'AFFECTED' EXTERNAL POSSESSORS IN BULGARIAN

Significant contrast in locality constraints of Bulgarian external possessors is reported by native speakers between constructions with stative predicates *(see, like, hear, etc)* as in (1) and constructions with predicates that give raise to 'affected' reading as in (2) and (3):

(1) a. Včera **mu** vidjaxa [DPsbj momičeta-**ta**] [DPobj topka-ta] [PP ot mol-**a**]
    yesterday he.DAT saw.3PL girls-the ball-the from mall-the
        *'Yesterday, the girls saw **his** ball from the mall'*
        'Yesterday, **his girls saw the ball from the mall'*
        ** 'Yesterday, the girls saw the ball from **his** mall'*

    b. * Včera **mu** vidjaxa [DPsbj momičeta-**ta**] [DPobj topka] [ot mol-**a**]
    c. * Včera **mu** vidjaxa [DPsbj momičeta] [DPobj topka] [ot mol-**a**]

(2) Včera **mu** xvărlixa [DPsbj deca-(ta)] [DPobject topka-(ta)] [PP v gradina-(ta)] [PP do mol-(a)]
    yesterday he.DAT threw.3PL children-the ball-the in garden-the near mall-the
    *'Yesterday **his** children threw (the) ball in (the) garden near (the) mall'*
    *'Yesterday (the) children threw **his** ball in (the) garden near (the) mall'*
    *'Yesterday (the) children threw (the) ball in **his** garden near (the) mall'*
    *'Yesterday (the) children threw (the) ball in (the) garden near **his** mall'*

(3) Xuligani-te **í** otkradnaxa [DP topka-(ta) [PP na dete-**to**]]
    hooligans-the she.DAT stole.3PL ball-(the) of child-the
    *'The hooligans stole **her** child's ball' i.e. 'a/the ball of her child'*

Possessive relations between Bulgarian external (datival) possessors and <u>definite</u> possessums in direct object positions (as in (1)) have been discussed already in the literature as instances of sytactic *possessor raising* (Penchev 1993, Dimitrova-Vulchanova and Guisti 1998, Franks 2000, Stateva 2001) and the current paper assumes that in general all predicates in Bulgarian allow such syntactic raising of nominal (high) possessors[1] to the clitic-designated clausal position. The novel data in (2) and (3), however, demonstrate that under certain conditions one can understand external possessive relations also to possessums in indirect object position (2b), adjuncts (2c), and complex possessive constructions (3). The available possessive relations in (2) and (3) are even more surprising in structural terms since PPs are otherwise islands for extraction in Bulgarian.

In recent work on possessor raising in Bulgarian, Cinque and Krapova (2009, 2013) point out that (at least for possession of inalienable body parts) one needs to distinguish between *raised possessors* and *clausal base-generated possessors*, despite the fact that all possessors in Bulgarian look datival. In this spirit, the current paper enlarges the empirical data and demonstrates that externally generated 'possessors' are pervasive in the language, reaching well beyond inalienable body-parts relations (as demonstrated in (2) and (3)). This paper has two main objectives. The first is developing diagnostics - such as reference to *indefinite possessums*, *PP-embedded possessums*, possibility of co-occurring DP-external and DP-internal possessors, and availability of *affectee reading* - in order to distinguish the clausal datives from the raised nominal possessors. The second goal is to develop a syntactic analysis of externally generated 'possessor' datives. The graphic bellow, summarizes the proposed distinction:

---

[1] The paper distinguishes (and provides empirical evidence) between *high alienable possessors* that are base-generated within a functional domain above the nominal expression, *low modificational possessors* that are base generated within the nominal expression, and *inalienable possessors* (in the case of kinship nouns) that enter the derivation as arguments of the nominal expression (see Munn 1995, Barker 2011, Partee & Borschev 1998, Landau 1999).

TP **mu**$_1$ [VP…. [$_{DP-DO}$ **t**$_1$ (*poss pronoun) NP$_{def}$]]		(Possessor raising)
TP **mu**$_{affectee}$ [VP…. [$_{DP/PP}$ (poss pronoun) NP$_{def/indef}$]]		(Affected Dative)

The externally generated 'possessor' datives are analyzed in this paper as non-core clausal arguments that enter the derivation above VP, introduced by so called *High Applicative* syntactic heads (Pylkkanen 2002, 2008). They crucially differ from datives of true ditransitive verbs (*give, show, tell*), but they nevertheless render the truth condition of the proposition as they combine via Event Identification (Kratzer 1996, 2003). Crucially, the paper claims that these non-core arguments are added to the entire proposition of the clause as *causally affected participants* and any 'possessive' meaning to some other argument in the clause arises due to pragmatic inference, thus allowing the variation in meanings in (2) (see Bar-Asher Siegal & Boneh's (2015) treatment of affected datives in Modern Hebrew and Holle 2005 affected datives in German). To sum up, this paper's main contribution to the study of external possessors is (i) a systematic discussion of novel data in Bulgarian, (ii) development of language-specific diagnostics, and (iii) re-analysis of external dative 'possessors' as 'affected non-core clausal arguments'. This analysis crucially contrasts with existing proposals according to which nominal possessors move to secondary *theta positions* within the clause where they assume an additional 'affectee' reading (Landau 1999, Stateva 2002, Deal 2013, Lee-Schoenfeld 2015).

Selected References:

Bar-Asher Siegal, E. and Boneh, N. 2015. *Decomposing Affectedness: Truth-Conditional Non-core Datives in Modern Hebrew*. MIT Working Papers in Linguistics (MWPL78), Proceedings of IATL30.

Cinque, G. and Krapova, I. 2009. *The two possessors Raising Constructions of Bulgarian*. In S. Franks, V. Chidambaram, and B. Joseph, eds. A Linguist's Linguist. Studies in South Slavic Linguistics in Honor of E. Wayles Browne. Bloomington, Indiana: Slavica, 123-148.

Deal, A. 2013. *External Possession and Possessor Raising*. In M. Everaert & H. van Riemsdijk eds. The Companion to Syntax, 2nd edition.

Dimitrova-Vulchanova, M. and Guisti, G. 1998. Fragments of Balkan nominal structure. In: A. Alexiadou and C. Wilder eds. Possessors, Predicates and Movement in the Determiner Phrase, Amsterdam: John Adams, 333-360.

Hole, D. 2005. Reconciling 'possessor'datives and 'beneficiary' datives – Towards a unified voice account of dative binding in German. In C. Maienborn and A. Woellstein eds. *Event Arguments: Foundation and application*, 213-242.

Krapova I. and Cinque, G. 2013. *The Case for Genitive Case in Bulgarian*, The Nominal Structure in Slavic and Beyond, Berlin, 237-274.

Kratzer, A. 1996). Severing the external argument from its verb.- In: J. Rooryck & L. Zaring eds.*Phrase Structure and the Lexicon*, 109-137.

Landau, I. 1999. *Possessor raising and the structure of VP*. Lingua 107, 1–37.

Lee-Schoenfeld, V. 2015. *The syntax of external and internal possessor variation in German inalienable possession*. In G. Diewald ed. Non-Central Usages of Datives (guest-edited volume in Language Typology and Universals).

Munn, A. 1995. *The Possessor that Stayed Close to Home*. Proceedings of WECOL 24.

Pancheva, R. 2004.*Balkan Possessive Clitics: The Problem of Case and Category*. In O. Tomić ed. Balkan Syntax and Semantics. John Benjamins, 175-219.

Stateva, P. 2002. *Possessive clitics and the structure of nominal expressions*. Lingua 112, 647-690.

Vergnaud, J-R. and Zubizzarreta M. L. 1992. *The definite determiner and the inalienable constructions in French and in English*. LI 23, 595-653.