

*Balkanologie – Beiträge zur Sprach- und Kulturwissenschaft*

*Bd. 3*

Thede Kahl, Michael Metzeltin, Helmut Schaller (Hg.)

Balkanismen  
heute –  
Balkanisms  
Today –  
Балканизмы  
сегодня



LIT

# BALKANOLOGIE

Beiträge zur

Sprach- und Kulturwissenschaft

herausgegeben von

Thede Kahl, Michael Metzeltin,  
Gabiella Schubert und Christian Voss

Band 3

Thede Kahl, Michael Metzeltin,  
Helmut Schaller (Hg.)

Balkanismen heute –  
Balkanisms Today –  
Балканизмы сегодня

## Contents / Inhalt / Содержание

Vorwort .....	1
<b>I Geschichte und Zukunft eines Konstrukts</b>	
Helmuth W. SCHALLER Balkanismen in Vergangenheit und Gegenwart – Theorie und Wirklichkeit...	5
Татьяна В. ЦИВЬЯН Языковые союзы и балканизмы сегодня: вспомяная Н. С. Грушецкого ...	13
Olga M. MLADENOVA Balkanisms in the Context of the Markedness Theory of Linguistic Change ..	21
Victor A. FRIEDMAN Conjunction Calquing – A Heartland Balkanism .....	31
Ronelle ALEXANDER Convergence and Causation in Balkan Slavic .....	39
Uwe HINRICHS Die Balkanismen in geolinguistischer Sicht. Ein erster Schritt .....	47
Jürgen KRISTOPHSON Können linguistische Ordnungsversuche, beispielsweise Balkansprachen, auf ewig gültig bleiben? .....	65
Klaus STEINKE Welche Zukunft hat der Balkansprachbund? .....	75
<b>II Gesamtbalkanische Fallstudien</b>	
Thede KAHL, Michael METZELTIN Die Herausbildung der Wortklassenterminologie in den Balkansprachen .....	81
Irena SAWICKA The Phonetics of the Balkans .....	105

Umschlagbild:  
Dreidimensionale Getränkewerbung vor der Altstadtkulisse  
von Berat (Albanien).

Foto: Thede Kahl, September 2009



Gedruckt auf alterungsbeständigem Werkdruckpapier entsprechend

ANSI Z3948 DIN ISO 9706

### Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der  
Deutschen Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind  
im Internet über <http://dnb.d-nb.de> abrufbar.

ISBN 978-3-643-50388-6

© LIT VERLAG GmbH & Co. KG

Wien 2012

Krotenthallengasse 10/8

A-1080 Wien

Tel. +43 (0) 1-409 56 61

Fax +43 (0) 1-409 56 97

e-Mail: [wien@lit-verlag.at](mailto:wien@lit-verlag.at)

<http://www.lit-verlag.at>

LIT VERLAG Dr. W. Hopf

Berlin 2012

Verlagskontakt:

Fresenstr. 2

D-48159 Münster

Tel. +49 (0) 2 51-620 320

Fax +49 (0) 2 51-23 19 72

e-Mail: [lit@lit-verlag.de](mailto:lit@lit-verlag.de)

<http://www.lit-verlag.de>

### Auslieferung:

Deutschland: LIT Verlag Fresenstr. 2, D-48159 Münster

Tel. +49 (0) 2 51-620 32 22, Fax +49 (0) 2 51-922 60 99, e-Mail: [vertrieb@lit-verlag.de](mailto:vertrieb@lit-verlag.de)

Österreich: Medienlogistik Pichler-ÖBZ, e-Mail: [mlo@medien-logistik.at](mailto:mlo@medien-logistik.at)

Schweiz: B + M Buch- und Medienvertrieb, e-Mail: [order@buch-medien.ch](mailto:order@buch-medien.ch)

Илиана КРАРОВА	113
On the Syntax of Possession in the Balkan Languages: the Elusive Nature of the External Possessive Construction .....	
Doris K. KYRIAZIS	137
Aspects of Inter-Linguistic Iosemy in the Pastoral Terminology of the Pindos Mountain Region .....	
Corinna LESCHNER	151
Kreativität sprachlicher Mittel im Balkanraum .....	
Анастасия ПЕТРОВА	171
Балканская фразеология – в поисках исследовательского подхода .....	
<b>III Einzelsprachliche Vergleiche</b>	
Claudia RÖMER	185
On Some Peculiar Datives in Colloquial Middle Ottoman Texts .....	
Gerhard NEWEKLOWSKY	195
Greek and Turkish Influence upon the Balkan Slavic Verb .....	
Mariana BARA	209
Balkanisms in Aromunian today: A View of the Core Vocabulary .....	
Adrian PORUCIUC	221
A new View on the Latin Origin of Romanian ( <i>fşat</i> 'village', Aromanian <i>fşat</i> 'ditch' and Albanian <i>fshat</i> 'village' .....	
Elton PRIFTI	245
Aromanian Elements of an Albanian <i>argot</i> .....	
Marjan MARKOVIKJ	265
Formal and Semantic Analysis of the Compound Past Tenses in the Macedonian and Aromanian Dialects of the Ohrid Region .....	
Ina ARAPI, Petrea LINDENBAUER	275
Die Gestaltung des Direkten Objekts im albanisch-rumänisch-spanischen Vergleich .....	
Ingmar SÖHRMAN	299
Balkanisms in Modern Romanian .....	
Христина МАРКУ	307
К вопросу о структурно-семантической специфике „съм/сѣца“ фразеологических конструкций в болгарском и новогреческом языках ..	

Илиана ДИМИТРОВА-ТОДОРОВА	32
Функционирование греческой лексемы <i>факел</i> в болгарском языке (семантический, словообразовательный и фонетический анализ) .....	
Todor At. TODOROV	32
Zur Etymologie der bulgarischen Wörter <i>дъждѝжи-бѝджѝ</i> , <i>керѝда</i> , <i>корѝлѝж</i> und der griechischen <i>κοκάρѝ</i> , <i>κοκѝарѝ</i> , <i>κοκѝάρ</i> .....	
Петя АСЕНОВА	33
О статусе общих особенностей двух балканских языков – балканизмы они или нет? .....	
Krasimira KOLEVA	34
Balkanisms today: The Dialect of Župa (Kosovo) .....	
Xhelal YLLI	35
Balkanisms in den Mundarten der Slavophonen Albanien .....	
Emilija MANČIĆ	36
Sprache und Legitimierung nationaler Ziele: Kulturwissenschaftliche Analyse zu einem ambivalenten Verhältnis .....	
List of authors / Autorenverzeichnis / Список авторов .....	

# On the Syntax of Possession in the Balkan Languages: the Elusive Nature of the External Possessive Construction

Iliana KRAPOVA (Venice)

## 0. Introduction

As observed by ASSENOVA (2001), Balkan languages feature four types of possessive expressions, exploiting the intricate connection between the grammatical category of definiteness and the semantic category of possession, in particular the notion of inalienable possession. In this paper, I will be concerned with what Assenova labels “Preverbal Dative + Definite article” (Strategy B. below), a construction which is also referred to as “external possession” (EP). It is often pointed out in the literature that EP has a special status in the typology of possessive constructions since the possessor argument (a true dative argument or a dative clitic, as is the case with some of the Balkan languages) forms a syntactic complex with the sentential predicate, as opposed to the more “logical” strategy A., where the possessive pronoun or clitic stands next to the noun expressing the possessum.

A. [Noun Phrase + D(efinite) A(rticle)] + possessive pronoun (tonic or clitic): all Balkan languages

a. possessive adjectives: *cartea mea, moja(ta) kniga* ‘my book’;

b. possessive pronouns: *prietenul lui* ‘his friend’, *libri i tij* ‘his book’

c. personal clitic pronouns in Genitive/Dative Case: *cartea-mi, knigata mi* ‘my book’, *to skilf mu* ‘my dog’.

(1a) [Chipu-i luminos] *domina multimea* (AVRAM/COENE 2000: 12)

(1b) [Svetloto í litse] *izpákvaše sred tálpata*. ‘Her bright face dominated the crowd’

(1c) *Patisa kata laθος [to poði tu]*. ‘I stepped on his foot by mistake’ (MG, Kupa 2008: 145)

B. Preverbal Dative + [Noun Phrase + Definite Article] = Possessive Clitic Construction: all Balkan languages

(2a) *I-am zárit chipul ín multíme*. (Romanian, AVRAM 2000: 11)

(2b) *Az í zabeljazax litseto sred tálpata*. (Bulgarian) ‘I spotted her face in the crowd’

(2c) *Tu patisa kata laθος to poði*. (MG) ‘I stepped on his foot by mistake’

(2d) *I pashë fytyrën në pasgyrë*. (Albanian, G. Turano, p.c.) ‘I spotted her face in the mirror’

C. Noun Phrase + Definite Article (inalienable possession): all Balkan languages

- (3) *a coborî ochii* ('to lower one's eyes'), *a mişca mâna* ('to move one's hand')  
*ngre dorën* 'I raise the hand'; *slagam pod glavata, vë poshië kokës* 'I put  
 (something) under the/[my] head'

D. Noun Phrase +  $\emptyset_{\text{article}}$  (Bulgarian only)

- (4) *zatvarjam oči* 'close (my) eyes'; *vdigam rāka* 'raise (my) hand'

The Balkan EP has not been studied extensively from a typological perspective, although several studies have dealt with language-specific issues of its distribution, special semantics and syntactic properties (STATEVA 2002 for Bulgarian, SVESNIKOVA 1986: 202, DINDELEGAN 1994: 129–131, AVRAM/COENE 2000: 2008 for Romanian). A major concern in the syntactic literature has been to account for the presence of the Dative clitic, which is apparently unselected by the predicate (and hence, extra-thematic), yet occupies the same position as that of the indirect object clitic in (non-possessive) clauses encoding the thematic roles of recipient, target or goal typically associated with the Dative. As illustrated by the Romanian examples in (5), the possessive and the indirect object clitic obey the same ordering constraints with respect to negation, auxiliaries, and the main verb. Moreover, both share the same morphosyntactic and phonological dependency, i.e., as enclitic or proclitic to the verb, according to language specific structural requirements:

- (5a) *Eu nu-i (nu îi) dădusem cheile*. 'I did not give him/her the keys'  
 (5b) *Eu nu-i (nu îi) găsisem pālăria*. 'I did not find his/her hat'

Given that at least the Balkan languages to be considered here (Bulgarian, Romanian and Modern Greek) also dispose of noun phrase internal dative/genitive clitics (strategy A(c))<sup>1</sup>, some syntacticians (notably STATEVA 2002, AVRAM/COENE 2000) have proposed to view EP as a derivative pattern. More precisely, the possessive clitic has its source within the noun phrase, to which it is semantically linked, but can sometimes "raise" to the clausal Dative position reserved otherwise for the indirect object clitic, as in (6):

XP  $CL_{\text{possessor}}$  (Aux) V [noun phrase+Definite article  $CL_{\text{possessor}}$ ]

- 1 I abstract away from issues of frequency and style. In Romanian, internal possession is very rarely used, "being felt as outdated, formal and poetic" (AVRAM/COENE 2000: 158), and has been almost entirely (with the exception of the singular paradigm, in particular 3<sup>rd</sup> person) replaced by the EP construction regardless of register and stylistic marking (*Grammatica Academiei* 1966, CORNILESCU 1995, PANICHEVA 2004: 187). Bulgarian grammars have hardly discussed external possession (cf. for a brief mention NITSOLOVA 1986: 2008: 165), although it is the norm in both educated and colloquial speech. A first look at Greek grammars uncovers few examples, cf. HOLTON et al. (1997: 194) who refer to these clitics as benefactive and malefactive genitives.

- (6a) *Az vidjax litseto í* 'I saw her face'

- (6b) *Az í vidjax litseto í*

Apparent evidence for such an approach comes from the ungrammaticality of examples like (7), where the external and the internal possessor position are simultaneously filled by the same clitic.<sup>2</sup>

- (7) \**Az í zāmax litseto í v tālmeta*.

\*I-am zārit chipu-i în mulțime. 'I her-DAT spotted her face in the crowd'

Although the "possessive raising" approach became quite popular in accounting for a subset of the EP constructions in typologically diverse languages (e.g. Hebrew, LANDAU 1999, Choktaw, DAVIES 1984, BAKER 1988), its predictive power has turned out to be limited. First, many languages instantiate the EP construction but appear to asymmetrically miss its structural correlate – the Internal Possession (IP) construction in (6a). Slavic, Romance, and Germanic have Dative possessive clitics or pronouns but they can appear only externally:

- (8a) On *poceloval ej* ruku. 'He kissed her hand' (Russian, *PODLESSKAYA, RAKHILINA* 1999: 512); *Teklo nam* do kuchyně. 'We had a leak in our kitchen' (Czech, *FRIED* 1999: 479); *Slomila mi* se čaša. 'The glass went and broke on me/My glass broke' (TOMIĆ 2009: 455)

- (8b) On *lui* a coupé les cheveux. 'They cut his/her hair' (French, *KAYNE* 1977: 159); *El gato le* arañó la cara. 'The cat scratched his/her face' (Spanish, *SÁNCHEZ LÓPEZ* 2007: 153); *Gli hanno rotto* la macchina. 'They broke his car' (Italian).

Additionally, even if a certain language has possessive clitics in the nominal domain, it is hardly the case that the two constructions (EP and IP) are syntactically reversible or semantically synonymous so as to justify a free choice Dative placement for this language. The peculiar property of EP resides in the fact that the rela-

- 2 This possibility is available in the languages under study but under precise conditions. Doubly-filled constructions with an external clitic and an internal possessive modifier are considered pleonastic and much less acceptable or completely ungrammatical, as in Bulgarian \**Az í vidjax nejnoto lise* 'I saw her face'. According to AVRAM/COENE (2000) also in Romanian the construction \**I-am zārit chipul său în mulțime* 'I have seen his/her face in the crowd' is ungrammatical, but SVESNIKOVA (1986: 207) gives acceptable examples like *ne regăsim, ne înținem în viața noastră* 'we find each other, we encounter our life'. Nevertheless, she notes that such doubly-filled constructions are special, and require emphasis or focus on the possessor, so they are excluded with body parts or with some other inalienably possessed property of the human being like e.g. *soul, potential, character, life* where possession is taken for granted. For more examples and an analysis cf. CORNILESCU (1991: 64).

tion possessor-possessed seems only implied or in any case subordinate to the more salient “affectedness” interpretation which focuses on the effect or impact (positive or negative) that the circumstances described in the predicate have on the possessor. This pragmatic reading illustrated in (9a) from Bulgarian lacks parallels in the realm of adnominal possession (9b). This is also true of languages which lack internal possession, as in the examples in (8) above:

- (9a) Toj í skša pismoto. lit. ‘He tore off to her the letter’  
 (9b) Toj skša pismoto í ‘He tore off her letter’

In this paper, I want to argue that the apparent complexity of the Balkan EP as it emerges from the three Balkan languages I will consider – Bulgarian, Romanian and Modern Greek (see section 2) – can be dealt with theoretically if what is thought to be a single EP construction is decomposed into two discrete instances, corresponding to a purely possessive (genitive) vs. “affected” (dative of interest) interpretation, the latter only inferentially associated with possession in ways that are familiar from other European languages, e.g. Slavic and Romance. In the last section, it will be suggested that this functional split within EP is a follow-up of the well-known dative-genitive syncretism which has conflated the two morphological forms but has nevertheless retained their distinct underlying case functions.

### 1. EP from a typological perspective

The “affectedness” condition, which HASPELMATH 1999 identifies as one of the two (alongside dative case marking) constraints on the realization of EP in a broader perspective, reduces to two more basic requirements: 1) that the predicate of the construction bear a benefactive or a malefactive meaning, and 2) that there be a strict semantic relationship between possessor and possessed. The combined effect of these two requirements explains the strong cross-linguistic tendency, especially among the European languages, for marking humans as possessors and inalienably possessed items as possessives, in particular body parts as they represent the prototypical member of what BALLY 1926/1996 has identified as the human “personal sphere” (cf. also WIERZBICKA 1988). The implicational nature of this tendency arises from a purely pragmatic consideration: affecting some inalienably possessed item implies affecting its possessor as well. According to BYBEE (1988), cited in an article by Kate BURRIDGE<sup>3</sup>, this implicit sense of possession (inferred meaning) may become actual meaning by way of a semantic transfer and can thus be seen as the crucial factor for the grammaticalization of possessivity.

Deviations from the prototypical schema may result in a different strength of the affectedness condition. Apart from variation in terms of inalienability, purely structural parameters may also affect the syntax of the construction, with reference

3 See [www.latrobe.edu.au/linguistics/latrobepapers/linguistics/.../03burridge.pdf](http://www.latrobe.edu.au/linguistics/latrobepapers/linguistics/.../03burridge.pdf).

to the type of predicates selected as affecting in each particular language. To capture cross-linguistic variation, and the relative accessibility of the various grammatical elements for EP encoding, several implicational hierarchies have been proposed:

- (10a) The Animacy Hierarchy (KÖNIG/HASPELMATH 1997: 7.1)  
 1<sup>st</sup>/2<sup>nd</sup> p. pronoun  $\subset$  3<sup>rd</sup> p. pronoun  $\subset$  proper name  $\subset$  other animate  $\subset$  inanimate
- (10b) The Possessive Hierarchy (FRIED 1999: 477)  
 Body part  $>$  kinship relations  $>$  close alienable entities  $>$  distant alienable entities
- (10c) The Situation Hierarchy (KÖNIG/HASPELMATH 1997: 6)  
 Patient-affecting  $\subset$  dynamic non-affecting  $\subset$  stative (KÖNIG/HASPELMATH 1997)
- (10d) The Syntactic Relation Hierarchy (KÖNIG/HASPELMATH 1997: 2.6)  
 PP  $\subset$  direct object  $\subset$  unaccusative subjects  $\subset$  unergative subjects  $\subset$  transitive subjects

Languages may choose to grammaticalize different cut-off points of these four universal hierarchies but the conclusion of HASPELMATH (1999) strongly suggests that EP constructions are favored cross-linguistically if they are relatively high on all of the hierarchies. In particular, European languages restrict EP to a) animate possessors (as well as the positions above “other animate” on the Animacy hierarchy, especially 1<sup>st</sup> person); b) affecting verbs denoting an event, i.e. dynamic (typically transitive) but not stative predicates (on the Situation Hierarchy); c) syntactic functions that can express the affected semantic roles of patient, theme or goal, i.e. prepositional phrases, direct objects, and (to a much less extent) unaccusative subjects (on the Syntactic Relations Hierarchy). As confirmed by a number of studies (FRIED 1999 for Czech, PODLESKAYA/RAKHILINA 1999 for Russian, ŠARIĆ 2002 for Slavic, LAMIROY 2003, SÁNCHEZ LÓPEZ for Romance, GUERÓN 1985 for French), the common tendencies have led typologists to think that there is just one homogeneous construction, which HASPELMATH 1999 calls “the European proto-type” given that “variation in Europe is not particularly great” (p. 113).<sup>4</sup>

4 The only more significant locus of variation seems to be the Inalienability Hierarchy but it is known since BALLY 1926/1996 that this very notion is flexible and membership in the personal sphere often depends on cultural, pragmatic and contextual factors that may be predominant in one language or another. Apart from body parts, also kinship terms, clothes, picture nouns and even familiar objects such as *home*, *car* etc. are also be available for EP construal (these are the extended inalienables of VERGNAUD and ZUBI-ZARRETA 1992, cf. also CHAPPELL and MCGREGOR 1996: 8). Some European languages tend to be stricter than others. For example, French admits only body parts while the

## 2. The Balkan EP construction

In this section, I want to show that at first glance, Balkan EP strongly deviates from the European prototype in that as has already emerged from previous studies (CRISTEA 1974, ŠVEŠNIKOVA 1986, CORNILESCU 1991, MANOLIU-MANEA 1996, NICULESCU 2008 for Romanian, STATEVA 2002 for Bulgarian), there are practically no restrictions relevant to

- a) the reference of the possessor (human or non-human);
- b) the type of possessive relation (inalienable or alienable);
- c) the type of syntactic function that the possessum can fulfill;
- d) the type of verb that can enter the configuration (affecting or not).

The three Balkan languages under study will be shown to pattern alike with respect to the first three points, and to diverge with respect to d) in that only Modern Greek obeys the “affectedness” constraint regarding choice of predicate type, a feature which will be attributed to the fact that this language instantiates just one of the two constructions which I am going to posit for the other two languages.

Starting with animacy effects, the most significant property of Balkan EP is that the external possessive clitic need not refer to a human possessor; in fact, it can pick up any of the reference points on the Animacy hierarchy in (10a). In particular, as illustrated by the examples in (11), objects typically belonging to the human “personal sphere”, but not exclusively so<sup>5</sup>, can be viewed as inanimate possessors with respect to their constituent parts, basic functions or properties:<sup>6</sup>

rest of Romance seems to extend the construction also to kinship terms and to extended inalienables. See the following examples from French (i) vs. Italian (ii):

- (i) a. Il me prend le bras. ‘He grabs my arm’ (LAMIROY 2003: 259)  
On lui a coupé les cheveux. ‘They cut his/her hair’ (KAYNE 1977: 159)
- (ii) a. Mi ha preso la mano. ‘He grabbed my hand’  
b. Gli hanno rotto la macchina. ‘They broke his car’

Slavic languages too, judging from data presented in ŠARIĆ 2002, as well as in FRIED 1999 for Czech, occasionally extend EP to kinship terms, garments, familiar objects of possession.

5 This seems to be particularly true for Romanian where the reflexive dative construction can express the same possessive relations as the personal dative clitic, cf. e.g. (i):

- (i) Soarele își trimețea razele. (Murd 159) ‘The sun was pouring its rays’  
Cântecul și-a repetat vraja. ‘The song repeated its charm’ (ŠVEŠNIKOVA 1986: 202)

6 Often, as in (11) in the text, the inanimate possessor is represented by a full dative noun phrase (a prepositional phrase in Bulgarian) in addition to the dative clitic. The result is a clitic doubling structure whose function however is not to mark topicality, as in the standard case, but to resolve potential ambiguity (cf. (i)), given the lesser accessibility of inanimates for possessor encoding.

- (11) Ioana i-a rupt (mesei) piciorul ‘Ioana broke its leg (= the leg of the table). (NICULESCU 2008, 488); Njakoј í e otrjazal krakata (na masata). ‘Someone has sawn off the legs of the table’; Na radioto sa mu sváršili bateriite; Radioului i s-au terminat bateriile; Tis teliosan i bataries tou radiofonou ‘The batteries of the radio are consumed’.

Another remarkable feature of the possessive clitic construction is that the possessive relation encoded by the possessive dative structure need not be inalienable. (See the extensive lists presented in ŠVEŠNIKOVA 1986, and NICULESCU 2008 for Romanian.) Apart from the prototypical body parts, cf. (12), and kinship terms, (13), the following kinds of referents can appear as possessums in the EP construction:

- a. extended inalienables such as clothes, cf. (14) and familiar objects from the possessor’s environment, cf. (15);
- b. permanent abstract properties or qualities, cf. (16);
- c. temporary mental or psychological states (17a); functional relations (17b); objects in the near vicinity to the possessor (17c); close alienable entities (17d); actions and results (expressed by deverbal nouns) in relation to their Agents qua possessors (17e), distant alienable entities (17f), etc. (Romanian examples are from NICULESCU 2008, see also CRISTEA 1974, CORNILESCU 1991, MANOLIU-MANEA 1996).<sup>7</sup>
- (12) Afti **tu** espasse to mikro dahtilo; Tja **mu** sčupi malkija prást. ‘She broke his little finger’
- (13) Afti **tu** katestrepsan tin kori/ ti ghineka. ‘They ruined his daughter/wife’
- (14) Objlakox í rokjjata. ‘I put one her dress’
- (15) Apa **i**-a distrus casa. ‘The water destroyed his house’; **Tou** ehassa tin ombrella. ‘I lost his umbrella’; **Sou** hrisimopiisa to stilo. ‘I used your pen’; **Raz-bixa mi** kolata. ‘They destroyed my car’; **Sou** sinkentrosa ta vivlia. ‘I collected your books’
- (16) Mrazja ti taja čerta na xarakterá. ‘I hate this feature of your character’; **fi** urásc lipsa de respect. ‘I hate her lack of respect’
- (17a) Ne **mi** vgorčavaj radostta. ‘Don’t spoil my happiness’; Nu-**i** apreciez comportamentul. ‘I don’t appreciate her behavior’; Esi **mou** ekmetaleftikes tin kali diathesi. ‘You spoiled my good mood’

- (i) Ioana mu sčupi glavata ‘Ioana broke his/its head’.

In the default case, the possessor gets interpreted as animate regardless of the grammatical function of the possessum.

7 Here and elsewhere in the text the Modern Greek examples present native judgements of my informants. I thank in particular Eugenia Liosatou, and also Marika Lekakou, for invaluable help with the data.



- (17b) **Ti**-am condus șeful la aeroport; Izpratrix **ti** șefa na letișteto. 'I saw your boss off at the airport'
- (17c) **A-și** termina cafeaua/izpivam si kafeto 'finish one's coffee' (SVESNIKOVA 1986: 204)
- (17d) Te sa **ni** zaeli mestata. 'They have occupied our places'
- (17e) **Ne ti** priemam izvinenieto. 'I don't accept your excuse', Lupul nu-și încetă prădăciunile 'The wolf did not stop the robbery' (SVESNIKOVA 1986); **Tou** diekopsa ti roi' tis skepsis. 'I interrupted the flow of his thought'
- (17f) Dăždovete **ni** uniștožixa rekoltata. 'The rains ruined our crops'.

It is obvious that the referents in (12)–(17) cover the entire range of elements on the possessive hierarchy in (10b), including its lowest cut-off point, distant alienable entities, as in (17f). This semantic expansion of the possessive construction reveals a consistent grammaticalization pattern reflected not only in the increased number of elements that can enter the construction but also in its greater contextual freedom. As shown by (18) from Bulgarian, even nominals that fall outside of the realm of possession (such as abstract temporal and spatial relations) can be coded as possessums:

- (18) Izgubix mu dirite/koordinatite/doverieto/vremeto/ceľija den.  
'I lost his traces/whereabouts/faith/time/the whole day'

It would seem therefore that the Balkan languages have gone one step further in the grammaticalization of possession, in that their EP signals not only the first and foremost relation of possession (ownership) or some pragmatic extension thereof, as in the other European languages, but practically all relations belonging to possession in a very broad sense.<sup>8</sup> However, the generalization of lexical meaning is just one of the ingredients of the process of grammaticalization. The other involves a reanalysis of the syntactic functions of the dative clitic in its relation to the type of predicate involved in the construction.

Judging from the above examples, it appears very plausible that the dative clitic be considered a particular case of datus commodi/incommodi (dative of interest) expressing the beneficiary of an action, i.e., the person in whose favor or to whose detriment the action is being performed. As pointed out by a number of scholars, beneficiary datives share with the other usages of the dative a typically goal-oriented semantics. However, differently from the more prototypical dative functions (that of recipient with verbs of giving and of experiencer with experiencer predi-

8 As has been noted in the literature, it often appears difficult to arrive at some coherent notion of "possession". Within the cognitive framework, LANGACKER (1991) has pointed out that the only thing all possessives have in common is that one entity (the possessor) is invoked as a reference point for purposes of establishing mental contact with another (the possessum).

cates), the beneficiary dative is not required by the verb's valence, hence it is often viewed as an additional or extra-thematic argument which traditional grammars term 'free' dative (but see NICULESCU 2008 for an attempt to relate all usages of the dative under a single common denominator as 'entity on which the action has an indirect effect'). FRIED (1999) proposes that affectedness may evolve into ownership by way of a semantic shift which extends possessive construal into constructions where the dative is simply an additional argument that can be interpreted as affected by the circumstances described in the predicate. In (19a) for example, which constitutes an intermediate step of this process, a possessor-possesum relation can be established given that "work" is a possessible entity and the goal argument can be felicitously construed as the possessor of this entity. This possessive relation can then be further extended to contexts like (19b) where the verb is incompatible with a goal argument but the possessive relation is nevertheless available:

- (19a) *Preča ti (na rabotata) 'I disturb you on the work'*  
(19b) *Vali mi na glavata/v kăštata. 'It rains on my head/in my house'*

In other words, the grammaticalization of possessivity has arisen in clauses where a potentially possessible item is present which could be associated with a dative of interest reading. According to Fried, it is precisely this linking between affectedness and possession that gets conventionalized and starts off as an independent grammatical pattern. One can imagine that initially the process has affected only elements which are high on the possessive hierarchy (e.g. a body part) and on the animacy hierarchy (e.g. a human possessor; for converging data on the evolution of the possessive dative in Bulgarian, see MINČEVA 1964), and has eventually extended also to the lower cut-off points on the hierarchies, bringing the possessive construction further away from its originally dative functions but without making it lose completely the initial semantic link with possession.

An immediate proof for treating EP as a special case of dative of interest comes from the fact that, as mentioned above, in many contexts the possessive dative is still ambiguous between an affected and a possessive interpretation (see also TOMIĆ 2009 for Balkan Slavic):

- (20a) *Šte ti nareža dărvata. 'I will cut your wood/I will cut the wood for you'*  
(20b) *Opravjam ti radioto; Ĥti repar radioul (NICULESCU 2008: 39); Sou episke- vazo to radiofono. 'I am repairing the radio for you/I am repairing your radio'*

An explanation in terms of ambiguity however is too narrow to account for the numerous cases where a purely possessive interpretation is available to the exclusion of the dative of interest reading. To see this, let's see how the Balkan lan-

guages perform on the situation hierarchy in (10c) in comparison to other European languages.

(10c) **The Situation Hierarchy** (KÖNIG/HASPELMATH 1997, section 6)

Patient-affecting  $\subset$  dynamic non-affecting  $\subset$  stative (KÖNIG/HASPELMATH 1997)

The situation hierarchy reflects the strength of the affectedness constraint as a function of the type of predicate selected for the EP construction. As mentioned above, Haspelmath's generalization is that cross-linguistically and in Europe in particular, the higher points of the hierarchy are favored, especially the classical patient affecting verbs, such as *open, repair, lose, lift, break, scratch, destroy, ruin*, all of which transitives.

Balkan EP however is not limited to these predicate. It is also available – and this is true to a maximum extent for Bulgarian and Romanian – with:<sup>9</sup>

- i. intransitives such as *walk, run, enter, flow*, unaccusatives such as *get old, lose weight, die, become red*, unergatives, such as *work, cry, laugh*, among many others;
- ii. stative predicates like *see, hear, love, hate, know, remember*, among many others.

For reasons of space I cannot go into much detail, so I just illustrate these possibilities (see (21)–(22) and for more examples BACIU (1985), SVEŠNIKOVA (1986), AVRAM/COENE (2000, 2008), NICULESCU (2008)):

(21a) **Teče mu nosăt; Ūi curge nasul.** 'His nose is running.' – Unaccusative predi-

cates

**Mi-a căzut un dinte; Padna mi edin zăb.** 'One of my teeth fell out';

**Treperjat mi rătsete.** 'My hands are trembling';

**Zăcervixa mi se buzite.** 'My cheeks grew red';

**I-a murit pisica.** 'His cat died'.

- 9 For Romanian, NICULESCU (2008) has shown that there are few restrictions which seem to be of *lexical* nature, as some verbs do not accept the occurrence of this clitic, be it possessive or of a different type: *a constitui* ('to constitute, to be'), *a exista* ('to exist'), *a însemna* ('to mean'), *a reprezenta* ('to represent, to be'), *a spera* ('to hope'):
- (i) \***Ūmi sper fericirea.** 'I hope for my happiness' (NICULESCU 2008: 64).

Also excluded, but for an independent reason, are obligatorily reflexive verbs which cannot accommodate a second dative:

- (ii) \***Nu-i amintesc fata vs. Nu-mi amintesc de fata lui.** 'I don't remember her face'

I thank Corina Bădeŷiŷa for judgements and precious help with the Romanian data.

(21b) **Ne mi raboti kompjutărăt.** 'My computer doesn't work' – Unergative predi-

cates

**Zasmja mi se sărceŷo.** 'My heart was happy'.

(22) **Az mu vidjax novata prijelteika.** 'I saw his new girlfriend' – Stative predi-

cates

**Az mu zabravix imeto.** **I-am uitat numele** 'I forgot his name'

**Poznavam ŷi prijelelite.** 'I know your friends'

**Nu-ŷi stju adresa** (LAMIROY 2003: 268, citing DUMITRESCU 1990).

As mentioned above with respect to (19b), intransitives represent the next stage of the grammaticalization of possessivity, given the absence of any benefactive/malefactive component in their lexical semantics, of the semantic role of "patient", as well as of a goal argument. Therefore, it is only via the salient possessive relation that affectedness gets signaled, or better, inferred, in this case, which is why some authors prefer to speak of "mental affectedness"<sup>10</sup> in order to distinguish this more abstract way of affecting a possessor, or even to discard the connection with the beneficiary dative in favor of a possessive dative analysis. Without elaborating on this type of dative in relation to affectedness, I will treat it together with the beneficiary datives, noting that the possessive value is supplementary here and thus closer to the so-called dativeus sympatheticus<sup>11</sup> as it is used traditionally. EP with such type of predicates is occasionally found in the European EP construction e.g.

10 See e.g. HASPELMATH (1999). The possessor is affected in a more abstract way by the whole situation by virtue of holding a possessor relationship with the main argument of the sentence, typically a subject or (in impersonal sentences) a prepositional phrase or both, as in (i):

- (i) **Edin košăm mi padna v supata** 'A hair fell into my soup'

Semantic information, e.g. the double possessive relation in (i), is entirely manipulated by syntactic function. According to FRIED (1999), to account for the common ground between "mental affectedness", which for her is a form of interest, and possession, a more abstract semantic relation should be used instead of "affectedness", namely 'end-point of the event'. In any case, this kind of implicational affectedness can be considered an intermediate step between beneficiary Datives and pure possessive Datives. Note that the term "non-affecting" in (10c) is rather misleading.

11 The classical (and historically very early) usage of dativeus sympatheticus, labeled by some authors dativeus possessivus, is represented by (i). In such cases, the dative clitic appears with the verb *essere* and in Romanian also with *habere*, and expresses a relation between a possessor and a kinship term or some other close possession:

- (i) **Ūmi este naş.** 'He is my godfather'; **Toj mi e čičo.** 'He is my uncle'

**Ūŷi are mama în spital.** 'He has his mother in the hospital.'

I will not discuss predicative possession here. It is not clear how this type of dative is to be differentiated from dativeus commodi/incommodi.

in Czech, Spanish and Italian. The pattern however is very productive in Romanian and Bulgarian, and is also available in Modern Greek (23), mainly with unaccusative verbs (parallel to those in (21a) where the possessum is coded as the subject and represents the theme argument), but also with unergatives (where the possessum is an agentive subject, as in (21b), and also (23b)).<sup>12</sup>

- (23a) **Mou** pomi to kefali. 'I have a headache'; **Tou** kopikan ta ghonata lit. 'He felt his feet torn off'/'His feet were trembling' (Sint. 1990: 88)  
 (23b) **De mou** doulevi to kompiouter. 'My computer doesn't work'

From a broader typological perspective, the dividing line that sets apart Bulgarian and Romanian regards stative predicates. Crucially, one of the defining properties of statives is the absence of any inherent benefactive or malefactive semantics: the patient of e.g. a perception/experience verb like *see*, *hear*, *love* or a verb of knowledge like *know* cannot possibly be conceptualized as affected by the very act of seeing/hearing/knowing, and in consequence, the possessor cannot be cast as affected either. See (24)–(25) from Romance and Slavic. As reported by FRIED (1999), such data are consistent with the same restriction noted for other languages.

- (24) Slavic  
 \*Už iste **jim** viděli zahradu. 'Have you seen their yard yet?' Czech (FRIED 1999: 484)  
 \*Widziałem **mu** zęby. 'I saw his teeth' Polish (WIERZBICKA 1986, cited in HASPELMATH 1999: 114)  
 (25) Romance  
 \*Non **le** ho visto la faccia. 'I didn't see her face'  
 \*Je **lui** ai oublié le nom. 'I forgot his name' French (KAYNE 1977: 159)  
 \*Je **ne te** connais pas l'adresse; \*Non **ti** so/conosco l'indirizzo; \*No **te** sé/conozco la dirección. 'I don't know your address' (SÁNCHEZ LÓPEZ 2007: 168).

Romanian thus stands in contrast to the rest of Romance, as does Bulgarian to the rest of Slavic (Czech included in spite of the greater predicate range allowed in this language, to judge from FRIED 1999). In the absence of an affecting reading at least

<sup>12</sup> According to HASPELMATH (1999), unergatives are inexistent in Europe but Albanian is an exception (HASPELMATH refers to examples from O. BUCHHOLZ and W. FIEDLER: *Albanische Grammatik*, 1987). Such facts, which need further research, will turn out to be highly relevant for the overall analysis of Balkan EP. Several examples (from Giuseppe TURANO, p.c.) are given below:

- Djali nuk më noton 'My child does not swim'  
 Nuk më punon komputeri 'My computer does not work'  
 ?Libri nuk më ka ftuar asnjë çmim 'My book did not win a prize'  
 Sytë nuk më qeshin 'My eyes are not laughing'

a subset of Balkan EPs should be analyzed as possessive only and not as a special case of the dative of interest construction. I will come back to the situation in Modern Greek later.

What I want to show now, following previous work (CINQUE/KRAPOVA 2009), is that the maximal permissiveness of Bulgarian and Romanian with respect to predicate choice is an effect of conflating in a single construction what some Romance languages (French, Italian) express in two different ways: by a dative clitic (in a dative of interest construction) and by a genitive clitic (*ne/en*) in a purely possessive construction. In fact, this type of clitic is the only possible way of rendering (25) grammatical in the presence of a stative predicate, implying that one of the functions of *ne/en* in Romance is to express possession outside the realm of affectedness:

- (26a) Non **ne** conosco l'indirizzo  
 not it<sub>gen</sub> know-1sg the-address 'I don't know his/its address'  
 (26b) J'**en** ai oublié le nom  
 it<sub>gen</sub> have-1sg forgotten the name 'I have forgotten his/its name'

The evidence in the next section will help tease apart the dative from the genitive usage of the "possessive" clitic, applying diagnostics internal to Bulgarian, which can be extended, I believe, also to Romanian. The historical relevance of this bi-constructional approach, if it is on the right track, will amount to denying the possibility of semantic bleaching of the affectedness feature in the emergence of a true possessive construction, and to claiming that in spite of the genitive-dative syncretism which has rendered the two case functions morphologically indistinguishable, they are nevertheless still well differentiated syntactically.

### 3. On distinguishing two EP constructions

Starting from constructions involving a dynamic (patient-affecting or intransitive) predicate, there is particularly clear evidence that the dative clitic corresponding to the beneficiary/possessor is an extra argument of the predicate and not an argument of the noun phrase expressing the possessum. In generative grammar terms, this means that the dative argument is base generated externally rather than derived by "possessor raising" from within the noun phrase. To take one example, consider idiomatic expressions such as (27a/a') from Bulgarian. If we try to substitute the external with an internal clitic, either the idiomatic reading is lost (27b/b'), or the sentence becomes ungrammatical (28b):<sup>13</sup>

<sup>13</sup> In Romanian too the idiomatic reading is lost if we substitute the external clitic with a possessive adjective:

- (i) a. A nu-și crede ochilor 'to not believe one's own eyes' (NICULESCU 2008)  
 b. \*A nu crede ochilor săi/Ioanei ('\*to not believe his/Ioana's eyes')

- (27a) Ti **mi** skri topkite/šajbata. 'You really shocked/confused me'  
 (27b) Ti skri topkite/šajbata **mi** (no idiomatic interpretation). 'You hid my balls/disk' (e.g. tennis balls, hockey disk)  
 (27a') Padna **mi** šapkata. 'I was extremely surprised'  
 (27b') Šapkata **mi** padna (v kalta). 'My hat fell (in the mud)' (no idiomatic interpretation)  
 (28a) Ti **mi** xodiš po nervite. lit. 'You are walking on my nerves' ('You are getting on my nerves')  
 (28b) \*Ti xodiš po nervite **mi**.

The lack of symmetrical reading between the a. and the b. examples suggests that the external clitic is not related to the noun phrase internal position; if this were indeed the case, the pairs should have been mutually reversible, contrary to fact. The test in (27)/(28) can be replicated for all of the idiomatic expressions given in the (unordered) lists below:

(29) Bulgarian

*čupja mu xatāra* ('displease someone'); *gledam si rabotata* ('mind my own business'); *gledam si kefa* ('indulge in pleasure'); *vlači mi se opaškata* ('people are gossiping about me'); *vleze mi muxa v glavata* ('it got into my head'); *vjazāl mi e v krāvta* ('be particularly fond of something or somebody'); *vjazla mi e glavata v torbata* ('be in a mortal danger'); *vjazāl mi e pod kožata* ('be under someone's influence'); *da si izbālvaš červata* ('feel bad because of something or somebody disgusting'); *da si kāsāš glavata* ('feel bad because of something or somebody nasty'); *ne mi miġa okoto* ('not to be afraid'); *ne mi pee petelāt* ('not to be respected'); *ne mi se čuva dumata* ('have no influence, not to be respected'); *izvaždam mu očite, vmesto da mu izpiša veždite* ('do a bad favor'); *razkaza mi se igrata* ('have a real hard time'); *da ti padne šapkata* ('be shocked'); *sveti mi červenoto* ('have no chance'); *planna mi glavata* ('have a lot of trouble'); *seče mi akālāt* ('be real clever', etc.

(30) Romanian (from NICULESCU 2008: 506)

*a-și da viața* ('to die'), *a-i merge numele* ('to become famous'); *a-și pierde urma* ('to get lost'); *a-și pierde mințile/capul/viața/vremea* ('to lose one's mind/~mind/to die/to lose one's time'); *a-și pune capăt zilelor* ('to end one's life'); *a-și pune în gând* ('to set one's mind to something'); *a-i trece prin cap* ('to cross one's mind'); *a-i ține cuiva calea* ('to follow someone'); *a-și ține firea* ('to keep calm'); *a-și ține gura* ('to keep silent'); *a-și vedea de treabă* ('to mind one's business'); *a nu-și vedea lungul nasului* ('to be vane'); *a-i veni pe limbă* ('to find the words'); *a-i veni inima la loc* ('to calm down'); *a-i veni ceasul* ('to die'); *a-i veni dracii* ('to get furious').

Note that all of the above idiomatic expressions contain a) a benefactive or malefactive verb meaning, b) a beneficiary or "sympathetic" dative, c) a human possessor, and d) a body part (or some other inalienable possession in the strict or extended sense). These are precisely the properties which form the quintessential affectedness EP pattern, or the "European prototype" in Haspelmath's terms. Parallel idiomatic constructions in Romance also require an external dative clitic that cannot be substituted by an internal possessive adjective nor by a genitive *ne/en clitic*. Cf. (31)–(32).

- (31a) Luc **lui** casse les pieds. 'Luc bothers him/her' (LAMROY 2003: 260f.)  
 (31b) Luc casse **ses** pieds. 'Luc breaks his/her feet' (no idiom interpretation available)  
 (31c) Luc **en** casse les pieds. 'Luc him<sub>gen</sub> breaks the feet' (no idiom interpretation available)  
 (32a) **Gli** hanno rotto le scatole. 'They annoyed him'  
 (32b) Hanno rotto le **sue** scatole. 'They have broken his boxes' (no idiom interpretation available)  
 (32c) **Ne** hanno rotto le scatole. 'Him<sub>gen</sub> they have broken the boxes' (no idiom interpretation available).

In non-idiomatic constructions the same possessive dative clitic is apparently free to occur either noun phrase-internally or externally:

- (33a) Tja **mu** ščupi [<sub>NP</sub> malkija präst]. 'She broke his little finger'  
 (33b) Tja ščupi [<sub>NP</sub> malkija **mu** präst]. 'She broke his little finger'

However, the internal variant of (33) must meet a crucial requirement not holding of the external variant; namely that the noun phrase containing the possessive clitic must be definite: the possessive dative clitic cannot appear inside an indefinite phrase, a restriction known from the syntactic literature as the "definiteness restriction"<sup>14</sup> (PENČEV 1998: 30, FRANKS/KING 2000: 282; ASSENOVA 2001). See the contrast between (33b) and (34) below:

- (34) \*Tja ščupi [edin **mu** präst]. 'She broke a finger of his'

No definiteness requirement holds of the external variant, (34), as can be seen from (35) which is the only possible way to render (34):

- (35) Tja **mu** ščupi [edin präst]. 'She broke a finger of his'

The availability of indefinite (partitive) possessive elements in a subset of the EP constructions, namely those involving an affecting predicate, as opposed to the

14 The clitic appears immediately attached to a demonstrative or to whichever element is inflected with the definite article (PENČEV 1993, FRANKS 2000: 59ff., STATEVA 2002: 660, a.o.).

obligatory definiteness feature of the same elements in the Internal Possessive construction suggests that (33a) and (33b) are not related transformationally and consequently, the external dative clitic in (35) does not have its source inside the noun phrase but is generated within the verb phrase as an additional argument of the verb rather than being moved to this position by way of raising or cliticization (cf. (6) above).

Other cases however call for an analysis in terms of possessor raising. The ungrammaticality of (36a), for example, follows from the impossibility of the clitic to appear inside an indefinite noun phrase (36b).

- (36a) \*Ne **mu** poznavam **edin prijatelj**. 'I know a friend of his'  
 (36b) \*Ne poznavam [edin mu prijatelj].

This case contrasts with the one before since here, the external dative clitic remains affected by the definiteness restriction inside the noun phrase. If in (36a) the external clitic position is derived by possessor raising from within the noun phrase, then the "wrong" result in (36a) can be attributed to a movement out of an improper syntactic configuration (36b). This implies that whenever the definiteness restriction is respected on the noun phrase internal level, the corresponding external clitic formation is expected to be grammatical, as e.g. in (37):

- (37) Ne mu poznavam [NP-def prijateljja  $\mu$ ]. 'I don't know his friend'

Similar reasoning can be made for the other EP constructions which contain a stative (non-dynamic and non-affected) predicate. The claim therefore is that precisely with these predicates will external and internal possession correspond to each other semantically and syntactically because of the mirror-like positioning of the possessive clitic. An even stronger claim is that precisely in these cases, the possessive clitic, although dative in morphology, has an underlying genitive case value which makes it compatible with Romance *ne/en*-clitic amenable to a "possessor raising" analysis as well.

Before we turn to Modern Greek, I just point out one consequence of the split approach to Bulgarian, extendable also to Romanian, EP constructions. Since the clitic in the affecting EP type is not related to a noun phrase internal position, we can expect that this latter position could be simultaneously filled. This would give rise to a double occurrence of the clitic, as in (37) and in other similar contexts involving some type of mental affectedness – once in the external position where the clitic bears a beneficiary (dative of interest) value, and a second time in the internal position where it is specialized for possession and has a genitive value.<sup>15</sup>

15 The co-occurrence of two dative clitics corresponding respectively to a dative and to a possessive argument under coreference is possible also when the clitic realizes one of the prototypical dative functions (word order and optionality apart). In (i), for example,

- (38) Umrja **mu** (...) konjat **mu** (...). 'His horse died on him' (SCHICK 2000: 191)

With pure possessive structures, on the other hand, no similar double occurrences are predicted to be possible under the possessor raising analysis suggested above, or else the sentence would end up having two coreferential clitics with the same syntactic function. We can follow the standard assumptions in the generative grammar tradition and suggest that in this case, the possessive clitic leaves an unpronounced copy in the noun phrase from which it has been raised. The relation with the overt clitic takes care of the possessive interpretation (cf. (7) above repeated here as (39a) and the structure in (39b)). For additional evidence bearing on the syntactic properties of the two EP types the reader is referred to CINQUE/KRAPOVA (2009).

- (39a) \*Az í zárna*x* litseto í v tálpata. 'Her-DAT spotted her face in the crowd'  
 (39b) Az [vp*í* zárna*x*] [NP litseto í] [v tálpata]. 'I saw her face in the crowd'

Modern Greek also allows for the double occurrence pattern analogous to (37) with predicates of the mental affecting type such as e.g. *die* in (40):

- (40) **Tou** pethane to alogo **tou**. 'His horse dies on him'.

However, in spite of sharing this, as well as many of the other semantic or syntactic peculiarities of the Romanian and Bulgarian EP (possessed objects, nonhuman possessors, unaccusative and unergatives predicates, cf. the examples in (11)–(16), (23) above), the so-called "personal pronoun genitive" in Modern Greek does not allow, as the following ungrammatical examples show, a stative predicate (*like, see, remember, understand, know*) to appear in this construction. All of the examples in (41) have been judged ungrammatical by my informants:

- (41) \***Tis** sou aressoun ta podhia. 'You like her legs'; \***Tus** idha to kenourghio avtokimito. 'I saw his new car' (PANCHEVA 2004); ?? \***Tou** xehasa to onoma. 'I forgot your name'; \*Den **tou** thimame to prossopo. 'I don't remember his face'; \***Sou** katalava tin idea. 'I got your idea'; \*Den **tou** xero ton filo. 'I don't know his friend'.

The only way to render the possessive meaning in (41) is by a noun phrase internal possessive clitic:

the first appearance of *mu* corresponds to the recipient of *nosja* 'bring', and the second occurrence is the obligatory internal possessive argument of a kinship term, *majka mu* 'his mother':

- (i) Zakuskata [**mu** donese] [majka **mu**]. / [Majka **mu**] [**mu** donese] zakuskata.

'His mother brought him the breakfast'

This possibility gives support to the claim made in the text that the beneficiary dative belongs to the same family of dative functions.

- (42) Sou aressoun [ta podhia tis]: Idha [to kenourghio tou autokinito]; Xehasa [to onoma tou].  
Den thimame [to prosopo tou]; Katalava [tin idea sou]; Den xero [ton filo tou].

Given that stative predicates diagnose the presence of a true possessive structure, Modern Greek obviously does not dispose of this pattern, so its EP is basically a dative of interest context. As in other European languages, the beneficiary dative can cumulate an additional possessive value due to the inferential relation between possessor and possessed. HOLTON et al. (1997: 194) refer to this usage of the Greek genitive as “malefactive” and “benefactive”, although the distinction with the other dative functions (e.g. the ethic dative) needs to be made more precise:

- (43) Afti mou skotose ton enthousiasmo ‘She killed my enthusiasm’; Esi mou katestrepses ti zoi. ‘You ruined my life’; Mou ekapses to spiti. ‘You burned my house’; Tou dankosa to dahtilo. ‘I bit his finger’; Mou ponì to kefali ‘I have a headache’; Sou haidevi to kefali ‘He/She caresses your head’ (Sint. 1990: 62); Ghiati mas halases tin parea? ‘Why did you spoil the party for us?’ (HOLTON et al. 1997: 194)

Restricting EP to just “affectedness” leaves the additional possessive interpretation open to context. Also somewhat “vague” in this sense is the extent to which a certain predicate can count as affecting for the purposes of the construction. For example, the verb *like* and experienter predicates in general do not seem good candidates for an EP construal, and sometimes even the inalienable relation does not succeed in rendering the construction possible. *Hate* on the other hand, is acceptable to some extent, (44a), especially under emphasis, as in the second examples of (44a). In spite of the lexical and pragmatic support, my informants would still prefer the internal possessive construal (44b):

- (44a) (?) **Tou** misso to haraktira /?Den **tu** misso to haraktira.  
b. Miso to haraktira **tu**. ‘I hate his character’

However, in other cases a stricter inalienability (ownership) relation can provide an interpretive clue and increase the verb’s chances for entering an EP construction and provoking the same ambiguity as in the other two Balkan languages. In (45b), as reported by my informants, only the benefactive/malefactive reading survives, given that no possessive relation is likely to be implied, while such reading is more readily available in (45b) because of the ownership relation:

- (45a) **Sou** anteghrapsa to arthro. ‘I copied the article for you/\*I copied your article’.

Cf. Prepisax **ti** statijata. ‘I copied your paper/I copied the paper for you’

- (45b) Na **mou** taisis to skilaki. ‘Feed the dog for me/Feed my dog’

Although a historical scenario of the grammaticalization process in the Balkan languages is beyond the scope of this paper, I just point out that the affectedness criterion internal to Modern Greek is yet another proof that we are dealing with two separate constructions well differentiated in the other two languages: dative of interest and possessive dative. The ambiguity of the Bulgarian example in (45a) is thus only apparent. What is visible on the superficial level as “two-in one” in fact conceals two distinct underlying constructions whose syntactic properties can be successfully extrapolated in the non-ambiguous contexts we have discussed above. In other words, the emergence of a truly possessive dative cannot be said to result from a process of semantic bleaching of the affectedness feature on the possessor in the EP construction on its way to expressing pure possession; this would leave unexplained the distinct behavior of the EP constructions in Bulgarian and Romanian, as well as the special choice of Modern Greek not to follow the exact same path in the grammaticalization of possession, as opposed to the other two languages.

#### 4. The case for dative case

For HASPELMATH (1999), the morphological dative-genitive case in the Balkan EP behaves as unambiguously dative from a structural and synchronic point of view. However, if this were so, the restrictions presented by Modern Greek would remain mysterious in the face of what would seem to be an overgenerated pattern in Romanian and Bulgarian. What I would like to suggest, as mentioned before, is that the dative clitic in the possessive construction is a genitive clitic “in disguise”, while in the affectedness construction it is a true dative clitic. Following TOPOLINSKA (2004), I understand case “not as a morphological form, but as a syntactic relation of dependence of a noun phrase either on the verbal construction ... or on another noun phrase”. The dative is an adverbial case related to predicative expressions, while the genitive is an adnominal case related to argumental expressions and although there is the additional possibility (in Bulgarian and Romanian) of expressing a possessive (genitive) relation outside of the noun phrase and on the sentence level, it is not the case that that genitive case functions switch to dative case functions. The genitive-dative case syncretism, as pointed out again by Topolińska, has unified the morphological devices of grammatical accommodation, but the syntactic functions of the adverbial dative vs. the adnominal genitive are still as visibly distinct as they have been before the merger; wherever the two cases appear “fused” from a syntactic point of view, in the contemporary languages, independent evidence can establish their different syntactic behavior.

A very brief look at the history of the construction in Bulgarian and Greek shows that in fact the two languages may have gone in opposite directions in grammaticalizing external possession. As pointed out by HORROCKS (2007), ‘displaced’ genitives had a crucial role in the diachronic process related to the dative –

genitive functional transfer: genitive clitics which properly belonged to the possessed noun could cliticize to the verb and end up in the position typically reserved for indirect objects and other types of datives. This allowed for their interpretation as *dativus commodi/incommodi* (or *dativus ethicus*) which quickly led to the assumption of all dative functions by the genitive clitic pronouns. By the 8<sup>th</sup> or 9<sup>th</sup> century the dative almost entirely disappeared. A process in the opposite direction must have taken place in Old Bulgarian (Old Church Slavonic), to be further extended in the period of Middle Bulgarian as a result of Balkan influence on analytic development. MIŇČEVA (1964) has shown that the first contexts to yield a possessive interpretation of the dative were those involving a *dativus commodi/incommodi* context where a dative (lexical or pronominal) argument translating the Greek genitive clitic and appearing in preposition to the noun and closer to the verb, could get interpreted as “doubly dependent” – once as signaling possession with respect to the noun, and a second time as an argument of the verb. Internal possession on the other hand heavily relied on the genitive, at least in Old Bulgarian, in the rendering of the Greek postnominal genitives, and only after the spread of the doubly dependent dative did the internal genitives get substituted by a dative. Of course, a number of questions remain unanswered pertaining to the more precise picture of these historical processes, but it seems that while in Greek (which has generalized the genitive) a reanalysis of the dative relation has taken place, in Bulgarian (which has generalized the dative) it was the genitive relation that underwent a reanalysis. Both the intrusion of the dative into the sphere of possession (in Bulgarian) as well as the assumption of dative functions by the genitive in Greek are due to some sort of syntactic displacement of the pronominal or clitic argument which has allowed the respective reinterpretation of the original case functions. This, and other issues (especially the possibility of clitic doubling of the possessive element) are essential for a better understanding of the syntax of Balkan possession but of course require much further research.

## Bibliography

- ASSENOVA, Petya (2001): «Observations sur la structure du texte balkanique». *Zeitschrift für Balkanologie* 37, 2, 119–135.
- AVRAM, Larisa; COENE, Martine (2000): “Dative/Genitive Clitics as Last Resort”. In: M. Dimitrova-Vulchanova, I. Krapova, L. Hellan (eds.): *Papers from the Third Conference on Formal Approaches to South Slavic and Balkan Languages*. (University of Trondheim Working Papers in Linguistics 34). Trondheim: NTNU Linguistics Department, 157–169.
- AVRAM, Larisa; COENE, Martine (2008): “Romanian possessive clitics revisited”. In: D. Kalhuli, L. Tasmowski (eds.): *Clitic Doubling in the Balkan Languages*. Amsterdam: Benjamins. 361–387.

- BACTU, Ion (1985): «Observations sur le datif possessif en roumain». *Linguistique comparée et typologie des langues romanes*, II. Université de Provence. 349–359.
- BAKER, Mark (1988): *Incorporation: A theory of Grammatical function changing*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- BALLY, Charles (1926): «L'expression des idées de sphère personnelle et de solidarité dans les langues indo-européennes». In: F. Frankhauser, J. Jud (eds.): *Festschrift Louis Gauchat*. Aarau: Sauerländer (English Translation in CHAPPELL/MCGREGOR 1996). 68–78.
- BYBEE, Joan (1988): “Semantic substance vs. contrast in the development of grammatical meaning”. *Berkeley Linguistics Society* 14. 247–264.
- CINQUE, Guglielmo; KRAPOVA, Iliana (2009): “The two possessor raising constructions of Bulgarian”. In: S. Franks, V. Chidambaram, B. Joseph (eds.): *A Linguist's Linguist. Studies in South Slavic Linguistics in honor of E. Wayles Browne*. Slavic Publishers: Bloomington, Indiana. 149–166.
- CHAPPELL, Hilary; McGREGOR, William (eds.) (1996): *The Grammar of Inalienability: A typological perspective on body-part terms and the part-whole relation*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- CORNILESCU, Alexandra (1995): “Romanian Genitive Constructions”. In: G. Cinque, G. Giusti (eds.): *Advances in Rumanian Linguistics*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 1–54.
- DAVIES, William (1984): “Inalienable possession and Choctaw Referential Coding”. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 50. 384–402.
- DUMITRESCU, Domnita (1990): “El dativo posesivo en español y en rumano”. *Revista Española de Lingüística* 20, 2. 403–430.
- FRANKS, Steven (2000): “The Internal Structure of Slavic NPs, with Special Reference to Bulgarian”. In: *Generative Linguistics in Poland 2 (syntax and morphology)* (Proceedings of the GLiP-2 Conference). Warsaw: Institute of Computer Science, Polish Academy of Sciences. 53–70.
- FRIED, Mirijam (1999): “From Interest to Ownership: A constructional View of External Possessors”. In: D. Payne, I. Barshi (eds.): *External Possession*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 473–504.
- HASPELMATH, Martin (1999): “External Possession in a European Areal Perspective”. In: D. Payne, I. Barshi (eds.): *External Possession*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 109–135.
- HOLTON, David; MACKRIDGE, Peter; PHILIPPAKI-WARBURTON, Irene. (1997): *Greek: A Comprehensive Grammar of the Modern Language* (Comprehensive Grammars). London: Routledge.
- HORROCKS, Geoffrey (2007): “Syntax: From Classical Greek to the Koine”. In: A. P. Christidis (ed.): *A History of Ancient Greek. From the Beginnings to Late Antiquity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 618–631.
- KAYNE, Richard S. (1977): *Syntaxe du français. Le cycle transformationnel*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil (French translation of *French Syntax*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1975).
- KÖNIG, Ekkerhard; HASPELMATH, Martin (1997): «Les constructions à possesseur externe dans les langues d'Europe». In: J. Feuillet (ed.): *Actance et valence dans les langues de l'Europe* (Empirical Approaches to Language Typology/EUROTYP, 20-2). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 525–600.

- KUPULA, Mikko (2008): *Adnominal Possession and Ditransitives*. *Studia graeca stockholmiensia*. Series neohellenica. Stockholm University.
- LAMIROY, Béatrice (2003): "Grammaticalization and external possessor structures in Romance and Germanic languages". In: M. Coene, Y. D'Hulst (eds.): *From NP to DP. Volume II: the expression of possession in noun phrases*. Amsterdam: Benjamins. 257–280.
- LANGACKER, Ronald (1991): *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar*. Volume II. Descriptive application. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- LANDAU, Idan (1999): Possessor raising and the structure of VP. *Lingua* 107. 1–37.
- МИНЦЕВА, Ангелина (1964) = А. Минчева: Развой на дателния притежателен падеж в българския език. София 1964.
- MANOLIU-MANEA, Maria (1996): "Inalienability and topicality in Romanian: Pragmatic semantics of syntax". In: H. Chappel, W. McGregor (eds.): *The Grammar of Inalienability: a Typological Perspective on Body Part Terms and the Part-Whole Relation*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 711–743.
- NICULESCU, Dana (2008): "Romanian possessive dative – The limits of the structure". *Revue Romaine Linguistique* LIII, 4. București. 485–515.
- НИТСОЛОВА, Руселина (1986): *Българските местоимения*. София: Наука и изкуство.
- НИТСОЛОВА, Руселина (2008): *Българска граматика. Морфология*. София: Университетско издателство „Св. Климент Охридски“.
- PANĂ DINDELEGAN, Gabriela (1994): *Teorie și analiză gramaticală*. București: Coresi.
- PANCHEVA, Roumyana (2004): "Balkan Possessive Clitics: The Problem of Case and Category". In O. Mišeska Tomić (ed.): *Balkan Syntax and Semantics*. Amsterdam: Benjamins. 175–219.
- PENČEV, Jordan (1998): *Sintaksis na savremennija bălgarski knižoven ezik*. Plovdiv.
- SÁNCHEZ LÓPEZ, Cristina (2007): "The possessive dative and the syntax of affected arguments". *Cuadernos de Lingüística del I. U. I. Ortega y Gasset* XIV. 153–173. <http://www.ortegaygasset.edu/uooyg/dpto/linguistica/publicaciones/c114/sanchez.pdf>.
- ŠARIĆ, Lilijana (2002): "On the semantics of the 'dative of possession' in the Slavic languages: An analysis on the basis of Russian, Polish, Croatian/Serbian and Slovenian examples". *Glossos* 3. <http://seelrc.org/glossos/issues/3/saric.pdf>.
- ŠCHICK, Ivanka (2000): "The phenomenon of possessive clitics in the Balkan Slavic languages". In: M. Dimitrova-Vulchanova, I. Krapova, L. Hellan (eds.): *Papers from the Third Conference on Formal Approaches to South Slavic and Balkan Languages*. (University of Trondheim Working Papers in Linguistics 34). Trondheim: NTNU Linguistics Department. 183–195.
- Synt. (1990) = *Συντακτικό της Νέας Ελληνικής. Α', Β' και Γ' Γυμνασίου*, Οργανισμός εκδόσεων διδακτικών βιβλίων. Αθήνα 1990.
- STATEVA, Penka (2002): "Possessive Clitics and the Structure of Nominal Expressions". *Lingua* 112. 647–690.
- SVEŠNIKOVA (1986) = Т. Н. Свешникова: Об одном способе выражения посессивности в румынском языке [Вып. 10]. Славянское и балканское языкознание. Проблемы диалектологии. Категория посессивности. М. 201–208.
- ТОМИЌ, Olga (2009): "South Slavic clitics expressing possession". In: S. Franks, V. Chidambaram, B. Joseph (eds.): *A Linguist's Linguist. Studies in South Slavic Linguistics in honor of E. Wayles Browne*. Slavic Publishers: Bloomington, Indiana. 445–464.

- ТОПОЛНСКА, Zuzana (2004): Paper presented at the 9<sup>th</sup> International Congress of the Association Internationale d'Études du Sud-Est Européen, Tirana, 30.8–3.9.2004.
- VERGNAUD, Jean-Roger, ZUBIZARRETA, Maria Luisa (1992): "The definite determiner and the inalienable constructions in French and in English". *Linguistic Inquiry* 23. 595–652.
- WIERZBICKA, Anna (1988): *The semantics of Grammar*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.