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1. Introduction.

In this article we present an analysis of a specific phenomenon of Bulgarian syntax, which can be better understood, we argue, through a comparison with Romance. As is often the case when one compares different languages, certain constructions appear not to correspond neatly. However, before surrendering to the conclusion that no neat correspondence exists across languages, one should try to see if one can find it by decomposing the complexity of the data. This is what we attempt to do here.

Bulgarian clausal dative clitics can, as in other languages, be interpreted as external possessors of a DP, provided they are contained in the same minimal clause containing the DP, and that they c-command the DP (or its trace); examples of each of these, respectively, are shown in (1–4) (cf. Guéron 1985: 48; 2003: 193f.):\(^1\)

(1) a. Kućeto **mu** otkapa prästa.  
   dog\(_{DEF}\) him\(_{DAT}\) bit-off finger\(_{DEF}\)

   ‘The dog bit off his finger.’

---

\(^1\) The literature on so-called “possessor raising” in various languages is extensive, and we are able to review it here only partially. References to specific studies are made where they directly bear on points of our analysis.

(1) b. Te 'mu namerixła čadára.
   they himDAT found umbrellaDEF
   'They found his umbrella.'

c. Te ne 'mu sábštixla imeto.
   they not himDAT communicated nameDEF
   'They didn't communicate his name.'

(2) a. Kaza se [če sa 'mu namerili čadára].
   said3SG REFL that are3PL himDAT found umbrellaDEF
   'It was said that they found his umbrella.'

   b. Kaza 'mu se [če sa namerili čadára].
      said3SG himDAT REFL that are3PL found umbrellaDEF
      'It was said to him that they found the umbrella.'

   *'It was said that they found his umbrella.'

(3) a. Kaza [če ne 'mu se vârtjala glavatá ot vinoto].
   said3SG that not himDATREFL spinEVID headDEF from wineDEF
   'He said his head was not spinning because of the wine.'

   b. Kaza [če glavatá ne 'mu se vârtjala tì ot
      said3SG that headDEF not himDAT REFL spinEVID from
      vinoto],
      wineDEF
      'He said his head was not spinning because of the wine.'

(4) a. *Jumrukát ne 'mu udari masata.
   fistDEF not himDAT hit tableDEF
   'His fist did not hit the table.'

   b. Jumrukát 'mu ne udari masata.
      fistDEF himDAT not hit tableDEF
      'His fist did not hit the table.'

The examples in (1) have been taken in the literature on Bulgarian to constitute a homogeneous construction, and have been analyzed as involving either movement of the clitic from the DP expressing the possessee (Franks and King 2000: 276; Stateva 2002; Moskovsky 2004) or direct base generation of the clitic in the clausal dative clitic position

(Schick 2000; Schürcks and Wunderlich 2003, section 4; Tomić forthcoming).

Here we argue that in fact two distinct constructions should be recognized. The first, identical to what is sometimes referred to as "possessor raising" in Romance, imposes a benefactive/malefactive reading on the possessor, is limited to inalienably possessed body parts (with some extensions), and shows properties of a base-generated construction; the other, which does not have any benefactive/malefactive connotation, nor limitation to inalienably possessed DPs, involves instead movement of the clitic from within the DP that expresses the possessee.²

To see this, it may be useful to start from a puzzling contrast between the Romance and the Bulgarian constructions.³

2. A Comparative Puzzle

The Romance construction corresponding to (1) is subject to a number of well-known restrictions, listed here in (1a–c):⁴

² With respect to these properties Romanian appears to pattern with Bulgarian rather than with the other Romance languages (see fn. 16 below).
³ We ignore here certain differences among the Romance languages, which are orthogonal to our concerns. For example, those pertaining to the obligatory vs. optional character of the dative clitic (compare (iap) with (1b); in (ib), either gli or a Gianni is possible, but not both), or the possibility vs. impossibility of a full prepositional dative (compare (ia–b) with (1c)):
   (i) a. *(Le) sacaron la muela del juicio a Juan. Spanish
      himDAT pulled the tooth of-the wisdom to Juan
      'They pulled out Juan's wisdom tooth.' (Jaeggli 1980: 62)
   b. <Gli> hanno estratto il dente del giudizio <a Gianni>.
      himDAT have3PL pulled the tooth of-the wisdom to Gianni
      'They pulled out Gianni's wisdom tooth.' Italian
   c. Ils lui ont arraché les dents de sagesse (*à Patrick).
      they himDAT have3PL pulled the teeth of wisdom to Patrick
      'They pulled out Patrick's wisdom teeth.' French
      (Authier 1988: 168)

⁴ These restrictions are discussed for French by Kayne (1977, section 2.15) and Vergnaud and Zubizarreta (1992, section 1). They seem to be shared by Spanish (Piccallo and Rigau 1999; Sánchez López 2007) and Italian.
It is limited to inalienable possession, and admits only predicates that affect their objects and impose a benefactive/malefactive reading on the external possessive dative clitic. See the contrast between (5) and (6) below:

(5) a. On lui a coupé les cheveux. French
\[ \text{IMP him}_{\text{DAT}}/\text{her}_{\text{DAT}} \text{ has cut the hair} \]
\[ \text{They cut his/her hair.} \] (Kayne 1977: 159)

b. El gato le arañó la cara. Spanish
\[ \text{the cat } \text{him}_{\text{DAT}} \text{ scratched the face} \]
\[ \text{The cat scratched his/her face.} \] (Sánchez López 2007: 153)

(6) a. *Tu lui aimes bien les jambes. French
\[ \text{you him/her}_{\text{DAT}} \text{ love}_{2\text{SG}} \text{ well the legs} \]
\[ \text{You like his/her legs.} \] (Kayne 1977: 159)

b. *Le odio el carácter. Spanish
\[ \text{him}_{\text{DAT}} \text{ hate}_{1\text{SG}} \text{ the character} \]
\[ \text{I hate his character.} \] (Picallo and Rigau 1999: 1015)

c. *Gli ho dimenticato il nome. Italian
\[ \text{him}_{\text{DAT}} \text{ have}_{1\text{SG}} \text{ forgotten the name} \]
\[ \text{I forgot his name.} \]
(8) b. Hanno lavato la loro testa/le loro teste.  
    have3PL washed the their head/the their heads  
    'They washed their head/heads.'

Ic. The NP expressing inalienable possession may only be modified 
by a restrictive adjective, not by an appositive one, as shown in 
(9a) and (10a) (see Kayne 1977: 161; Vergnaud and Zubizarreta 
1992: 603f). This again contrasts with the case containing a 
possessive inside the DP, as in (9b) and (10b):  

(9) a. *Tu lui as photographié la belle bouche,  
    you him/herDAT have2SG photographed the beautiful mouth  
    'You photographed his/her beautiful mouth.' 
    (Kayne 1977: 161)

b. Tu as photographié sa belle bouche.  
    you have2SG photographed his/her beautiful mouth  
    'You photographed his/her beautiful mouth.'  
    (Kayne 1977: 161)

(10) a. Gli hai fotografato la <bella> bocca  
    himDAT have2SG photographed the beautiful mouth  
    (<bella>).  
    beautiful  
    'You photographed his beautiful mouth.'

As noted by Aoun (reported in Authier 1988: 175, fn. 3), appositive relatives, 
as opposed to appositive adjectives, can instead modify the NP expressing 
alienable possession:

(i) Tu lui a photographié la bouche, laquelle/qui était  
    you her/himDAT have photographed the mouth which was  
    très belle.  
    very beautiful  
    'You photographed her/his mouth, which was very beautiful.'

In Romance, prenominal adjectives are only appositive, postnominal ones  
either appositive or restrictive (see Cinque forthcoming for discussion).

At first sight, Bulgarian does not seem to obey any of these restrictions. First, it allows "possessor raising" also with predicates which do 
not affect their objects nor impose a benefactive/maleactive reading 
on the possessive dative. See (11), the equivalents of which are indeed 
impossible in Romance (but see fn. 16 on Romanian):

(11) a. Az mnogo mu xaresvam novata šapka.  
    I very much himDAT like1SG newDEF hat  
    'I love his new hat.'  
    (Stateva 2002: 649)

b. Ne mu pomnja fizionomijata.  
    not himDAT remember1SG faceDEF  
    'I don't remember his face.'

c. Ne mu poznavam prijatelja.  
    not himDAT know1SG friendDEF  
    'I don't know his friend.'

d. Az mu polučix pismo.  
    I himDAT received1SG letterDEF  
    'I received his letter.'

e. Boris Simeonov mi beše pärvijat professor po  
    Boris Simeonov meDAT was firstDEF professor in  
    ezikoznanie.  
    linguistics  
    'Boris Simeonov was my first professor of linguistics.'

Second, unique inalienable body parts and unique extended inalienable DPs, like 'head', 'face', 'stomach', 'nose', ('mother', 'home'), etc., can either be singular or plural, again differently from Romance, 
where, as seen in (7) and (8) above, they must be singular:
(12) Ako jadete mnogo, šte si napalnite stomaxa/
if eat2pl a lot will REFL_DAT fill2pl stomachs_DEF
stomasite i posle šte vj stane lošo.
stomachs_DEF and then will you_DAT.PL get3sg sick
'Iif you(pl.) eat a lot, you(pl.) will fill your stomachs and you will feel sick.'

Third, as shown by (13a–b), the inalienably possessed NP can apparently be modified by an appositive adjective (once again differently from Romance).

(13) a. Mnogo ti mrazja toja loš karakter.
a lot you_DAT hate1sg this bad character
'I really hate this bad character of yours.'

b. Ne moga da i opisja krasivata kosa. Ne not can1sg MOD her1sg describe1sg beautiful_def hair not
sâm poet.
am poet
'I cannot describe her beautiful hair. I am not a poet.'

In spite of this evidence, which seems to show that Bulgarian does not have a "possessor raising" construction of the Romance type, we are going to argue that it does, and that this construction is subject to all of the restrictions noted above for Romance. The impression that Bulgarian does not have the Romance-type construction comes from the hasty conclusion that the cases in (1) and in (11–13) constitute one and the same construction, comparable to that which (5), (7–8), and (10) belong to. But, as shown below, (1a–b) correspond to the Romance "possessor raising" construction, while (1c) and (11–13) should rather be viewed as akin to the possessive genitive ne/en/etc. 'of it' construction familiar from some of the Romance languages.

As can be seen from the contrast between (6c) above and (14) below, a non-affecting verb like Italian dimenticare/ French oublier 'to forget' can only appear in the ne/en-construction. The fact that the Bulgarian counterpart of (14), given in (15), is also grammatical suggests that (15) should perhaps be treated on a par with the Romance ne/en construction rather than with the Romance possessive dative con-

struction. For evidence corroborating this conjecture, see section 5, where it will be shown that (15) and the like have all the hallmarks of a movement construction, just like the Romance ne/en construction (Belletti and Rizzi 1981, Burzio 1986: chapter 1):

(14) a. Ne ho dimenticato il nome.
\text{Italian} 
\text{it}_\text{GEN} \text{have1sg} forgotten the name
'I have forgotten his/its name.'

b. J'en ai oublié le nom.
\text{French} 
\text{I it}_\text{GEN} \text{have1sg} forgotten the name
'I have forgotten his/its name.'
\text{(cf. *Je lui ai oublié le nom} 'I him\_DAT have forgotten the name.')

(15) Az sâm mu zabravil imesto.
\text{Bulgarian} 
\text{I am} him\_DAT forgotten name\_DEF
'I have forgotten his/its name.'

Even if Bulgarian is generally taken to have morphologically neutralized the genitive and dative cases, so that one could think that the "dative" clitic in those cases that have no correspondent in the Romance "possessor raising" construction is actually a "genitive" clitic (like Romance en/ne), we do not push the resemblance that far, partly because of Mrčev’s (1978: 189), Duridanov’s (1993: 241), and Pancheva’s (2004) (diachronic) evidence that Bulgarian really has no genitive, but just dative, also for possession.\footnote{This actually needs to be looked into more carefully since the DP-internal dative clitic can quite generally correspond to the subject or object of a deverbal noun (agent/theme), or a subjective experience dative, but can never correspond to a (goal) indirect object argument (Franks 2000: 62; Franks and King 2000: 56 and 276ff).}

Once the movement construction is factored out, the remaining cases, i.e., those with an inalienably possessed DP affected by the predicate, and with a benefactive/malefactive interpretation of the external possessive clitic, involve no extraction of the possessor, exactly as their Romance counterparts in (5), (7–8), and (10).
This line of reasoning thus leads us to posit the existence of two separate constructions involving external possessive clitics in Bulgarian, which have so far been lumped together under the general label of possessor raising.

We label the construction akin to Romance "possessor raising" the "base-generated possessor construction," distinguishing it from the one involving extraction on the basis of certain properties that are present in one but not the other construction.

Before examining these properties, we recall in the next section some of the evidence that shows the Romance "possessor raising" construction to be a misnomer, given that it does not involve raising but rather base generation, of the dative clitic outside of the DP expressing the possessee.

3. The Non-Movement Nature of the Romance "Possessor Raising" Construction

One first piece of evidence against taking the posseseive dative clitic in Romance to raise from inside the DP expressing the inalienable body part is the fact, observed in Kayne (1977: 1596), that such extraction would sometimes have to cross a PP node as in (16). Given that PPs, as opposed to simple DPs, normally block extraction (compare (17a) and (18a) with (17b) and (18b)), it is reasonable to infer from the contrast between (16) and (18a) that the external possessive dative clitic gli (as opposed to the external possessive genitive clitic ne) cannot have resulted from movement out of the DP expressing the possessee:

(16) Gli hanno urlato [PP ne [DP gli orecchi]].
    himDAT have3PL shouted in the the ears
    'They shouted in his ears.'

(17) a. *Di chi hanno urlato [PP ne [DP gli orecchi]]?
    of whom have3PL shouted in the ears
    'Who was it that they shouted in his ears?'

b. Di chi hanno medicato [DP gli orecchi]
    of whom have3PL treated the ears
    'Of whom have they treated the ears?'

Another problem with taking the clausal dative clitic to originate inside the DP expressing the inalienable body part is that, as seen in (7) and (8) above, repeated here as (19) and (20), the putative sources of extraction of the posseseive dative clitic in (19b) and (20b) lack the restriction found in (19a) and (20a) according to which the possessed body part must be singular even when the posseseive clitic is plural:

(19) a. Le médecin leur a examiné la gorge/ *les gorges.
    the doctor themDAT has examined the throat/ the throats
    'The doctor examined their throats.'
    (Vergnaud and Zubizarreta 1992: 597, 602)

b. Le médecin a examiné leur gorge/ leur gorges.
    the doctor has examined their throat/ their throats
    'The doctor examined their throats.'
    (Vergnaud and Zubizarreta 1992: 598, 602)

(20) a. Hanno loro lavato la testa/ *le teste.
    have3PL themDAT washed the head/ the heads
    'They washed their heads.'

b. Hanno lavato la loro testa/ le loro teste.
    have3PL washed the their head/ the their heads
    'They washed their head/heads.'

These examples suggest that it is rather dubious to derive the external possessive dative clitic in (19a) and (20a) via raising from the DP expressing the possessee.

A third difficulty for the raising analysis comes from the fact that in some cases there simply is no plausible source for the dative clitic
inside the DP expressing the inalienable body part. See, for example, (21), from Kayne (1977: 160).9

(21) Elle lui a mis la main [là où il ne
she him/her_{DAT} has put the hand there where it NEG
fallait pas].
was-appropriate not
'She put her hand where she shouldn't have.'

9 Further difficulties for a movement analysis of "possessor raising" are discussed in Kayne 1977, section 2.15, and Guéron 2006, section 2.4.2. Given cases like (i), which seem to be characterized by the same type of coreference between the pronoun and the DP expressing the body part (cf. Vergnaud and Zubizarreta 1992), one would presumably also have to posit movement of the DP internal possessor to a thematic (subject or object) position:

(i) a. Loro hanno alzato la mano.
they have_{ML} raised the hand
'They raised their hands.'

b. Lei lo ha colpitosulla testa.
she him_{ACC} has struck on_{DEF} head
'She struck him on the head.'

Also, cases like (ii) (cf. Kayne 1977: 163) could hardly involve movement of the clitic from both the object DP and the complement PP, or movement from the object DP licensing a pronominal inside the PP, given the general inability of clitics to license pronominal gaps (see Chomsky 1982: 65, based on an observation of Luigi Rizzi's, and Burzio 1986: 32ff):

(ii) Gli ho spostato (il braccio) [da sotto la testa].
him_{DAT} have_{SG} removed the arm from under the head
'The removed his arm from under his head.'

Landau (1999), without addressing the evidence mentioned above, claims that "possessor raising" in Romance (and Hebrew) involves movement out of the DP expressing inalienable possession. But to us his arguments do not seem convincing. Even his "most straightforward evidence" for extraction—namely, that its possibility from subcategorized PPs but not from adjunct PPs is indicative of island sensitivity and thus of movement—is less than clear. Quite apart from the general island character of PPs, that contrast could very well depend on a requirement that the dative possessor be a co-argument of the body part DP/PP within the same minimal clause. See also Guéron's (2006) critical discussion.

4. The Bulgarian Base Generated Possessor Construction Akin to the Romance Construction

Bulgarian too offers particularly clear evidence that at least some of its possessive datives cannot have raised from inside the DP/PP which contains the possessee. These are the external possessive datives that receive a benefactive/malefactive reading and are interpreted as possessors of an inalienable body part (or its extensions), like the Romance base-generated possessors discussed in the previous section.

In Bulgarian, differently from Romance, the same possessive dative clitic is free to occur either DP-internally or DP-externally:

(22) a. Tja mu ščupi [DP malkija prast].
she him_{DAT} brokε_{SG} little_{DEF} finger
'She broke his little finger.'

b. Tja ščupi [DP malkija mu prast].
she brokε_{SG} little_{DEF} him_{DAT} finger
'She broke his little finger.'

However, the DP internal variant of (22) must meet a crucial requirement not holding of the DP external variant; namely that the DP containing the possessee must be definite.10 No possessive dative clitic can appear inside a DP when this is indefinite (Penčev 1998: 30; Dimitrova-Vulchanova and Giusti 1999: 169; Franks and King 2000: 282; Moskovsky 2004: 221f). See the contrast between (22b) and (23) below:

(23) Tja ščupi [edin mu prast].
she brokε_{SG} a him_{DAT} finger
'She broke a finger of his.'

As noted, no definiteness requirement holds of the DP external variant, as can be seen from (24), which is the only possible way to render (23):

10 In this case, the clitic follows the demonstrative or whichever element is inflected with the definite article (Penčev 1993; Dimitrova-Vulchanova and Giusti 1999: 169f; Franks 2000: 59ff; Franks and King 2000: 275; Stateva 2002: 660; Schürcks and Wunderlich 2003: 121).
(24) Tja mu ščupi [edin prast].
    she him_{DAT} broke_{3SG} a finger
    'She broke a finger of his.'

This evidence suggests that (22a) and (22b) are not related transformationally and, consequently, the external dative clitic in (24) does not have its source inside the DP, but is merged directly in a clausal clitic position and is related to the DP expressing the inalienable body part via a non-movement mechanism.\textsuperscript{11}

Further evidence exists that the possessive dative clitic in the Romance-type base generated possessor construction of Bulgarian cannot have raised from the DP expressing inalienable possession. We have just noted that the DP containing a possessive dative clitic must be overtly marked as definite. However, most kinship terms (dăšterja ‘daughter’, žena ‘wife’, etc.) seem to provide an exception to this constraint (Franks and King 2000: 282; Moskovsky 2004: fn. 1). They can be followed by a possessive clitic even in the absence of an overt definite article (as a matter of fact, if a possessive clitic is present in the DP, they cannot take the definite article).\textsuperscript{12} See (25):

(25) Te sâsipaxa [dăšterja*(ta) mu]/ [žena*(ta) mu]/...
    they ruined_{3PL} daughter_{DEF}/ him_{DAT}/ wife_{DEF}/ him_{DAT}
    'They ruined his daughter/wife/...'

However, when the possessive clitic is in the DP-external position, the definite article on the kinship term inside the DP is obligatory.\textsuperscript{13}

\textsuperscript{11} Also see Schürcks and Wunderlich 2003 (135). Non-movement mechanisms proposed in the literature are: (anaphoric) Binding by the possessive dative of the deterrer of the DP expressing the body part (Guéron 1985, Demonte 1988, among others), or of a pro subject of the DP expressing the body part (Authier 1988, chapter 4), and Predication (Vergnaud and Zubizarreta 1992). For evidence that in Bulgarian "the structural position occupied by the possessive clitic when it shows up preverbally is the one that is otherwise reserved for the Dative clausal clitic," see Stateva 2002: 652 and Pancheva 2004.

\textsuperscript{12} This is true only for the singular. In the plural, as noted by Penčev (1998: 31), all forms must be overtly marked for definiteness.

\textsuperscript{13} For some reason other kinship terms (e.g., majka ‘mother’, băšta ‘father’, etc.) accept the definite article in such structures only rather marginally (??)

(26) Te mu sâsipaxa [dăšterja*(ta)]/ [žena*(ta)]/...
    they him_{DAT} ruined_{3PL} daughter_{DEF}/ wife_{DEF}/
    'They ruined his daughter/wife/...'

This suggests that the clitic in (26) cannot have originated in the position of the clitic in (25), for we would expect the definite article on the kinship term in (26) to be just as impossible as in (25), contrary to fact.

One more case exists where the external dative clitic finds no possible source inside the DP, thus supporting a base generation analysis of the Romance-type Bulgarian possessor construction.

As in Romance (where they also constitute evidence for the non-movement nature of the corresponding construction), Bulgarian has idioms with external possessive dative clitics which do not have a variant with a DP-internal clitic. Compare (27a) with (27b):\textsuperscript{14}

sâsipaxa majkata). They are entirely natural however in colloquial expressions like (i):

(i) Njama da mi obidâš majkata.
    not have MOD me_{DAT} insult_{2SG} mother_{DEF}
    'You should not insult my mother'.

\textsuperscript{14} Analogously, in Romance no variant exists with a possessive adjective internal to the DP, or with extraction of nielen. See the French and Italian examples (i) and (ii) ((ia–b) are from Lamiro 2003: 260ff, who notes the same facts also for Spanish and Dutch):

(i) a. Luc lui casse les pieds.
    Luc him/her_{DAT} breaks the feet
    'Luc bothers him/her.'

b. Luc casse ses pieds.
    Luc breaks his/herfeet
    (no idiom interpretation available)

c. Luc en casse les pieds.
    Luc him_{GEN} breaks the feet
    (no idiom interpretation available)

(ii) a. Gli hanno rotto le scatole.
    him_{DAT} have_{3PL} broken the boxes
    'They annoyed him.'

b. Hanno rotto le sue scatole.
    have_{3PL} broken the his boxes
    (no idiom interpretation available)

c. Ne hanno rotto le scatole.
    him_{GEN} have_{3PL} broken the boxes
    (no idiom interpretation available)
(27) a. Ti mi xodiš po nervite.
you.me{DAT} walk{2SG} on nerves{DEF}
lit. 'You are walking on my nerves.' (‘You are getting on my nerves.’)

b. *Ti xodiš po [nervite mi].
you walk{2SG} on nerves{DEF} me{DAT}

Given the evidence reviewed so far for the non-movement characteristic of the relation between the clausal possessive dative clitic and the DP expressing inalienable possession, it is not surprising that the latter may be found, like in Romance, inside a PP, which is an island for extraction also in Bulgarian (see (28) below):

(28) a. Toj mi se izkrjaska [PP v [DP u xoto]].
he me{DAT} REFShouted{2SG} in ear{DEF}
'He shouted in my ear.'

b. Az i se izsmjaj [PP v [DP liceto]].
I her{DAT} REFLaughed{1SG} in face{DEF}
'I laughed in her face.'

All of this suggests that with affecting verbs the clitic is directly base-generated DP-externally.

5. The Movement Nature of Bulgarian Possessor Raising with Non-Affecting Predicates

Let us now turn to the cases in (11–13) above, which, as noted, do not share the restrictions of the Romance "possessor raising" construction. First, they appear to involve predicates that do not affect their objects. Second, they do not impose a benefactive/malefactive interpretation on the external possessor. Third, they do not necessarily take inalienable body parts as their objects.\footnote{To judge from Dumitrescu (1990), Romanian seems to pattern with Bulgarian rather than with the rest of Romance. She reports many Romanian examples, a couple of which are given in (i) below, of the same general type seen in (11), quoting the following telling passage from Baciu (1985: 357): “en roumain, le datif possessif est incomparablement plus fréquent que dans les autres langues romanes. Cette fréquence élevée est due à l’absence de toute contrainte d’ordre sémantique, alors que dans les autres langues romanes le datif possessif indique de préférence, sinon uniquement, la possession d’une partie du corps.” For similar observations, see Avram and Coene 2000, 2008 and references cited there.}

These cases, in opposition to Romance and to Bulgarian base-generated possessor constructions, show clear signs that movement is involved. For one thing, they cannot occur with an indefinite DP (compare examples (11c–d) above with (29)):

(29) a. *Ne mu poznavam edin prijatel.
not him{DAT} know{1SG} one/a friend
'I know a friend of his.'

b. *Az mu polučī edno pismo.
I him{DAT} received{1SG} one/a letter
'I received a letter of his.'

Their ungrammaticality follows directly from the impossibility of the dative clitic to appear inside an indefinite DP (cf. (23)), and from the fact that with non-affecting predicates the dative clitic cannot be directly merged externally. The examples in (29) contrast with (24), which has the possessive dative clitic merged outside of the DP (in the clausal position of dative arguments) and is thus unaffected by the indefinite character of the object.
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That the ungrammaticality of (29) really derives from the impossibility of movement is confirmed by the observation that wherever movement is blocked possessor raising with non-affecting predicates becomes impossible. One such case is provided by the examples in (30a, b) containing non-affecting predicates in which the external possessive dative clitic cannot be construed with a possessee embedded in a PP. Under the possessor raising approach adopted for these cases, their ungrammaticality follows directly from the island character of the PP (cf. (30c)), which blocks the raising of the clitic. Examples (30a, b) should be compared once again with cases like (28) above, which are grammatical precisely because no movement has taken place:

(30)

a. "Az i misija [PP za [DP očite _]].
   I her\textsubscript{DAT} think\textsubscript{1SG} for eyes\textsubscript{DEF}
   'I think of her eyes.'

b. "Az ne ti zavisja [PP ot [DP parite _]].
   I not you\textsubscript{DAT} depend\textsubscript{1SG} from money\textsubscript{DEF}
   'I don’t depend on your money.'

c. "Na kogo govori [PP sás [DP zetja _]].
   to whom spoke\textsubscript{2SG} with son-in-law\textsubscript{DEF}
   'To whose son-in-law did you talk.'

6. Further Consequences

A direct consequence of the proposed distinction between the two types of possessor constructions in Bulgarian is the possibility of having a DP external possessive clitic when the DP expressing the possessee is pronounalized. See the contrast between (31a) and (31b):

(31)

a. Question

   A prästa mu?
   and finger\textsubscript{DEF} him\textsubscript{DAT}
   'And [what about] his finger?'

b.

   b. Az mu goi polučix [pro].
   I him\textsubscript{DAT} it\textsubscript{ACC} received\textsubscript{1SG}
   'I received it (*on him).'

   In (31a–b), go 'it\textsubscript{ACC}' pronounalizes the entire DP that expresses the possessee. This means that only when the possessive dative clitic is base generated outside of the DP, as in (31a), which contains the affecting verb 'bit', can it cooccur with the accusative clitic, as shown in (32a). No such possibility exists when the possessive clitic should have originates inside the DP that is pronounalized, as in (31b), since there would be no room for the merger of the possessive clitic in (32b):

(32)

a. Kučeto mu goi otxapa [pro].
   dog\textsubscript{DEF} him\textsubscript{DAT} it\textsubscript{ACC} bit\textsubscript{3SG}
   'The dog bit it on him.'

b. Az mu goi polučix [pro].
   I him\textsubscript{DAT} it\textsubscript{ACC} received\textsubscript{1SG}
   'I received it (*on him).'

   Another consequence is the contrast between (33) and (34), related to the possibility of having a possessive clitic both inside and outside the DP expressing the possessee. If the external possessive clitic is base generated outside of the DP in the former case, but comes from inside the DP in the latter case, then only in the former case is cooccurrence with a DP-internal possessive clitic expected to be possible (barring spell-out of traces).
containing an unbound A-bar trace leads to an unacceptable result. Consider Italian (37):

(37) *I Rossi, [regalare t_i ai quali]_k non so cosa;
the Rossis give_{INF} to the whom_{PL} not know what
potrei t_k...
could_{SG}

(cf. Non so cosa potrei regalare ai Rossi. 'I don’t know what I
could give to the Rossis.')

An A-bar moved phrase containing a trace of A-movement does
not lead to a comparable problem, as the grammaticality of (38) shows:

(38) [venduto t_i ai Rossi]_k (l’ appartamento)_i non è stato t_k,
sold to-the Rossis the apartment wasn’t

In this respect, the trace of a clitic behaves like the trace left by A-
movement since it does not lead to unacceptability, (39). If so, then in
(36) we have a case analogous to that of (37) (modulo the A instead of
A-bar traces).

(39) [venduto t_i ai Rossi]_k non l’ hanno t_k,
sold to-the Rossis not it have_{3PL}

The generalization that emerges is that a configuration resulting
from movement of a certain type (A or A-bar) followed by remnant
movement of the same type (A or A-bar) leads to unacceptability: a
situation possibly related to the fact that Reconstruction of a certain
type of movement happens in one solution (cannot feed itself).

The ungrammaticality of (35b) is in fact parallel to that of (40) in
Italian with ne-extraction interacting with the A-movement of the ob-
ject DP to subject position:

---

16 Under the copy theory of movement (Chomsky 1995, chapter 3), the repre-
sentation would be (i):

(i) [DP imeto t_k]_i ne mu_k beše sǎobšteno na Maria [DP imeto mu_k]_i

For a recent general discussion of Reconstruction (also under the copy theory
of movement), see Sportiche 2003.

17 The grammatical status of (38) and (39) suggests that Reconstruction of A-
bar chains may feed Reconstruction of A-chains.

18 In both cases extraction of the clitic after the DP object has raised to prever-
bal subject position would involve an illicit downward movement. The pos-
sibility of so-called en-avant in French remains to be understood in relation to
its impossibility in Italian (and Bulgarian).
(40) "[Il nome t\textsubscript{k} non ne, è stato comunicato t\textsubscript{k}."

the name not it\textsubscript{gen} has been communicated

‘His name was not communicated.’

In (35a), on the other hand, the possessive clitic is base generated outside of the DP object expressing the possessee, as we have argued above, so no issue of simultaneous reconstruction of two A-chains arises here and grammaticality is completely expected.

7. Conclusion

In this paper, we have presented evidence that the traditional “possessor raising” phenomenon of Bulgarian (and, perhaps, that of other Balkan languages as well) should be decomposed into two separate cases. The first, here labeled “the base-generated possessor construction,” appears to have the same properties as the Romance “possessor raising” construction, namely:

(i) It is limited to inalienable possession (and its extensions);
(ii) It is limited to predicates which affect their objects and impose a benefactive/malefactive interpretation on the external possessor; and
(iii) It does not involve movement of the possessive clitic from inside the DP expressing the possessee.

The second case, which we could label “possessor raising” proper, is characterized by the opposite properties:

(iv) It is not limited to inalienable possession;
(v) It contains predicates that do not affect their object nor impose a benefactive/malefactive interpretation on the external possessor; and
(vi) It involves raising of the internal possessive clitic to a clausal dative position.

Crucially, then, the non-movement option in only available (in Bulgarian, as well as in Romance) whenever a dative clitic can be directly merged in the clausal dative position licensed by predicates that affect their objects, and assign to them a benefactive/malefactive theta-role, rather than the possessive one assigned inside the DP (as in the genuine possessor raising case). Since the predicates compatible with the latter construction (such as know, forget, describe, etc.) do not license any benefactive/malefactive theta-role, the clausal dative position is able to host via raising only clitics that have received a (possessive, or other) theta-role inside the DP.\textsuperscript{19}

We leave open the exact mechanism responsible for the added possessive interpretation that relates the external benefactive/malefactive dative to the DP expressing the inalienable possession in Romance and Bulgarian.
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Morphology-Free Syntax: Two Potential Counter-Examples from Serbo-Croat*

Greville G. Corbett

1. Introduction

An important aspect of Wayles’ work is his combined interest in the small and the large: he is very interested in the detail, the individual items of language, and at the same time in how these impact on large-scale generalizations. For instance, his (1978) paper on the Russian verb виждатъ ‘appear’ focuses on this single verb, whose stressed prefix suggests it would be perfective, according to the general rule, yet it is imperfective.

In this paper I look at the very general principle of morphology-free syntax and consider two potential counter-examples from Serbo-Croat. Following Wayles’ usage in Corbett and Browne 2009, I use “Serbo-Croat” as a linguistic cover term for Bosnian, Croatian, Montenegrin, and Serbian; an alternative is Central South Slavonic. The first example has been discussed previously, and is recapitulated in order to highlight the type of argumentation involved. It concerns conjoined noun phrases (the “carelessness and capriciousness problem”). The second has received little attention, and is our main focus. It may be summarized as the “two colleagues problem.”

2. Morphology-Free Syntax

* The support of the AHRC under grant AH/D001579/1 is gratefully acknowledged. While working on this topic it was natural to ask Wayles for his view, so I thank him for his (unwitting) help. I am also very thankful to Mirela Dumić for her linguistic intuitions, to Matthew Baerman, Ranko Matasović, and Ljubomir Popović for suggestions and comments, and to Steven Franks and an anonymous reviewer for their reactions to the final draft.