1997: 25) and they are intransitive personal verbs (both of imperfective and perfective aspect) with an inanimate subject and two obligatory clitics: the reflexive by its form (not by its meaning) particle *ce* (se, oneself) and a dative personal pronoun clitic: *отщя му се*, *отщява му се* (to be tired of something). The subject-predicate agreement categories for person and number are manifested by the morphological person and number of the dative clitic (the **experiencer**), while the verb form is restricted to third-person singular and plural as the subject noun is always inanimate.

27. *Ябълката ми | ти | му | ни | ви | им се услади*.
The apple tasted good to me (you, him, her, us, you, them).

The verbs in this class do not have an optative interpretation and cannot be seen as transformations from a source structure.

In some cases, semantically and grammatically diverse structures are considered simultaneously: a) optative diathesis as *яде ми се ябълка* (I feel like eating an apple); b) impersonal optative diathesis as *спи ми се* (I am sleepy); c) verbs that have the same form as the optative diathesis but do not convey optative meaning as *услажда ми се* (it tastes good to me), and d) verbs with an optative meaning and structure that are not derived from an optative diathesis as *гади ми се* (I feel like vomiting) (Savova 2014). However, it is better to differentiate them: b) and d) are semantically and grammatically equal, except for the fact that b) corresponds to a source diathesis,

while d) does not; the semantic and grammatical structure of a) and b) differ; and the semantic structures of a) and c) also are not similar as a different type of **experiencer** is expressed, referring to a cognitive process or an unreal perception[20].

Some perfective verbs built from imperfective stems with the prefixes *до*- (do-) and *при*- (pri-) can be attributed to the last of the listed groups. As noted in dictionaries[21], the prefixes themselves express the meaning of a desire to perform a given activity or to become in a certain state. Such verbs are a result of word formation[22], which comprises prefixation, compounding, and the semantic and syntactic structure of the optative diathesis (Коева / Koeva 2022a: 86).

28.a. *Светла спи до късно*. 'намирам се в състояние на сън'
Svetla sleeps late. 'to be in a state of sleep'

b. *Спи ми се до късно*. 'желая да съм в състояние на сън' (optative diathesis)
I feel like sleeping late. 'to wish to be in a state of sleep'

c. *Приспиваше го сама*. 'правя някой (обикновено дете) да се унесе в сън'
She put him to sleep herself. 'make someone (usually a child) drift off to sleep'

d. *Приспива ми се от досада*. 'обхваща ме желание за сън' (lexically optative)
I'm falling asleep from boredom. 'I feel sleepy'

e. *Към пет заранта им се доспива*. 'обхваща ме желание за сън' (lexically optative)
At five o'clock in the morning they tend to feel like sleeping. 'I feel sleepy'

The optatives in Bulgarian are derived from personal transitive imperfective verbs[23] with a full paradigm of the category person that are neither formally nor

---

[20] Some characteristics of mental predicates like *струва ми се* (it seem to me) and predicates for an unreal perception like *привижда ми се* (to see things) have been outlined for Bulgarian (Джонова / Dzhonova 2008: 236–237).

[21] https://ibl.bas.bg/rbe/lang/bg/пре-/ https://ibl.bas.bg/rbe/lang/bg/до-/

[22] Some authors consider such verbs built directly from optative diathesis (Джонова / Dzhonova 2008: 232; Иванова и др. / Ivanova et al. 2021: 258–262) and an argument in favor of this is that the semantic structure of the inchoative predicates repeats the structure of the source optative diathesis (Иванова и др. / Ivanova et al. 2021: 261). A counter-argument comes from the meaning of word-forming prefixes, which in themselves express optative semantics, as well as from the formation of both perfective and secondary imperfective verbs, which is a regular word-formation mechanism: *приспи ми се, приспива ми се* (tend to feel like sleeping). If we look closely at the semantic structure of optative diathesis and prefixed inchoative verbs with optative semantics, we will in fact see that they join different participants: source predicate: *Спя до късно*, **Спя от шума* (I sleep late, *I sleep from the noise); derived optative diathesis: *Спи ми се до късно*, **Спи ми се от шума* (I feel like sleeping late, *I feel like sleeping from the noise); inchoative verb with optative meaning: **Приспива ми се до късно*, *Приспива ми се от шума* (*I tend to feel like sleeping late, I tend to feel like sleeping from the noise).

[23] The limitation to imperfective source verbs is implied by the statement that those are verbs that can express prolonged activities (Пенчев / Penchev 1998: 150).

lexically reflexive, optative, or middle[24] (Koeva 1998: 151; Коева / Koeva 2004: 201). The resulting optative diathesis is a personal imperfective intransitive verb with a restricted paradigm of the category person (third-person) and a full paradigm of the category number.

The restricted paradigm of the verb and the obligatory dative personal pronoun clitic are combinatorially linked (as with the *reflexiva dativa tantum* verbs): the paradigm of the category person is reflected in the dative personal pronoun clitic (the semantic subject with the semantic role of an **experiencer**) and the verb expresses the subject-predicate agreement in number (Коева / Koeva 2004: 200).

The compulsory dative personal pronoun clitic is used to convey the human (animate) subject of the source transitive diathesis as a prepositional object of the optative verb. The dative clitic can only be doubled with a prepositional phrase that introduces the word to which the clitic refers. It cannot be removed or replaced by another pronoun or noun (the source subject) (Коева / Koeva 2004: 201).

29.a. *Садят **ми** се цветя.*
I feel like planting flowers.

b. ***На мене ми** се садят цветя.*
As for me, I feel like planting flowers.

c. ***На Светла ѝ** се садят цветя.*
As for Svetla, she feels like planting flowers.

The inanimate object of the transitive source verb acts as subject of the optative diathesis, a feature which the optative shares with the *se* passive[25] (Rivero 2003: 6; Коева / Koeva 2004: 201, Ницолова / Nitsolova 2008: 240). The optative marker, the particle *ce* (*se,* oneself), appears at the position of the original object. The resultant optative diatheses are third-person verbs since they agree in number with the (inanimate) subject, which should be overtly expressed.

30.a. *Пее ми се **тази песен**.*
I feel like singing this song.

b. *Пеят ми се **тези песни**.*
I feel like singing these songs.

Both the source structure and the derived structure may have additional complements or adjuncts.

---

[24] Some authors argue that reflexive (Пенчев / Penchev 1998: 152; Димитрова / Dimitrova 2015: 32) verbs can form optative diathesis. However, verbs like *смея се, грижа се, храня се* (laugh, take care, feed myself) are not transitive and the optative diatesis such as *Хранят ми се лебедите* (I feel like feeding swans) is derived from the transitive non-reflexive counterpart *храня* (feed).

[25] Actually, R. Nitsolova considered optatives as a type of passive (Ницолова / Nitsolova 2008: 240).

31.a. *Ям ябълки **на двора**.*
I eat apples in the yard.

b. *Ядат ми се ябълки **на двора.***
I feel like eating apples in the yard.

Since the source verbs are only imperfective, this limits the eventuality type to activities and states. And since the source subject can only be agentive and animate the only option to generate an optative diathesis from source transitive stative verbs is from verbs attaching animate conscious 'doer': *гледа ми се филм*, *слуша ми се музика* (I want to watch a movie, I want to listen to music), which excludes any stative transitive verbs in which the animate subject is an **experiencer**[26].

The conditions for the imperfective source predicate: agentive person (animate) source subject and inanimate source complement (direct object), might be further refined as follows.

In the case of imperfective verbs without a prefix, whether they are primary imperfective: *нося*, *мия* (carry, to wash), or formed from nouns or adjectives: *арестувам*, *чертая* (arrest, draw), or with an opaque word-building: *кисна*, *мъкна* (soak, drag), and whether or not they have a corresponding perfective verb: *родя – раждам*, *умра – умирам*; *меля*, *пия* (give birth – am giving birth, die – am dying; grind, drink), if the conditions for an agentive animate subject and for an inanimate object are fulfilled, the diathesis is realized without restrictions both in the positive and in the negative form.

32.a. *Момчето кара кола.* 'управлявам превозно средство'
The boy drives a car. 'to drive a vehicle'

b. *Кара му се кола.* 'имам желание да управлявам превозно средство'
He feels like driving a car. 'somebody has a desire to drive a vehicle'

c. *Не му се кара кола.* 'нямам желание да управлявам превозно средство'
He does not feel like driving a car. 'somebody doesn't have a desire to drive a vehicle'

33.a. *Майката бърше прах.* 'премахвам нещо от някаква повърхност, обикновено с парцал, кърпа и др.'
The mother is dusting. 'to remove something from some surface, usually with a rag, cloth, etc.'

b. *Бърше ѝ се прах.* 'имам желание да премахвам нещо от някаква повърхност, обикновено с парцал, кърпа и др.'
She feels like dusting. 'somebody has a desire to remove something from some surface, usually with a rag, cloth, etc.'

---

[26] Examples provided to justify the relevance of the feature control (whether something is carried out according to somebody's will) (Димитрова / Dimitrova 2015: 33) actually fit the class of eligible source diatheses.

c. *Не ù се бърше*. 'нямам желание да премахвам нещо от някаква повърхност, обикновено с парцал, кърпа и др.'

She doesn't feel like dusting. 'somebody doesn't have a desire to remove something from a surface, usually with a rag, cloth, etc.'

The definiteness of the derived object is not ruled out, but in such cases, the meaning of the optative construction is very limited (to express a desire to do something over a specific object) and is therefore rare.

34.a. *Детето яде **супата с грах***. 'приемам храна, храня се с нещо'
The child eats the soup with peas. 'to take food, eat something'

b. *Яде му се **супата с грах*** (*а не доматената супа*). 'имам желание да се храня с нещо'
He feels like eating the pea soup (not the tomato soup). 'somebody has a desire to eat something'

The usual usage of optatives is with an indefinite subject, which relates to the semantics: to express a desire to do something over any object of a particular type. When the source object is human, the optative diathesis is possible only if the object is expressed by an indefinite noun.

35.a. *Полицаите арестуват **престъпници***. 'поставям някого под арест'
Police officers arrest criminals. 'to put someone under arrest'

b. *Арестуват им се **престъпници***. 'имам желание да поставям някого под арест'
They want to arrest criminals. 'someone wants to put someone under arrest'

c. *Не им се арестуват **престъпници***. 'нямам желание да поставям някого под арест'
They don't want to arrest criminals. 'someone doesn't want to put someone under arrest'

The imperfective verbs built with a prefix show the following dependencies:
If there is an aspect verb pair sharing the same root, but built without prefixation: *вдигна – вдигам* (to raise – am raising); *повдигна – подвигам* (to lift – am lifting); *кажа – казвам* (to say – am saying); *разкажа – разказвам* (to tell – am telling), the "secondary" imperfective verb can be considered as formed directly from the respective primary imperfective verb: *вдигам – повдигам* (to raise – am lifting), and thus, an optative diathesis can be formed.

36.a. *Състезателят **вдига** гири*. 'вземам и издигам нещо по-високо'
The competitor lifts dumbbells. 'to take and raise something higher'

b. ***Вдигат му се** гири*. 'иска да вземе и издигне нещо по-високо'
He feels like lifting dumbbells. 'somebody wants to take and raise something higher'

c. *Състезателят **повдига** гири, а не панели*. 'вземам и издигам нещо по-високо, като го задържам за известно време'

The competitor lifts dumbbells, not panels. 'to pick up and raise something higher, holding it for a while'

d. ***Повдигат му се* гири, а не панели**. 'иска да вземе и издигне нещо по-високо, като го задържи за известно време'

He feels like lifting dumbbells, not panels. 'somebody wants to pick up and raise something higher, holding it for a while'

However, if the secondary imperfective verb is a result of the derivational chain imperfect verb – perfect verb – imperfect verb: *шия – зашия – зашивам* (am sewing – sew up – am sewing up); *горя – изгоря – изгарям* (am burning – to burn up – am burning up); *гледам – погледна – поглеждам* (am looking – look up – l am looking up), the diathesis is not possible since the secondary imperfect verb is formed from the perfect one and the semantics of the perfect aspect is clearly preserved (the perfect aspect contradicts the stative meaning): *зашива ми се (I feel like sewing something); *изгаря ми се (I am burning up something); *поглежда ми се (I feel like looking at something). Personal optative verbs cannot be built from source reflexive and reciprocal verbs simply because they are intransitive.

Dual aspect verbs, in as much as they can be interpreted as perfective or imperfective in different contexts, can also form an optative diathesis if they meet the rest of the conditions.

37.a. *Музикантът акордира пиана.* 'настройвам хармонично клавирен инструмент'

The musician tunes pianos. 'to harmonically tune a keyboard instrument'

b. *Акордират му се пиана.* 'искам да настроя хармонично клавирен инструмент'

He feels like tuning pianos. 'to feel like tuning a keyboard instrument'

To summarize, optative diatesis expresses individual-level (Kimian) states with a semantic argument **experiencer** and an inanimate grammatical subject, thus adding an additional class to the presented classification of stative verbs. If the source verb is an activity verb, the eventuality type of the optative diathesis is changed to an individual-level state. If the source verb is a stage-level stative predicate with a conscious participant, the state is also changed to an individual-level state.

5.2. Impersonal optatives

The impersonal optative diatheses exemplify the case in which the semantic role of source subject is changed and semantic role of the source complement object is reduced. There are some impersonal verbs (called impersonal reflexiva dativa tantum) whose structure coincides with the structure of impersonal optatives. They are reflexive by form, intransitive impersonal verbs that attach an obligatory dative clitic corresponding to the semantic subject. The categories of person and number of the semantic subject are again manifested by the dative clitic (Koeva 1998: 152).

38. *Не ми | ти | му | ни | ви | им се зловиди*.
I | you | he | we | you | they (do | does) not envy someone.

The impersonal reflexiva dativa tantum verbs also do not have either a desirable interpretation or a corresponding source diathesis.

The impersonal optative verbs are imperfective verbs with a limited paradigm of the category person (third-person) and of the category number (singular), while the full paradigm of the category person is manifested by the dative personal pronoun clitics (Коева / Koeva 2004: 203). The impersonal optatives, like optatives, do not describe a real situation but express the desire to carry it out; therefore, they express the eventuality type of state.

39.a. ***Моряците*** *ходят на дълги плавания*. 'отивам някъде'
Sailors go on long voyages. 'to go somewhere'

b. *Ходи **им се*** (на моряците) *на дълги плавания*. 'иска ми се да отида някъде'
They (sailors) like to go on long voyages. 'I feel like going somewhere'

Impersonal optatives correspond to source transitive and intransitive verbs with an animate subject, which is an agent. The semantic role of the source agent is shifted to an **experiencer** expressed by a dative personal pronominal clitic. Similarly to optatives, the dative clitic cannot be omitted or replaced by another pronoun or noun, but only doubled. The semantic role of the inanimate source object of transitive verbs is reduced, and in its position the optative particle *се* (se, oneself) is located. The appearance of other complements and adjuncts, as in the other cases, depends on the source verb.

Some authors consider that the source diathesis is restricted to verbs whose subjects can "control" the activity expressed by the predicate (Ницолова / Nitsolova 2008: 246; Димитрова / Dimitrova 2015: 33) and to support such a thesis the authors provide examples such as: **изпотява ми се, *радва ми се, *чува ми се, мига ми се, кашля ми се* (*I feel like sweating, *I feel like being glad, *I feel like hearing it, I feel like blinking, I feel like coughing); however, some of the structures are grammatically incorrect because the source verb cannot function without the marker *se* (being either formally or lexically reflexive), or connects **experiencer** subject (Коева / Koeva 1998: 152; Коева / Koeva 2004: 204) *радвам се, чувам* (glad, hear), while the last two examples are grammatical, although rare: *Ако ти се мига, ми кажи да спра с процедурата* (If you feel like blinking, tell me to stop the procedure).

Impersonal optatives correspond to source transitive and intransitive verbs with an animate subject, which can only be an active or conscious 'doer' of the action. The inanimate object of the transitive source verb is omitted; the optative marker *se* takes its position. In the case of a transitive source verb, the following transformations are eligible.

40.a. Т*е строят къщи на това място*.
They build houses here.

b. *Строят им се къщи на това място*. (personal optative diathesis)
They feel like building houses here.

c. *Строи им се на това място*. (impersonal optative diathesis)
They feel like building here.

If the source transitive verb attaches an animate object, only an impersonal optative diathesis can be formed. If the source transitive verb attaches an inanimate object, it forms both an optative and an impersonal optative diathesis (Коева / Koeva 2004: 204).

41.a. *Тя чака Иван в стаята*.
She is waiting for Ivan in the room.

b. **Чака ѝ се Иван в стаята*. (personal optative diathesis)
She feels like waiting for Ivan in the room.

c. *Чака ѝ се в стаята*. (impersonal optative diathesis)
She feels like waiting in the room.

A number of the impersonal optatives correspond to intransitive verbs, and therefore they do not have optatives.

42.a. *Вървя бавно*.
I walk slowly

b. *Върви ми се бавно*. (impersonal optative diathesis)
I feel like walking slowly.

Inherently reflexive verbs require a subject that cannot be qualified as an **agent**, and accordingly do not form optative diathesis.

Inherently reciprocal verbs require equivalent restrictions for the animacy of their arguments, so they can only have animate subjects. Since such verbs are intransitive, they only form impersonal optative constructions.

43.a. *Той се състезава с по-слаб противник*.
He is competing with a weaker opponent.

b. *Състезава му се с по-слаб противник*.
He feels like competing with a weaker opponent.

Impersonal optative diatheses are individual-level (Kimian) states with a semantic argument **experiencer**. If the source verb is an activity verb, the eventuality type of the impersonal optative diathesis is changed to an individual-level state. If the source verb is a stage-level stative predicate with a **conscious participant**, the state is changed to an individual-level state. The same correspondences between different types of impersonal verbs and options for deriving impersonal optative diathesis are valid as with the personal optative verbs.

6. "Oblique" subjects

When the semantic role of the subject does not change and the semantic role of the prepositional object is reduced but the source noun from the prepositional

phrase is realized as the derived subject, the so-called "**oblique subject**" **diathesis** is realized. The condition for this type of alternation is a source three-place predicate with arguments: a subject, a complement noun phrase, and a complement prepositional phrase. The alternations that fall into this group are: Natural force subject, Instrument subject, Locatum subject, Raw Material Subject (Levin 1993: 79–83). In our view, the other two alternations that are included in the group: Time subject (*The world saw the beginning of a new era in 1 492*; *1 492 saw the beginning of a new era.*) (Levin 1993: 79) and Sum of Money Subject (*I bought* (*you*) *a ticket for $5*; *$5 will buy* (*you*) *a ticket*) (Levin 1993: 83) express a metaphorical meaning, while the Source Subject alternation formally does not belong to this class (*The new tax laws will benefit the middle class; The middle class will benefit from the new tax laws*) (Levin 1993: 83) as the subject is derived from the source direct object, and in Bulgarian this can be classified as an active-passive alternation (*Новите данъчни закони ще облагодетелстват средната класа; Средната класа ще се облагодетелства от новите данъчни закони*).

The "oblique" subject diatheses do not involve a change in transitivity, but they do involve a change in the number of noun phrases found with the verb. The derived subjects have been referred to as "oblique" subjects because the source prepositional phrases are sometimes called oblique (Levin 1983: 79).

6.1. Bulgarian "oblique" subjects

The number of semantic arguments in a **prototypical diathesis** is reduced by one in comparison to the basic diathesis (e.g., the verb is bivalent while its source counterpart is trivalent). The semantic role of the subject to the predicate is unaffected by the alternation, while the semantic role of the complement prepositional object is reduced. While the agent of the source diathesis (the subject) is entirely removed, the "oblique" subject corresponds to the source prepositional object. At the syntactic level, this reflects the change of the syntactic category and the grammatical role of the source prepositional complement (respectively to a noun phrase and subject), and at the morphological level, the "oblique" subject diathesis is formally coded by means of the reduction of the verb category person to the third-person singular and plural, which is due to the restriction for an inanimate subject. There are some examples below:

Natural force subject
44.a. *Тя изсуши* (суши, изсушава) *дрехите **на слънцето**.* 'правя нещо мокро да стане сухо, като осигурявам причина за това'
She dried up (dried, was drying up) the clothes in the sun. 'to cause something wet to become dry'

b. ***Слънцето*** *изсуши* (суши, изсушава) *дрехите*. 'нещо прави нещо мокро да стане сухо'
The sun dried up (dried, was drying up) the clothes. 'something causes something wet to become dry'

Instrument subject

45.a. *Рибарите чупят* (ще счупят, счупват) *леда с греблата*. ʻправя нещо твърдо да стане на късове, като използвам инструментʼ

Fishermen break (will break up, break up) the ice with their oars. ʻto break something solid into pieces by using an instrumentʼ

b. *Греблата чупят* (ще счупят, счупват) *леда*. ʻдаден инструмент прави нещо да стане на късовеʼ

The oars break (will break up, break up) the ice. ʻan instrument makes something fall to piecesʼ

Locatum subject[27]

46.a. (той) *напълни* (пълни, напълва) *чашата с вино*. ʻпълня догоре, докрай някакъв съд с нещоʼ

He filled up (is filling, is filling up) the glass with wine. ʻto fill a vessel to the top with somethingʼ

b. *Виното напълни* (пълни, напълва) *чашата*. ʻнещо заема изцяло някакво пространство; изпълваʼ

The wine filled up (is filling, is filling up) the glass. ʻsomething completely occupies some space; fills upʼ

Raw material subject[28]

47.a. *Тя направи* (*прави*) *хубави сапунени мехури с тази пяна*. ʻсъздавам нещо от някакъв материалʼ

She made (*makes*) *nice soap bubbles with this foam*. ʻto create something from raw materialʼ

b. *Тази пяна направи* (*прави*) *хубави сапунени мехури*. ʻза материал – създава нещоʼ

This foam has made (makes) nice soap bubbles. ʻfor a raw material – creates somethingʼ

A peculiarity of the source diathesis is that both the subject and the prepositional object have similar semantics; the first one causes something to happen, and the other provides the conditions, the "reason" for the event to occur. Thus, in the source diathesis, the prepositional object expresses the inanimate cause of the action, and the subject – an animate agentive causer, which provides the option for the inanimate cause to affect the affected object. In the source diathesis, the verbs are perfective and imperfective, and the subject is agentive (causer) (Koeva 2022a: 85).

---

[27] The source verbs are categorized as **fill verbs** and include words like *adorn*, *bandage*, *bind*, *block*, *cover*, *decorate*, *enrich*, *fill*, *mask*, *saturate*, *surround*, *tile*, *vein*, etc. (Levin 1993: 81).

[28] Alternating verbs are **build verbs**: *bake*, *carve*, *cook*, *make*, *sew*, *spin*, *weave*, etc. (Levin 1993: 82).

A distinction between two types of instruments, pure instruments and instruments causers, is proposed (Kamp, Rossdeutscher 1993:143-145): pure instruments can be conceived as an auxiliary used by the **agent,** and the respective verbs are not involved in the instrument subject diathesis (*The doctor cured the patient with his scalpel, *The scalpel cured the patient*); on the other hand, instruments causers could act on their own (with the implication that the **agent** has been involved), and they can become subjects (*The doctor cured the patient with camomile, The camomile cured the patient*) (Alexiadou, Schäfer 2006: 42).

The source semantic role of the preposition object may vary across various "oblique subject" diatheses. However, the semantics in common among the presented group of diatheses is that the semantic role of the prepositional object is reduced, and the nouns eligible for this position can act as inanimate subjects, which are causers.

It is noteworthy that in Bulgarian, if the source verb for the "oblique" subject diathesis is in the perfective form, the dynamic eventuality type is preserved in the derived structure, whereas if it is in the imperfective form, the derived structure can be interpreted as either: a) something that is happening (at the moment), in which case the eventuality type is dynamic (both with perfect and imperfect verbs), or b) something that is true generally or for a specific period of time, and in such a case the eventuality type is a state (Koeva 2022a: 86). Although in both cases the source predicates are equal, the two interpretations should be seen as different types of diatheses: if the eventuality type of the source and the derived predicate is left unchanged, the diathesis is an "oblique" subject; if it is changed from a dynamic eventuality type to a stative one, the derived diathesis is the **property of** "**oblique**" **subject**.

6.2. Property of "**oblique**" subjects

Similarly to the "oblique" subject diatesis, the number of semantic arguments is reduced by one in comparison to the basic diathesis, resulting in a bivalent structure. The difference is that the semantic role of the subject to the predicate is affected by the alternation, while at the same time the semantic role of the prepositional object is removed. The source prepositional object's syntactic category and grammatical role are modified, and the derived diathesis is formally coded at the morphological level by reducing the verb category person to the third-person singular and plural, which is due to the restriction for an inanimate subject.

44.c. ***Слънцето*** *суши* (изсушава) *дрехите*. ʿприродна сила има свойството да прави нещо мокро да стане сухоʾ
The sun dries (dries up) the clothes. ʿa natural force has the property of making something wet become dryʿ

45.c. ***Греблата*** *чупят* (счупват) *леда*. ʿдаден инструмент има свойството да прави нещо да стане на късовеʾ
The oars break (break up) the ice. ʿan instrument has the property of making something come to piecesʾ

46.c. **Виното** *пълни* (напълва) *чашата*. ʻнещо има свойството да заема изцяло някакво пространство'

The wine fills (fills up) the glass. ʻsomething has the property of completely occupying some space'

47.c. **Тази пяна** прави хубави сапунени мехури. ʻза материал – има свойството от него да се създава нещо'

This foam makes nice soap bubbles. ʻfor a material – it has the property of creating something from it'

It was suggested for the instrument subject diathesis that the derived subjects are neither causers nor instruments if they are not perceived as causing an event or as being used by an **agent**, rather, in such cases, the verb predicates a property of the subject considered a **theme** (Ježek, Varvara 2015). The same conclusion can be drawn about the derived subjects in all diatheses from this group. The **property of** "**oblique**" **subject** diathesis, in contrast to "oblique" subject diathesis, is characterized by a shift in the subject's semantic role and a reduction of the semantic role of the prepositional complement. The predicate's eventuality type is consequently altered from dynamic to stative.

The alternations Container subject, Abstract cause subject and Location subject (Levin 1983: 81–82) can also be attributed to this group.

Container subject[29]

48.a. (ние) *Включваме новите резултати **в обзора***. ʻприбавям нещо към състава, съдържанието на друго нещо'

We include the new results in the overview. ʻto add something to the composition, the content of another thing'

b. **Обзорът** *включва новите резултати*. ʻнещо има в състава, в съдържанието си нещо'

The overview includes the new results. ʻsomething has in its composition, in its content, something'

Abstract cause subject[30]

49.a. (той) *Доказва невинността си **с тази снимка***. ʻпоказвам истинността на нещо с помощта на доводи и факти'

He proves his innocence with this photo. ʻto show the truth of something by means of arguments and facts'

---

[29] Alternating verbs are, for example: *amalgamate*, *contain*, *embed*, *include*, *incorporate*, *integrate*, *omit* (Levin 1993: 82).

[30] Alternating verbs are verbs such as *assert*, *confirm*, *demonstrate*, *establish*, *explain*, *imply*, *indicate*, *justify*, *nullify*, *obscure*, *proclaim*, *predict*, *prove*, *reveal*, *show*, *suggest*, and so on (Levin 1993: 81).

b. ***Тази снимка*** *доказва невинността му*. 'нещо служи за доказателство, потвърждение за нещо'
This photo proves his innocence. 'something serves as proof, confirmation of something'

Location subject[31]
50.a. *Ние побираме пет книги в **една чанта.*** 'слагам, поставям обикновено голям брой предмети в ограничено по обем място'
We fit five books in one bag. 'to put, to place usually a large number of objects in a limited volume space'

b. ***Една чанта*** *побира пет книги*. 'за помещение, съд, мебел и др. – има свойството да осигурява място, в което да се разположи, намести нещо'
One bag fits five books. 'for a room, vessel, furniture, etc. – provides, gives a place for something to be located, set up'

In summary, stative predicates are not involved in the "oblique" subject diathesis at either the source or the derived level, and the diathesis operates over the predicate rather than the sentence. The "oblique" subject affects Bulgarian perfective and imperfective verbs expressing activity eventuality type. Individual-level states cannot participate in the property of "oblique" subject diatheses as source predicates: even if the verbs are transitive, their subjects are either experiencers or animate and inanimate themes. There are no stage-level states that match the characteristics of the source diatheses, either. The derived predicates of the "oblique" subject diathesis maintain the eventuality type of the source predicate and are not states. The property of "oblique" subject diathesis, a new type of diathesis that is described, only works with imperfective transitive source verbs, which are ineligible to be stative predicates. Only individual-level states involving inanimate subjects and inanimate objects are expressed by the property of "oblique" subject diathesis.

7. Conclusion

In the presented study, we consider one grammatical diathesis (participial passive) and several lexical diatheses in Bulgarian (*se* passive, impersonal participle passive, impersonal *se* passive, middle, anticausative, lexically reciprocal, optative, impersonal optative).

Lexical diatheses can be either argument-structure preserving (meaning that the number of semantic roles remains the same but at least one of the arguments obtains a new semantic role) or argument-structure modifying (where there are different semantic roles of the arguments in the alternating diatheses). We present closely only one grammatical diathesis – the periphrastic passive.

---

[31] Alternating verbs are **fit verbs** such as *contain*, *fit*, *feed*, *hold*, *store*, etc. (Levin 1993: 82).

The number of the semantic arguments is preserved by passives, lexical reciprocals, and optatives. The passive diathesis does not alter the semantic roles of the arguments; the change affects their grammatical roles and the syntactic category of the source subject. With lexical reciprocal diathesis, the semantic roles of both arguments change, as do the grammatical role and the syntactic category of the source object. With the optative diathesis, the semantic role of the subject shifts from **agent** to **experiencer**, and the syntactic category of the source subject is also changed.

The impersonal passives (both participial and *se* passive), impersonal optatives, middles, and anticausatives demonstrate a reduction of the semantic role as follows: both the source subject and the source object with the impersonal passives, and the source subject – with the remaining two diatheses. The reduction of the semantic role is accompanied by a change in the semantic role, grammatical role, and syntactic category of the source subject (for impersonal optatives) or by a change in the semantic and grammatical role of the source object (for middles and anticausatives).

Verb aspect, verb transitivity and semantic properties of arguments such as **human**, **animate**, **agent**, and **experiencer** determine the formation of alternations, operating as follows:

All diatheses under consideration have source verbs with a full paradigm of the person and number categories, and the passives and the lexical reciprocals correlate with the source verbs in both perfective and imperfect forms. The remaining diatheses are formed from imperfective verbs, with some restrictions depending on the derivation from perfective verbs.

The source diathesis for passive (both types), impersonal passive (both types), middle, anticausative, lexically reciprocal, optative, and impersonal optative is a transitive verb. With the impersonal passive and impersonal optative, the source diathesis can also be an intransitive verb.

All considered diatheses lose the transitivity of the source verb; the derived verb is a compound formed with the marker *se*, which marks the intransitivity, and, depending on the semantics of the diathesis, can be called a passive marker, an impersonal passive marker, an optative marker, a middle marker, an anticausative marker, a reciprocal marker, an optative marker, or an impersonal optative marker. Only the participial passive diathesis possesses all forms for person and number, the others are limited to the third-person, and the impersonal diathesis to the singular.

Passives preserve the eventuality type of the source predicate. Personal passives can be built from individual-level states with a topical argument expressing an inherent property psychological experience, animacy, and inanimacy, and from stage-level states with a topical argument expressing the property conscious participation. Only source stage-level state predicates with the topical argument characterized by the property **intentional participation** build impersonal passives.

The lexical reciprocals do not change the eventuality type: an activity predicate derives a reciprocal activity predicate, and a state predicate derives a reciprocal state predicate.

Middles and anticausatives in Bulgarian affect only verbs expressing an activity (with the exception of stage-level states with an argument experiencing conscious participation, which build "impersonal dispositional middle"). The derived predicates are different types of states; dispositional middles are individual-level states, while anticausatives are stage-level states.

Both optative diatheses (personal and impersonal) are expressed by individual-level states with a topical argument psychological experiencer. If the source verb is an activity verb, the eventuality type of the optative diathesis is changed to the individual-level state. If the source verb is a stage-level stative predicate with a conscious participant, the derived state is changed to an individual-level state.

The property of "oblique" subject diathesis, a new type of diathesis that has been described, only works with source imperfective transitive verbs expressing activities. The derived diatheses are individual-level states with an inanimate topical argument.

Acknowledgements

References

Alexiadou 2010: Alexiadou, A. On the morpho-syntax of (anti-)causative verbs. – In: Rappaport Hovav, M., Doron, E., Sichel, I. (eds.) *Syntax, Lexical Semantics and Event Structure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 177–203.

Alexiadou, Doron 2012: Alexiadou, A., Doron, E. The syntactic construction of two non-active voices: Passive and middle. – In: *Journal of Linguistics* 48, pp. 1–34.

Alexiadou, Schäfer 2006: Alexiadou, A., F. Schäfer. Instrument subjects are agents or causers. – In: Baumer D., Montero, D., M. Scanlon (ed.) *Proceedings of the 25th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, Somerville: Cascadilla Proceedings Project, pp. 40–48.

Babby 1998: Babby, L. H. Voice and Diathesis in Slavic. – In: *Workshop on Comparative Slavic Mophosyntax*, Indiana: Indiana University, pp. 1–61.

Bybee et. al. 1994: Bybee, J. L., Perkins, R., P, W. *The evolution of grammar: Tense, aspect and modality in the languages of the world.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Bach 1981: Bach, E. On time, tense, and aspect: An essay in English metaphysics. – In: Cole, P. (ed.) *Radical pragmatics,* New York, Academic Press, pp. 63–81.

Barakova 1981: Баракова, П. Пасив и глаголна лексика. – В: *Български език*, 1, с. 3–12. (Barakova, P. Pasiv i glagolna leksika. – In: *Balgarski ezik*, 1, pp. 3–12.)

Carlson 1977: Carlson, G. *Reference to Kinds in English.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts.

Comrie 1988: Comrie, B. Passive and voice. – In: Shibatani, M. (ed.) *Passive and Voice*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 9–23.

Davidson 1967: Davidson, D. The Logical Form of Action Sentences. – In: Rescher N. (ed.) *The Logic of Decision and Action*. Pittsburgh, University of Pittsburgh Press, pp. 81–95.

Dimitrova 2015: Димитрова М. Оптативните конструкции в съвременния български език: свобода и ограничения в образуването им. – В: *Български език,* кн. 3, с. 25–37. (Dimitrova 2015: Dimitrova M. Optativnite konstruktsii v savremenniya balgarski ezik: svoboda i ogranicheniya v obrazuvaneto im. – In: *Balgarski ezik,* kn. 3, pp. 25–37.)

Dowty 1979: Dowty, D. *Word Meaning and Montague Grammar: The Semantics of Verbs and Times in Generative Semantics and in Montague's PTQ.* Dordrecht: Reidel.

Dzhonova 2008: Джонова М. Аргументна структура на изреченията, съдържащи предикат с непряко допълнение експериенцер от типа „спи ми се". – В: Comati S. (ed.) *Bulgarica – studia et argumenta. Festschrift für Ruselina Nitsolovazum 65. Geburtstag.* Munchen: Otto Saggner, с. 231–240. (Dzhonova M. Argumnetna struktura na izrecheniyata, sadarzohashti predikat s nepryako dopalnenie ot tipa "spi mi se". – In: Comati S. (ed.) *Bulgarica – studia et argumenta. Festschrift für Ruselina Nitsolovazum 65. Geburtstag.* Munchen: Otto Saggner, pp. 231–240.)

Dzhonova, Mihaylova 2021: *Джонова, М., В. Михайлова.* Рефлексивният пасив в българския и румънския език – форми и употреба. – В: *Съпоставително езикознание*, т. XLVI, 2–3, с. 50–55. (Dzhonova, M., B. Mihaylova, Refleksivniyat pasiv v balgarskia i rumanskia ezik – formi i upotreba, – In: *Sapostavitelno ezikoznanie,* t. XLVI, 2–3, pp. 50 – 55).

Filip 1999: *Filip, H. Aspect, eventuality types, and nominal reference.* New York: Garland Pub.

Fillmore 1970: Fillmore, C. J. Subjects, Speakers and Roles. – In: *Semantics of Natural Language, Vol. 21, No. 3/4,* pp. 251–274.

Geniušienė 1987: Geniušienė, E. *The typology of reflexives.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Givon 1994: Givón, T. *Syntax. A Functional-Typological Introduction.* Vol. II. Amsterdam – Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Grimshaw 1990: Grimshaw J. *Argument Structure.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press.

Grosz 2012: Grosz, P. G. *On the Grammar of Optative Constructions.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Guentchéva, Asenova 2006: Генчева, З., П. Асенова. Рефлексив и медиум в балканските езици. – В: *Езиковедски изследвания в чест на 75-годишнината от рождението на ст.н.с. I ст. д.ф.н. Йордан Пенчев Пенчев,* София: Издателство „Артграф", с. 442–454. (Guentchéva, Z., P. Asenova. Refleksiv i medium v balkanskite ezitsi. – In: *Ezikovedski izsledvaniya v chest na 75-godishninata ot rozhdenieto na st.n.s. I st. d.f.n. Yordan Penchev Penchev,* Sofia: Izdatelstvo "Artgraf", pp. 442–454.)

Guentchéva, Rivière 2007: Guentchéva, Z., N. Rivière. Reciprocal and reflexive constructions in French. – In: Nedjalkov, V. P. (ed.). *Reciprocal Constructions*, volume 2 of *Typological Studies in Language* 71, John Benjamins Publishing Company, pp. 561–607.

Guglielmo 2021: Guglielmo, I. Towards a typology of middle voice systems. – In: *Linguistic Typology.* <https://doi.org/10.1515/lingty-2020-013> [31.08.2022]

Haspelmath 2007: Haspelmath, M. Further remarks on reciprocal constructions. – In: Nedjalkov, V. (ed.) *Reciprocal Constructions.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins*,* pp. 2087–2115.

Haspelmath, Müller-Bardey 2004: Haspelmath, M., T. Müller-Bardey, Valency change. – In: Booij, G., Lehmann, C., Mugdan, J., Skopeteas, S. (eds.) *Morphology: A Handbook on Inflection and Word Formation, Vol. 2*. Berlin: de Gruyter, pp. 1130–1145.

Ivanova 1983: Иванова, К. Залог на глагола. – В: *Граматика на съвременния български книжовен език*. Т. 2 *Морфология*. София: Издателство на БАН, с. 249–254. (Ivano-

va, K. Zalg na glagola. – In: *Gramatika na savremennia balgarski knizhoven ezik*. T. 2 *Morfologiya*. Sofia: Izdatelstvo na BAN., pp. 249–254.)

Ivanova et al. 2021: Иванова, Е., Джонова, М., Лесева, S. Инхоативная деривация в болгарском языке: предикаты состояний и их производные. – В: *Acta Linguistica Petropolitana*. 2021. т. 17.3., с. 218–286. (Ivanova, E., Dzhonova, M., Leseva S. Inchoative derivation in Bulgarian: State predicates and their derivatives. Available – In: *Acta Linguistica Petropolitana*. 2021. Vol. 17.3., pp. 218–286.)

Ježek, Varvara 2015: Ježek, E., Varvara, R. Instrument subjects without instrument role. – In: *Proceedings of the 11th joint ACL-ISO workshop on interoperable semantic annotation*. <https://aclanthology.org/W15-0206.pdf> [31.08.2022]

Kamp, Rossdeutscher 1994: Kamp, H., A. Rossdeutscher. Remarks on lexical structure and DRS construction. – In: *Theoretical Linguistics*, 20, pp. 97-164.

Katz 2003: Katz, G. Event arguments, adverb selection, and the Stative Adverb Gap. – In: E. Lang, E., Maienborn, C. And C. Fabricius-Hansen (eds). *Modifying Adjuncts,* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 455-474.

Keenan, Dryer 2007: Keenan, E. L., M. S. Dryer. Passive in the world's languages. – In: Shopen, T. (ed.) *Clause structure, language typology and syntactic description*, vol. 1, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 301–348.

Kim 1976: Kim, J. Events as Property Exemplifications. – In: Brand, M., D. Walton (eds.) *Action Theory. Proceedings of the Winnipeg Conference on Human Action*, Dordrecht: Reidel, pp. 159-177.

Klaiman 1991: Klaiman, M. H. *Grammatical voice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Koeva 1995: Коева, С. Семантична и синтактична интерпретация на реципрочните изречения. – В: *Български език*, 1/2, с. 160–163. (Koeva. S. Semantichna i sintaktichna interpretatsiya na retsirochnite izrecheniya. – In: *Balgarski ezik*, 1/2, pp. 160–163.)

Koeva 1997: Коева С. Класификация на българските глаголи. – В: *Български еизк*, 6, с. 22–28. (Koeva, S. Klasifikatsiya na balgarskite glagoli. – In: *Balgarski ezik*, 6, pp. 22–28.)

Koeva 1998: Koeva, S. Reflexive, passive, optative, reciprocal and impersonal verbs in Bulgarian. – В: *Научни трудове на Пловдивския университет – Филология*, 36, 1, с. 142–157. (Koeva, S. Reflexive, passive, optative, reciprocal and impersonal verbs in Bulgarian. – In: *Nauchni trudove na Plovdivskiya universitet – Filologiya*, 36, 1, pp. 142–157.)

Koeva 2004: Коева С. Семантично и синтактично описание на диатезите в българския език. – В: Пенчев Й. и др. (ред.) *Българско езикознание*. Т. 4: *Когнитивна граматика на българския и френски език – описание и формализация*. София: Издателство на БАН, с. 182–231. (Koeva 2004: Koeva S. Semantichno i sintatichno opisanie na diatezite v balgarskiya ezik . – In: Penchev J. i dr. (red.) *Balgarsko ezikoznanie*. T. 4: *Kognitivna gramatika na balgarskiya i frenskiya ezik – opisanie i formalizatsiya*. Sofia: Izdatelstvo na BAN, pp. 182–231.)

Koeva 2005: Коева, С. Синтактични трансформации. – В: A*ргументна структура. Проблеми на простото и сложното изречение*. София: Сема РШ, с. 106–139. (Koeva, S. Sintaktichni transfotmacii. – In: *Argumentna struktura. Problemi na prostoto i sloznoto izrechenie*. Sofia: Sema RSH, pp. 106–139.)

Koeva 2006: Коева С. Синтактични редувания в български – диатези и алтернации. – В: *Български език,* 2006, кн. 4, с. 19–32. (Koeva Sv. Sintaktichni reduvaniya v balgarski – diatezi i alternatsii. – In: *Balgarski ezik,* 2006, kn. 4, pp. 19–32.)

Koeva 2007: Koeva S. Bulgarian Alternations – Lexicon or Grammar? – In: *Southern Journal of Linguistics,* 29, pp. 49–70.

Koeva 2022a: Коева, С. Система на диатезите в български. – В: Коева, С., М. Стаменов (съст.) *Доклади от Международната годишна конференция на Института за български език „Проф. Любомир Андрейчин"* (София, 2022). София: Издателство на БАН „Проф. Марин Дринов", с. 81– 91. (Koeva, S. Sistema na diatezite v balgarski. – In: Koeva, S., M. Stamenov (sast.) *Dokladi ot Mezhdunarodnata godishna konferentsiya na Instituta za balgarski ezik „Prof. Lyubomir Andreychin"* (Sofia, 2022). Sofia: Izdatelstvo na BAN „Prof. Marin Drinov", pp. 81– 91.)

Koeva 2022b: Коева С. Семантична класификация на предикатите за състояние в български. – В: *Български език. Приложение,* 69, с. 367–389. (Koeva S. Semantichna klasifikatsiya na predikatite za sastoyanie v balgarski. – In: *Balgarski ezik. Prilozhenie,* 69, pp. 367–389.)

Kratzer 1995*: Kratzer, A.* Stage-Level and Individual-Level Predicates. – In: Carlson, G. N., Pelletier, F. J., (eds.) *The Generic Book.* Chicago, London, The University of Chicago Press, pp. 125–175.

Kulikov 2011: Kulikov, L. I. Voice typology. – In: *The Oxford Handbook of Linguistic Typology.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 368–398.

Kulikov 2013: Kulikov, L. Middle and reflexive. – In: Silvia Luraghi, S., C. Parodi (eds.) *The Bloomsbury companion to syntax,* London: Bloomsbury, pp. 261–280.

Kutsarov 2007: Куцаров, И. *Теоретична граматика на българския език. Морфология.* Пловдив: Университетско издателство „Паисий Хилендарски". (Kutsarov 2007: Kutsarov, I. *Teoretichna gramatika na balgarskiya ezik. Morfologiya.* Plovdiv: Universitetsko izdatelstvo „Paisii Hilendarski".)

Landau 2010: Landau I. *The Locative Syntax of Experiencers.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press.

Levin 1993: Levin, B. *English Verb Classes and Verb Alternations: A Preliminary Investigation.* Chicago – London: University of Chicago Press.

Levin, Rappaport 2005: Levin, B., M. Rappaport. *Argument Realization.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Maienborn 2019: Maienborn C. Events and states. – In: Truswell R. (ed.) *The Oxford Handbook of Event Structure.* Oxford, Oxford University Press, pp. 50–89.

Michaelis 2011: Michaelis, L A. Stative by Construction. – In: *Linguistics,* 49(6), pp. 1359–1399.

Mel'čuk 2006: Mel'čuk, I. *Aspects of the Theory of Morphology.* Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Mel'čuk, Xolodovič 1970: Мельчук И. А., Холодович, А. А. К теории грамматического залога. – В: *Народы Азии и Африки.* No 4. с. 111–124. (Mel᷄čuk, I., A. Xolodovič. K teorii gramaticheskova zaloga. – In: *Narody Azii i Afriki.* No 4, pp. 111–124.)

Nedjalkov 2007: Nedjalkov, V. Overview of the research. Definitions of terms, framework, and related issues. – In: Nedjalkov, V. (ed.) *Reciprocal Constructions.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins*,* pp. 3–114.

Nitsolova 2008: Ницолова, Р. *Българска граматика. Морфология*. София: Университетско издателство „Св. Климент Охридски“. (Nitsolova, R. *Balgarska gramatika. Morfologiya*. Sofia: Universitetsko izdatelstvo „Sv. Kliment Ohridski“.)

Partee 1984: Partee, B. Nominal and temporal anaphora. – In: *Linguistics and Philosophy.* 7, pp. 243–286.

Penchev 1995: Пенчев, Й. Функции на форманта *се / си* в съвременния български език. – В: *Български език,* кн. 5/6, с. 404–418. (Penchev 1995: Penchev J. Funktsii na formanta se / si v savremenniya balgarski ezik. – In: *Balgarski ezik*, kn. 5/6, pp. 404–418.)

Penchev 1998: Пенчев, Й. *Синтаксис на съвременния български книжовен език*. Асеновград: Издателска къща „Вечерник“. (Penchev, Y. *Sintaksis na savremenniya balgarski knizhoven ezik*. Asenovgrad: Izdatelska kashta “Vechernik”.)

Penchev 2007: Penchev, J. Reciprocal and reflexive constructions in Bulgarian. – In: Nedjalkov, V. P. (ed.) *Reciprocal Constructions*, volume 2 of *Typological Studies in Language* 71, John Benjamins Publishing Company, pp. 609–632.

Petrova 2008: Петрова, Г. *Функции на клитиките се и си в съвременния български език*. Бургас: Димант. (Petrova G. *Funktsii na klitikite se i si v savremenniya balgarski ezik*. Burgas: Dimant.)

Rivero 2003: Rivero, M. L. Reflexive clitic constructions with datives: syntax and semantics – In: Browne, W., Kim, J.-Y., Partee, B., Rothstein, R. (eds.) *Formal approaches to Slavic linguistics 11. The Amherst Meeting*. Ann Arbor, MI: Michigan Slavic Publications, pp. 469–494.

Savova 2018: Савова, Д. Синтактични конструкции с логически субект ‘глагол+ми се’ в българския език. – В: *Slavia Meridionalis*, 18, с. 1–21. (Savova, D. Sintaktichni konstruktsii s logicheski subekt ‘glagol + mi se’ v balgarskiya ezik. – In: *Slavia Meridionalis*, 18, 1–21.)

Slavcheva 2010: Славчева, М. *Семантични дескриптори на рефлексивни по форма глаголни структури в съвременния български, френски и унгарски език*, дисерта- ция. (Slavcheva 2010: Slavcheva, M. *Semantichni deskriptori na refleksivni po forma glagolni strukturi v savremenniya balgarski, frenski i ungarski ezik*, disertatsiya.)

Van Valin, LaPolla 1997: Van Valin R. D., R. J. LaPolla. *Syntax: Structure, meaning and function*. Cambridg: Cambridge University Press.

Vendler 1957: Vendler, Z. Verbs and times. – In: *Philosophical Review*, 56, pp. 143–160.
Zúñiga, Kittilä 2019: Zúñiga, F., S. Kittilä. *Grammatical voice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Система на диатезите в българския език с фокус върху предикатите за състояние

Светла Коева

Институт за български език „Проф. Любомир Андрейчин“,
Българска академия на науките

svetla@dcl.bas.bg

Резюме

В изследването се разглеждат граматически и лексикални диатези в български, като се прилага семантичен анализ на езиковите факти. Наричаме лексикална диатеза редуванията, които освен с промени на граматично равнище се характеризират с промяна или редукция на поне една семантична релация. Лексикалните диатези, които се обект на това изследване, са: *се* пасивът, безличният пасив (причастен и рефлексивен), средната диатеза, антикаузативът, лексикалната реципрочна диатеза, оптативът и безличният оптатив. Разглеждат се семантичните и граматичните характеристики (аргументи и семантични роли; вид на глагола, транзитивност, морфологични категории на глаголната лема) на изходните и производните диатези. Проследява се каква е корелацията между изходния и производния предикат от гледна точка на изразявания ситуационен тип: действие – състояние или състояние – състояние.

Ключови думи: *диатеза, предикати за състояние, пасиви, средни глаголи, антикаузативи, реципрочна диатеза, оптативи*

Svetla Koeva
Institute for Bulgarian Language
Bulgarian Academy of Sciences
52, Shipchenski prohod Blvd., Bl. 17
Sofia 1113 Bulgaria
https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5947-8736