Janez Orešnik
Filozofska fakulteta, Ljubljana

Naturalness: Some Slovenian (Morpho)syntactic Examples

V Sloveniji smo naravno skladnjo celovške šole razširili v »slovensko teorijo«, ki preučuje vedenje (bolj ali manj) sopomenskih skladenjskih izrazov, tu imenovanih skladenjske dvojnice. Temeljne predpostavke:

V paru dvojnic nastopa (v vsaki dvojnici) ena izmed naslednjih izbirnih možnosti:

1. najmanj ena >sym-vrednost teži po povezavi z najmanj še eno >sym-vrednostjo in/ali z najmanj eno <sem-vrednostjo;
2. najmanj ena <sym-vrednost teži po povezavi z najmanj še eno <sym-vrednostjo in/ali z najmanj eno >sem-vrednostjo;
3. najmanj ena >sem-vrednost teži po povezavi z najmanj še eno >sem-vrednostjo in/ali z najmanj eno <sym-vrednostjo;
4. najmanj ena <sem-vrednost teži po povezavi z najmanj še eno <sem-vrednostjo in/ali z najmanj eno >sym-vrednostjo.

Te predpostavke so ponazorjene s slovenskim jezikovnim gradivom, razdeljenim na 27 »izpeljav« (katerih vsebina je navedena v povzetku sestavka).

In Slovenia, the natural syntax of the Klagenfurt School has been extended to "the Slovenian Theory," which studies the behaviour of (near-)synonymous syntactic expressions, here called syntactic variants. The basic assumptions:

In a pair of syntactic variants, within each variant, one of the following alternatives obtains:

(1) at least one >sym-value tends to associate with at least one additional >sym-value and/or with at least one <sem-value;
(2) at least one <sym-value tends to associate with at least one additional <sym-value and/or with at least one >sem-value;
(3) at least one >sem-value tends to associate with at least one additional >sem-value and/or with at least one <sym-value;
(4) at least one <sem-value tends to associate with at least one additional <sem-value and/or with at least one >sym-value.

The paper illustrates the above assumptions with Slovenian language material divided into 27 "deductions" (whose subject-matter is listed in the summary of the paper).

The subject-matter of my paper is a (language-universal) theory developed in Slovenia by a small group of linguists (under my guidance), who mainly use English, German, and Slovenian language material as the base of verification. Our work owes much to, and exploits, the (linguistic) Naturalness Theory as elaborated especially at some Austrian and German universities; cf. Mayerthaler (1981), Wurzel (1984), Dressler et al. (1987), Stolz (1992), Dressler (2000). Naturalness Theory has also been applied to syntax, notably at the University of Klagenfurt; the basic references are Dotter (1990), Mayerthaler & Fliedl (1993), Mayerthaler et al. (1993, 1995, 1998). Within the natural syntax of the Klagenfurt School, the Slovenian work group has built an extension, which will henceforth be referred to as "the Slovenian Theory."

The Slovenian Theory studies the behaviour of (near-)synonymous syntactic expressions, here called syntactic variants. Whenever two syntactic variants are in-

cluded in the same naturalness scale, and consequently one variant can be asserted to be more natural than the other, the Slovenian Theory has something to say about some grammatical properties of the two variants.

Naturalness Theory operates with two basic predicates, "marked" and "natural." I cannot see any reason to distinguish the two predicates within the Slovenian Theory, therefore I use throughout one predicate only, namely "natural." (This standpoint was implied as early as Mayerthaler 1987: 50.)

Beside the technical terms "natural(ness)" and "naturalness scale," which have already been alluded to, the terms "sym-value" and "sem-value" (adopted from Mayerthaler 1981: 10 *et passim*) must be mentioned. The sym-value refers to the naturalness of an expression in terms of its encoding properties. The sem-value refers to the naturalness of an expression in terms of its semantic complexity.

The following auxiliary symbols will be employed: ">sym" (= more natural with respect to encoding), "<sym" (= less natural with respect to encoding), ">sem" (= more natural with respect to semantic complexity), and "<sem" (= less natural with respect to semantic complexity).

The assumptions of the Slovenian Theory (in my recently revised version) can be briefly stated as follows.

In a pair of syntactic variants, within each variant, one of the following alternatives obtains:

(1) at least one >sym-value tends to associate with at least one additional >sym--value and/or with at least one <sem-value;
(2) at least one <sym-value tends to associate with at least one additional <sym--value and/or with at least one >sem-value;
(3) at least one >sem-value tends to associate with at least one additional >sem-value and/or with at least one <sym-value;
(4) at least one <sem-value tends to associate with at least one additional <sem-value and/or with at least one >sym-value.

In the above items (1–4) the object of the meta-verb "associate" refers to the interior of the unit under observation, OR to a part of the immediate environment of the unit under observation. The Slovenian Theory covers both cases.

Forschungsgeschichtlich, the predecessor of the above assumptions (1–4) is the familiar principle of constructional iconicity as formulated in Natural Morphology. The principle runs as follows. Iff a semantically more marked category C_j is encoded as 'more' featured than a less marked category C_i, the encoding of C_j is said to be iconic (Mayerthaler 1987: 48–9). Using the predicate "natural," the principle can be briefly stated as follows: <sem in combination with >sym is iconic. In the Slovenian Theory, the principle has been extended to syntax and expanded. Two published papers utilizing this framework: Orešnik (1999, 2000).

Each case considered is presented in the format of a deduction. A straightforward example:

1. English. The referent of the subject of the clause is usually given, the referent of the direct object of the clause is usually new (Biber et al. 1999: 123, 127).

The two syntactic variants: the subject of the clause and the object of the clause.

1. The assumptions of Naturalness Theory:
1.1. >sem (subject, object) / clause element in nom.-acc. languages

I.e., with respect to semantic complexity, the subject is more natural than the object, in nominative-accusative languages (Mayerthaler 1981: 14).
1.2. >sem (given, new) / referent

I.e., with respect to semantic complexity, a given referent is more natural than a new referent (Mayerthaler 1981: 14 on the property presupposed).

2. The assumptions of the Slovenian Theory, concerning any two syntactic variants:
2.1. >sem tends to associate with another >sem
2.2. <sem tends to associate with another <sem

3. The consequences:

From 1.1, 1.2 and 2.1 it can be deduced:
3.1. If there is any difference between the subject and the object of the clause, such that the referent of one element is given, and the referent of the other element is new, it is the subject that tends to have a given referent. Q.E.D.

From 1.1, 1.2 and 2.2 it can be deduced:
3.2. If there is any difference between the subject and the object of the clause, such that the referent of one element is given, and the referent of the other element is new, it is the object that tends to have a new referent. Q.E.D.

The Slovenian Theory operates *ex post facto*. However, in some cases, the theory can be interpreted as applying *ante factum*. Assume that a generative grammar of English posits subjects and objects in finite clauses, and stipulates that one kind of clause elements has a given referent, and the other kind of clause elements has a new referent. In that situation the Slovenian Theory can intervene by predicting that given referents tend to be associated with subjects, and new referents tend to be associated with objects. In other words, the Slovenian Theory is able to help complete the generation of the language phenomenon under discussion.

In deduction 1 above, and in many additional deductions, naturalness scales are utilized which have already been discussed in the technical literature. However, some other cases require new scales, to be justified as we go along. In addition, a new scale format will be introduced.

The remainder of the paper contains illustrative material taken from Slovenian.

2. Slovenian. If the clause contains the characterizing copular 'be' and a subject complement, the controller of person, number and gender agreement is the subject, e.g., *Brežice so bile mesto* 'Brežice was a town', where the subject *Brežice* is in the third person plural feminine, therefore the target of agreement, namely the complex form of the copular verb *so bile*, is in the third person plural feminine as well. However, if the copular 'be' is identifying, the controller of person, number and gender agreement is the subject complement (the so-called back agreement, Corbett 1999: 14), e.g., *to mesto so bile Brežice* 'this town was Brežice', where the subject complement *Brežice* is in the third person plural feminine, therefore the target of agreement, namely the complex form of the copular verb *so bile*, is in the third person plural feminine as well (some of this data from Toporišič 1976: 478; 2000: 609; the rest my observations).

The two syntactic variants: subject and subject complement as controllers of person, number and gender agreement in clauses containing the copular 'be'.

1. The assumptions of Naturalness Theory:
1.1. >sem (subject, subject complement) / controller of agreement

I.e., with respect to semantic complexity, the subject as controller of agreement is more natural than the subject complement as controller of agreement.–The subject is the normal controller of agreement.
1.2. >sem (characterizing, identifying) / copula

I.e., with respect to semantic complexity, a characterizing copula is more natural than an identifying copula (Mayerthaler et al. 1998: 197).

2. The assumptions of the Slovenian Theory, concerning any two syntactic variants:
2.1. >sem tends to associate with another >sem
2.2. <sem tends to associate with another <sem

3. The consequences:

From 1.1–2 and 2.1 it can be deduced:
3.1. If there is any difference between subject and subject complement as controllers of person, number and gender agreement in clauses containing the copular 'be', such that one controller is used when the copula is characterizing, and the other controller is used when the copula is identifying, it is the subject that tends to be used as controller when the copula is characterizing. Q.E.D.

From 1.1–2 and 2.2 it can be deduced:
3.2. If there is any difference between subject and subject complement as controllers of person, number and gender agreement in clauses containing the copular 'be', such that one controller is used when the copula is characterizing, and the other controller is used when the copula is identifying, it is the subject complement that tends to be used as controller when the copula is identifying. Q.E.D.

4. Note. A possibly related matter is the back agreement between the subject complement and the pronominal subject in Latin (regularly, *sed haec mea culpa est* 'but this is my fault'), in Ancient Greek (less regularly), in Italian (*questa è la mia casa* 'this is my house'), in English (*these are vain wishes*) (Brandenstein 1966: 141).

3. Slovenian. The affirmative imperative can be formed from verbal lexemes of perfective and imperfective aspects, e.g., *ustreli* (pf.), *streljaj* (ipf.) both in different readings of 'shoot (imperative)'. In the negative imperative, it is mostly the imperfective aspect that is used, e.g., *ne streljaj* 'do not shoot' (Toporišič 1976: 433; 2000: 350–1, 397; Herrity 2000: 188).

The two syntactic variants: the affirmative imperative, and the negative imperative.

1. The assumptions of Naturalness Theory:
1.1. >sem (affirmation, negation)

I.e., with respect to semantic complexity, affirmation is more natural than negation (Mayerthaler 1981: 15).
1.2. >sem (perfective & imperfective, imperfective) / aspect of verbal forms in Slovenian

I.e., with respect to semantic complexity, a verbal form admitting both perfective and imperfective aspect is more natural than a verbal form admitting only the imperfective aspect.–The scale has the format >sem (A + B, A). See item 4.

2. The assumptions of the Slovenian Theory, concerning any two syntactic variants:
2.1. >sem tends to associate with another >sem
2.2. <sem tends to associate with another <sem

3. The consequences:

From 1.1, 1.2 and 2.1 it can be deduced:

3.1. If there is any difference between the affirmative and the negative imperative, such that one kind of imperative admits perfective and imperfective aspect, and the other kind of imperative prefers the imperfective aspect, it is the affirmative imperative that tends to be used in both the perfective and the imperfective aspects. Q.E.D.

From 1.1, 1.2 and 2.2 it can be deduced:

3.2. If there is any difference between the affirmative and the negative imperative, such that one kind of imperative admits perfective and imperfective aspect, and the other kind of imperative prefers the imperfective aspect, it is the negative imperative that tends to be used in the imperfective aspect. Q.E.D.

4. Note. The scale format >sem (A + B, A) is new. Any scale of the format in combination with another scale reflects the well-known observation that what is more natural (less marked) is more varied. Turning to the subject-matter of the present deduction, the positive imperative is more natural than the negative imperative; the positive imperative accomodates both the perfective and the imperfective aspects, whereas the negative imperative is mostly limited to the imperfective aspect.

4. Slovenian. Informally, a man is addressed by the second person singular pronoun *ti* 'thou', and any subject complements are in the masculine singular, e.g., *ti si dober* 'thou art good'. Less informally, a man is addressed by the second person plural pronoun *Vi* 'you', and any subject complements are in the masculine singular, e.g., *Vi ste dober* 'you are good'.

Informally, a woman is addressed by the second person singular pronoun *ti* 'thou', and any subject complements are in the feminine singular, e.g., *ti si dobra* 'thou art good'. Less informally, a woman is addressed by the second person plural pronoun *Vi* 'you', and any subject complements are in the feminine singular, e.g., *Vi ste dobra* 'you are good' (Toporišič 2000: 390).

For the purposes of this deduction, the subject complement includes l-participles of complex verbal forms, e.g., *ti si prišel* 'thou (masc.) art come', *Vi ste prišel* 'you (masc.) have come', *ti si prišla* 'thou (fem.) art come', *Vi ste prišla* 'you (fem.) have come'.

The two syntactic variants: the type *ti si dober*, and the type *Vi ste dober*. Two more syntactic variants: the type *ti si dobra*, and the type *Vi ste dobra*.

1. The assumptions of Naturalness Theory:
1.1. >sem (informal, less informal) / address

I.e., with respect to semantic complexity, informal address is more natural than less informal address.–In primitive and early societies, informal relations prevail(ed).
1.2. >sem (expected number, plural) / of the subject pronoun

I.e., with respect to semantic complexity, the expected number of the subject pronoun is more natural than the plural.–The expected number is determined by the notional number of the subject. Since the expected number includes the plural, the scale has the format >sem (A + B, A).

2. The assumptions of the Slovenian Theory, concerning any two syntactic variants:
2.1. >sem tends to associate with another >sem
2.2. <sem tends to associate with another <sem

3. The consequences:

From 1.1, 1.2 and 2.1 it can be deduced:

3.1. If there is any difference between the informal type *ti si dober* and the less informal type *Vi ste dober* (between the informal type *ti si dobra* and the less informal type *Vi ste dobra*), such that one type contains the subject in the expected grammatical number, and the other type contains the subject in the plural, it is the informal type *ti si dober* (the informal type *ti si dobra*) that tends to contain the subject in the expected grammatical number. Q.E.D.

From 1.1, 1.2 and 2.2 it can be deduced:

3.2. If there is any difference between the informal type *ti si dober* and the less informal type *Vi ste dober* (between the informal type *ti si dobra* and the less informal type *Vi ste dobra*), such that one type contains the subject in the expected grammatical number, and the other type contains the subject in the plural, it is the less informal type *Vi ste dober* (the less informal type *Vi ste dobra*) that tends to contain the subject in the plural. Q.E.D.

4. Note. Cf. deduction 5.

5. Slovenian. Less formally, a man is addressed by the second person plural pronoun *Vi* 'you', and any subject complements are in the masculine singular, e.g., *Vi ste dober* 'you are good'. Less formally, a woman is addressed by the second person plural pronoun *Vi* 'you', and any subject complements are in the feminine singular, e.g., *Vi ste dobra* 'you are good'. More formally, a man or a woman is addressed by the second person plural pronoun *Vi* 'you', and any subject complements are in the masculine plural, e.g., *Vi ste dobri* 'you are good'. For the purposes of this deduction, the subject complement includes l-participles of complex verbal forms, e.g., *Vi ste prišel/prišla* 'you have come', *Vi ste prišli* 'you have come' (Toporišič 2000: 390).

The two syntactic variants: the type *Vi ste dober/dobra*, and the type *Vi ste dobri*.

1. The assumptions of Naturalness Theory:
1.1. >sem (less formal, more formal) / address

I.e., with respect to semantic complexity, less formal address is more natural than more formal address.–Less formal address is nearer to informal relations that prevail(ed) in early and primitive societies.
1.2. >sem (expected gender agreement, default gender agreement) / of subject complement

I.e., with respect to semantic complexity, expected gender agreement is more natural than default gender agreement.–The expected gender agreement is determined by the gender of the subject. The default gender is masculine in Slovenian. The scale has the format (A + B, A), see item 4 of deduction 3.

2. The assumptions of the Slovenian Theory, concerning any two syntactic variants:
2.1. >sem tends to associate with another >sem

2.2. <sem tends to associate with another <sem

3. The consequences:

From 1.1, 1.2 and 2.1 it can be deduced:

3.1. If there is any difference between the less formal type *Vi ste dober* and the more formal type *Vi ste dobri* (between the less formal type *Vi ste dobra* and the more formal type *Vi ste dobri*), such that one type shows expected gender agreement, and the other type shows default gender agreement, it is the less formal type *Vi ste dober* (the less formal type *Vi ste dobra*) that tends to show expected gender agreement. Q.E.D.

From 1.1, 1.2 and 2.2 it can be deduced:

3.2. If there is any difference between the less formal type *Vi ste dober* and the more formal type *Vi ste dobri* (between the less formal type *Vi ste dobra* and the more formal type *Vi ste dobri*), such that one type shows expected gender agreement, and the other type shows default gender agreement, it is the more formal type *Vi ste dobri* that tends to show expected gender agreement. Q.E.D.

4. Note. Cf. deduction 4.

6. Slovenian. If the adjective modifier which normally stands to the left of its head is displaced to the right of the head, the adjective modifier expresses emphasis (a derogatory or praising meaning), e.g., (derogatory) *krava stara zoprna, hudič frdamani, ženska pritegnjena, avša avšasta, trola zmedena,* (praising) *srček moj dragi, ljubček moj dragi, ljubica ljubljena, Špela špelasta*. (The examples supplied by Varja Cvetko Orešnik *viva voce*, 1996; they are too idiomatic to be translatable.) Cf. Toporišič 2000: 562.

The two syntactic variants: adjective + head, and head + adjective.

1. The assumptions of Naturalness Theory:

1.1. >sym (more transparent, less transparent) / syntactic unit

I.e., with respect to encoding, a syntactic unit of greater syntactic transparency is more natural than a corresponding syntactic unit of lesser syntactic transparency (Mayerthaler 1981: 35; Mayerthaler et al. 1998: 186; on the notion of transparency see Mayerthaler 1987: 49).

A special case of 1.1:

1.1.1 >sym (postmodification, premodification) / of noun-phrase head, in Slovenian

I.e., with respect to encoding, the postmodification of the noun-phrase head is more natural than the premodification of the noun-phrase head, in Slovenian.–Postmodification is structurally richer than premodification in Slovenian, speaking of averages.

1.2. >sem (–derogatory/praising, +derogatory/praising)

I.e., with respect to semantic complexity, non-derogatory/non-praising is more natural than derogatory/praising (in the spirit of Mayerthaler 1981: 15).

2. The assumptions of the Slovenian Theory, concerning any two syntactic variants:

2.1. >sym tends to associate with <sem

2.2. <sym tends to associate with >sem

3. The consequences:

From 1.1.1, 1.2 and 2.1 it can be deduced:

3.1. If there is any difference between the premodification and the postmodification of the noun-phrase head, such that one construction has derogatory or praising meaning, and the other construction not, it is the postmodification that tends to have derogatory or praising meaning. Q.E.D.

From 1.1.1, 1.2 and 2.2 it can be deduced:

3.2. If there is any difference between the premodification and the postmodification of the noun-phrase head, such that one construction has derogatory or praising meaning, and the other construction not, it is the premodification that tends not to have derogatory or praising meaning. Q.E.D.

7. Slovenian. An expressive variant of the imperative is various kinds of non-imperative sentences, for instance *da prideš točno* that you-come accurately 'come in time', or *a ne boš miren* not will-you-be quiet 'be quiet' (my observations).

The two syntactic variants: the imperative, and the sentences expressing command (not containing the imperative).

1. The assumptions of Naturalness Theory:

1.1. >sym (more transparent, less transparent) / syntactic unit

I.e., with respect to encoding, a syntactic unit of greater syntactic transparency is more natural than a corresponding syntactic unit of lesser syntactic transparency (Mayerthaler 1981: 35; Mayerthaler et al. 1998: 186; on the notion of transparency see Mayerthaler 1987: 49).

A special case of 1.1:

1.1.1. >sym (–imperative sentence, +imperative sentence) / expressing command in Slovenian

I.e., with respect to encoding, a non-imperative sentence expressing command is more natural than an imperative sentence expressing command.–The non-imperative sentence has more structure than the imperative sentence.

1.2. >sem (+/–emphasis, +emphasis)

I.e., with respect to semantic complexity, admitting both emphasis and non-emphasis is more natural than admitting only emphasis.–The scale has the format >sem (A + B, A), see item 4 of deduction 3.

2. The assumptions of the Slovenian Theory, concerning any two syntactic variants:

2.1. >sym tends to associate with <sem

2.2. <sym tends to associate with >sem

3. The consequences:

From 1.1.1, 1.2 and 2.1 it can be deduced:

3.1. If there is any difference between the imperative sentence and the non-imperative sentence (both expressing command), such that one is always extra insistent, and the other only ocassionally, it is the non-imperative sentence that tends to express extra insistence. Q.E.D.

From 1.1.1, 1.2 and 2.2 it can be deduced:

3.2. If there is any difference between the imperative sentence and the non-imperative sentence (both expressing command), such that one is extra insistent, and the other only occasionally, it is the imperative sentence that tends to express extra insistence only occasionally. Q.E.D.

4. Note. Similarly in German: *wirst du nicht ruhig sein* 'be quiet', *daß du mir pünktlich kommst* 'come on time'. Also in Ancient Greek and in Latin (Brandenstein 1966: 134–5).

8. Slovenian. An imperative clause can express the conditional, e.g., *reci bedaku, da je pameten, pa ti bo verjel* 'tell an idiot that he is intelligent, and he will believe you' (Toporišič 1976: 433; 2000: 444).

The two syntactic variants: conditional clause introduced by a conditional subordinator, conditional clause expressed with an imperative.

1. The assumptions of Naturalness Theory:

1.1. >sym (more transparent, less transparent) / syntactic unit

I.e., with respect to encoding, a syntactic unit of greater syntactic transparency is more natural than a corresponding syntactic unit of lesser syntactic transparency (see Mayerthaler 1981: 35; Mayerthaler et al. 1998: 186; on the notion of transparency see Mayerthaler 1987: 49).

Two special cases of 1.1:

1.1.1. >sym (introduced by a conditional subordinator, expressed with an imperative) / conditional clause

I.e., with respect to encoding, a conditional clause introduced by a conditional subordinator is more natural than a conditional clause expressed with an imperative.–The conditional clause introduced by a conditional subordinator has more structure than a conditional clause expressed with an imperative.

1.1.2. >sym (–formula, +formula)

I.e., with respect to encoding, a non-formula is more natural than a formula.

2. The assumptions of the Slovenian Theory, concerning any two syntactic variants:

2.1. >sym tends to associate with another >sym

2.2. <sym tends to associate with another <sym

3. The consequences:

From 1.1.1–2 and 2.1 it can be deduced:

3.1. If there is any difference between a conditional clause introduced by a conditional subordinator and a conditional clause expressed with an imperative, such that one tends to be used in formulaic expressions, and the other not, it is the conditional clause introduced by a conditional subordinator that tends not to be used in formulaic expressions. Q.E.D.

From 1.1.1–2 and 2.2 it can be deduced:

3.2. If there is any difference between a conditional clause introduced by a conditional subordinator and a conditional clause expressed with an imperative, such that one tends to be used in formulaic expressions, and the other not, it is the conditional clause expressed with an imperative that tends to be used in formulaic expressions. Q.E.D.

4. Note. Similarly in German: *sage mir, mit wem du umgehst, und ich will dir sagen, wer du bist* 'tell me with whom you associate, and I will tell you who you are'. Also in Ancient Greek and Latin (Brandenstein 1966: 134).

9. Slovenian. The affirmative imperative supported with suitable particles can be used ironically instead of the negated imperative, e.g., *potem pa še komu zaupaj* then but still anybody trust 'trust no-one' (Toporišič 1976: 433).

The two syntactic variants: the negated imperative, and the ironical affirmative imperative, both expressing negative command.

1. The assumptions of Naturalness Theory:
1.1. >sym (more transparent, less transparent) / syntactic unit

I.e., with respect to encoding, a syntactic unit of greater syntactic transparency is more natural than a corresponding syntactic unit of lesser syntactic transparency (Mayerthaler 1981: 35; Mayerthaler et al. 1998: 186; on the notion of transparency see Mayerthaler 1987: 49).

A special case of 1.1:
1.1.1. >sym (affirmative imperative supported with particles, negated imperative) / expressing negative command, in Slovenian

I.e., with respect to encoding, an affirmative imperative supported with suitable particles is more natural than a negated imperative, as expression of a negative command, in Slovenian.
1.2. >sem (stylistically unmarked, stylistically marked)

I.e., with respect to semantic complexity, stylistically unmarked is more natural than stylistically marked.–The stylistically marked opposite number may be lacking.

A special case of 1.2:
1.2.1. >sem (–ironical, +ironical)

I.e., with respect to semantic complexity, lack of irony is more natural than presence of irony.

2. The assumptions of the Slovenian Theory, concerning any two syntactic variants:
2.1. >sym tends to associate with <sem
2.2. <sym tends to associate with >sem

3. The consequences:

From 1.1.1, 1.2.1 and 2.1 it can be deduced:
3.1. If there is any difference between the affirmative imperative and the negated imperative, such that both express a negative command, and such that one is used ironically, and the other not, it is the affirmative imperative that tends to be used ironically. Q.E.D.

From 1.1.1, 1.2.1 and 2.2 it can be deduced:
3.2. If there is any difference between the affirmative imperative and the negated imperative, such that both express a negative command, and such that one is used ironically, and the other not, it is the negated imperative that tends not to be used ironically. Q.E.D.

10. Slovenian. With singular masculine adjectivals, the accusative takes the form of the corresponding nominative if the adjectival is accompanied by an inanimate noun head, e.g., *bel avto* 'white car (acc. sg. masc.)'. The accusative takes the form of the corresponding genitive, if the inanimate noun head of the adjectival is ellipted, e.g., *hočem belega* 'I want the white one (scil. the white car)' (Perlmutter and Orešnik 1973).

The two syntactic variants: accusative singular masculine adjectival accompanied by an inanimate head noun, and accusative singular masculine adjectival whose inanimate head noun has been ellipted.

1. The assumptions of Naturalness Theory:

1.1. >sem (accusative = nominative, accusative = genitive) / in nom.-acc. languages

I.e., with respect to semantic complexity, the option accusative = nominative is more natural than the option accusative = genitive, in nominative-accusative languages.–The affinity of the accusative with the nominative is greater than the affinity of the accusative with the genitive, in nominative-accusative languages (Mayerthaler et al. 1998: 167).

1.2. >sym (more transparent, less transparent) / syntactic unit

I.e., with respect to encoding, a syntactic unit of greater syntactic transparency is more natural than a corresponding syntactic unit of lesser syntactic transparency (Mayerthaler 1981: 35; Mayerthaler et al. 1998: 186; on the notion of transparency see Mayerthaler 1987: 49).

A special case of 1.2:

1.2.1. >sym (–ellipted, +ellipted) / head noun accompanying attributive adjectival, in Slovenian.

I.e., with respect to encoding, a non-ellipted head accompanying an attributive adjectival is more natural than an ellipted head of an attributive adjectival.

2. The assumptions of the Slovenian Theory, concerning any two syntactic variants:

2.1. >sym tends to associate with <sem

2.2. <sym tends to associate with >sem

3. The consequences:

From 1.1, 1.2.1 and 2.1 it can be deduced:

3.1. If there is any difference between the singular masculine adjectival accompanied by a non-ellipted inanimate head and the singular masculine adjectival whose inanimate head has been ellipted, such that one adjectival's accusative case equals the corresponding nominative, and the other adjectival's accusative case equals the corresponding genitive, it is the adjectival accompanied by a non-ellipted inanimate head that tends to have the accusative equal to the corresponding nominative. Q.E.D.

From 1.1, 1.2.1 and 2.2 it can be deduced:

3.2. If there is any difference between the singular masculine adjectival accompanied by a non-ellipted inanimate head and the singular masculine adjectival whose inanimate head has been ellipted, such that one adjectival's accusative case equals the corresponding nominative, and the other adjectival's accusative case equals the corresponding genitive, it is the adjectival whose inanimate head has been ellipted that tends to have the accusative equal to the corresponding genitive. Q.E.D.

4. Notes.

4.1. The same phenomenon obtains in the singular neuter, optionally. e.g., *belo vino* 'white wine (acc. sg. neuter)', as against *hočem belo/belega* 'I want the white one (scil. the white wine)'. I cannot account for the circumstance that the tendency of singular inanimate nouns for accusative = genitive is considerably stronger in the masculine than in the neuter.

4.2. Cf. deduction 11.

11. Slovenian. With singular masculine adjectivals, the accusative takes the form of the corresponding nominative if the adjectival is accompanied by an inanimate noun head, e.g., *bel avto* 'white car (acc. sg. masc.)'. The accusative takes the form of the corresponding genitive, if the inanimate noun head of the adjectival is ellipted, e.g., *hočem belega* 'I want the white one (scil. the white car)' (Perlmutter and Orešnik 1973).

The two syntactic variants: accusative singular masculine adjectival accompanied by an inanimate noun, and accusative singular masculine adjectival whose inanimate noun has been ellipted.

1. The assumptions of Naturalness Theory:

1.1. >sym (more transparent, less transparent) / syntactic unit

I.e., with respect to encoding, a syntactic unit of greater syntactic transparency is more natural than a corresponding syntactic unit of lesser syntactic transparency (Mayerthaler 1981: 35; Mayerthaler et al. 1998: 186; on the notion of transparency see Mayerthaler 1987: 49).

A special case of 1.1:

1.1.1. >sym (the type *bel avto*, the type *belega*) / accusative singular masculine in Slovenian

1.2. >sem (repetition, its original)

I.e., with respect to semantic complexity, repetition is more natural than its original.–This is based on the fact that a repetition is easily retrievable from memory, and on the circumstance that repetition is imitation, which is speakers' innate ability (Li 1986: 40–1).

2. The assumptions of the Slovenian Theory, concerning any two syntactic variants:

2.1. >sym tends to associate with <sem

2.2. <sym tends to associate with >sem

3. The consequences:

From 1.1.1, 1.2 and 2.1 it can be deduced:

3.1. If there is any difference between the type *bel avto* and the type *belega*, such that one type is used as first mention, and the other as subsequent mention, it is the type *bel avto* that tends to be used as first mention. Q.E.D.

From 1.1.1, 1.2 and 2.2 it can be deduced:

3.2. If there is any difference between the type *bel avto* and the type *belega*, such that one type is used as first mention, and the other as subsequent mention, it is the type *belega* that tends to be used as subsequent mention. Q.E.D.

4. Notes.

4.1. The same phenomenon obtains in the singular neuter, optionally. e.g., *belo vino* 'white wine (acc. sg. neuter)', as against *hočem belo/belega* 'I want the white one (scil. the white wine)'. I cannot account for the circumstance that the tendency of singular inanimate nouns for accusative = genitive is considerably stronger in the masculine than in the neuter.

4.2. Cf. deduction 10.

12. Slovenian. Sentence negation is expressed with *ne*, e.g., *danes ne dežuje* 'it is not raining today'. The answer to a yes/no question can be *ne* as well, e.g., *ne, danes ne*

dežuje 'no, it is not raining today'; in that case *ne* is an extra-clausal adverb. Both negations can be emphatic or not. However, the probability that extra-clausal negation will be emphatic is significantly greater than the probability that sentence negation will be emphatic (my observation).

The two syntactic variants: the sentence negation *ne*, and the extra-clausal *ne*.

1. The assumptions of Naturalness Theory:

1.1. >sym (more transparent, less transparent) / syntactic unit

I.e., with respect to encoding, a syntactic unit of greater syntactic transparency is more natural than a corresponding syntactic unit of lesser syntactic transparency (Mayerthaler 1981: 35; Mayerthaler et al. 1998: 186; on the notion of transparency see Mayerthaler 1987: 49).

A special case of 1.1:

1.1.1. >sym (extra-clausal negation, sentence negation) / in Slovenian

I.e., with respect to encoding, extra-clausal negation is more natural than sentence negation, in Slovenian.–Extra-clausal negation is more conspicuous than intra-clausal negation.

1.2. >sem (–emphasis, +emphasis)

I.e., with respect to semantic complexity, non-emphasis is more natural than emphasis (Mayerthaler 1981: 15).

A special case of 1.2:

1.2.1. >sem (less often emphatic, more often emphatic)

I.e., with respect to semantic complexity, less often emphatic is more natural than more often emphatic.

2. The assumptions of the Slovenian Theory, concerning any two syntactic variants:

2.1. >sym tends to associate with <sem

2.2. <sym tends to associate with >sem

3. The consequences:

From 1.1.1, 1.2.1 and 2.1 it can be deduced:

3.1. If there is any difference between extra-clausal negation and sentence negation, such that one is more often emphatic than the other, it is extra-clausal negation that tends to be more often emphatic than sentence negation. Q.E.D.

From 1.1.1, 1.2.1 and 2.2 it can be deduced:

3.2. If there is any difference between extra-clausal negation and sentence negation, such that one is more often emphatic than the other, it is sentence negation that tends to be less often emphatic than extra-clausal negation. Q.E.D.

13. Slovenian. In normal, non-emphatic speech, the sentence negator *ne* 'not' is proclitic on the finite verb, e.g., *danes ne dežuje* 'it is not raining today' Nothing can intervene between the sentence negator and the finite verb. If the negated verb is infinite, the negator precedes it, is accented, and can be separated from the verb, e.g., *ne ga še obiskati* not him yet to-visit 'don't visit him yet' (M. Milojević-Sheppard and M. Golden 2000). Also, *ne prav posebno pogosto bivajoč v Ljubljani* 'not exactly especially often residing in Ljubljana'.

The two syntactic variants: the sentence negator before the finite verb, and before the infinite verb.

1. The assumptions of Naturalness Theory:
1.1. >sym (more transparent, less transparent) / syntactic unit

I.e., with respect to encoding, a syntactic unit of greater syntactic transparency is more natural than a corresponding syntactic unit of lesser syntactic transparency (Mayerthaler 1981: 35; Mayerthaler et al. 1998: 186; on the notion of transparency see Mayerthaler 1987: 49).

A special case of 1.1:
1.1.1. >sym (accented, clitic) / sentence negator in Slovenian

I.e., with respect to encoding, an accented sentence negator is more natural than a clitic sentence negator, in Slovenian.
1.2. >sem (finite, infinite) / verb

I.e., with respect to semantic complexity, a finite verb is more natural than an infinite verb (Mayerthaler et al. 1993: 144).

2. The assumptions of the Slovenian Theory, concerning any two syntactic variants:
2.1. >sem tends to associate with <sym
2.2. <sem tends to associate with >sym

3. The consequences:

From 1.1.1, 1.2 and 2.1 it can be deduced:
3.1. If there is any difference between the sentence negator before the finite verb and the sentence negator before the infinite verb, such that one kind of sentence negator is accented, and the other clitic, it is the sentence negator before the finite verb that tends to be clitic. Q.E.D.

From 1.1.1, 1.2 and 2.2 it can be deduced:
3.2. If there is any difference between the sentence negator before the finite verb and the sentence negator before the infinite verb, such that one kind of sentence negator is accented, and the other clitic, it is the sentence negator before the infinite verb that tends to be accented. Q.E.D.

14. Slovenian. The subject complement of middle-voice reflexive verbs can assume the accusative case if the subject is animate, e.g., *Micka/medvedka se čuti premagano* 'Micka/the she-bear feels defeated'. The nominative case is also possible, e.g., *Micka/medvedka se čuti premagana* same meaning. If the subject is not animate, the subject complement must be in the nominative, e.g., *blazina se čuti mehka* 'the pillow feels soft' (my observation).

The two syntactic variants: the type *Micka/medvedka se čuti premagana -o*, and the type *blazina se čuti mehka*.

1. The assumptions of Naturalness Theory:
1.1. >sem (the nominative and the accusative, the nominative only) / the case of the subject complement with reflexive verbs in Slovenian

I.e., with respect to semantic complexity, the nominative or the accusative is more natural than just the nominative, as the case of the subject complement with reflexive verbs in Slovenian.–The scale has the format >sem (A + B, A), see item 4 of deduction 3.
1.2. >sem (+animate, –animate) / the subject

I.e., with respect to semantic complexity, an animate subject is more natural than an inanimate subject (Mayerthaler 1981: 14).

2. The assumptions of the Slovenian Theory, concerning any two syntactic variants:
2.1. >sem tends to associate with another >sem
2.2. <sem tends to associate with another <sem

3. The consequences:

From 1.1–2 and 2.1 it can be deduced:

3.1. If there is any difference between the subject complement to animate subjects and the subject complement to inanimate subjects, such that one kind of complement can assume the nominative case only, and the other type of complement can assume the nominative or the accusative case, it is the complement of the animate subject that tends to assume the nominative or the accusative case. Q.E.D.

From 1.1–2 and 2.2 it can be deduced:

3.2. If there is any difference between the subject complement to animate subjects and the subject complement to inanimate subjects, such that one kind of complement can assume the nominative case only, and the other type of complement can assume the nominative or the accusative case, it is the complement of the inanimate subject that tends to assume the nominative only. Q.E.D.

15. Slovenian. When an adjective is used as part of a vocative, it takes the definite form, e.g., *Dragi Janez!* 'dear Janez' (my observation).

The two syntactic variants: the nominative singular masculine used as vocative, and used as non-vocative, in both cases containing an adjective.

1. The assumptions of Naturalness Theory:
1.1. >sem (the definite and the indefinite form, the definite form) / of the adjective in Slovenian

I.e., with respect to semantic complexity, having the definite and the indefinite form is more natural than having just the definite form, in the adjective in Slovenian.–The scale has the format >sem (A + B, A), see item 4 of deduction 3.

1.2. >sem (–vocative, +vocative) / nominative case in Slovenian

I.e., with respect to semantic complexity, the non-vocative use of the nominative is more natural than the vocative use of the nominative, in Slovenian.–The non-vocative use of the nominative is more common than the vocative use.

2. The assumptions of the Slovenian Theory, concerning any two syntactic variants:
2.1. >sem tends to associate with another >sem
2.2. <sem tends to associate with another <sem

3. The consequences:

From 1.1–2 and 2.1 it can be deduced:

3.1. If there is any difference between the nominative singular masculine (containing an adjective) used as vocative and used as non-vocative, such that one use takes the definite and the indefinite forms of the adjective, and the other use takes the definite form only, it is the non-vocative use that tends to take the definite and the indefinite forms of the adjective. Q.E.D.

From 1.1–2 and 2.2 it can be deduced:

3.2. If there is any difference between the nominative singular masculine (containing an adjective) used as vocative and used as non-vocative, such that one use takes

the definite and the indefinite forms of the adjective, and the other use takes the definite form only, it is the vocative use that tends to take the definite form of the adjective only. Q.E.D.

16. Slovenian. (a) In the plural and dual, full noun phrase subjects can be used even with verbs in the non-third verbal person, e.g., *študentje garate* 'you students work hard', *oba študenta garava* 'both of us students work hard'. The verbal person is marked only in the desinence of the verb. (b) If the subject contains a cardinal numeral higher than '4' (see note 4), it must be followed by the head noun in the genitive, and agreement with the verb becomes impossible; the verb assumes the default value of the third person singular. The grammatical person of the subject must be expressed with a pronoun clitic copy of the subject's head noun (indicating the case and number of the head noun, as well as the grammatical person of the whole subject): *pet študentov nas/vas gara* 'we/you five students work hard'. (All the English glosses are misleading in the crucial syntactic respect.)–The present deduction deals with case (a). Case (b) is treated in deduction 17. My interest in case (a) has been instigated by Lyons 1999: 310 ff.

The two syntactic variants: the type *študentje garajo* 'the students work hard' (occurring in the third person of the non-singular; transparent agreement of the verb with the subject), and the type *študentje garamo* 'we students work hard' (occurring in the non-third person of the non-singular; opaque agreement of the verb with the subject).

1. The assumptions of Naturalness Theory:

1.1. >sem (transparent, opaque) / agreement with full-NP subject

I.e., with respect to semantic complexity, transparent agreement with a full-NP subject is more natural than opaque agreement with such a subject (in the spirit of Mayerthaler et al. 1998: 127).

1.2. >sem (+third, –third) / grammatical person

I.e., with respect to semantic complexity, the third person is more natural than the non-third person (according to the linguistic tradition beginning with Jakobson 1932).

2. The assumptions of the Slovenian Theory, concerning any two syntactic variants:

2.1. >sem tends to associate with another >sem

2.2. <sem tends to associate with another <sem

3. The consequences:

From 1.1, 1.2 and 2.1 it can be deduced:

3.1. If there is any difference between the type *študentje garajo* and the type *študentje garamo*, such that one type is used in the third person, and the other in the non-third person, it is the transparent type *študentje garajo* that tends to be used in the third person. Q.E.D.

From 1.1, 1.2 and 2.2 it can be deduced:

3.2. If there is any difference between the type *študentje garajo* and the type *študentje garamo*, such that one type is used in the third person, and the other in the non-third person, it is the opaque type *študentje garamo* that tends to be used in the non-third person. Q.E.D.

4. Note. The above observation about cardinal numerals higher than '4' must be understood as referring to cardinal numbers which, when pronounced, end in 5–99, or are hundred or thousand bases (Toporišič 1976: 268; 2000: 333; Herrity 2000: 132f).

17. Slovenian. (a) In the plural and dual, full noun phrase subjects can be used even with verbs in the non-third verbal person, e.g., *študentje garate* 'you students work hard', *oba študenta garava* 'both of us students work hard'. The verbal person is marked only in the desinence of the verb. (b) If the subject contains a cardinal numeral higher than '4' (see note 4.2), it must be followed by the head noun in the genitive, and agreement with the verb becomes impossible; the verb assumes the default value of the third person singular. The grammatical person of the subject must be expressed with a pronoun clitic copy of the subject's head noun (indicating the case and number of the head noun, as well as the grammatical person of the whole subject): *pet študentov nas/vas gara* 'we/you five students work hard'. (All the English glosses are misleading in the crucial syntactic respect.)–The present deduction deals with case (b). Case (a) is treated in deduction 16.

The two syntactic variants: the type *študentje garamo* 'we students work hard' (occurring in the non-third person of the non-singular; opaque agreement of the verb with the subject), and the type *pet študentov nas gara* 'we five students work hard' (occurring in the non-third person of the plural; no agreement of the verb with the subject).

1. The assumptions of Naturalness Theory:

1.1. >sym (more transparent, less transparent) / syntactic unit

I.e., with respect to encoding, a syntactic unit of greater syntactic transparency is more natural than a corresponding syntactic unit of lesser syntactic transparency (Mayerthaler 1981: 35; Mayerthaler et al. 1998: 186; on the notion of transparency see Mayerthaler 1987: 49).

Two special cases of 1.1:

1.1.1. >sym (+subject agreement, –subject agreement) / verb

I.e., with respect to encoding, subject agreement with the verb is more natural than lack of that agreement.

1.1.2. >sym (clitic pronoun, desinence) / expression of grammatical person

I.e., with respect to encoding, a clitic pronoun is more natural as an expression of grammatical person than a desinence.

2. The assumptions of the Slovenian Theory, concerning any two syntactic variants:

2.1. >sym tends to associate with another >sym

2.2. <sym tends to associate with another <sym

3. The consequences:

From 1.1.1–2 and 2.1 it can be deduced:

3.1. If there is any difference between the type *študentje garamo* (lacking any cardinal numeral in the subject) and the type *pet študentov nas gara* (containing a cardinal numeral in the subject), such that in one type there is subject agreement (the grammatical person is expressed with a desinence on the verb), and in the other type there is no subject agreement (the grammatical person is expressed with a clitic pronoun), it is the type *pet študentov nas gara* (containing a cardinal number in

the subject) that tends to express the grammatical person with a clitic pronoun. Q.E.D.

From 1.1.1–2 and 2.2 it can be deduced:

3.2. If there is any difference between the type *študentje garamo* (lacking any cardinal numeral in the subject) and the type *pet študentov nas gara* (containing a cardinal numeral in the subject), such that in one type there is subject agreement (the grammatical person is expressed with a desinence on the verb), and in the other type there is no subject agreement (the grammatical person is expressed with a clitic pronoun), it is the type *študentje garamo* (lacking any cardinal number in the subject) that tends to express the grammatical person with a desinence on the verb. Q.E.D.

4. Notes.

4.1. If the verb is transitive in the type *pet študentov nas gara*, say *pet študentov vas gleda*, the sentence is ambiguous between 'you five students are watching' and 'five students are watching you' (seeing that *vas* can be the genitive of the subject-issued clitic or the accusative of the clitic direct object). Disambiguation is possible using the alternative type *mi študentje vas gledamo* (containing the determiner *mi* 'we' in the subject), which becomes *nas pet študentov vas gleda* 'we five students are watching you' when a suitable numeral is present in the subject. Just as *mi* is at least accented (if not emphatic) in *mi študentje vas gledamo*, the genitive *nas* (corresponding to *mi* in *mi študentje vas gledamo*) is at least accented (let alone clitic) in *nas pet študentov vas gleda*, and of course does not belong to the Wackernagel position.

4.2. The above observation about cardinal numerals higher than '4' must be understood as referring to cardinal numbers which, when pronounced, end in 5–99, or are hundred or thousand bases (Toporišič 1976: 268; 2000: 333; Herrity 2000: 132f).

18. Slovenian. Pronominal possession, alienable and inalienable. (a) Alienable possession with a pronominal possessor is expressed with the possessive adjective of the possessor, e.g., *moja hiša* 'my house'. Inalienable possession is expressed with the bare possessum optionally preceded by the possessive adjective of the possessor, e.g., *(moj) brat* 'my brother'. (b) In inalienable possession, the possessive adjectives are used obligatorily when disambiguation is necessary, and are then emphatic, e.g., *MOJ brat* (my observations). The present deduction deals with case (a). Case (b) is considered in deduction 19.

The two syntactic variants: the type *moja hiša*, and the type *(moj) brat*.

1. The assumptions of Naturalness Theory:

1.1. >sym (more transparent, less transparent) / syntactic unit

I.e., with respect to encoding, a syntactic unit of greater syntactic transparency is more natural than a corresponding syntactic unit of lesser syntactic transparency (Mayerthaler 1981: 35; Mayerthaler et al. 1998: 186; on the notion of transparency see Mayerthaler 1987: 49).

A special case of 1.1:

1.1.1. >sym (the type *moja hiša*, the type *(moj) brat*) / in Slovenian

I.e., with respect to encoding, the type *moja hiša* is more natural than the type *(moj) brat*, in Slovenian.

1.2. >sem (–alienable, +alienable) / possession

I.e., with respect to semantic complexity, inalienable possession is more natural than alienable possession (Mayerthaler 1981: 152; Mayerthaler et al. 1998: 275).

2. The assumptions of the Slovenian Theory, concerning any two syntactic variants:
2.1. >sym tends to associate with <sem
2.2. <sym tends to associate with >sem

3. The consequences:

From 1.1.1, 1.2 and 2.1 it can be deduced:

3.1. If there is any difference between the type *moja hiša* and the type *(moj) brat*, such that one expresses alienable possession, and the other expresses inalienable possession, it is the type *moja hiša* that expresses alienable possession. Q.E.D.

From 1.1.1, 1.2 and 2.2 it can be deduced:

3.2. If there is any difference between the type *moja hiša* and the type *(moj) brat*, such that one expresses alienable possession, and the other expresses inalienable possession, it is the type *(moj) brat* that expresses inalienable possession. Q.E.D.

19. Slovenian. Pronominal possession, alienable and inalienable. (a) Alienable possession with a pronominal possessor is expressed with the possessive adjective of the possessor, e.g., *moja hiša* 'my house'. Inalienable possession is expressed with the bare possessum optionally preceded by the possessive adjective of the possessor, e.g., *(moj) brat* 'my brother'. (b) In inalienable possession, the possessive adjectives are used obligatorily when disambiguation is necessary, and are then emphatic, e.g., *MOJ brat* (my observations). The present deduction deals with case (b). Case (a) is considered in deduction 18.

The two syntactic variants: the type *(moj) brat*, and the type *moj brat*.

1. The assumptions of Naturalness Theory:
1.1. >sym (more transparent, less transparent) / syntactic unit

I.e., with respect to encoding, a syntactic unit of greater syntactic transparency is more natural than a corresponding syntactic unit of lesser syntactic transparency (Mayerthaler 1981: 35; Mayerthaler et al. 1998: 186; on the notion of transparency see Mayerthaler 1987: 49).

A special case of 1.1:

1.1.1. >sym (the type *moj brat*, the type *(moj) brat*) / in Slovenian

I.e., with respect to encoding, the type *moj brat* is more natural than the type *(moj) brat*, in Slovenian.

1.2. >sem (–emphasis, +emphasis)

I.e., with respect to semantic complexity, non-emphasis is more natural than emphasis (Mayerthaler 1981: 15, 159).

2. The assumptions of the Slovenian Theory, concerning any two syntactic variants:
2.1. >sym tends to associate with <sem
2.2. <sym tends to associate with >sem

3. The consequences:

From 1.1.1, 1.2 and 2.1 it can be deduced:

3.1. If there is any difference between the type *(moj) brat* and the type *moj brat*,

such that one type is emphatic, and the other not, it is the type *moj brat* that tends to be emphatic. Q.E.D.

From 1.1.1, 1.2 and 2.2 it can be deduced:

3.2. If there is any difference between the type *(moj) brat* and the type *moj brat*, such that one type is emphatic, and the other not, it is the type *(moj) brat* that tends to be non-emphatic. Q.E.D.

20. Slovenian. The main arguments of the verb are the nominative as the case of the subject and the accusative as the case of the direct object. The main argument of the noun is the genitive. (My attention was drawn to the putative unpredictability of the relationship between the main arguments of the verb and of the noun by Martina Križaj-Ortar *viva voce*, in the early 1980s.)

The two syntactic variants: nominative/accusative of the verb, and genitive of the noun.

1. The assumptions of Naturalness Theory:

1.1. >sem (verb, noun)

I.e., with respect to semantic complexity, the verb is more natural than the noun.–The morphology of the verb is mostly better developed than the morphology of the noun. Such a state of affairs is expected with the less marked (the verb) and the corresponding more marked (the noun) parts of speech.

1.2. >sem (nominative/accusative, genitive) / as argument in nom.-acc. languages

I.e., with respect to semantic complexity, the nominative/accusative is more natural than the genitive, as argument in nominative-accusative languages (Mayerthaler et al. 1998: 167).

2. The assumptions of the Slovenian Theory, concerning any two syntactic variants:

2.1. >sem tends to associate with another >sem

2.2. <sem tends to associate with another <sem

3. The consequences:

From 1.1, 1.2 and 2.1 it can be deduced:

3.1. If there is any difference between the noun and the verb concerning their main arguments, such that one part of speech takes nominatives and accusatives, and the other part of speech takes genitives, it is the verb that tends to take the nominative and the accusative. Q.E.D.

From 1.1, 1.2 and 2.2 it can be deduced:

3.2. If there is any difference between the noun and the verb concerning their main arguments, such that one part of speech takes nominatives and accusatives, and the other part of speech takes genitives, it is the noun that tends to take the genitive. Q.E.D.

21. Slovenian. (In what follows only the standard usage of those speakers whose pronunciation lacks tonemes is discussed.) Slovenian distinguishes +definite and –definite adjective forms. (a) The formal difference between +definite and –definite adjectives obtains only in the nominative singular masculine where the +definite form ends in *-i*, and the –definite form lacks any ending, e.g., +definite *lep-i*, –definite *lep*, both meaning 'beautiful'. (In the event that the accusative singular masculine equals in form the nominative singular masculine, the formal difference between the +definite and the –definite adjective obtains in that case form too.) (b)

With the adjectives 'little' and 'big', the formal difference between +/–definite obtains throughout the declension: *majhen* is –definite, *mal-i* is +definite, both meaning 'little'; *vêlik* is –definite, *vélik-i* is +definite, both meaning 'big' (Toporišič 1976: 256; 2000: 320; Herrity 2000: 73–4). The present deduction deals with case (a). For case (b) see deduction 22.

The two syntactic variants: the nominative singular masculine, and the remaining case forms of the adjectival declension.

1. The assumptions of Naturalness Theory:
1.1. >sem (+definite OR –definite form, +definite AND –definite form) / case in the adjectival declension of Slovenian

I.e., with respect to semantic complexity, a case showing +definite OR –definite form is more natural than a case not distinguishing between +definite and –definite form.–The scale has the format >sem (A + B, A), see item 4 of deduction 3.
1.2. >sem (nominative singular masculine, the remaining case forms) / the adjectival declension of Slovenian

I.e., with respect to semantic complexity, the nominative singular masculine is more natural than the remaining case forms, in the adjectival declension of Slovenian.–The nominative is more sem-natural than the remaining cases. The singular is more sem-natural than the remaining grammatical numbers. The masculine is more sem-natural than the remaining genders (Mayerthaler 1981: 14–5).

2. The assumptions of the Slovenian Theory, concerning any two syntactic variants:
2.1. >sem tends to associate with another >sem
2.2. <sem tends to associate with another <sem

3. The consequences:

From 1.1–2 and 2.1 it can be deduced:
3.1. If there is any difference, within the adjectival declension, between the nominative singular masculine and the remaining case forms, such that the formal difference between +/–definite is or is not expressed, it is the nominative singular masculine that tends to express the formal distinction between +/–definite. Q.E.D.

From 1.1–2 and 2.2 it can be deduced:
3.2. If there is any difference, within the adjectival declension, between the nominative singular masculine and the remaining case forms, such that the formal difference between +/–definite is or is not expressed, it is the remaining case forms that tend to lack the formal distinction between +/–definite. Q.E.D.

22. Slovenian. (In what follows only the standard usage of those speakers whose pronunciation lacks tonemes is discussed.) Slovenian distinguishes +definite and –definite adjective forms. (a) The formal difference between +definite and –definite adjectives obtains only in the nominative singular masculine where the +definite form ends in *-i*, and the –definite form lacks any ending, e.g., +definite *lep-i*, –definite *lep*, both meaning 'beautiful'. (In the event that the accusative singular masculine equals in form the nominative singular masculine, the formal difference between the +definite and the –definite adjective obtains in that case form too.) (b) With the adjectives 'little' and 'big', the formal difference between +/–definite obtains throughout the declension: *majhen* is –definite, *mal-i* is +definite, both meaning 'little'; *vêlik* is –definite, *vélik-i* is +definite, both meaning 'big' (Toporišič 1976: 256;

2000: 320; Herrity 2000: 73–4). The present deduction deals with case (b). For case (a) see deduction 21.

The two syntactic variants: the lexical items 'big' and 'little', and the remaining adjectival lexical items.

1. The assumptions of Naturalness Theory:
1.1. >sem (+definite OR –definite form, +definite AND –definite form) / case in the adjectival declension of Slovenian

I.e., with respect to semantic complexity, a case showing +definite OR –definite form is more natural than a case not distinguishing between +definite and –definite forms.–The scale has the format >sem (A + B, A), see item 4 of deduction 3.
1.2. >sem (more frequent, less frequent) / unit

I.e., with respect to semantic complexity, a more frequent unit is more natural than a less frequent unit (in the spirit of G. Fenk-Oczlon 1991).

A special case of 1.2:
1.2.1. >sem ('big', 'little'; most other adjectival lexical items) / in Slovenian

I.e., with respect to semantic complexity, the lexical items 'big' and 'little' are more natural than most other adjectival lexical items, in Slovenian.

2. The assumptions of the Slovenian Theory, concerning any two syntactic variants:
2.1. >sem tends to associate with another >sem
2.2. <sem tends to associate with another <sem

3. The consequences:

From 1.1, 1.2.1 and 2.1 it can be deduced:
3.1. If there is any difference, within the adjectival declension, between the lexical items 'big' and 'little' on the one side, and the remaining adjectival lexical items on the other, such that the formal difference between +/–definite is or is not expressed, it is the lexical items 'big' and 'little' that tend to show the formal distinction between +/–definite. Q.E.D.

From 1.1, 1.2.1 and 2.2 it can be deduced:
3.2. If there is any difference, within the adjectival declension, between the lexical items 'big' and 'little' on the one side, and the remaining adjectival lexical items on the other, such that the formal difference between +/–definite is or is not expressed, it is the remaining adjectival lexical items that tend to lack the formal distinction between +/–definnite. Q.E.D.

4. Note to item 3.2. The "remaining" adjectival lexical items do show the formal distinction +/–definite in the nominative singular masculine. See deduction 21.

23. Slovenian, non-standard. The definite article takes the form of the prefix *ta-* affixed to any adjectival in the noun phrase, e.g., *ta-zelena obleka* 'the green dress/suit'. Bare head nouns cannot take this prefix, and do not express the definiteness at all, e.g., *obleka* 'dress/suit (+/–def.)' (my observations; cf. Herrity 2000: 76–7).

The two syntactic variants: the type *ta-zelena obleka* (article+adjective + head noun, +definite) and the type *obleka* (bare head noun, +definite).

1. The assumptions of Naturalness Theory:
1.1. >sym (more transparent, less transparent) / syntactic unit

I.e., with respect to encoding, a syntactic unit of greater syntactic transparency is more natural than a corresponding syntactic unit of lesser syntactic transparency (Mayerthaler 1981: 35; Mayerthaler et al. 1998: 186; on the notion of transparency see Mayerthaler 1987: 49).

Two special cases of 1.1:

1.1.1. >sym (prefix, 0) / the definite article in non-standard Slovenian

I.e., with respect to encoding, a prefix is more natural than 0, as the definite article of non-standard Slovenian.

1.1.2. >sym (the type *ta-zelena obleka*, the type *obleka*) / in non-standard Slovenian

I.e., with respect to encoding, the type *ta-zelena obleka* is more natural than the type *obleka*, in non-standard Slovenian.

2. The assumptions of the Slovenian Theory, concerning any two syntactic variants:

2.1. >sym tends to associate with another >sym

2.2. <sym tends to associate with another <sym

3. The consequences:

From 1.1.1–2 and 2.1 it can be deduced:

3.1. If there is any difference between adjective + noun (def.) and the bare noun (def.), such that definiteness is expressed with the prefix *ta-* in one case, and not expressed in the other, it is adjective + noun (def.) that tends to take the prefix *ta-*. Q.E.D.

From 1.1.1–2 and 2.2 it can be deduced:

3.2. If there is any difference between adjective + noun (def.) and the bare noun (def.), such that definiteness is expressed with the prefix *ta-* in one case, and not expressed in the other, it is the bare noun (def.) that tends not to express definiteness. Q.E.D.

24. Slovenian. In the construction type *Plečnikova hiša mojega očeta* '[architect] Plečnik's house of my father's', the possessive adjective *Plečnikov* 'of [architect] Plečnik' is characterizing, whereas the genitive *mojega očeta* 'of my father' is identifying.

The two syntactic variants: the possessive adjective and the genitive in the construction type *Plečnikova hiša mojega očeta*.

1. The assumptions of Naturalness Theory:

1.1. >sem (characterizing, identifying) / attribution

I.e., with respect to semantic complexity, characterizing attribution is more natural than identifying attribution (in the spirit of Mayerthaler et al. 1998: 197).

1.2. >sym (more transparent, less transparent) / syntactic unit

I.e., with respect to encoding, a syntactic unit of greater syntactic transparency is more natural than a corresponding syntactic unit of lesser syntactic transparency (Mayerthaler 1981: 35; Mayerthaler et al. 1998: 186; on the notion of transparency see Mayerthaler 1987: 49).

A special case of 1.1:

1.2.1. >sym (the genitive, the possessive adjective) / in Slovenian

I.e., with respect to encoding, the genitive is more natural than the possessive adjective, in Slovenian.–The syntactic potential of the genitive is significantly greater than the syntactic potential of the possessive adjective.

2. The assumptions of the Slovenian Theory, concerning any two syntactic variants:
2.1. >sym tends to associate with <sem
2.2. <sym tends to associate with >sem

3. The consequences:

From 1.1, 1.2 and 2.1 it can be deduced:

3.1. If there is any difference between the possessive adjective and the genitive in the construction type *Plečnikova hiša mojega očeta*, such that one of these modifying elements characterizes, and the other identifies, then it is the genitive that tends to have the identifying function. Q.E.D.

From 1.1, 1.2 and 2.2 it can be deduced:

3.2. If there is any difference between the possessive adjective and the genitive in the construction type *Plečnikova hiša mojega očeta*, such that one of these modifying elements characterizes, and the other identifies, then it is the possessive adjective that tends to have the characterizing function. Q.E.D.

25. Slovenian. Genitivus subiectivus tends to be expressed with a possessive adjective, morphology permitting, e.g., *profesorjevo občudovanje* 'the professor's admiration' (scil. 'the professor admires'). Genitivus obiectivus tends to be expressed with the genitive case, e.g., *občudovanje profesorja* 'the admiration of the professor' (scil. 'one admires the professor').

The two syntactic variants: genitivus subiectivus, and genitivus obiectivus.

1. The assumptions of Naturalness Theory:
1.1. >sym (more transparent, less transparent) / syntactic unit

I.e., with respect to encoding, a syntactic unit of greater syntactic transparency is more natural than a corresponding syntactic unit of lesser syntactic transparency (Mayerthaler 1981: 35; Mayerthaler et al. 1998: 186; on the notion of transparency see Mayerthaler 1987: 49).

A special case of 1.1:
1.1.1. >sym (genitive, possessive adjective) / in Slovenian

I.e., with respect to encoding, the genitive is more natural than the possessive adjective, in Slovenian.–The syntactic potential of the genitive is significantly greater than the syntactic potential of the possessive adjective.
1.2. >sem (subject, object) / in nom.-acc. languages

I.e., with respect to semantic complexity, the subject is more natural than the object, in nominative-accusative languages.–This follows from the basic properties of nominative-accusative languages (Mayerthaler 1981: 14).

2. The assumptions of the Slovenian Theory, concerning any two syntactic variants:
2.1. >sym tends to associate with <sem
2.2. <sym tends to associate with >sem

3. The consequences:

From 1.1.1, 1.2 and 2.1 it can be deduced:

3.1. If there is any difference between the genitivus subiectivus and the genitivus obiectivus, such that one of them is expressed with the possessive adjective (morphology permitting), and the other is expressed with the genitive, it is the genitivus obiectivus that tends to be expressed with the genitive. Q.E.D.

From 1.1.1, 1.2 and 2.2 it can be deduced:

3.2. If there is any difference between the genitivus subiectivus and the genitivus obiectivus, such that one of them is expressed with the possessive adjective, and the other is expressed with the genitive, it is the genitivus subiectivus that tends to be expressed with the possessive adjective, morphology permitting. Q.E.D.

26. Slovenian. The direct object mostly takes the accusative, e.g., *žela je pšenico* 'she was cutting the wheat'. In obsolete use, the direct object takes the genitive in infinite clauses of purpose (containing the so-called supine), e.g., *šla je pšenice žet* 'she went to cut the wheat' (Toporišič 1976: 204, 293, 338; 2000: 269, 402).

The two syntactic variants: the type *žela je pšenico*, and the obsolete type *šla je pšenice žet*.

1. The assumptions of Naturalness Theory:

1.1. >sem (+finite, –finite) clause

I.e with respect to semantic complexity, the finite clause is more natural than the infinite clause (Mayerthaler et al. 1998: 325).

1.2. >sem (accusative, genitive) / in Slovenian

I.e., with respect to semantic complexity, the accusative is more natural than the genitive, in Slovenian (which is a nominative-accusative language) (Mayerthaler et al. 1998: 167).

2. The assumptions of the Slovenian Theory, concerning any two syntactic variants:

2.1. >sem tends to associate with another >sem

2.2. <sem tends to associate with another <sem

3. The consequences:

From 1.1, 1.2 and 2.1 it can be deduced:

3.1. If there is any difference between the direct object in finite clauses and infinite clauses of purpose, such that the direct object takes the accusative in one clause type, and the genitive in the other, it is the direct object of the finite clause that tends to take the accusative. Q.E.D.

From 1.1, 1.2 and 2.2 it can be deduced:

3.2. If there is any difference between the direct object in finite clauses and infinite clauses of purpose, such that the direct object takes the accusative in one clause type, and the genitive in the other, it is the direct object of the infinite clause of purpose that tends to take the genitive. Q.E.D.

27. Slovenian. Men's surnames are mostly inflected, whereas women's surnames are mostly uninflected (Toporišič 1976: 219, 231; 2000: 296, 560; Herrity 2000: 33). E.g., *Jože Toporišič*, genitive *Jožeta Toporišiča*; *Breda Pogorelec*, genitive *Brede Pogorelec*.

The two syntactic variants: man's surname, and woman's surname.

1. The assumptions of Naturalness Theory:

1.1. >sym (+[one meaning–one form], –[one meaning–one form])

I.e., with respect to encoding, "one meaning–one form" is more natural than non-adherence to that principle (Mayerthaler 1981: 34; 1987: 49).

A special case of 1.1:

1.1.1. >sym (–inflected, +inflected) / surname in Slovenian

I.e with respect to encoding, an uninflected surname is more natural than an inflected surname, in Slovenian.

1.2. >sem (masculine, feminine)

I.e., with respect to semantic complexity, masculine is more natural than feminine (Mayerthaler 1981: 15).

2. The assumptions of the Slovenian Theory, concerning any two syntactic variants:

2.1. >sym tends to associate with <sem

2.2. <sym tends to associate with >sem

3. The consequences:

From 1.1.1, 1.2 and 2.1 it can be deduced:

3.1. If there is any difference between men's surnames and women's surnames, such that one kind is inflected and the other not, it is women's surnames that tend not to be inflected. Q.E.D.

From 1.1.1, 1.2 and 2.2 it can be deduced:

3.2. If there is any difference between men's surnames and women's surnames, such that one kind is inflected and the other not, it is men's surnames that tend to be inflected. Q.E.D.

28. Slovenian. The Slovenian geographical regions often have names ending in *-sko* and *-ska*, e.g., *Gorenjsko, Gorenjska* 'Upper Carniola'. The name in *-sko* tends to be used with spatial reading, e.g., *na Gorenjskem* 'in Upper Carniola', as against *Gorenjska je lepa* 'Upper Carniola is beautiful' (Toporišič 1976: 236; 2000: 301; Herrity 2000: 62).

The two syntactic variants: the type *Gorenjsko*, and the type *Gorenjska*.

1. The assumptions of Naturalness Theory:

1.1. >sem (the type *Gorenjsko*, the type *Gorenjska*)

I.e., with respect to semantic complexity, the type *Gorenjsko* is more natural than the type *Gorenjska*.–The type *Gorenjsko* is the older of the two. The speakers are aware of this on the basis of the fact that the nominative *Gorenjsko* is obsolescent or obsolete.

1.2. >sem (spatial reading, other reading) / of place names

I.e., with respect to semantic complexity, the spatial reading of a place name is more natural than any other reading of that place name (Hock 1991: 233).

2. The assumptions of the Slovenian Theory, concerning any two syntactic variants:

2.1. >sem tends to associate with another >sem

2.2. <sem tends to associate with another <sem

3. The consequences:

From 1.1, 1.2 and 2.1 it can be deduced:

3.1. If there is any difference between the region names in *-sko* and in *-ska*, such that one tends to be used with spatial reading, and the other not, it is the type *Gorenjsko* that tends to be used with spatial reading. Q.E.D.

From 1.1, 1.2 and 2.2 it can be deduced:

3.2. If there is any difference between the region names in *-sko* and in *-ska*, such that one tends to be used with spatial reading, and the other not, it is the type *Gorenjska* that tends not to be used with spatial reading. Q.E.D.

References

Biber, Douglas, Stig Johansson, Geoffrey Leech, Susan Conrad, and Edward Finegan. 1999. *Longman grammar of spoken and written English*. London: Longman.

Brandenstein, Wilhelm. 1966. *Griechische Sprachwissenschaft. III. Syntax I*. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Corbett, Greville G. 1999. "Agreement," 12–8. In: Keith Brown and Jim Miller, eds., *Concise encyclopedia of grammatical categories*. Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Dotter, Franz. 1990. *Nichtarbitrarität und Ikonizität in der Syntax*. Hamburg: Buske.

Dressler, Wolfgang U., Willi Mayerthaler, Oswald Panagl, and Wolfgang U. Wurzel. 1987. *Leitmotifs in natural morphology*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Dressler, Wolfgang U. 2000. "Naturalness," 288–96. In: Geert Booij, Christian Lehmann, and Joachim Mugdan, eds., *Morphologie: Ein internationales Handbuch zur Flexion und Wortbildung*. Volume I. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Fenk-Oczlon, Gertraud. 1991. "Frequenz und Kognition – Frequenz und Markiertheit," *Folia Linguistica* 25: 361–94.

Herrity, Peter. 2000. *Slovene: A comprehensive grammar*. London: Routledge.

Hock, Hans Henrich. 1991. *Principles of historical linguistics*. Second edition. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Jakobson, Roman. 1932. "Zur Struktur des russischen Verbums," 74–84. In: *Charisteria Gvilelmo Mathesio qvinqvagenario a discipvlis et Circvli lingvistici pragensis sodalibvs oblata*. Prague: Pražský lingvistický kroužek.

Li, Charles N. 1986. "Direct and indirect speech: A functional study," 29–45. In: Florian Coulmas, ed., *Direct and indirect speech*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Lyons, Christopher. 1999. *Definiteness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mayerthaler, Willi. 1981. *Morphologische Natürlichkeit*. Wiesbaden: Athenaion.–English version: Mayerthaler 1988.

Mayerthaler, Willi. 1987. "System-independent morphological naturalness," 25–58. In: Wolfgang U. Dressler, Willi Mayerthaler, Oswald Panagl, and Wolfgang U. Wurzel, *Leitmotifs in natural morphology*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Mayerthaler, Willi. 1988. *Morphological naturalness*. Ann Arbor: Karoma.

Mayerthaler, Willi, and Günther Fliedl. 1993. "Natürlichkeitstheoretische Syntax," 610–35. In: Joachim Jacobs, Armin von Stechow, Wolfgang Sternefeld, and Theo Vennemann, eds., *Syntax*. Volume I. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Mayerthaler, Willi, Günther Fliedl, and Christian Winkler. 1993. *Infinitivprominenz in europäischen Sprachen*. Teil I: Die Romania (samt Baskisch). Tübingen: Narr.

Mayerthaler, Willi, Günther Fliedl, and Christian Winkler. 1995. *Infinitivprominenz in europäischen Sprachen*. Teil II: Der Alpen-Adria-Raum als Schnittstelle von Germanisch, Romanisch und Slawisch. Tübingen: Narr.

Mayerthaler, Willi, Günther Fliedl, and Christian Winkler. 1998. *Lexikon der natürlichkeitstheoretischen Syntax und Morphosyntax*. Tübingen: Stauffenburg.

Milojević-Sheppard, Milena, and Marija Golden. 2000. "Imperatives, negation and clitics in Slovene," 93–109. In: Jože Toporišič, ed., *Razprave drugega razreda SAZU XVII*. Ljubljana: Slovenska akademija znanosti in umetnosti.

Orešnik, Janez. 1999. "Naturalness: The English *s*-genitive and *of*-phrase," *Studia anglica posnaniensia* 34: 191–200.

Orešnik, Janez. 2000. "Naturalness: The preterite and present perfect tenses in German," 21–43. In: Irena Kovačič, Milena Milojević-Sheppard, Silvana Orel-Kos, and Janez Orešnik, eds., *Linguistics and language studies: Exploring language from different perspectives*. Ljubljana: Filozofska fakulteta.

Perlmutter, David M., and Janez Orešnik. 1973. "Language particular rules and explanation in syntax," 419–59. In: Stephen R. Anderson and Paul Kiparsky, eds., *A Festschrift for Morris Halle*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Toporišič, Jože. 1976. *Slovenska slovnica*. Maribor: Obzorja.

Toporišič, Jože. 2000. *Slovenska slovnica*. Fourth (revised and augmented) edition. Maribor: Obzorja.

Stolz, Thomas. 1992. *Sekundäre Flexionsbildung. Eine Polemik zur Zielgerichtetheit im Sprachwandel*. Two volumes. Bochum: Brockmeyer.

Wurzel, Wolfgang Ullrich. 1984. *Flexionsmorphologie und Natürlichkeit*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.

Prispelo januarja 2001, sprejeto februarja 2001
Received January 2001, accepted February 2001

Jezikovna naravnost – nekaj (obliko)skladenjskih zgledov iz slovenščine

V slovenski izvedbi teorije o jezikovni naravnosti se obravnavajo naslednji večinoma (obliko)skladenjski pojavi slovenščine (številke se nanašajo na t. i. izpeljave v glavnem besedilu):

2. Tip *Brežice so bile mesto* nasproti tipu *to mesto so bile Brežice*. 3. Glagolski vid v trdilnem in zanikanem velelniku. 4. Neformalno in manj neformalno ogovarjanje edninskega sogovornika. 5. Formalno in manj formalno ogovarjanje edninskega sogovornika. 6. Umik levega pridevniškega prilastka desno od jedra samostalniške zveze. 7. Nevelelniške povedi kot čustveno poudarjeni različki velelnika. 8. Pogojnik izražen z velelniškim stavkom. 9. Raba trdilnega velelnika, podprtega s primernimi členki, namesto zanikanega velelnika. 10–11. Tožilnik v obliki soodnosnega rodilnika, če je neživo jedro ob pridevniški besedi izpuščeno, npr. *hočem belega* (namreč bel avto). 12. Poudarjanje zunaj- in znotrajstavčne nikalnice. 13. Stavčna nikalnica + osebna in neosebna glagolska oblika. 14. Povedkovo določilo povratnih srednjiških glagolov v imenovalniku in tožilniku. 15. Določna oblika pridevnika v zvalniku.

16–7. Nezaimenski osebki ob glagolskih obliki v netretji osebi, npr. *študentje garate*. 18–9. Zaimkovno izražena svojina, odtujljiva in neodtujljiva. 20. Glavni argumenti glagola in samostalnika. 21–2. Določna in nedoločna oblika pridevnika. 23. Določni člen *ta-*. 24. Opisovalni in določevalni svojilni pridevniki. 25. Osebkov rodilnik nasproti predmetnemu. 26. Premi predmet v nedoločniških polstavkih namere. 27. Sklanjanje moških in ženskih priimkov. 28. Slovenska pokrajinska imena na *-sko* in *-ska*, npr. *Gorenjsko*, *Gorenjska*.

Naturalness: Some Slovenian (Morpho)syntactic Examples

Within Naturalness Theory as practised in the local work, the following mostly (morpho)syntactic phenomena of Slovenian are considered (the numbering refers to the so-called deductions in the main text):

2. The type *Brežice so bile mesto* 'Brežice was a town', as against *to mesto so bile Brežice* 'this town was Brežice'. 3. The verbal aspect in the affirmative and the negative imperative. 4. Informal and less informal addressing of one person. 5. Formal and less formal addressing of one person. 6. The displacement of the adjective modifier to the right of the head. 7. Non-imperative sentences as expressive variants of the imperative. 8. The conditional expressed with an imperative clause. 9. The use of the affirmative imperative supported with suitable particles instead of the negated imperative. 10–11. The accusative in the form of the corresponding genitive if the inanimate noun head of the adjectival is ellipted, e.g., *hočem belega* 'I want the white one (scil. the white car)'. 12. The emphasis of intra- and extra-clausal sentence negation. 13. The sentence negation + the finite and infinite verb. 14. The subject complement of middle-voice reflexive verbs in the nominative and in the accusative. 15. The definite form of the adjective in vocatives. 16–7. Full noun phrase subjects with verbs in the non-third verbal person, e.g., *študentje garate* 'you students work hard'. 18–9. Pronominal possession, alienable and inalienable. 20. The main arguments of the verb and of the noun. 21–2. Definite and indefinite adjective forms. 23. The definite article *ta-*. 24. Characterizing and identifying possessive adjectives. 25. Genitivus subiectivus v. genitivus obiectivus. 26. The direct object in infinite clauses of purpose. 27. Inflection of men's and women's surnames. 28. Slovenian geographical regions whose names end in *-sko* and *-ska*, e.g., *Gorenjsko*, *Gorenjska* 'Upper Carniola'.