

RAISING AND COPY RAISING IN ENGLISH AND SERBIAN^{1,2}

ABSTRACT: This paper looks into the phenomena of raising and copy raising verbs in English and Serbian within the generative framework. Constructions with the Serbian equivalents of the English raising verbs *seem* 'činiti se', *appear* 'izgledati/delovati' and *turn out* 'izgledati/delovati' are examined. The cases in which raising out of the clause is necessary (small clauses) and those in which raising is allowed (topicalization and contranstrive focusing) are considered. It is concluded that there are no real equivalents of the English raising verbs in Serbian. However, a special raising construction is described. This construction does not show subject-verb agreement and the verb is always inflected for default third person singular neuter. As far as copy raising verbs are concerned, the situation is less clear. There is an ongoing debate about the existence of thematic and non-thematic subjects of these verbs in English. Moreover, it remains an open question whether the pronominal copy has to be the copy of the subject. In this paper, the aforementioned questions are discussed in light of Serbian equivalent constructions. The examples from Serbian show that the copy of the subject noun phrase does not appear at all. The conclusion is that copy raising verbs are generally thematic in Serbian.

Key words: raising, copy raising, subject-verb agreement, thematic subject.

1. Introduction

Whereas the phenomenon of raising verbs has been widely discussed in linguistics for many years, the phenomenon of copy raising is a relatively neglected one, although it has attracted a lot of attention recently (Asudeh and Toivonen 2005; Potsdam and Runner 2001; Snider 2005).

In English, raising occurs in order to satisfy the Extended Projection Principle (EPP) features of the matrix verb. In the embedded clause, the non-finite T cannot assign nominative case to the external argument. In Serbian, things are quite different. The T head of the embedded clause in Serbian constructions is always finite. As a result, the subject can get licensed i.e. it can get nominative case at this step of the derivation.

Copy raising is somewhat similar to raising in that the subject of the embedded clause has raised to the position of the subject of the main clause. The main difference is that the copy of the subject is pronounced in the embedded clause, which is not the case with raising verbs.

In this paper, the two phenomena in English and Serbian will be compared, with the intention to point to some of the ostensibly ambiguous restrictions of the Serbian equivalents of the English raising verbs *činiti se* 'seem', *izgledati* 'appear', *delovati* 'appear' and *ispstaviti se* 'turn out'. Moreover, an overview of English copy raising

¹Rad je izlagan na skupovima *Novi Sad Linguistic Colloquium (NSLingColl)* 4 (27. decembar 2014. godine, Filozofski fakultet, Univerzitet u Novom Sadu) i *Novi Sad Regional Linguistics Meeting* (21. februar 2015. godine, Filozofski fakultet, Univerzitet u Novom Sadu). Nigde nije objavljen.

²Rad pod nazivom *Raising and Copy Raising in English and Serbian* je rađen pod mentorstvom mr Tanje Milićev, na četvrtoj godini osnovnih studija anglistike (2013/2014), na predmetu Teorijska gramatika. Autorka trenutno pohađa master studije na Filozofskom fakultetu u Novom Sadu.

will be presented, and then some of the conclusions which have been drawn related to copy raising will be further examined. More specifically, the issue of the thematic and non-thematic use of copy raising verbs will be looked into (i.e. whether or not they take an external argument).

2. Raising in Serbian

2.1. (Non-) raising in Serbian?

First, cases in which there is subject-matrix verb agreement will be examined, since this structure is actually the only one parallel to English raising structures. The Serbian equivalents of the English raising verbs *činiti se* ‘seem’, *izgledati* ‘appear’ and *delovati* ‘appear’ seem to be highly restricted in the structures they occur in. They normally appear in structures which do not involve subject raising, as shown in (1).

- 1) Čini se/Izgleda/Deluje da je Petar u vezi sa Marijom.
 seem-3sg. SE/appear-3sg.pres. that is Peter-NOM in relationship-LOC with Maria-INSTR.
 ‘It seems/appears that Peter is in a relationship with Maria.’

If we try to raise the subject out of the embedded clause, we see that this leads to ungrammaticality, as illustrated by (2) and (3).

- 2) *Petar se čini da t_{Petar} je u vezi sa Marijom.
 Peter SE seem-3sg. pres. that is in relationship-LOC with Maria-INSTR.
 ‘Peter seems to be in a relationship with Maria.’
- 3) *Ti izgledaš/deluješ da t_{ti} ne spavaš.
 you-NOM appear-2sg.pres. that not sleep-2sg.pres.
 ‘You appear not to be sleeping.’

Another candidate for raising verb equivalents in Serbian is the verb *ispostaviti se*, parallel to the English verb ‘turn out’. This verb always takes the 3rd person singular neuter past form. It is also very restricted and appears only in the structure matrix verb+*da*-complement (4).

- 4) Ispostavilo se da pro je pao ispit.
 turn out-3sg.neuter.past SE that fail-3sg.masc.past exam-ACC
 ‘It turned out that he failed the exam.’
- 5) *On se ispostavilo da t_{on} je pao ispit.
 he-NOM SE turn out-3sg.neuter.past that fail-3sg.masc.past exam-ACC
 ‘He turned out to have failed the exam.’

Radišić (2006) claims that the ungrammaticality shown in (2), (3), and (5) results from the fact that there is a CP domain in the embedded clauses, out of which the subjects cannot raise. She uses the Clitic Climbing test³ (Rizzi 1982) and the Topic/

³The Clitic Climbing test examines whether the clitic can move out of the embedded clause. If the pronominal clitic replacing the embedded object NP/DP remains in the complement clause, the embedded clause is a phase. If not, the complement clause is not a CP domain. The examples from Radišić (2006) show that the embedded clause in Serbian is a phase:

- 1) pro_i izgleda [da deca_i čitaju knjigu] (Radišić, 2006: 5)
 pro_i seem.SG [that children_i read.PL book
 ‘It seems that the children are reading a book.’
- 2) pro_j (*je) izgleda (*je) [da (je) deca_i čitaju] (Radišić, 2006: 6)

Focus test (Rizzi 1997) to prove that clauses which are taken as complements of ‘seem-type’ verbs in Serbian are phases (CP domain).

Serbian is a pro-drop language. In the case of raising verbs, the subject is a phonologically unpronounced element *pro* (morphological marker on the verb is third person singular), and not an expletive, as in English. Since the EPP feature on T actually represents the main motivation for the subject of the embedded clause to move to the position reserved for the higher subject, it is not that unusual that we do not find regular raising in Serbian.

2.2. Small clauses

Raising is obligatory in Serbian with small clauses:

- 6) Ta knjiga se čini [SC t_{ta knjiga} zanimljiva/zanimljivom/*zanimljivo].
that book-NOM SE seem-3sg.pres. [SC interesting-NOM/INSTR./*interestingly]
‘That book seems interesting/*interestingly.’
- 7) On izgleda [SC t_{on} pametan/pametno].
he-NOM appear-3sg.pres. [SC smart-NOM/smarty]
‘He appears smart/*smartly.’
- 8) Marija deluje [SC t_{Marija} razumna/razumno].
Maria-NOM appear-3sg. Pres. [SC reasonable-NOM/reasonably]
‘Maria appears reasonable/*reasonably.’

It is important to comment on the alternation of the adjective (predicate) and the adverb⁴ in (7) and (8). English raising verbs do not allow the alternation of the adjective and the adverb. Since we can have both options in (7) and (8) (the second one is even preferred among the speakers), the verbs *izgledati* ‘appear’ and *delovati* ‘appear’ seem to be somewhere in-between raising and non-raising equivalents of English raising verbs. They do behave like raising verbs, at least when they occur with adjectives. On the other hand, *činiti se* ‘seem’ behaves like a real raising verb, because it involves real subject-verb agreement and it does not allow the alternation of the adjective and the adverb. The reason for this may be related to the semantics of these verbs, since *izgledati* and *delovati* are often interpreted as ‘look like’, which even in English is not always categorized as a real raising verb (Asudeh and Toivonen 2005: 4). On the other hand, the semantics of *činiti se* corresponds to the semantics of the English verb ‘seem’.

2.3. Contrastive focusing and topicalization

We have seen in section 2.1 that raising is not allowed in Serbian, in which there is subject-matrix verb agreement. However, raising (the term will be used for any movement out of the embedded clause) is allowed in a specific construction in which there is no subject-matrix verb agreement. These constructions require the presence of a personal pronoun in the dative case and are used more frequently in contrastive contexts (9).

pro_i (*it) seems.SG (*it) [that (it) children_i read.PL]
‘It seems that the children are reading it.’

⁴This form could also be the neuter form of the predicative adjective (which describes state of affairs).

- 9) Petar*(mi) se čini da t_{Petar} je u vezi
 PeterI-DAT SE seem-3sg. pres. that is in relationship-LOC
 sa Marijom (a ne Luka).
 with Maria-INSTR and not Luka-NOM
 ‘Peter seems to me to be in a relationship with Maria (and not Luka).’

What has to be pointed out though is that (9) sounds odd to some native speakers. As shown above, it is ungrammatical without the dative clitic.

In addition to the examples in which the subject is contrastively focused, topicalization, shown in (10), is also allowed with raising verbs. The construction again obligatorily takes a personal pronoun in the dative case.

- 10) Šta ti se čini da si već negde čula t_{šta}?
 What you-DAT SE seem-3sg. pres. that already somewhere hear-2.sg. fem. past
 Tu pesmu *(mi) se čini da pro sam već
 that song-ACC I-DAT SE seem-3sg. pres. that already
 negde čula t_{tu pesmu}
 somewhere hear-1sg. fem. past
 ‘That song, it seems to me that I have already heard somewhere.’

The construction in (10) seems to be impossible without the dative *mi* ‘me’, *ti* ‘you’ etc.

2.4. Raising out of *da*-clauses

There are, however, some cases in which the subject appears in the position of the specifier of the higher T, as shown in the structure in (11):

- 11) [CP/TP Subj [VP V_{seem-type} [TP t_{Subj} ... [VP t_{Subj} ...]]]].

In the examples with the given structure, the subject is always inanimate and/or non-referential. It appears in the form of demonstratives (12), (13).

- 12) Ovo mi se čini da t_{ovo} je u redu.
 This-NOM I-DAT SE seem-3sg. pres. that is in order-LOC
 ‘This seems to me to be fine.’
- 13) To se ispostavilo da t_{to} je bilo tačno.
 That-NOM SE turn out-3sg. neut. part. that was true
 ‘That turned out to be true.’

What is interesting is that in the above cases we see subject-matrix verb agreement. For instance, in (13) the verb is marked as 3rd person singular neuter and the subject is singular and neuter. Switching to an animate subject would lead to an ungrammatical sentence as in (5), repeated here as (14), in which there is no subject-verb agreement. Using the masculine form of the verb also results in an ungrammatical sentence, as shown in (15).

- 14) *On se ispostavilo da t_{on} je pao ispit.
 he-NOM SE turn out-3sg. past that fail-3sg. past exam-ACC
 ‘He turned out to have failed the exam.’

- 15) *On se ispostavio da je pao ispit.
 He-NOM SE turn out-3sg. past that fail-3sg.past exam-ACC
 ‘He turned out to have failed the exam.’

The data above strongly suggest that raising verbs in Serbian always have to be in 3rd sg.neut form and that the Serbian equivalents of raising verbs get some kind of default neuter gender agreement. This leads to another interesting phenomenon – a special raising construction in which there is no subject-matrix verb agreement. Structures of this type have already been noted in Spanish (Holmlander 2004). The following example clearly illustrates this construction in Serbian:

- 16) Ti izgleda da me uopšte nisi slušala.
 You-NOM seem-3 sg. pres. that I-ACC at all not be-2sg. listen-2sg.past
 ‘You seem not to have listened to me at all.’

In (16), the raised subject *ti* ‘you’ is stressed. In the unmarked case, it would be dropped. However, we can find structures in which the raised subject is not stressed. This incongruent structure has even been mentioned by some Serbian authors (Simonović and Arsenijević 2013), as shown in (17). As can be seen, the heavy topicalized phrase delays the clitic in the matrix subject.

- 17) Naredni odlomak čini se da počinje jednom samostalnom rečenicom.
 Following section-NOM seem-3.sg.pres.SE that begin-3.sg.pres. one independent sentence- INSTR.
 ‘The following section seems to begin with an independent sentence.’

All in all, it seems that the typical English raising construction is not acceptable in Serbian. However, there are some structures in which raising out of *da*-clauses is allowed. In those structures, the matrix verb always takes the third person singular neuter form.

3. Copy-Raising in English

3.1. An overview of English copy raising

Different authors provide different interpretations and definitions of copy raising. Asudeh and Toivonen (2005: 1) define copy raising as “a phenomenon in which a raising verb takes a non-expletive subject and a complement containing an obligatory pronominal copy of the subject”. The example is given in (18).

- 18) Thora seems like she adores popsicles. (Asudeh and Toivonen 2005: 1)

Asudeh and Toivonen (2005) claim that the subjects of real raising verbs are always non-thematic. What seems to be specific for their work is that they discard all those cases without a pronominal copy in the embedded clause as ungrammatical. For instance, example (19) is used to illustrate the ungrammaticality of a copy raising verb used without a pronominal copy in the embedded clause.

- 19) *Thora seems like Isak adores popsicles. (Asudeh and Toivonen 2005: 3)

According to the authors, it is impossible to have two sources of perception within one sentence with a copy-raising verb, and this is exactly the reason why the previous

example is ungrammatical – there would be two sources of perception, namely Thora and Isak. In copy raising sentences, the subject of the copy raising verb is interpreted as the source of perception, i.e. P-source. Moreover, the source of perception has to be present at the moment of utterance,⁵ which is why (20) is not allowed on the reading that Tom is not present.

20) #Tom seems like he is cooking. (Asudeh and Toivonen 2005: 7)

They further support their claim by providing Swedish examples with *på* ‘on’ adjuncts (meaning “to give off the impression”), in which it is impossible to express two different sources of perception, since this leads to ungrammaticality (21).

21) *Tom verkar på Lisa so mom han har vunnit.

T. seems on L. as if he has won (Asudeh and Toivonen 2005: 11)

The intended meaning of the sentence is that Lisa gives the impression that Tom has won. However, the sentence is ungrammatical because, as Asudeh and Toivonen (2005) claim, two different linguistic expressions mark the P-source. The condition of the presence of the P-source will be discussed again in Section 5.

Furthermore, Asudeh and Toivonen (2005) make a distinction between copy-raising verbs and perceptual resemblance verbs (‘look/sound/smell/feel/taste like’), because the latter do not require a copy pronoun in their complement, as presented in (22).

22) Thora smells like Chris has been baking sticky beans. (Asudeh and Toivonen 2005: 4)

They claim that perceptual resemblance verbs are ambiguous between a thematic subject reading, when they have a non-expletive subject and a non-thematic subject reading, when there is an expletive. On the contrary, real raising subjects are always non-thematic.

Potsdam and Runner (2001: 453), on the other hand, define copy-raising (CR) as “a construction in which some constituent appears in a non-thematic position with its thematic position occupied by a pronominal copy”. Their analysis is quite different from Asudeh and Toivonen’s (2005), because they do not treat examples without a pronominal copy in the embedded clause as ungrammatical. In fact, they do categorize perception resemblance verbs as copy raising verbs. However, they present the concept of thematic and non-thematic use of copy raising verbs in English, i.e. verbs such as *seem* and *appear* are ambiguous between these two uses, when they take finite clauses introduced by *like* as their complements. The distinction is based on the observation that the subject in copy raising can have a there-expletive or an idiom chunk when the copy is placed in the embedded clause’s subject position (non-thematic reading), as in (23) and (24). A non-thematic reading is not possible when the pronominal copy is not the subject of the embedded clause, which is why (25) and (26) are ungrammatical.

23) There looks like there’s gonna be a riot. (Potsdam and Runner 2001: 455)

24) The shoe looks like it’s on the other foot. (Potsdam and Runner 2001: 455)

25) *There seems like John expects there to be an election. (Potsdam and Runner 2001: 456)

26) *The other foot appears like the shoe is on it. (Potsdam and Runner 2001: 456)

Thus, only the examples with a pronominal copy in the subject position (27) are included in the category of the non-thematic use.

⁵Asudeh and Toivonen (2005) name this problem ‘the puzzle of the absent cook’.

- 27) It seems like Richard is in trouble.
Richard seems like he is in trouble. (Potsdam and Runner 2001: 454)

It should be added that they claim that the thematic use is available with these examples (with subject CR) as well:

- 28) He seems like he's ill.
29) 'It seems like he is ill' or 'He is acting like he is ill' (Potsdam and Runner 2001: 457)

Sentence (28) is ambiguous between a non-thematic reading (where the paraphrase with an expletive is possible) and a thematic reading, where the external theta role is assigned to 'he', with the meaning of the verb 'act like' or 'put on the appearance of' (Potsdam and Runner 2001: 457).

All instances of non-subject copies are classified under the thematic use of these predicates:

- 30) That book sounds like everyone thinks it should be banned (Potsdam and Runner 2001: 456)

Therefore, Potsdam and Runner (2001) exclude the possibility of a non-thematic reading with a pronoun which occupies a position other than that of the subject of the embedded clause.

Snider (2005) provides another account of copy raising. He claims that the referents of the subjects of the main and the embedded clause must be identical in copy raising sentences. He terms the constructions in which matrix and complement clause subjects are not identical "like-complement verbs". He also claims that the subject is thematic in (31), an example of such a construction. Verbs like *seem* can occur in both copy raising and like-complement constructions.

- 31) ...he seems like they are bothering him. (Snider 2005: 4)

Snider (2005) distinguishes between monadic and dyadic semantics, which is basically whether the verb takes one or two arguments. He also predicts some ambiguous cases (32) when 'seem' can be interpreted as either monadic or dyadic, i.e. it can be interpreted as both a copy raising and a like-complement verb.

- 32) Pat seems like she's going to fail the course. (Snider 2005: 7)

(32) can be interpreted as either: 'somebody is grading her assignment; she is doing nothing at the time' or 'somebody sees Pat coming out of a difficult situation', with the former interpretation being monadic and the latter being dyadic.

Snider's view (2005) is actually similar to Potsdam and Runner's (2001), who claim that copy raising verbs are ambiguous between a thematic and a non-thematic reading. This is where the analysis diverges from Asudeh and Toivonen's (2005) account of real copy raising verbs, which, as they claim, can only be non-thematic. I am going to rely on Potsdam and Runner's (2001) approach in my analysis of Serbian data, because they show that examples of copy raising verbs without a subject copy in the embedded clause have been attested. Moreover, they show how copy raising verbs are sometimes ambiguous between a non-thematic and a thematic reading.

4. Copy-Raising in Serbian

4.1. Copy-Raising with *izgledati/delovati* ‘appear’

At first sight, copy raising seems available in Serbian:

- 33) Lena izgleda [kao da x_{Lena} je izgubila posao].
 Lena-NOM look-3sg.pres. like that lose-3sg.past job-ACC
 ‘Lena looks like she lost her job.’
- 34) Rob deluje [kao da x_{Rob} ne prihvata raskid
 Rob-NOM appear-3sg. pres. like that not accept-3sg.pres. break-
 up-ACC
 sa Barbarom].
 with Barbara-INSTR.
 ‘Rob appears like he does not accept his break-up with Barbara.’

In Serbian we find both the preposition *kao* ‘like’ and the complementizer *da*. Moreover, there is no copy of the subject in the embedded clause. If we try to insert it, this leads to ungrammatical sentences (unless the copy is placed in a stressed/contrastive position), as exemplified by (35) and (36).

- 35) *Lena izgleda kao da je ona izgubila posao.
 Lena-NOM look-3sg. pres. like that be-3sg. she-NOM lose-3sg.past job-ACC
 ‘Lena looks like she lost her job.’
- 36) *Rob deluje kao da on ne prihvata raskid
 Rob-NOM appear-3sg.pres. like that he-NOM not accept-pres.3sg. break-up-ACC
 sa Brabarom.
 with Barbara-INSTR.
 ‘Rob appears like he does not accept his break-up with Barbara.’

Since the verbs in the embedded clauses are both two-place predicates, there are two possibilities regarding their subjects. They are either raised to the position of the subject of the matrix clause or they actually take the form of PRO. When the antecedent of an entity is highly accessible, it is common to find PRO as the subject of the embedded clause. On the other hand, if we assume that the subject of the embedded clause raised to the position of the subject of the higher clause, that would imply that this construction in Serbian is actually parallel to English raising structures. However, that would be somewhat problematic for different reasons. First, if *da* is a complementizer, then there is a CP layer, which means that movement would be prohibited (movement out of a phase is prohibited) (Adger 2003: 321). Second, that would entail that the copy-raising verbs in Serbian are actually 1-place predicates. However, following Asudeh and Toivonen’s (2005) classification, (33) would obviously fall out of that category, since in this context it would be a perception resemblance verb. We can test it by complementing (35) with another clause that stands in opposition to the person’s appearance (37), and makes it clear that the verb is thematic.

- 37) Lena izgleda kao da je izgubila posao,
 Lena-NOM look-3sg.pres. like that be-3sg. lose-participle job-ACC
 iako se samo pretvara.
 although SE only pretend-3.sg.
 ‘Lena looks like she lost her job, but she is only pretending’

(34) could be a bit more ambiguous. However, it will be argued that (34) is also unlikely to include a 1-place predicate, because a thematic reading would be a more probable

option than a non-thematic one, if we apply the same test. Potsdam and Runner's (2001) paraphrase 'act like' could be successfully applied to the example (36). The test used above yields a similar interpretation, given in (38):

38) Rob appears like he does not accept his break-up with Barbara, although he is only pretending.

However, I will not completely reject the possibility of a non-thematic reading with the verb *delovati* 'appear' at this point. I will return to this issue in the section 5.

4.2. Copy raising with *činiti se* 'seem' and dative *mi* 'me'

In the section 2.2, it was mentioned that the semantics of the verb *činiti se* 'seem' is different from the semantics of *izgledati/delovati* 'appear' and that the verb *činiti se* 'seem' does not allow adverbs. Therefore, it is expected that this verb behaves differently. Actually, its use is quite restricted in this sense:

39) ?Marko mi se čini kao da x_{Marko} me ne razume.
 Marko-NOM I-DAT SE seem-3sg. pres. like that I-ACC not understand-3sg. pres.
 Marko seems to me like he does not understand me.

Whereas to some native speakers of Serbian (39) seems acceptable, others reject it or mark its use as highly limited.⁶ The construction without the dative *mi* 'me' is even less frequent:

40) *?Marko se čini kao da x_{Marko} me ne razume.
 Marko-NOM SE seem-3sg. pres. like that I-ACC not understand-3sg. pres.
 Marko seems like he does not understand me.

We have seen that it is impossible to use contrastive focusing (9) or topicalization (10) without a personal pronoun in dative case. Moreover, with copy raising verbs, structures without dative pronouns seem to be even more restricted than those which have them.

4.3. Non-subject copy

While considering Serbian copy-raising equivalents, a very interesting example involving a non-subject copy in the embedded clause should also be considered:

41) Ta slika (mi) deluje kao da ju je Milan naslikao.
 That picture-NOM I-DAT seem-3 sg. pres. like that it-ACC be-3sg. Milan paint-3sg.past
 'That picture appears (to me) like Milan painted it.'

The subject is inanimate. Thus, it cannot be the case that it is something related to its behavior that provides the source of perception (the verb could not be paraphrased as 'act like'). A non-thematic reading, given in (42), is possible.

42) Deluje mi kao da je tu sliku naslikao Milan.
 Appear-3sg.pres. I-DAT like that be-3sg.that picture-ACC paint-3sg.past Milan-NOM
 'It appears (to me) like that picture was painted by Milan.'

This offers an interesting alternative to Potsdam and Runner's (2001) claim that all non-subject copies involve only a thematic reading, because (41) could have a non-

⁶(39) sounds like a marked word order. Speakers always prefer the constructions which begin with the verb, not with the subject.

thematic reading.⁷ Moreover, it is also contrary to what Snider (2005) suggests about those sentences in which there is no token identity between the subject of the matrix and the subject of the embedded clause. The example in (42) only has a non-thematic reading. The meaning of (41) is the same; just the information structure is different. Non-subject copy examples in Serbian go in line with Asudeh and Toivonen's (2005) analysis, which says that real copy raising is non-thematic and that it involves an obligatory pronominal copy. They do not claim that it has to be a subject copy. Actually, there is an example with an object copy that they mention:

- 43) The corpse seemed like the coroner had done an exceptionally bad job of dissecting it. (Asudeh and Toivonen 2005: 6).

5. Discussion

After considering cases with inanimate subjects, the animate subject and the verb *delovati* 'appear', which was claimed to be more likely to get a thematic reading, need to be considered again. The relevant example is repeated in (44).

- 44) Rob deluje [kao da x_{Rob} ne prihvata raskid
 Rob-NOM appear-3sg. pres. like that not accept-3sg. pres. break-up-ACC
 sa Barbarom].
 with Barbara-INSTR.
 'Rob appears like he does not accept his break-up with Barbara.'

At this point of research, a straightforward answer to the question why a thematic reading is more appropriate cannot be provided. It seems that this verb tells us more about a person's appearance, behavior etc. than about the state of affairs, when the subject is placed in initial position in the sentence. When native speakers of Serbian utter something like (44), they are prone to visualize a person involved and their actions or manners. The test has shown that a thematic reading is more appropriate than a non-thematic one.

It should also be pointed out that, at least in Serbian, speakers do not need to have the source of perception in front of them in order for a sentence to be grammatical. For instance, (41) could be uttered without having the picture in front of the speaker. Similarly, (45) could be uttered without having Maria in front of the speaker. Thus, the source of perception is not required to be present at the moment of speech.

- 45) Marija mi deluje kao da je poludela u zadnje vreme.
 Maria-NOM I-DAT appear-3sg. pres. like that be-3sg. gone crazy in latest time- ACC
 'Maria appears (to me) like she has gone crazy lately.'

6. Conclusion

Looking into the phenomena of raising and copy raising in English and Serbian, it has been shown that these constructions differ to a large extent. Whereas the structures in which the subject raises out of the embedded clause and agrees with the matrix verb are common in English, they are ungrammatical in Serbian.

However, there are some specific cases when it is possible to raise a constituent out of the embedded clause in Serbian. Namely, contrastive focusing and topicalization are allowed, though not without limitations. They require the presence of a personal

⁷Consulting native speakers of English, I realized that (41) sounded awkward to some of them. Yet, none of them marked this example as ungrammatical.

pronoun in the dative case. There is no subject-matrix verb agreement in contrastive focusing and topicalization in Serbian.

The only instance of raising which does involve subject-matrix verb agreement is found with inanimate and/or non-referential neuter subjects. The form of the verb is always inflected for the third person neuter gender. Therefore, the data obtained strongly suggest that the verb in Serbian raising constructions gets default agreement. Incongruent raising constructions which are found in Serbian support this claim as well.

As far as copy raising is concerned, the situation is less clear. Serbian copy raising examples include no copy of the subject in the embedded clause at all. If a copy is inserted, the sentence is ungrammatical, unless the context is contrastive. The test used has shown that a thematic-reading is more probable with the verbs *izgledati/delovati* 'appear'. This is not the case with the verb *činiti se* 'seem', whose use is very restricted. Regarding non-subject copy examples, they provide an interesting alternative to the argument that all non-subject copy examples are thematic.

The possibility of thematic and non-thematic uses of the Serbian verbs *izgledati/delovati* 'appear' open up new directions for future work. The overview of copy raising in Serbian provided in this paper should be a starting line for further research.

References

- Adger, David. 2003. *Core syntax: a minimalist approach*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Asudeh, Ash, and Ida Toivonen. "Copy raising and its consequences for perceptual reports". <http://users.ox.ac.uk/~cpgl0036/pdf/asudeh-toivonen05-JBfest.pdf> (15.7.2015)
- Holmlander, Disa. 2004. "Constructions with the raising verb *parecer* in Spanish". Unpublished bachelor thesis, Lund University, Lund, Sweden.
- Potsdam, Eric, and Jeffrey Runner. 2001. "Richard returns: Copy raising and its implications." In: Mary Andronis, Chris Ball, Heidi Elston, & Sylvain Neuvel eds. 2001. *Papers from the 37th regional meeting of the Chicago Linguistics Society (CLS 37)*. Chicago, IL: Chicago Linguistic Society: 453–468.
- Radišić, Milica. "Subject raising and obligatory subject control in Serbian". <http://westernlinguistics.ca/Publications/CLA2006/Radisic.pdf> (13.7.2015)
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1982. *Issues in Italian Syntax*. Dordrecht, Holland: Foris Publications.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1997. "The fine structure of the left periphery". In: L. Haegeman eds. 1997. *Elements of Grammar: Handbook in Generative Syntax*. Dordrecht, Holland; Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers: 281–337.
- Simonović, Marko, and Boban Arsenijević. "Ličnost i bezličnost srpskog glagola trebati: Avanture teorijske lingvistike u prenormiranom domenu". http://www.academia.edu/4269866/Li%C4%8Dnost_i_bezli%C4%8Dnost_srpskog_glagola_trebati_Avanture_teorijske_lingvistike_u_prenormiranom_domenu (10.7.2015)
- Snider, Neal. "English Copy Raising". http://lingo.stanford.edu/sag/papers/snider-copy_raising_paper.pdf (25.7.2015)

Nina Ilić

PODIZANJE I PODIZANJE SA KOPIJOM U ENGLISKOM I SRPSKOM

Rezime

Ovaj rad se bavi fenomenom glagola podizanja, kao i fenomenom glagola podizanja koji ostavljaju kopiju imeničke fraze u engleskom i srpskom jeziku, pre svega sa stanovišta generativnog pristupa. Ispituju se konstrukcije sa srpskim ekvivalentima engleskih glagola *seem* 'činiti se', *appear* 'izgledati/delovati' i *turn out* 'ispostaviti se'. Razmatraju se određeni slučajevi u kojima je podizanje imeničke fraze u srpskom jeziku neophodno (male klauze) i dozvoljeno (tematizacija i fokus, mada se dolazi do zaključka da pravi ekvivalenti engleskim glagolima podizanja u srpskom jeziku ne postoje. Ipak, opisuje se posebna konstrukcija podizanja u kojoj ne dolazi do slaganja subjekta sa glagolom. Glagol u ovoj konstrukciji uvek ima nastavak za treće lice jednine srednjeg roda. Što se tiče glagola podizanja koji ostavljaju kopiju imeničke fraze, kod njih je situacija manje jasna. U engleskom jeziku i dalje postoji debata oko postojanja tematskih i netematskih subjekata kod ove vrste glagola. Takođe, postavlja se pitanje da li zamenica koja predstavlja kopiju imeničke fraze mora biti kopija subjekta. U radu se pomenuta pitanja ispituju na primerima ekvivalentnih konstrukcija ovih glagola u srpskom jeziku. Primeri iz srpskog pokazuju da se kopija imeničke fraze uopšte ne javlja. Zaključak je da su ovi glagoli uglavnom tematski u srpskom jeziku.

Ključne reči: glagoli podizanja, kopija, slaganje glagola, tematski subjekat.