

ANNA BONDARUK

AGAINST A MOVEMENT ANALYSIS OF *DAC* + *SIE* + INFINITIVE STRUCTURE IN POLISH

1. INTRODUCTION

The *dać* + *się* + infinitive structure is used in Polish to express generic statements which convey the modal sense of capability. When studied from a syntactic point of view, the structure shows argument realisation typical of the passive and middle construction. In the *dać* + *się* + infinitive structure, as well as in passives and middles, the understood complement surfaces in the subject position. Since passives and middles are often treated in the Principles and Parameters framework of Noam Chomsky¹, and its most recent incarnation, the Minimalist Program (cf. Chomsky²), as derived via movement of a complement to the subject position (cf. for passives

Prof. dr hab. ANNA BONDARUK – Katedra Językoznawstwa Teoretycznego KUL; adres do korespondencji: Al. Raławickie 14, 20-950 Lublin; e-mail: bondaruk@kul.pl

Prof. dr hab. ANNA BONDARUK – Department of Theoretical Linguistics, John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin; postal address: Al. Raławickie 14, PL 20-950 Lublin; e-mail: bondaruk@kul.pl

¹ N. CHOMSKY, *Lectures on government and binding*, Dordrecht 1981.

² N. CHOMSKY, *Minimalist inquiries: The framework*, in: *Step by step*, eds. R. Martin, D. Michaels, and J. Uriagereka, Cambridge (MA) 2000, pp. 89-155; N. CHOMSKY, *Derivation by phase*, in: *Ken Hale. A life in language*, ed. M. Kenstowicz, Cambridge (MA) 2001, pp. 1-52; N. CHOMSKY, *On phases*, in: *Foundational Issues in Linguistic Theory. Essays in Honor of Jean-Roger Vergnaud*, eds. R. Freidin, C. P. Otero, and M. L. Zubizarreta, Cambridge (MA) 2008, pp. 134-166.

Chomsky³, Osvaldo Jaeggli⁴, Mark Baker⁵, Mark Baker, Kyle Johnson and Ian Roberts⁶, Chris Collins⁷, and for middles Samuel Keyser and Thomas Roeper⁸, Thomas Stroik⁹, Teun Hoekstra and Ian Roberts¹⁰), it is natural to pose a question whether the *dać + się + infinitive* structure is also movement derived.

The aim of this paper is to examine whether it is feasible to offer a movement-based analysis of the *dać + się + infinitive* structure in Polish. Since the structure under scrutiny is superficially similar to the so-called *lassen*-middles in German, an attempt will be made to test the validity of the movement-based derivation of *lassen*-middles proposed by Marcel Pitteroff¹¹ for Polish data. Although at first glance it might seem that Pitteroff's analysis would be applicable to the Polish *dać + się + infinitive* structure, under closer examination it turns out to be inadequate to account for the Polish data. The position that will be defended in the paper is that the Polish *dać + się + infinitive* structure is not derived by movement of any kind, but rather involves base generation.

The paper consists of six sections. Section 2 focuses on the data to be analysed in the paper. Section 3 overviews the similarities between the *dać + się + infinitive* structure and *lassen*-middles in German. Section 4 briefly sketches Pitteroff's analysis of *lassen*-middles in German, whereas section 5 tests the applicability of Pitteroff's account to the Polish *dać + się + infinitive* structure. Finally, section 6 concludes the paper.

2. THE DATA TO BE ANALYSED

The verb *dać* 'give' in Polish is most frequently used as a ditransitive predicate in sentences such as (1) below:

³ CHOMSKY, *Lectures*.

⁴ O. JAEGGLI, *Passive*, "Linguistic Inquiry" 17(1986), pp. 587-622.

⁵ M. BAKER, *Incorporation*, Chicago 1988.

⁶ M. BAKER, K. JOHNSON, I. ROBERTS, *Passive arguments revisited*, "Linguistic Inquiry" 20(1989), pp. 219-251.

⁷ Ch. COLLINS, *A smuggling approach to the passive in English*, "Syntax" 8(2005), pp. 81-120.

⁸ S. KEYSER, T. ROEPER, *On the middle and ergative construction in English*, "Linguistic Inquiry" 13(1984), pp. 381-416.

⁹ T. STROIK, *Middles and movement*, "Linguistic Inquiry" 23(1992), pp. 127-137.

¹⁰ T. HOEKSTRA, I. ROBERTS, *Middle constructions in Dutch and English*, in: *Knowledge and Language II. Lexical and Conceptual Structure*, eds. E. Reuland and W. Abraham, Dordrecht 1993, pp. 183-220.

¹¹ M. PITTEROFF, *Non-canonical lassen-middles*, Ph.D. dissertation, University of Stuttgart 2014.

- | | | | | |
|-----|---------------------------|------|----------|---------------------------|
| (1) | Marek | dał | Marii | kwiaty. |
| | Mark-nom | gave | Mary-dat | flowers-acc ¹² |
| | ‘Mark gave Mary flowers.’ | | | |

In (1) the indirect object is marked for the dative case, while the direct one bears the accusative. The ditransitive use of the verb *dać* ‘give’ is analysed by Zuzanna Topolińska¹³, among others.

Moreover, *dać* ‘give’ also figures in Polish in a number of constructions in which it has a modal meaning. The first structure to be mentioned here corresponds to the *dać* + *się* + infinitive construction, analysed in this paper, and exemplified in (2) below:

- | | | | | | |
|-----|-----------------------------------|------------|---------|------|---------------|
| (2) | Te | artykuły | dają | się | tłumaczyć. |
| | these | papers-nom | give-pl | refl | translate-inf |
| | ‘These papers can be translated.’ | | | | |

Sentence (2) contains an inanimate subject which determines the ϕ -features of the verb *dać* ‘give’ as 3rd person, plural, and which corresponds to the Theme argument of the infinitival form of the verb *tłumaczyć* ‘translate’. The reflexive pronoun *się*, present in (2), is co-referential with the surface subject. Sentence (2) has a modal meaning, as it “expresses the possibility grounded in the patient of a transitive verb” (Ruprecht von Waldenfels¹⁴). In other words, some property characteristic of the subject has an influence upon the (im)possibility of the event expressed by the verb in the infinitive. The meaning of this kind is normally associated in the literature with the label ‘dispositional’. The dispositional meaning is connected with the ascription of a property to a subject which holds in virtue of an inherent quality that the subject has (cf. Marika Lekakou¹⁵)¹⁶. The dispositional interpretation in (2) is to be understood as follows: in virtue of the way in which they are written, these papers can be translated. It is worth emphasising that al-

¹² The following abbreviations have been used in the paper: acc – accusative, dat – dative, inf – infinitive, inst – instrumental, nom – nominative, perf – perfective, pl – plural, refl – reflexive, sg – singular.

¹³ Z. TOPOLIŃSKA, *The verb dać/ dawać in Polish periphrastic constructions*, in: *Studies in Polish Morphology and Syntax*, eds. G. Henstchel and R. Laskowski, München 1993, pp. 229-249.

¹⁴ R. VON WALDENFELS, *The grammaticalization of ‘give’ + infinitive. A comparative study of Russian, Polish, and Czech*, Berlin 2012.

¹⁵ M. LEKAKOU, *In the middle, somewhat elevated. The semantics of middles and its crosslinguistic realization*, Ph. D. dissertation, University of London 2005.

¹⁶ The dispositional ascription is characterized by Lekakou (2005: 68) as follows: (i) it expresses ‘in virtue of’ generalizations, (ii) it employs a VP-level Gen (genericity operator), and (iii) it is subject-oriented.

though example (2) is translated into English by means of the passive sentence, the structure in (2) bears no passive morphology whatsoever¹⁷.

Another modal structure with the verb *dać* ‘give’ is the reflexive permissive construction, such as (3) below:

- (3) Ci ludzie dają się zapraszać na przyjęcia.
 these people-nom give-pl refl invite-inf to parties
 ‘These people let themselves be invited to parties.’

In (3), the subject is animate, and it controls verbal agreement. The reflexive pronoun is co-referential with the surface subject, which corresponds to a Theme argument of the infinitival verb *zapraszać* ‘invite’. Sentence (2) expresses permissive causation (cf. von Waldenfels¹⁸), in a way analogous to a sentence such as (4) below:

- (4) Ci ludzie dają zapraszać gości na przyjęcia.
 these people-nom let invite-inf guests to parties
 ‘These people let invite guests to parties.’

Although sentences like (4) are considered to be colloquial by Topolińska¹⁹, they are perfectly grammatical in Polish. Example (4) would cease to be colloquial if the verb *dać* ‘give’ were replaced with *pozwalać* ‘let/allow’. When compared with (3), sentence (4) does not contain a reflexive pronoun, but instead it exhibits a fully referential DP *gości* ‘guests’ as a complement of the infinitive *zapraszać* ‘invite’. However, the meaning in both cases is the same, namely that of permission. Examples (3) and (4) differ from (2) in meaning, as the former sentences express causative permission, while the latter is associated with the dispositional meaning. Additionally, both (3) and (4) exhibit an animate subject, while the subject in (2) is inanimate. Otherwise, sentences (2) and (3) seem to be quite similar (an analogous syntactic analysis is proposed for the *dać* + *się* + infinitive structure and the causative permissive structure with *dać* in Anna Bondaruk ms.²⁰).

Finally, Polish has also an impersonal structure with *dać* ‘give’, as in example (5) below²¹:

¹⁷ Von Waldenfels refers to what we call here the *dać* + *się* + infinitive structure as the agreeing modal passive. We do not adopt this label here, as the structure in (2) lacks any passive morphology, which seems to cast doubt on calling it passive.

¹⁸ R. VON WALDENFELS, *The grammaticalization*.

¹⁹ Z. TOPOLIŃSKA, *The verb dać/ dawać in Polish periphrastic constructions*, p.239.

²⁰ A. BONDARUK, *The modal dać się structure in Polish is syntactically causative*, Lublin, John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin, ms.

²¹ Von Waldenfels refers to sentences such as (5) as non-agreeing modal passives.

- (5) Tę książkę daje się tłumaczyć.
 this book-acc give-3sg refl translate-inf
 ‘One can translate this book.’

In (5) the verb appears in the default 3rd singular form, and the sentence initial DP has no influence upon the ϕ -features of the verb, because it is marked for the accusative case, and serves as a complement of the infinitive *tłumaczyć* ‘translate’, not the subject of the main clause. The reflexive *się* in (5) is not co-referential with the complement of the infinitive (for a recent analysis of impersonal structures such as (5), cf. Małgorzata Krzek²²). Meaning-wise, (5) is similar to (2), as it expresses dynamic possibility (cf. von Waldenfels²³), but it is less specific than the modal *dać się* structure in (2), as it shows no connection with the inherent properties of the subject (i.e. it has no dispositional meaning).

Out of the three structures containing the verb *dać* ‘give’ with a modal interpretation, presented in this section, the one exemplified in (2) above, i.e. the *dać* + *się* + infinitive structure will be the main focus of this paper. The two remaining structures, i.e. the causative, and the impersonal one, as in (3) and (5), respectively, will be only drawn upon, when they are relevant for the discussion carried out here.

3. SIMILARITIES BETWEEN THE *DAĆ* + *SIE* + INFINITIVE STRUCTURE AND *LASSEN*-MIDDLES

As has been noted in section 2, the *dać* + *się* + infinitive structure has a dispositional meaning, which makes it similar to middles, such as (6) below:

- (6) Te artykuły tłumaczą się łatwo.
 these papers-nom translate-pl refl easily
 ‘These papers translate easily.’

Both the middle in (6) and the *dać* + *się* + infinitive structure in (2) represent generic statements which have a dispositional meaning, according to which a certain property holds of the subject in virtue of its inherent quality. Sentences (6) and (2) differ only in that the verb *dać* is missing in the former, while the manner adverbial is absent in the latter. However, the manner adverbial can be attested

²² M. KRZEK, *The syntax of impersonal constructions in Polish*, Ph.D. dissertation, University of Newcastle 2013.

²³ R. VON WALDENFELS, *The grammaticalization*.

in the *dać + się + infinitive* structure, although its presence is not obligatory, as shown in (7), where the optional adverbial is put in brackets:

- (7) Te artykuły dają się (łatwo) tłumaczyć.
 these papers-nom give-pl refl easily translate-inf
 ‘These papers can be translated easily.’

A detailed comparison between the dispositional middle, as in (6), and the *dać + się + infinitive* structure, as in (2), has been carried out in Bondaruk²⁴ and the interested reader is referred to this work for details. Bondaruk argues that despite surface similarities, the *dać + się + infinitive* structure and the dispositional middle are syntactically and semantically different. The differences that they show make it impossible to treat the *dać + się + infinitive* structure as an instance of the dispositional middle proper. However, Bondaruk proposes that it can be regarded as a type II middle (Peter Ackema and Maike Schoorlemmer²⁵), or as an instance of the so-called *lassen*-middles.

The term ‘*lassen*-middles’ goes back to Sarah M. B. Fagan²⁶ and is used to refer to the sentences in German that contain the verb *lassen* ‘let’ followed by the reflexive pronoun *sich*, as in (8), taken from Pitteroff²⁷:

- (8) Das Problem lässt sich (leicht) lösen.
 the problem-nom lets refl easily solve-inf
 ‘The problem can be solved easily.’

Sentence (8) represents a generic statement with a dispositional meaning, i.e. (8) means that the problem can be solved easily in virtue of its inherent properties. The presence of the manner adverbial is optional, as indicated by the brackets around *leicht* ‘easily’ in (8). The German sentence in (8) can be compared with its Polish equivalent in (9) below:

- (9) Te problemy dają się (łatwo) rozwiązać.
 these problems-nom give-pl refl easily solve-inf
 ‘These problems can be solved easily.’

²⁴ A. BONDARUK, *A comparison of the modal dać się structure with the dispositional middle in Polish*, “*Linguistics Beyond and Within*” 1(2015), pp. 43–63; <http://lingbaw.com/volumes/2015/>

²⁵ P. ACKEMA, M. SCHOORLEMMER, *Middles*, in: *The Blackwell Companion to Syntax*, vol. III, eds. M. Everaert and H. van Riemsdijk, Oxford 2005, pp. 131–203.

²⁶ S.M.B. FAGAN, *The syntax and semantics of middle constructions: A study with special reference to German*, Cambridge 1992.

²⁷ Example (8) comes from Pitteroff (p. 49).

In (9) the plural subject is used, instead of the singular adopted in the corresponding German sentence in (8), because sentence (9) with the singular DP *ten problem* ‘these problems’ would be ambiguous between the *dać* + *się* + infinitive structure and the impersonal *dać się* structure (cf. (5) above), since the form *ten problem*, being masculine, is syncretic between the nominative and accusative, as demonstrated in (10).

- (10) Ten problem da się (łatwo) rozwiązać.
 this problem-nom/acc gives-sg refl easily solve-inf
 ‘This problem can be solved easily.’ or ‘One can solve this problem easily.’

The verb form *da się* in (10) can be taken to be either the default 3rd singular form, commonly found in impersonal structures, or the form agreeing with the 3rd singular nominative masculine DP *ten problem* ‘this problem’. The use of the plural DP *te problemy* ‘these problems’ in (9) allows us to avoid the ambiguity found in (10), because in (9) the verb clearly agrees with the plural DP, which must then be taken to represent the nominative²⁸.

Sentences (8) and (9) look superficially very similar, as they both contain the Theme argument of the infinitival verb form in the surface subject position and the reflexive pronoun co-referential with the surface subject. The only difference between the German *lassen*-middle as in (8), and its Polish equivalent in (9) lies in the verb used in the matrix clause; whereas in German the verb corresponds to the English *let*, in Polish it is realized by means of the equivalent of the verb *give*. However, just like Polish *dać* ‘give’, the German *lassen* ‘let’, can be used in a wide variety of structures, including the causative, as in (11), and the impersonal, as in (12):

- (11) Der Lehrer lässt die Schüler das Buch lesen.
 the teacher-nom lets the students-dat the book-acc read-inf
 ‘The teacher makes/lets the students read the book.’²⁹

- (12) Dort lässt (es) sich gut tanzen.
 there lets it refl well dance-inf
 ‘One can dance well there.’³⁰

²⁸ In Polish only nominative subjects determine verbal agreement, while DPs in any other case form co-occur with the default 3rd singular verb form, as in (i) below, where the dative pronoun is accompanied by the default form of the verb *być* ‘to be’:

- (i) Jest mi zimno.
 is-3 sg me-dat cold
 ‘I am cold.’

²⁹ Example (11) comes from Pitteroff (p. ix).

³⁰ Example (12) is taken from Pitteroff (p. xi).

Sentence (11) is similar to the causative structure with *dać* ‘give’ in Polish, as in (3) and (4), whereas (12) resembles impersonal sentences with *dać*, as in (5). The fact that verbs *lassen* and *dać* can appear in the same range of structures seems to further support the claim that *lassen*-middles in German and the *dać* + *się* + infinitive structure in Polish are at least superficially similar.

However, besides the superficial similarities just noted, German *lassen*-middles and the *dać* + *się* + infinitive in Polish structure share a number of common syntactic properties. According to Ackema and Schoorlemmer³¹, *lassen*-middles (or, what they call, Type II middles) show the following characteristics: 1) they have a syntactically active agent, 2) they place less stringent restrictions on the verbs they make use of than Type I middles (also called dispositional middles), 3) adverbial modification is not obligatory, and 4) episodic interpretation is available. Let us now test how the German and the Polish structures under scrutiny behave with respect to these characteristics. First of all, both *lassen*-middles and the *dać* + *się* + infinitive structure can have a syntactically active agent, realized as a *by*-phrase, as can be seen in (13) and (14) (for more evidence for the presence of a syntactically active agent in the Polish *dać* + *się* + infinitive structure, see Bondaruk³²):

- (13) Te pierwsze przekształcenia dają się całkowicie
 these first transformations-nom give-pl refl completely
 kształtować przez rząd i parlament.³³
 shape-inf by government and parliament
 ‘These first transformations can be shaped entirely by the government and parliament.’

- (14) Das Buch lässt sich von kleinen Kindern (leicht) lesen.³⁴
 the book-nom lets refl by small children easily read-inf
 ‘The book can be read easily by small children.’

The data in (13) and (14) demonstrate that *by*-phrases are compatible with *lassen*-middles and the *dać* + *się* + infinitive structure, which, in turn, is typically taken to be indicative of a syntactically active implicit agent (cf. Baker, Johnson and Roberts³⁵, Artemis Alexiadou³⁶, *inter alia*).

³¹ P. ACKEMA, M. SCHOORLEMMER, *Middles*.

³² A. BONDARUK, *A comparison*.

³³ Example (13) comes from von Waldenfels (p. 164).

³⁴ Examples (14) is taken from Pitteroff (p. 47).

³⁵ M. BAKER, K. JOHNSON, I. ROBERTS, *Passive arguments*.

³⁶ A. ALEXIADOU, *Non-canonical passives revisited: Parameters of non-active Voice*, “Linguistics” 50(2012), pp. 1079-1110.

Secondly, while achievement and stative verbs (Zeno Vender³⁷) are normally disallowed in Type I middles (Fagan³⁸)³⁹, they are perfectly licit in German *lassen*-middles and the Polish *dać + się + infinitive* structure, as confirmed by (15) and (16):

- (15) a. Te choroby dają się łatwo rozpoznać.
 these illnesses-nom give-pl refl easily recognise-inf
 ‘These illnesses can be easily recognized.’
- b. Te miasta dają się łatwo lubić.
 these cities-nom give-pl refl easily like-inf
 ‘These cities can be liked easily.’
- (16) a. Diese Krankheit lässt sich leicht erkennen.⁴⁰
 this illness-nom lets refl easily recognize-inf
 ‘This illness can be recognized easily.’
- b. Gott lässt sich leicht leben.⁴¹
 God-nom lets refl easily love-inf
 ‘God can be loved easily.’

In (15a) and (16a) an achievement verb is used, whereas (15b) and (16b) host a stative verb. However, not all stative verbs can be found either in German *lassen*-middles or in the *dać + się + infinitive* structure; the problem that will be briefly returned to in sections 4 and 5.

Thirdly, it has already been mentioned that the modification by a manner adverbial is optional both in the *dać + się + infinitive* structure, cf. (7) and (9) above, and in German *lassen*-middles, see example (8).

³⁷ Z. VENDLER, *Linguistics in philosophy*, Ithaca 1967.

³⁸ S.M.B. FAGAN, *The syntax and semantics*.

³⁹ The data in (i) below indicate that achievement verbs are disallowed in dispositional middles in either Polish or German:

(i) *Te choroby rozpoznają się łatwo.
 these illnesses-nom recognise-pl refl easily
 ‘These illnesses can be recognised easily.’

(ii) *Diese Krankheit erkennt sich leicht.
 this illness-nom recognises refl easily
 ‘This illness can be recognised easily.’ (Pitteroff p. 50)

Unacceptability also results from placing stative verbs in the dispositional middle in both Polish and German. No data to confirm this claim are provided here due to space limitations.

⁴⁰ Example (16a) comes from Pitteroff (p. 50).

⁴¹ Example (16b) comes from Pitteroff (p. 51).

Finally, as has already been noted, both *lassen*-middles and the *dać + się + infinitive* structure are normally taken to represent generic statements, and therefore they express regularities, rather than specific events (Pitteroff⁴²). However, the Polish structure under scrutiny can give rise to episodic meanings, as it can co-occur with time adverbials such as *in X time*, as in (17) below:

- (17) Te książki dają się przeczytać w pół godziny.
 these books-nom gave-pl refl read-inf in half hour
 ‘These books can be read in half an hour.’

Temporal adverbs of the form *in X time* are licensed only in eventive, but not in stative contexts (Marijana Marelj⁴³). Since the modifier *w pół godziny* ‘in half an hour’ is licit in (17), we must conclude that the sentence is eventive, and hence it gives rise to episodic, not generic interpretation. Consequently, the data like (17) above allow us to conclude that the *dać + się + infinitive* structure, which is typically interpreted as generic, can also be associated with an episodic interpretation, when an appropriate adverbial modifier is present. In the case of German, Pitteroff⁴⁴ mentions a sentence such as (18), which is similar to (17), except that the matrix verb *lassen* appears in the past tense:

- (18) Das Problem ließ sich in zehn Minuten lösen.
 the problem-nom let-past refl in ten minutes solve-inf
 ‘The problem could be solved in ten minutes.’

Pitteroff emphasizes that the fact the matrix verb in (18) appears in the past tense might be held responsible for the episodic interpretation available in this case. In other words, Pitteroff argues that the episodic interpretation of (18) is not directly related to the fact that the structure represents a *lassen*-middle, but is rather dependent on the past tense used in the matrix clause. Consequently, Pitteroff⁴⁵ concludes that there is no convincing evidence to demonstrate that *lassen*-middles in German can be episodic. As a result, the availability of episodic interpretation could be viewed as a difference between the Polish *dać + się + infinitive* structure and the German *lassen*-middle.

To sum up, beside superficial similarities, both German *lassen*-middles and the *dać + się + infinitive* structure in Polish have three syntactic properties in common, namely they show a syntactically active agent, they can host achievement

⁴² M. PITTEOFF, *Non-canonical lassen-middles*, p. 37.

⁴³ M. MARELJ, *Middles and argument structure across languages*, Ph.D. dissertation, Utrecht Institute of Linguistics 2004, p. 209.

⁴⁴ M. PITTEOFF, *Non-canonical lassen-middles*, p. 39.

⁴⁵ M. PITTEOFF, *Non-canonical lassen-middles*, p. 43.

and state verbs, and the modification by the manner adverbial is not obligatory. These properties make the two structures stand apart from dispositional middles, which show the properties opposite to those listed above. Since the German and the Polish structures under scrutiny are syntactically similar, an attempt might be made to analyse them in the same way. In section 4, Pitteroff's analysis of German *lassen*-middles is outlined, and later on in section 5 Pitteroff's account is confronted with the Polish data.

4. PITTEROFF'S ANALYSIS OF *LASSEN*-MIDDLES

In his analysis of *lassen*-middles, Pitteroff combines the Minimalist Program of Chomsky⁴⁶ with the Distributed Morphology (Marris Halle and Alec Marantz⁴⁷, Marantz⁴⁸, Heidi Harley and Rolf Noyer⁴⁹, and David Embick⁵⁰, inter alia). In a nutshell, Pitteroff argues that the verb *lassen* 'let' in *lassen*-middles is not an auxiliary, but a lexical verb, identical with the verb *lassen* attested in German causative structures (see (11) and (12) above). Moreover, Pitteroff proposes that the structural subject of *lassen*-middles originates as an internal argument of the infinitival predicate in the embedded clause and undergoes movement to the surface subject position, whereas the reflexive pronoun *sich* belongs to the verb *lassen*. Consequently, in Pitteroff's analysis *sich lassen* represents a reflexively marked anticausative verb whose complement is a passive sentence (actually, a passive VoiceP)⁵¹.

In this section we will focus only on three aspects of Pitteroff's account that will be relevant for the analysis of the *dać* + *się* + infinitive structure in Polish, carried out in section 5, namely: 1) arguments for treating *sich lassen* as a reflexive unaccusative verb, 2) evidence to support the claim that the surface subject originates as a complement of the embedded infinitive, and 3) the evidence for movement of a complement to the subject position in the matrix clause. Each of these points will be examined in detail below.

⁴⁶ N. CHOMSKY, *Minimalist inquiries: The framework*; N. CHOMSKY, *Derivation by phase*; N. CHOMSKY, *On phases*.

⁴⁷ M. HALLE, A. MARANTZ, *Distributed Morphology and the pieces of inflection*, in: *The View from Building 20*, eds. K. Hale, and S. J. Keyser, Cambridge (MA) 1993, pp. 111-176.

⁴⁸ A. MARANTZ, *No escape from syntax: Don't try morphological analysis in the privacy of your own lexicon*, "University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics" 4(1997), pp. 201-225.

⁴⁹ H. HARLEY, R. NOYER, *State-of-the-article: Distributed Morphology*, "Glot International" 4(1999), pp. 3-9.

⁵⁰ D. EMBICK, *Localism versus Globalism in Morphology and Phonology*, Cambridge (MA) 2010.

⁵¹ The actual implementation of Pitteroff's (2014) analysis, as well as all its technical details are omitted here, as they are not relevant for our analysis of the Polish *dać* + *się* + infinitive structure.

Let us first discuss Pitteroff's arguments for treating *lassen* in *lassen*-middles as a reflexive unaccusative verb. First of all, Pitteroff provides evidence that *sich* cannot be an argument of the infinitive in *lassen*-middles, but rather belongs to the verb *lassen*. To prove this, Pitteroff relies on sentences such as (19), involving case-copying (Kasuskongruenz, Gisbert Fanselow⁵²), in which in addition to the Theme argument of the verb, there is an extra argument DP, which shows the same case marking as the argument it refers to.

- (19) Mark nennt den Vorschlag *ein Angriff/einen Angriff auf die Privatsphäre⁵³.
 Mark calls the-acc proposal an-nom attack/an-acc attack on the privacy
 'Mark calls the proposal an attack on people's privacy.'

In (19) both *den Vorschlag* 'the proposal' and *einen Angriff* 'an attack' must bear the same accusative case, and any case mismatch between the two results in ungrammaticality. However, when the predicate used in (19) is embedded under the middle *lassen*, as in (20) below, a different pattern arises, as the additional DP must surface in the nominative, not in the accusative case associated with *sich*.

- (20) Der Vorschlag lässt sich leicht ein Angriff/*?einen Angriff
 the proposal lets refl-acc easily a-nom attack/a-acc attack
 auf die Privatsphäre nennen.⁵⁴
 on the privacy call
 'The proposal can be easily called an attack on people's privacy.'

The degraded status of the accusative case marking on *einen Angriff* 'an attack' in (20) demonstrates that the reflexive pronoun, present in *lassen*-middles, cannot be treated as an internal argument of the embedded verb, as it does not trigger case-copying the way ordinary complements do (cf. (19) above).

Furthermore, Pitteroff argues that *sich* in *lassen*-middles belongs to the verb *lassen*, rather than to the embedded predicate, and they together form a reflexive anticausative verb. For one thing, *sich lassen* lacks an agent of any sort, as can be seen in (21) below⁵⁵:

- (21) Das Buch lässt sich leicht lesen.
 the book lets refl easily read
 'The book can be read easily.'

⁵² G. FANSELOW, *Minimale Syntax*, Groningen 1991.

⁵³ Example (19) comes from Pitteroff (p. 117).

⁵⁴ Example (20) comes from Pitteroff (p. 119).

⁵⁵ Example (21) comes from Pitteroff (p.165).

Sentence (21) can be paraphrased as follows: the book has some properties that make it easy to read for anyone, and the only implied agent in (21) is the agent of the infinitival predicate, not of the matrix predicate, *sich lassen*. On account of lacking an implied agent, *sich lassen* may be viewed as anticausative.

The verb *sich lassen* also resembles anticausatives in that it licenses *durch* ‘through’-PP, as illustrated in (22) and (23)⁵⁶:

(22) Die Vase zerbrach durch die Erschütterung.
 the vase broke through the jolting
 ‘The vase broke through jolting.’

(23) Durch die großen Buchstaben lässt sich das Buch leicht lesen.
 through the big letters lets refl the book easily read
 ‘Because of the big letters, the book can be read easily.’

Following, Artemis Alexiadou, Eelena Anagnostopoulou and Florian Schäfer⁵⁷, Pitteroff argues that a *through/from*-phrase, which introduces a non-human causer or a causing event, can co-occur with anticausatives, as in (22). Since the *lassen*-middle in (23) is grammatical with the *durch*-phrase, the conclusion may be drawn that *sich lassen* is a reflexively marked anticausative verb⁵⁸.

Let us now focus on Pitteroff’s arguments in favour of treating the surface subject as an underlying complement of the infinitive in *lassen*-middles. Pitteroff observes that the subject of *lassen*-middles is c-selected by the embedded verb, as can be seen in (24) and (25)⁵⁹:

⁵⁶ Examples (22) and (23) are taken from Pitteroff (pp. 167-168).

⁵⁷ A. ALEXIADOU, E. ANAGNOUSTOPOULOU, F. SCHÄFER, *The properties of anticausatives cross-linguistically*, in: *Phases of Interpretation*, ed. M. Frascarelli, Berlin 2006, pp. 187-211.

⁵⁸ However, *lassen*-middles are different from anticausatives in that they can co-occur with a *by*-phrase. The contrast between the two structures is illustrated in (i) and (ii):

(i) *Die Tür öffnete sich von Peter. (Pitteroff 2014: 188)
 the door opened refl by Peter
 ‘*The door opened by Peter.’

(ii) Das Buch lässt sich von kleinen Kindern gut lesen.
 the book lets refl by small children well read
 ‘The book can be read well by small children.’ (Pitteroff 2014: 47)

Example (i) demonstrates that anticausatives disallow an agentive *by*-phrase, whereas (ii) shows that the opposite is the case for *lassen*-middles. The *by*-phrase present in (ii) modifies the embedded event, i.e. reading, not the matrix predicate *sich lassen*. Pitteroff (2014: 188) offers an explanation for the grammaticality contrast between sentences such as (i) and (ii) above which relies on different types of Voice heads that these sentences exhibit. As this explanation takes us too far afield and is not relevant for the discussion carried out in the paper, it will not be provided here, and the interested reader is referred to Pitteroff’s (2014) work.

⁵⁹ Examples (24) and (25) come from Pitteroff (p. 127).

- (24) *_[DP]Seine Unschuld] lässt sich leicht behaupten.
 one's innocence lets refl easily claim
 'One's innocence can be claimed easily.'
- (25) _[CP]Dass Mark die Vase gestohlen hat] lässt sich leicht behaupten.
 that Mark the vase stolen has lets refl easily claim
 'That Mark has stolen the vase can be claimed easily.'

The verb *behaupten* 'claim' c-selects just a CP, not a DP, which is illustrated in (26) and (27), respectively⁶⁰:

- (26) Hans behauptet _[CP]dass Mark die Vase gestohlen hat].
 Hans claims that that Mark the vase stolen has
 'Hans claims that Mark has stolen the vase.'
- (27) *Mark behauptet _[DP] seine Unschuld].
 Mark claims his innocence
 'Mark claims his innocence.'

The selectional properties of *behaupten* are preserved in *lassen-middles*, as can be seen in (24) and (25). (24) is unacceptable, because the subject DP originates as the alleged complement of the embedded verb *behaupten*, which never takes a DP complement (cf. (27))⁶¹. On the other hand, (25), in which the subject is realized as a CP, is perfectly grammatical, because *behaupten* can c-select a CP as its complement (cf. (26)). The data in (24) and (25) demonstrate that the subject of *lassen-middles* is c-selected by the embedded verb, and consequently, must be treated as an underlying complement thereof (a similar claim based on different evidence has been made by Marga Reis⁶², Günther Grewendorf⁶³, Martin Everaert⁶⁴, Jürgen Kunze⁶⁵).

Since the surface subject of *lassen-middles* originates in the complement position of the infinitival verb, Pitteroff argues that it must undergo movement to the matrix clause, in a way analogous to passive or unaccusative subjects. The first piece of evidence he provides in favour of the movement-based derivation of

⁶⁰ Examples (26) and (27) are taken from Pitteroff (p. 126).

⁶¹ However, some German native speakers consider (24) to be perfectly grammatical.

⁶² M. REIS, *Reflexivierung in deutschen A.c.i.-Konstruktionen. Ein Transformations-grammatisches Dilemma*, "Papiere zur Linguistik" 9(1976), pp. 5-82.

⁶³ G. GREWENDORF, *Reflexivierung in deutschen A.c.i.-Konstruktionen. Kein Transformationsgrammatisches Dilemma mehr*, "Groninger Arbeiten zur germanistischen Linguistik" 23(1983), pp. 120-196.

⁶⁴ M. EVERAERT, *The Syntax of Reflexivisation*, Dordrecht 1986.

⁶⁵ J. KUNZE, *Plain middles and 'lassen' middles in German: Reflexive constructions and sentence perspective*, "Linguistics" 34(1996), pp. 645-695.

lassen-middles relates to the fact that the complement marked for the dative can never surface as a subject in *lassen*-middles. This is noticeable in the double object construction, such as (28) and (29) below⁶⁶:

- (28) Mark verkauft seinem Bruder einen Hasen.
 Mark sells his-dat brother a-acc rabbit
 ‘Mark sells a rabbit to his brother.’
- (29) *Er lässt sich leicht einen Hasen verkaufen.
 he lets refl easily a-acc rabbit sell
 ‘A rabbit can be easily sold to him.’

Sentence (28) is just a double object construction with the first DP *seinem Bruder* ‘his brother’, marked for the dative, and the other DP *einen Hasen* ‘a rabbit’, bearing the accusative case. Sentence (29) shows that it is impossible to turn the dative case marked DP into the subject of the *lassen*-middle⁶⁷. Pitteroff accounts for the unacceptability of (29) by stating that inherent case marked DPs cannot serve as subjects in *lassen*-middles, only DPs marked for structural case are allowed in this position. He notes that the same restriction operates in German passives. Consequently, *lassen*-middles, just like passives, must have a derived subject, and therefore call for an unaccusative analysis.

Actually, Pitteroff argues that the complement of the reflexive unaccusative verb *sich lassen* is a passive sentence (or, what he calls, a passive VoiceP), which predicts that only verbs that passivise are possible as infinitival complements of *sich lassen*. This prediction is born out in German, as confirmed by (30) and (31) below⁶⁸:

- (30) *Ein kleines Auto lässt sich leicht besitzen.
 a small car lets refl easily possess
 Intended: ‘A small car can be owned easily.’
- (31) *weil nur ein kleines Auto besessen wurde
 because only a small car owned became
 ‘because only a small car was owned.’

Sentence (30) shows that the verb *besitzen* ‘possess’ cannot occur in *lassen*-middles, while (31) demonstrates that this verb cannot be found in verbal passives, either. Sentences such as (30) prove that German *lassen*-middles are possible only with verbs that can figure in verbal passives. This, in turn, supports Pitteroff’s

⁶⁶ Examples (28) and (29) come from Pitteroff (p. 131).

⁶⁷ However, for some German native speakers consulted, (29) is marginally possible.

⁶⁸ Examples (30) and (31) come from Pitteroff (pp. 200-201).

claim that *lassen*-middles are derived in the same way as passives, i.e. by means of movement of an internal argument to the surface subject position.

All in all, Pitteroff proposes an unaccusative analysis of *lassen*-middles in German. His main claim is that the surface subject originates as a complement of the embedded verb and subsequently moves to the matrix clause, the way complements of passive verbs do. The anticausative verb *sich lassen* is thus taken to be a predicate that selects a passive complement.

5. PITTEROFF'S ACCOUNT APPLIED TO POLISH

Since the Polish *dać + się + infinitive* structure closely resembles *lassen*-middles (cf. section 3), it seems worthwhile to confront Pitteroff's account with the Polish data. At first glance, it might appear that Pitteroff's analysis is well-suited to account for the Polish structure under scrutiny. However, a closer look at the syntax of the *dać + się + infinitive* structure proves that Pitteroff's analysis is not applicable to it

The first problem that Pitteroff's account gives rise to when confronted with the Polish data relates to the fact that in contradistinction to *sich lassen*, the verb *dać* and the reflexive pronoun *się* do not form a reflexive verb. In fact, there are two pieces of evidence to show that *się* originates as an argument of the embedded infinitive. The first one relates to the position in which the reflexive pronoun can sometimes occur in the structure under consideration, and the other is based on the fact that *się* can appear in different case forms, not just the accusative. As regards the position of *się*, it is possible for it to surface in the low position, as demonstrated in (32):

- (32) Te książki dają czytać się po ciemku.
 these books-nom.pl give-pl read-inf refl in dark
 'These books can be read in the dark.'

In (32) the reflexive pronoun appears in the complement position of the infinitival verb, and the structure is perfectly acceptable. A similar position of the reflexive pronoun is found in Swedish *låta*-middles, as observed by Eva Klingvall⁶⁹, but is disallowed in German *lassen*-middles.

What is more, whenever the infinitive assigns a case different from the accusative, the reflexive is not realized as *się*, but assumes the case form that the embedded

⁶⁹ E. KLINGVALL, *How to approach complex passives*, in: *Discourse and Grammar. A Festschrift in Honor of Valéria Molnar*, eds. J. Brandtler, D. Håkansson, S. Huber and E. Klingvall, Lund 2012, pp. 395-410.

verb assigns to its complement. This scenario is noticeable in (33) below, where the reflexive pronoun appears in the instrumental case:

- (33) Te urządzenia dają sobą zdalnie sterować.
 these devices-nom. give-pl refl-inst remotely steer
 ‘These devices can be steered by remote control.’

In (33) the verb *sterować* ‘steer’ can assign the inherent instrumental case to its complement, and this case is overtly realized on the reflexive pronoun *sobą*. This clearly indicates that the reflexive pronoun originates as a complement of the infinitival verb, and hence bears the case this verb assigns to it. However, besides the instrumental case form *sobą*, (33) can also host the accusative form *się*, as in (34), since *sterować* ‘steer’ can also assign the accusative, as confirmed by example (35), taken from the National Corpus of Polish (www.nkjp.pl)⁷⁰:

- (34) Te urządzenia dają się zdalnie sterować.
 these devices-nom. give-pl refl-acc remotely steer
 ‘These devices can be steered by remote control.’

- (35) Nowicki sterował łódź w kierunku wybrzeża.
 Nowicki-nom steered boat-acc in direction of-coast
 ‘Nowicki steered the boat in the direction of the coast.’

Beside verbs like *sterować* ‘steer’ in (34), there are predicates which do not allow the instrumental to alternate with the accusative, as in (36) below, taken from the National Corpus of Polish:

- (36) Książki Parnickiego [...] dają się sobą zachwycić.
 books-nom of-Parnicki give refl refl-inst admire
 ‘Parnicki’s books can be admired.’

Example (36) contains two reflexive pronouns, *się* and *sobą*. In (36) the problem arises which verb *się* belongs to, *dać* or *zachwycić* ‘admire’. It might even be the case that both *dać* and *zachwycić* are reflexive verbs, since *się* in some contexts, including non-finite clauses, is subject to haplology, a phenomenon whereby one

⁷⁰ There are other verbs like *sterować* ‘steer’ that can assign either the instrumental or the accusative to their complements. For example, *obrać* ‘turn’, as in (i) below:

- (i) Te przęsła dają się /sobą obracać w różne strony.
 these spans-nom give-pl refl-acc/refl-inst turn-inf in different ways
 ‘These spans can be turned in different ways.’

Von Waldenfels (p. 165) provides examples similar to (i) above with the verbs such as *rządzić* ‘govern’ and *kierować* ‘drive’. The reflexive pronoun in (i) can be realized as either the accusative *się* or the instrumental *sobie*, which corresponds to the case form assigned by the embedded verb.

occurrence of *się* fulfils a number of functions associated with this morpheme. The haplology of *się* is illustrated in (37), taken from Anna Kupść⁷¹:

- (37) Drzwi zdawały się powoli (się) otwierać.
 door-nom seemed refl slowly refl open-inf
 ‘The door seemed to be opening slowly.’

In (37) both verbs are reflexive, as confirmed by the presence of two instances of *się*. However, one occurrence of *się* can be dropped due to haplology, and the sentence is still grammatical. Let us check whether (36) can be treated as resulting from haplology. In order to test this, we can try to insert another instance of *się* in (36). Since haplology is optional (cf. (37) above), the insertion of another *się* in (36) should result in grammaticality if (36) contained two reflexive verbs. However, (36) with two occurrences of *się* is ungrammatical, as can be seen in (38):

- (38) Książki Parnickiego [...] dają się sobą (*się) zachwycić.
 books-nom of-Parnicki give refl refl-inst refl admire
 ‘Parnicki’s books can be admired.’

The unacceptability of (38) allows us to conclude that no haplology has taken place in (36), and therefore this sentence contains just one reflexive pronoun *się*. In (36) *się* is not associated with *dać*, but together with *zachwycić* ‘admire’, it forms a reflexive verb, *zachwycić się*, as in (39):

- (39) Zachwyciłam się tymi książkami.
 I-admiredrefl these books-inst
 ‘I admired these books.’

Sentence (39) demonstrates that the reflexive verb *zachwycić się* assigns the inherent instrumental case to its complement. Consequently, the other reflexive pronoun present in (36), i.e. *sobą*, corresponds to the complement of the infinitival form of the reflexive verb. As a result, (36) clearly shows that *dać się* is not a reflexive verb, but both reflexive pronouns, present in this case, belong to the lower infinitival verb⁷².

⁷¹ A. KUPŚĆ, *Haplology of the Polish reflexive marker*, in: *Slavic in Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar*, eds. R. D. Borsley and A. Przepiórkowski, Stanford (CA) 1999, p.105.

⁷² Other verbs like *zachwycić się* ‘admire’ include *nacieszyć się* ‘enjoy something to the full’, as in (i) below:

- (i) Te zabawki dają się sobą szybko nacieszyć.
 these toys-nom give-pl refl refl-inst quickly enjoy
 ‘These toys can be enjoyed to the full quickly.’

Moreover, the reflexive pronoun can surface in the dative in the *dać* + *się* + infinitive structure, as in (40) below:

- (40) Nowoczesne samochody dają sobie wbudować czujniki parkowania.
 modern cars-nom give-pl refl-dat build-inf sensors parking
 ‘Modern cars can have parking sensors built in.’

In (40) there is no pronoun *się* at all, but instead there is a dative form of the reflexive *sobie*, which originates as an indirect object of the infinitive *wbudować* ‘build in’, present in the embedded clause.

Finally, the reflexive pronoun can function as a complement of a preposition selected by the embedded predicate. This is the case in (41) below:

- (41) Nowe technologie dają się ze sobą zaprzyjaźnić.
 new technologies-nom give-pl refl with refl-inst become-friends
 ‘New technologies can be befriended.’

In (41) the preposition *z* ‘with’ complements the embedded reflexive verb *zaprzyjaźnić się* ‘befriend’, and its complement is the instrumental case marked reflexive pronoun *sobą*. Just like in (36), the two reflexive pronouns present in (41) belong to the lower verb, not to *dać*.

To sum up, it has been shown that the reflexive pronoun in the *dać* + *się* + infinitive structure does not combine with *dać* to form a reflexive verb, but rather functions as a complement of an embedded infinitival predicate, and hence assumes the case form associated with this position.

So far it has been argued that *dać się* cannot be viewed as a reflexive verb in Polish, since the reflexive pronoun originates as a dependent of the embedded infinitival clause. This makes Pitteroff’s analysis untenable for the Polish data under consideration. There is still another aspect which casts doubt on the validity of Pitteroff’s account for the *dać* + *się* + infinitive structure in Polish. Pitteroff proposes that the anticausative verb *sich lassen* selects a passive sentence as its complement, which predicts that only verbs that can passivise can be found in *lassen*-middles. Although this prediction is borne out in German, cf. (30) above, it turns out to be problematic for Polish. It seems that in Polish there is no direct link between passivisation and the grammaticality of the *dać* + *się* + infinitive structure. This claim is supported by the fact that verbs that resist passivisation can be found in the *dać* + *się* + infinitive structure, as in (42) and (43) (example (15b), repeated for convenience):

Like (36), sentence (i) contains a reflexive verb *nacieszyć się*, which assigns the inherent instrumental case to its complement, corresponding to the reflexive pronoun *sobą*.

(42) Te rozpadliny dają się przejść⁷³.
 these crevices-nom give-pl refl cross-inf
 ‘These crevices can be crossed.’

(43) Te miasta dają się lubić
 these cities-pl give-pl refl like-inf
 ‘The cities can be liked.’

Both *przejsć* ‘cross’ and *lubić* ‘like’ are transitive, but neither of them can be affected by passivisation. Although the impossibility of passivisation with the former verb may be viewed as a lexical gap, i.e. the unavailability of the passive participle **przechodzony* ‘crossed’, the lack of the verbal passive with the latter verb does not result from any lexical gap, as the passive participle *lubiany* ‘liked’ is perfectly grammatical, as can be seen in (44) below:

(44) Te miasta są lubiane.
 these cities-nom are liked
 ‘These cities are liked.’

However, (44) is just an instance of adjectival, not verbal passive, since the participle in (44) can be prefixed with *nie-* ‘un-’, which can only be attached to adjectival, not to verbal forms. Example (45) below contains the word *lubiany* ‘liked’, prefixed with *nie-* ‘un-’⁷⁴:

(45) Te miasta są nielubiane.
 these cities-nom are not-liked
 ‘These cities are not liked.’

What is more, *lubić* ‘like’ does not form verbal passives at all. This claim is supported by the fact that this verb does not form passive sentences with the auxiliary verb *zostać* ‘become’, which typically introduces verbal passives in Polish (Anna Kibort⁷⁵). *Zostać* ‘become’ in passives co-occurs with the perfective form of the passive participle, as can be seen in (46) below:

⁷³ Example (42) comes from von Waldenfels (p. 158).

⁷⁴ Sentence (45) contrasts with verbal passives, as in (i) below, in which the passive participle cannot be prefixed with *nie-* ‘un-’.

(i) *Marek został niezatrzymany przez policję.
 Mark-nom became undetained by police
 ‘Mark did not get detained by the police.’

⁷⁵ A. KIBORT, *Passive and passive-like constructions in English and Polish*, Ph.D. dissertation, University of Cambridge 2004.

- (46) Marek został zatrzymany przez policję.
 Mark-nom became detained-perf by police
 ‘Mark got detained by the police.’

If we turn (44) into the verbal passive with *zostać* ‘become’, the resulting structure is ungrammatical, as shown in (47):

- (47) ?*Te miasta zostały polubiane przez wszystkich.
 these cities-nom became liked-perf by everyone
 ‘These cities got liked by everyone.’

The ungrammaticality of (47) clearly indicates that *lubić* ‘like’ does not form verbal passives⁷⁶. Nonetheless, *lubić* ‘like’ is perfectly licit in the *dać* + *się* + infinitive structure, as confirmed by (43), which makes the direct link between verb’s passivisability and its occurrence in the modal *dać się* structure questionable for Polish⁷⁷.

Finally, Pitteroff’s analysis of German *lassen*-middles is crucially based on the movement of an internal argument of the embedded verb to the matrix clause. If this movement applied in the Polish *dać* + *się* + infinitive structure, as in (48) below, then we would predict that the idiomatic phrase *złapać byka za rogi* ‘to take the bull by the horns’ would preserve its idiomatic meaning when embedded under *dać* in the structure analysed here.

- (48) Byk daje się wziąć za rogi.
 bull-nom gives refl catch by horns
 ‘The bull lets us take it by the horns.’ not ‘The bull can be taken by the horns.’

This, however, is not the case, since (48) has only a literal, i.e. permissive causative, meaning, not the idiomatic one⁷⁸. This fact strongly argues against the movement based analysis of the modal *dać się* structure a la Pitteroff.

⁷⁶ Adam Biały uses an example slightly different from (47), i.e. (i) below:

- (i) Maria została polubiana przez Piotra. (Biały 2004:79)
 Mary-nom became liked-perf by Peter
 ‘Mary got liked by Peter.’

Biały notes that native speakers’ judgements of sentences such as (i) vary to a large extent.

⁷⁷ However, similarly to German, some stative verbs that do not passivise cannot appear in the *dać* + *się* + infinitive structure in Polish, cf. (i) below:

- (i) *Te małe mieszkania dają się posiadać.
 these small flats-nom give-pl refl possess-inf
 ‘*These small flats can be possessed.’

⁷⁸ The idiomatic meaning of the idiom used in (48) is preserved in the impersonal structure with *dać*, as in (i) below:

- (i) Byka daje się wziąć za rogi.
 bull-acc gives-3rdsg refl catch by horns

The evidence presented so far proves that the surface subject of the *dać + się* + infinitive structure does not originate as a complement of the embedded infinitive. The subject in question cannot originate in the specifier of vP headed by the infinitive, either, since this position is normally associated with Agents, not Themes. Consequently, it seems that the surface subject of the *dać + się* + infinitive structure is base generated Spec, vP, headed by the matrix verb *dać*. In other words, the surface subject is base-generated within the matrix clause and does not reach the matrix clause via movement (a detailed syntactic analysis of *dać + się* + infinitive structure is carried out in Bondaruk ms.⁷⁹).

All in all, it has been demonstrated in this section that Pitteroff's analysis of *lassen*-middles cannot be applied to Polish, as the major premise it relies on, i.e. the treatment of *sich lassen* as an anticausative verb, does not hold for the Polish verb *dać*. Actually it has been shown that *się* is generated in the embedded clause, not in the matrix one, and it corresponds to an argument of the infinitival predicate. In contradistinction to German, Polish does not restrict the verbs that can appear in the *dać + się* + infinitive structure just to those predicates that can passivise. This is another factor that makes Pitteroff's analysis inapplicable to the Polish data analysed here. Finally, there is no evidence for the movement of a DP from the embedded to the matrix clause in the *dać + się* + infinitive structure, which again excludes the possibility of analysing it in the way Pitteroff proposes for German *lassen*-middles.

6. CONCLUSIONS

The paper has demonstrated that the *dać + się* + infinitive structure in Polish shares three syntactic properties with German *lassen*-middles, namely: 1) these two structures can have a syntactically active agent, 2) they can host achievement and stative verbs in the embedded clause, and 3) the modification by a manner adverbial in these structures is optional, not obligatory. It has been noted that since both *lassen*-middles and the *dać + się* + infinitive structure show a Theme argument of the infinitive from the embedded clause in the surface subject position, it seems plausible to attempt an analysis of the two structures under scrutiny in terms of movement, analogous to passives. A movement-based analysis of German *lassen*-middles has been recently proposed by Pitteroff. In Pitteroff's account the reflexive pronoun and the verb *lassen* form a reflexive anticausative verb which takes a passive comple-

'The bull can be taken by the horns.' (i.e. the difficulty can be tackled) or 'One can take the bull by the horns.'

⁷⁹ A. BONDARUK, *The modal dać się structure*.

ment, while the surface subject originates as an argument of the embedded verb and subsequently undergoes movement to the matrix clause. Although Pitteroff's analysis works well for German *lassen*-middles, it is problematic for the Polish *dać* + *się* + infinitive structure. It has been argued that *dać* and *się* do not form a reflexive verb in Polish, because *się* represents an argument of the embedded infinitive. The surface subject, in turn, is not a dependent of the embedded verb, but must be taken to be base-generated in the matrix clause. Arguments have been provided that no movement from the embedded clause to the matrix one takes place in the *dać* + *się* + infinitive structure, which makes Pitteroff's analysis inapplicable to the Polish data under consideration.

REFERENCES

- ACKEMA P., SCHOORLEMMER M.: Middles, in: *The Blackwell companion to syntax*, vol. III, eds. M. Everaert and H. van Riemsdijk, Oxford 2005, pp. 131-203.
- ALEXIADOU A.: Non-canonical passives revisited: Parameters of non-active Voice, "Linguistics" 50(2012), pp. 1079-1110.
- ALEXIADOU A., ANAGNOUSTOPOULOU E., SCHÄFER F.: The properties of anticausatives cross-linguistically, in: *Phases of interpretation*, ed. M. Frascarelli, Berlin 2006, pp. 187-211.
- BAKER M.: *Incorporation*, Chicago 1988.
- BAKER M., JOHNSON K., ROBERTS I.: Passive arguments revisited, "Linguistic Inquiry" 20(1989), pp. 219-251.
- BIALY A.: Polish psychological verbs at the lexicon-syntax interface in cross-linguistic perspective, Ph.D. dissertation, Wrocław University 2004.
- BONDARUK A.: A comparison of the modal *dać się* structure with the dispositional middle in Polish, "Linguistics Beyond and Within" 1(2015), pp. 43-63; <http://lingbaw.com/volumes/2015/>
- BONDARUK A.: The modal *dać się* structure in Polish is syntactically causative, ms., John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin.
- CHOMSKY N.: *Lectures on government and binding*, Dordrecht 1981.
- CHOMSKY N.: Minimalist inquiries: The framework, in: *Step by step*, eds. R. Martin, D. Michaels and J. Uriagereka, Cambridge (MA) 2000, pp. 89-155.
- CHOMSKY N.: Derivation by phase, in: *Ken Hale. A life in language*, ed. M. Kenstowicz, Cambridge (MA) 2001, pp. 1-52.
- CHOMSKY N.: On phases, in: *Foundational issues in linguistic theory. Essays in honor of Jean-Roger Vergnaud*, eds. R. Freidin, C.P. Otero, M.L. Zubizarreta, Cambridge (MA) 2008, pp. 134-166.
- COLLINS Ch.: A smuggling approach to the passive in English, "Syntax" 8(2005), pp. 81-120.
- EMBICK D.: *Localism versus globalism in morphology and phonology*, Cambridge (MA) 2010.
- EVERAERT M.: *The Syntax of reflexivisation*, Dordrecht 1986.
- FAGAN S.M.B.: *The syntax and semantics of middle constructions: A study with special reference to German*, Cambridge 1992.
- FANSELOW G.: *Minimale Syntax*, Groningen 1991.
- GREWENDORF G.: Reflexivierung in deutschen A.c.i.-Konstruktionen. Kein transformationsgrammatisches Dilemma mehr, "Groninger Arbeiten zur germanistischen Linguistik" 23(1983), pp. 120-196.

- HALLE M., MARANTZ A.: Distributed morphology and the pieces of inflection, in: *The view from building 20*, eds. K. Hale and S. J. Keyser, Cambridge (MA) 1993, pp. 111-176.
- HARLEY H., NOYER R.: State-of-the-article: Distributed Morphology, "Glott International" 4(1999), pp. 3-9.
- HOEKSTRA T., ROBERTS I.: Middle constructions in Dutch and English, in: *Knowledge and language II. Lexical and conceptual structure*, eds. E. Reuland and W. Abraham, Dordrecht 1993, pp. 183-220.
- JAEGGLI O.: Passive, "Linguistic Inquiry" 17(1986), pp. 587-622.
- KEYSER S., ROEPER T.: On the middle and ergative construction in English, "Linguistic Inquiry" 13(1984), pp. 381-416.
- KIBORT A.: Passive and passive-like constructions in English and Polish, Ph.D. dissertation, University of Cambridge 2004.
- KLINGVALL E.: How to approach complex passives, in: *Discourse and Grammar. A festschrift in honor of Valéria Molnar*, eds. J. Brandtler, D. Håkansson, S. Huber and E. Klingvall, Lund 2012, pp. 395-410.
- KRZEK M.: The syntax of impersonal constructions in Polish, Ph.D. dissertation, University of Newcastle 2013.
- KUNZE J.: Plain middles and 'lassen' middles in German: Reflexive constructions and sentence perspective, "Linguistics" 34(1996), pp. 645-695.
- KUPŚĆ A.: Hapology of the Polish reflexive marker, in: *Slavic in Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar*, eds. R. D. Borsley and A. Przepiórkowski, Stanford (CA) 1999, pp. 91-124.
- LEKAKOU M.: In the middle, somewhat elevated. The semantics of middles and its crosslinguistic realization, Ph. D. dissertation, University of London 2005.
- MARANTZ A.: No escape from syntax: Don't try morphological analysis in the privacy of your own lexicon, "University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics" 4(1997), pp. 201-225.
- MARELJ M.: Middles and argument structure across languages, Ph.D. dissertation, Utrecht Institute of Linguistics 2004.
- PITTEROFF M.: Non-canonical lassen-middles, Ph.D. dissertation, University of Stuttgart 2014.
- REIS M.: Reflexivierung in deutschen A.c.I.-Konstruktionen. Ein Transformations-grammatisches Dilemma, "Papiere zur Linguistik" 9(1976), pp. 5-82.
- STROIK T.: Middles and movement, "Linguistic Inquiry" 23(1992), pp. 127-137.
- TOPOLIŃSKA Z.: The verb *dać*/ *dawać* in Polish periphrastic constructions, in: *Studies in Polish morphology and syntax*, eds. G. Henstchel and R. Laskowski, München 1993, pp. 229-249.
- VENDLER Z.: *Linguistics in Philosophy*, Ithaca 1967.
- WALDENFELS R. VON: The grammaticalization of 'give' + infinitive. A comparative study of Russian, Polish, and Czech, Berlin 2012.

PRZECIWKO OPARTEJ NA PRZESUNIĘCIU
ANALIZIE STRUKTURY *DAĆ* + *SIĘ* + BEZOKOLICZNIK
W POLSZCZYŹNIE

Streszczenie

Autorka analizuje składnię struktury zawierającej *dać* + *się* + bezokolicznik w języku polskim. Od strony semantyki struktura ta obejmuje stwierdzenia generyczne, wyrażające modalne znaczenie zdolności. Ze składniowego punktu widzenia struktura ta ma uporządkowanie argumentów typowe dla strony biernej i zwrotnej, a mianowicie tematyczny argument wewnętrzny pojawia się w pozycji podmiotu. Ponieważ struktura zawierająca *dać* + *się* + bezokolicznik jest na powierzchni podobna do zdań w stronie biernej i zwrotnej, podjęto próbę sprawdzenia, czy można ją derywować za pomo-

cą przesunięcia, tak jak to było często postulowane dla strony biernej i zwrotnej. Przedstawione są zwłaszcza argumenty za tym, że struktura zawierająca *dać* + *się* + bezokolicznik w polszczyźnie ma wiele wspólnych właściwości składniowych ze strukturą w stronie zwrotnej z czasownikiem *lassen* w języku niemieckim, która ostatnio była analizowana przez Piteroffa (2014) za pomocą przesunięcia. Autorka bada, czy derywacja opierająca się na przesunięciu ma rację bytu dla struktury zawierającej *dać* + *się* + bezokolicznik w polszczyźnie. Chociaż na pierwszy rzut oka atrakcyjny, po głębszej analizie okazuje się, że model Piteroffa nie ma zastosowania dla struktury analizowanej w artykule. W miejsce analizy opartej na przesunięciu autorka proponuje tezę, że podmiot jest generowany bazowo w zdaniu głównym i nie podlega przesunięciu do tej pozycji za pomocą przesunięcia żadnego typu.

Słowa kluczowe: zdania w stronie zwrotnej z *lassen*; strona bierna; przesunięcie; interpretacja dyspozycyjna; język polski; język niemiecki.

AGAINST A MOVEMENT ANALYSIS
OF *DAĆ* + *SIĘ* + INFINITIVE STRUCTURE
IN POLISH

S u m m a r y

The paper analyses the syntax of the *dać* + *się* + infinitive structure in Polish. Semantically speaking, the structure comprises generic statements expressing the modal sense of capability. From the syntactic point of view, it shows argument realization typical of the passive and the middle construction, namely the thematic internal argument surfaces in the subject position. Since the *dać* + *się* + infinitive structure is superficially similar to passives and middles, an attempt is made to check whether it can be movement-derived, the way it has been commonly postulated for passives and middles. Actually, it is argued that the Polish *dać* + *się* + infinitive structure shares a number of syntactic properties with German *lassen*-middles, which have been recently analysed in terms of movement by Pitteroff (2014). The paper examines whether a movement-based derivation of the Polish *dać* + *się* + infinitive structure is tenable. Although initially attractive, after closer scrutiny, Pitteroff's account turns out to be inapplicable to the Polish structure analysed here. Instead, it is suggested that the surface subject is based-generated within the matrix clause, and does not reach this position by means of movement of any kind.

Key words: *lassen*-middles; the passive voice; movement; dispositional interpretation; Polish; German.