

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/300469660>

Possessor Raising and Slavic clitics

Chapter · January 2013

DOI: 10.1075/slcs.146.03zim

CITATION

1

READS

110

1 author:



[Anton Zimmerling](#)

Pushkin State Russian language Institute

101 PUBLICATIONS 75 CITATIONS

[SEE PROFILE](#)

John Benjamins Publishing Company



This is a contribution from *Current Studies in Slavic Linguistics*.

Edited by Irina Kor Chahine.

© 2013. John Benjamins Publishing Company

This electronic file may not be altered in any way.

The author(s) of this article is/are permitted to use this PDF file to generate printed copies to be used by way of offprints, for their personal use only.

Permission is granted by the publishers to post this file on a closed server which is accessible to members (students and staff) only of the author's/s' institute, it is not permitted to post this PDF on the open internet.

For any other use of this material prior written permission should be obtained from the publishers or through the Copyright Clearance Center (for USA: www.copyright.com).

Please contact rights@benjamins.nl or consult our website: www.benjamins.com

Tables of Contents, abstracts and guidelines are available at www.benjamins.com

Possessor Raising and Slavic clitics*

Anton Zimmerling

Moscow State University for the Humanities (SMSUH), Russia

The paper discusses syntactic features of Slavic possessive clitics and Slavic constructions with so-called “Possessor Raising”. I prove that only a minority of Slavic languages have true phrase-level (NP-level or DP-level) possessive clitics and argue against a generalized syntactic account of all Slavic constructions with possessive operators. The weak aspects of the PR hypothesis are that it takes the mapping of syntax and possessive semantics to be iconic and the rules/principles of extracting a NP/DP-level possessive operator out of the NP/DP to be trivial. These assumptions are poorly justified empirically. Slavic languages typically apply different case-marking for non-agreeing phrase-level possessive operators and non-agreeing clause-level possessive operators. A group of languages, including Modern Russian, lacks phrase-level possessive clitics. For this group the PR hypothesis cannot be validated. Most cases where the PR hypothesis has been proposed in previous Slavic studies do not conform to the definition of Raising as a syntactic operation, since the identity of structures with a clause-level or phrase-level possessive operator cannot be established. Such cases must be reanalyzed in terms of Possessive Shift, i.e. alternation of a true possessive construction with a NP/DP-level possessive element and its quasi-synonym, a pseudo-possessive construction with a case-marked verbal argument.

Keywords: possessor raising; possessive shift; clitics; Slavic languages

1. Possessor Raising and possessive shift

In descriptive terms “PR” refers to a quasi-synonymic transformation where a phrase-level possessive operator located in a NP/DP and expressed by a clitic/free pronoun/NP is made an argument of the clausal predicate (cf. Szabolcsi 1983).

* The paper is written with financial support from the Russian Ministry of Education and Culture, project 2012–1.2.1-12-000-3004-9859 ‘Models of Case Grammar and Natural Languages’. The author is grateful to the audience of SLS-6 conference (Aix-en-Provence, University of Provence, September 1-3, 2011) and, personally, to Steven Franks, Frank Gladney and Grigory Krejdlin for the valuable comments. I am also grateful to the anonymous reviewers for their criticism. All responsibility for shortcomings is my own.

PR and other instances of raising can be analyzed as stages in the derivation of a sentence (cf. Don-Won Lee 2004; Pei-Jung Kuo & Yi-An-Lin 2008). In Slavic, specifically, in Russian studies, a description of possessive constructions in terms of PR became standard after the publications of Alexander Kibrik, (cf. Kibrik 2000, 2003), though there is no consensus whether underlying possessivity should be treated as a purely semantic relation (cf. Seliverstova 1990) or as a syntactic feature associated with some presumably prototypical possessive constructions, be it bare genitive NPs in all languages of the world, cf. Kibrik (2003: 307) or language-specific constructions such as the Russian construction with the preposition *u* + genitive NP, cf. Melčuk & Iordanskaja 1995; Raxilina 2000: 54.

The term “Possessive Shift” is introduced in this paper for a quasi-synonymic relation of sentences with a possessive operator that may be pragmatically equivalent in some contexts but have different syntactic structure. I argue that different placement of a possessive element may either change syntactic structure or preserve it, depending on the value morphosyntactic parameters assume in a given language. In some Slavic languages phrase-level and clause-level possessive operators are marked with different morphological cases. For instance, Russian phrase-level possessives are genitives, while Russian clause-level possessives are datives. Pairs of sentences like (a) ru. *Ona ne* [_{NP} *doč’ Petrova*_{GEN}/*ego*_{GEN} *doč’*] ‘She is not Petrov’s daughter/his daughter’ ~ (b) *Ona emu*_{DAT} *ne doč’/ Petrovu*_{DAT} *ne doč’*” should be analyzed as Possessor Shift, i.e. as an alternation between different structures. In Modern Russian Possessive Shift cannot be analyzed as Raising, since both the syntax and the argument marking in (a) and (b) are different. In Old Church Slavonic, Modern Bulgarian, and Macedonian Possessive Shift is bound to the use of pronominal clitics. These are marked by the same overt case (dative), both on the phrase-level and on the clause-level. For this group of languages, a PR analysis of clausal possessive forms remains possible. In Modern Serbo-Croatian, dative possessives in clausal 2P are marginally acceptable, according to Pennington 2010, but phrase-level dative possessives in SC are ungrammatical. A similar result can be shown for Modern Russian, a language lacking pronominal clitics. Here, clause-level dative possessive pronouns are marginally acceptable, cf. (1a), while phrase-level dative possessives are ungrammatical, cf. (1b).

- (1) Russian
- a. *Ja sebe ne vrag.*
 I:NOM REF.DAT NEG enemy:NOM
 ‘I am not an enemy to myself.’
- b. **Ja vstretil vraga sebe.*
 I:NOM met:PF.M enemy:ACC REF.DAT
 Intended: ‘I met my own enemy.’

The two oldest Slavic idioms – Old Church Slavonic (OCS) and Old Northern Russian (ONR) – exemplify two extremes: ONR completely lacked dative possessives, while in OCS they were common both in clausal-second position (2P)¹ and on the phrase-level. The clausal 2P in Slavic languages typically hosts argument and reflexive pronominal clitics (cf. Dimitrova-Vulchanova 1999; Franks & King 2000; Zimmerling 2008). Following Zimmerling & Kosta 2013, I claim that the majority of Slavic languages only have clause-level possessives and that these pattern with argument dative clitics. Modern Bulgarian and Macedonian give the best chances to check the Raising hypothesis, since these two languages both seem to have DP-level dative clitics (cf. Mišeska Tomić 2004; Franks et al. 2004) and mechanisms allowing for extracting dative clitics out of DP. In Franks & King 2000 and Franks 2008 pronominal and auxiliary Bulgarian clitics are analyzed as verb-adjacent proclitics in syntax but as phonetic 2P enclitics that do not stand clause-initially due to a presumably non-syntactic condition. Dimitrova-Vulchanova 1999; Zimmerling 2006 and Zimmerling & Kosta 2013 analyse all Bulgarian clustering clitics as 2P elements. There are two competing accounts of Bulgarian possessive clitics. According to Schürcks & Wunderlich 2003, Bulgarian dative possessives raise out of DP to a position overtly resembling clausal 2P² where they cluster with other 2P clitics, such as Bulgarian yes-no particle *li*, in (2a) and (2b).

(2) Bulgarian

- a. *Tja nameri= li* [_{DP} *užasni-te= si greški*]?
 she found:3SG Q horrible-the REF.DAT mistakes
 ‘Did she find her horrible mistakes?’
- b. *Tja nameri= li= si* [_{DP} *užasni-te___ greški*]?
 she found:3SG Q REF.DAT horrible-the mistakes
 ‘Did she find her horrible mistakes?’

1. I am adopting a traditional view that ‘clausal 2P’ is a position or a block of adjacent positions that can be defined in terms of syntax, cf. Progovac 1996 or syntax-prosody interface, cf. Zaliznjak 2008 and do not take into account an alternative hypothesis raised by Agbayani & Golston 2010 who argue that ‘2P’ is an epiphenomenon and claim that clitic hosts of 2P clitics always lie clause-external to them. Agbayani and Golston’s analysis is difficult to apply to Slavic clustering clitics.

2. The exact definition of the position taken by Bulgarian dative possessives depends on the analysis of Bulgarian pronominal and auxiliary clitics – whether they are explained as verb-adjacent elements in syntax or as 2P elements. I am adopting a 2P analysis to Bulgarian clustering clitics and classify them as enclitics (X=CL) in this paper. The problem of clitic hosts is however of minor importance for the analysis of examples like (1b), since clause-level clustering clitics and clusters like *=li=si* in (1b) end up in verb-adjacent positions, as an anonymous reviewer justly pointed out.

According to Cinque & Krapova 2013 Bulgarian possessives do not raise in sentences denoting inalienable possession (3a–b) and are never extracted out of PPs, cf. (4).

- (3) Bulgarian
- a. *Toj mi= se= izkrjaska* [_{PP}^v [_{DP} *uxoto*]].
 he me:DAT.SG REF.ACC shouted:3SG in ear-the
 ‘He shouted in my ear.’
- b. *Toj se= izkrjaska* [_{PP}^v [_{DP} *uxoto= mi*]].
 he REF.ACC shouted:3SG in ear-the me:DAT.SG
 ‘He shouted in my ear.’
- (4) Bg. **Az i= mislja* [_{PP}^{za} [_{DP} *očite*___]]
 I her:DAT think:1SG for eyes-the
 Intended: ‘I think of her eyes.’

I adopt Cinque and Krapova’s view and treat Bulgarian examples with inalienable possession like (3a–b) as instances of Possessive Shift, i.e. as pairs of different syntactic structures with a possessive operator, along the same lines as Russian examples (1a–b). Bulgarian sentences with alienable possession, such as (4), however seem to be compatible with a PR analysis.

2. Possessivity: Semantics and syntax

In this section, I discuss the basic facts concerning the semantics and syntax of possessive constructions. A seminal analysis of Russian existential and possessive predicates has been proposed in Arutjunova & Širjaev 1983 who analyze both semantic and pragmatic/communicative features of Russian possessive constructions. An analysis in terms of PR has been proposed for Russian by Kibrik (2000, 2003) who takes for granted that the prototypical function of genitive phrases in Russian and beyond is ‘encoding of the possessive semantic relation.’³ However, the interpretation of all phrases of the type [_{NP} N⁰ Ngen] as encoding the possessive relation is too broad and does not provide any basis for separating possessive relation of the type

3. The feature ascribed in Kibrik (2003:307) to all genitive phrases is more likely to be associated with a bulk of constructions called ‘weak genitives’ in Graščenkov 2007. Standard (i.e. ‘strong’) genitive markers link together two arguments, expressed by two NPs, *X* and *Y*. The tag ‘weak genitives’ is reserved for languages which apply the same markers both for linking two nominal expressions together as well as for adjoining relative clauses, adjectives, pronouns. Graščenkov (2007:44) claims that weak genitive markers tend to be phrasal affixes, not true case affixes. If this claim is true, the notion of ‘weak genitive construction’ is not applicable to most Slavic phrase-level possessive operators.

‘X has/owns Y’ from the WHOLE:PART relation or the characterization relation ‘X has feature Y’ etc. which are analyzed usually differently since Arutjunova & Širjaev 1983, cf. also Raxilina 2000:36–55. Therefore, some semantic and syntactic conditions must be imposed on the configuration of Possessors and Possesseees. Melčuk and Iordanskaja 1995 and Raxilina (2000:54–56) discuss the distribution of Russian constructions ‘Y X-a’ and ‘u X-a est’ Y’ at some length and arrive at the conclusion that both constructions encode the whole-part relation, though in a different perspective: in a bare genitive construction the most communicatively salient component is WHOLE, while the *u + gen* construction brings about a PART-oriented perspective, cf. Raxilina 2000:54.⁴ Melčuk and Iordanskaja (1995: 152) and Raxilina (2000: 156) in this context claim that in the Russian *u + gen* construction, cf. *U Maši_{GEN} glaza_{NOM.PL} golubye_{ADJ,NOM.PL}* ‘Masha’s eyes are blue’ the possessor is always focal. The term ‘focalization’ is infelicitous here, since under a standard reading cf. (5a) the possessor is topical (thematic), not focalized, while true focalization in Russian normally requires a different word order and accent marking, cf. (5b). In the notation of (5a–b) I use accent tags ‘/’ for a standard Russian topic accent (a steep rise followed by a steep fall on posttonics if any) and ‘\’ for a standard Russian focus (rheme) accent; the lowercase tags ‘T’ and ‘R’ stand for Topic and Focus respectively, while the lowercase tag ‘R Proper’ refers to the part of the Focus constituent which takes the focus accent. The lowercase tag ‘Contr’ indicates that the corresponding communicative constituent is contrastive. Curly brackets stand for communicative constituents, square brackets stand for formal constituents.

- (5) Russian
- a. {_T [_{PP} U /Maši]} {_R [_{NP} glaza]} {_{R Proper} [_{PredP} \golubye]}.
- by Masha:GEN eyes:NOM blue:NOM.PL
- ‘Masha’s eyes are blue.’
- b. {_{T CONTR} [_{NP} /Glaza]} [_{PredP} golubye]}
- eyes:NOM blue: NOM.PL
- {_{R CONTR} [_{PP} u \Maši]}.
- by Masha:GEN
- ‘It is Masha (not someone else) whose eyes are blue.’

Kibrik (2003:309) introduces another term for Melčuk’ and Iordanskaja’s ‘focalized possessors’ and claims that Possessor is ‘a local focus of empathy in a genitive phrase.’ This is a terminological improvement. However, Kibrik’s syntax-oriented approach to genitive NPs (and to other structures analyzed in his theory as derived from genitive phrases by virtue of PR and other transformations) is not directly

4. This point defended by Melčuk and Iordanskaja (1995) and Raxilina (2000) goes back to Krejdlin’s analysis (1979), which is explicitly stated in Raxilina 2000: 54.

That the moved NP [_{NP} *ščeki*] forms in the topicalized structure (6b) one and the same communicative constituent with the PP [_{PP} *u Maši*] certainly does not prove that they form one formal constituent. It is evident that PPs of the type ‘*u + gen*’ are not phrase-level, but clause-level possessive operators.⁶

Following Seliverstova 1990 and a bulk of preceding literature going back to Benveniste 1960, I specify that as a semantic relation, the possessive relation is strictly binary and assume that imposing a condition that the Possessor is animate gives the best chances for keeping apart possessive relation ‘X has/owns Y’ from other semantic relations, including the WHOLE: PART relation ‘Y is a part of X’ and the attributive relation ‘X has a feature Y’. The Possessee is normally inanimate. In a typical communicative reading, the Possessor is a Topic/Theme, while the Possessee and the verb/auxiliaries are parts of the Focus/Rheme; cf. Arutjunova & Širjaev 1983.

- (7) Ru. {_T [_{PP} *U Maši*]} {_R [_{VP} *est’ kvartira* [_{PP} *in Lubercax*]]}.
 by Masha:GEN be:3SG flat:NOM in Lubericy:LOC
 ‘Masha has a flat in Lubericy.’

The possessive relation intersects with the WHOLE: PART relation, though not all sentences expressing the WHOLE: PART relation are possessive in the specified sense. The possessive relation is grammaticalized in a different way with alienable and inalienable possession, cf. Aikhenvald (1998:93). In some languages this asymmetry also affects the whole: organic part relation, but most Slavic languages keep them apart. In Modern Russian the meaning ‘the leg of a table’ can be expressed both by a bare genitive NP, cf. [_{NP} *nožka* [_{NP} *stola*]] and by a PP with a preposition *ot* ‘of, from’, cf. [_{NP} *nožka* [_{PP} *ot* [_{NP} *stola*]]],⁷ but with an animate Possessor the insertion of *ot* is no longer possible: *rot Maši* ‘Masha’s mouth’, but not **rot ot Maši*.

Claims raised elsewhere that Russian and probably other Slavic languages belong to the class of world’s languages which allow inanimate possessors, cf. Herslund & Baron 2001 are based not on semantic considerations but on the observation that these languages apply similar constructions for encoding possession and for expressing other semantic relations, cf. (8a–d) and (9a–d). Examples (8a) and (8c) where the Possessor is a Topic and the remaining part of the sentence is in Focus can be regarded as basic, while variants (8b) and (8d) show topicalization of the Possessee.

6. This fact is acknowledged by Russian academic grammars as well, cf. *Russkaja grammatika* (1982:149–151), where *u + gen* phrases are recognized as the so called ‘determinants’, i.e. immediate daughters of S.

7. Selective restrictions on the use of Russian *ot* are mentioned in Raxilina (2000:43).

- (8) Russian
- a. $\{_{\text{T}} [_{\text{PP}} \nearrow U \text{ Maši}] \} \{_{\text{R}} [_{\text{VP}} \emptyset [_{\text{PredP}} [_{\text{NP}} \text{gniloj} \searrow \text{zub}]]] \}.$
 by Masha:GEN be:PRS.IND rotten:NOM.M tooth:NOM
 ‘Masha has a bad (lit.: rotten) tooth.’
- b. $\{ \{_{\text{T}} [_{\text{NP}} \nearrow \text{zub}]_i [_{\text{PP}} u \text{ Maši}] \} \{_{\text{R}} [_{\text{VP}} \emptyset [_{\text{PredP}} \searrow \text{gniloj } t_i]] \} \}.$
 tooth:NOM by Masha:GEN be:PRS.IND rotten:NOM.M
 ‘Masha’s tooth is rotten.’
- c. $\{_{\text{T}} [_{\text{PP}} \nearrow U \text{ Maši}] \} \{_{\text{R}} [_{\text{VP}} \text{sgnil} [_{\text{NP}} \searrow \text{zub}]] \}.$
 by Masha:GEN rotted-away:M tooth:NOM
 ‘Masha’s tooth rotted away.’
- d. $\{_{\text{T}} [_{\text{NP}} \nearrow \text{Zub}] [_{\text{PP}} u \text{ Maši}] \} \{_{\text{R}} [_{\text{VP}} \searrow \text{sgnil}] \}.$ ⁸
 tooth:NOM by Masha:GEN rotted-away:M
 ‘Masha’s tooth rotted away.’

In a similar way, in a construction encoding the WHOLE: PART relation, one gets two variants with a topical argument with the role ‘WHOLE’ and the rest of the sentence in broad focus, cf. (9a) and (9c) and two variants with a topicalized argument with the role ‘PART’, cf. (9b) and (9d).

- (9) Russian
- a. $\{_{\text{T}} [_{\text{PP}} \nearrow U \text{ stola}] \} \{_{\text{R}} [_{\text{VP}} \emptyset [_{\text{PredP}} [_{\text{NP}} \text{gnilaja} \searrow \text{nožka}]]] \}.$
 by table:GEN be:PRS.IND rotten:NOM.F leg:NOM.F
 ‘The table has a rotten leg.’
- b. $\{ \{_{\text{T}} [_{\text{NP}} \nearrow \text{nožka}]_i [_{\text{PP}} u \text{ stola}] \} \{_{\text{R}} [_{\text{VP}} \emptyset [_{\text{PredP}} \searrow \text{gnilaja } t_i]] \} \}.$
 leg:NOM by table:GEN be:PRS.IND
 rotten_{NOM.SG.F}
 ‘The leg of the table is rotten.’
- c. $\{_{\text{T}} [_{\text{PP}} \nearrow U \text{ stola}] \} \{_{\text{R}} [_{\text{VP}} \text{sgnila} [_{\text{NP}} \searrow \text{nožka}]] \}.$
 by table:GEN rotted-away:F leg:NOM
 ‘The table’s leg rotted away.’
- d. $\{_{\text{T}} [_{\text{NP}} \nearrow \text{Nožka}] [_{\text{PP}} u \text{ stola}] \} \{_{\text{R}} [_{\text{VP}} \searrow \text{sgnila}] \}.$ ⁹
 leg:NOM by table:GEN rotted-away:F
 ‘The leg of the table rotted away.’

8. The linear order in (8d) can also be linked with a different communicative reading where the extracted NP is focalized and the rest of the sentence is deaccented: $\{_{\text{R}} [_{\text{NP}} (\text{Zub}) [_{\text{PP}} u \text{ Maši}] [_{\text{VP}} \text{sgnil}]] \}.$

9. The linear order in (9d) can also be linked with a different communicative reading where the extracted NP is focalized and the rest of the sentence is deaccented: $\{_{\text{R}} [_{\text{NP}} (\text{nožka}) [_{\text{PP}} u \text{ stola}] [_{\text{VP}} \text{sgnila}]] \}.$

The parallelism of (8a–d) and (9a–d) can be interpreted differently. A straightforward solution is to admit that Russian allows inanimate possessors. This kind of analysis, is however based on the assumption that all non-locative uses of the *u + gen* construction are possessive.¹⁰ The validity of this assumption is far from self-evident and it is reasonable to test an alternative hypothesis that there is no direct mapping between possessive semantics and the structure of the *u + gen* construction.

Constructions expressing the possessive relation are labeled “possessive”, though they usually express non-possessive meanings in the same language as well.

- (10) Russian
- a. *U menja est' karta.*
 by me:GEN be:3SG map:NOM
 ‘I have a map.’
- b. *U menja est' podozrenie čto P.*
 by me:GEN be:3SG suspicion:NOM that P.
 ‘I have a suspicion that P.’

Russian (10a) and its English equivalent are true possessive sentences, while Russian (10b) and its English equivalent may be called pseudo-possessive, cf. Zimmerling 2000. The notion of “pseudo-possessivity” can also be applied to syntax if there is no real possessive relation between the predicate arguments on the surface level, but such a relation can be reconstructed by postulating a transformation, cf. Szabolcsi 1983. Along these lines, Russian (11a) meaning ‘X sewed a button on Y’s coat’ should allow for possessive structure (11b) with the intended meaning ‘Y’s button’. However, this analysis is on the wrong track, since the Russian sentence with the reconstructed NP *pugovica rebenka* ‘child’s button’ is ill-formed, as shown by the ungrammaticality of (11c):

- (11) Russian
- a. *Ona [VP prišila rebenku pugovicu].*
 she:NOM sew:F child:DAT button:ACC
 ‘She sewed a button on the child’s clothes.’
- b. *[NP pugovica [NP rebenka].*
 button:NOM child:GEN
 ‘the child’s button.’

10. It is evident that locative and non-locative uses of Russian *u + gen* phrases have different properties, cf. *U našego doma tri magazina* ‘There are three shops by our house’ (locative *u + gen* phrase) vs *U našego doma tri dveri* ‘Our house has three doors’ (non-locative *u + gen* phrase).

- c. **Ona prišila* [_{NP} *pugovicu* [_{NP} *rebenka*]].¹¹
 she:NOM sew:F button:ACC child:GEN
 Intended: ‘She sewed a button on the child’s clothes.’

It is reasonable to reduce the notion of quasi-possessivity to those situations where two different possessive constructions seem to be competing, as in (12a–b).

- (12) Russian
 a. ?*On* [_{VP} *grubym priemom* [_{VP} *slomal* [_{NP} *nogu Aršavina*]
 he rough:INST.M mode:INST broke:M leg:ACC A:GEN
 /*ego nogu*].
 /his leg:ACC
 ‘He broke Arshavin’s leg/ his leg in a rough way.’
 b. *On* [_{VP} *grubym priemom* [_{VP} *slomal* [_{NP} *Aršavinu*]
 he rough:INST.M mode:INST broke:M A:DAT
 /*emu*] [_{NP} *nogu*].
 /him:DAT leg:ACC
 ‘the same’, lit. ‘He broke the leg to Arshavin/to him.’

Both (12a) and (12b) are well-formed, although standard Russian favors (8b). In Russian, complex NPs with a special possessive marker/possessive genitive to some extent alternate with constructions of other types, though there are exceptions where complex NPs with a bare genitive NP cannot be used; cf. (12c) above and (13b) below.

- (13) Russian
 a. [_{NP} *probka* [_{PP} *ot* [_{NP} *butylki*]]].
 plug:NOM of bottle:GEN
 ‘the cork from the bottle.’
 b. ??[_{NP} *probka* [_{NP} *butylki*]].
 plug:NOM bottle:GEN
 Intended: ‘the cork from the bottle.’

3. PR and external Dative possessor

In Baker 1988 the term “Possessor Raising” is reserved for the inversion of the arguments of a ditransitive verb, where the [+ Animate] argument takes the position

11. Russian (11c) is well-formed only in the meaning ‘X made use of Y’s button and sewed it on some place not necessarily related to Y’s clothes’. Such a reading is however unnatural and requires a special context.

of Direct Object, as in English *He gave flowers [to Kate] > he gave Kate flowers*, while a construction where a possessive argument has been added to an intransitive sentence, as in Russian *ty u menja molodec* ‘you did well’, is called External Possessor Construction.¹² This delimitation seems too rigid for two reasons. First, argument inversion in transitive sentences does not depend on possessivity. Second, the opposition of transitive vs intransitive verbs is not always clear-cut. In Norwegian, one and the same verb allows transitive (14a) and non-transitive uses (14b). Instances of prepositional government (14b) can also be analyzed as combinations of phrasal verbs with a post-verbal particle. Sentences where the Possessor is Case-marked with prepositionless Accusative and the Possessor is a PP pattern with PR, as in (14c):

- (14) Norwegian
- a. *Hunden slikket* [_{DP} *hånden hans*].
 dog-the licked:3SG hand-the his.
 ‘The dog licked his hand.’
 - b. *Hunden slikket* [_{PP} *på* [_{DP} *hånden hans*]].
 dog-the licked:3SG on hand-the his.
 ‘The dog licked the hand on him’, lit. ‘the dog licked on his hand.’
 - c. *Hunden slikket ham* [_{PP} *på* [_{DP} *hånden*]].
 dog-the licked:3SG him:OBL.M on hand-the
 lit. ‘The Dog licked him on the hand.’

Slavic languages provide a parallel to these Norwegian examples, since Slavic Aktionsart prefixes corresponding to Slavic prepositions have functions similar to those of Norwegian prepositives like *på* ‘on’ which behave as Aktionsart particles. However, this parallel is only partial. Modern Russian allows for structures without PR resembling (14a) and (14b), but not structures with PR like (14c).

- (15) Russian
- a. *Sobaka lizala / liznula* [_{NP} *ego ruku*].
 dog:NOM licked:IPF.F / licked:PF.F his hand:ACC
 ‘The dog was licking/licked once his hand.’
 - b. *Sobaka polizala* [_{NP} *ego ruku*].
 dog:NOM ASP-licked:PF.F his hand:ACC
 ‘The dog licked his hand (several times).’
 - c. **Sobaka liznula ego* [_{PP} *po ruke*].
 dog:NOM licked:PF.F him:ACC on hand:LOC
 Intended: ‘The dog licked his hand (once).’

12. The term ‘External Possessor’ (ru. *vnešnij possessor*) is used in Kibrik (2000, 2003: 308–318) who, contrary to Baker, extends it to transitive predicates as well.

In (15a–b) the indeclinable possessive pronoun *ego* ‘3SG.M.POSS’ is NP-internal, just as the indeclinable possessive pronoun *hans* ‘3SG.M.POSS’ in Norwegian in examples (14a–b). In the Norwegian example (14b) one deals with a non-transitive or semi-transitive predicate *slikke på handen* lit. ‘to lick on one’s hand’, where the element *på* can be analyzed both as a preposition belonging to a PP [_{PP} *på handen*] or as part of the phrasal verb *slikke på* ‘to lick on smth’. Contrariwise, the Russian sentence (15b) is with the predicative *polizala* is transitive and does not involve any instance of preposition government. Finally, the Norwegian example (14c) demonstrates PR, where the oblique pronoun *ham* may be viewed as a raised external possessor, while the ungrammaticality of (15c) indicates that the construction with PR in this case is impossible.

4. Slavic possessive clitics

Slavic pronominal Dative possessive clitics have non-trivial features and may be used both as NP/DP-level clitics and as clause-level clitics across Slavic languages; cf. Franks & King 2000; Zaliznjak (2008: 35). Unambiguous DP-level clitics are attested in Bulgarian and Macedonian (cf. Franks et al. 2004) while the nature of the NP/DP-distinction in Polish remains controversial (cf. Rutkowski 2002). There are two competing views of Bulgarian Dative possessive clitics. Schürcks & Wunderlich 2003 basing on examples like (2) above, claim that PR is generalized in this language. On the contrary, Cinque & Krapova 2013 argue that PR is only possible in some sentences expressing alienable possession. Modern Russian has phrase-level Dative possessives but does not allow NP-level Dative possessives. Recall (1), repeated here as (16):

- (16) Russian
- a. *Ja sebe ne vrag.*
 I:NOM REF.DAT NEG enemy:NOM
 ‘I am not an enemy for myself.’
- b. **Ja vstretil vraga sebe.*
 I:NOM met:M enemy:ACC REF.DAT
 intended: ‘I met my own enemy.’

In (16) the element *sebe* is a reflexive clitic. Grigory Krejdlin (p.c.) points out that in (16a) the form *sebe* is no longer used as a reflexive marker and should be preferably analyzed as a discourse particle rather than as a pronoun. Irrespective of the validity of this claim, *sebe* in (16a) is an unambiguous clause-level element, and the ill-formedness of (16b) cannot be explained by the alleged pronoun/particle distinction. It is worth mentioning that in Slavic languages which make use of pronominal

Dative possessive clitics there is no obvious contrast in the syntax of non-agreeing possessive personal pronouns and non-agreeing possessive reflexives.

Old Russian had both clause-level possessive clitics and NP-level possessive clitics attached to nominal heads. Clause-level dative possessive clitics normally merged in clausal 2P, while NP-level possessive clitics did not have a fixed position in a clause. Applying this criterion, one can easily establish that the second entry of 2p.Sg. *ti* in (17a) is a NP-level element while the first entry of *ti* is a clause-level element, since it takes clausal 2P and is not adjacent to any element of a NP.

- (17) Old Russian
- a. *Čto vzdamŭ =ti* [_{PP} *protivou*
 what render:1SG you:DAT.SG for
 [_{NP} *blagodějaniju =ti*]]?¹³
 benefaction you:DAT.SG
 ‘What can I render for your benefaction?’
- b. [_{NP} *brata =ti Romana*] *Bogŭ pojalŭ*.¹⁴
 brother:ACC you:DAT.SG Roman:ACC God took:PRF.3SG.M
 ‘God took from you (your) brother Roman’
 or ‘God took your brother Roman (from you).’

Meanwhile, sentences like (17b), where the Dative Possessive clitic splits the clause-initial NP and is placed after a noun, remain ambiguous since we lack reliable criteria to establish whether we deal with a clause-level element related to the predicate or with a NP-level element.

Turning back to the Bulgarian data that motivated the contradicting syntactic accounts of PR and Cinque and Krapova’s hypothesis that Bulgarian only allows PR with alienable possession, I restate basic observations. First, Bulgarian blocks extraction out of PPs headed by a lexical preposition, as in (4) repeated here (in a modified notation) as (18).

- (18) Bg. **Az =i_i mislja* [_{PP} *za* [_{DP} *očite* *—_i*]]
 I her:DAT think:1SG for eyes-the
 Intended: ‘I think of her eyes.’

13. The example is from the *Ipatyevskaja chronicle* [1199], list 244. The first *=ti* stands after the verb *vzdamŭ*, not after the first phonetic word, wh-word *čto*, since the latter could act as an optional Barrier triggering late clitic placement, cf. Zaliznjak (2008:55).

14. The example is from the *Ipatyevskaja chronicle* [1180], list 217. All varieties of Old Russian allowed for inserting 2P clitics into fronted NPs, and in Old Novgorod Russian such clitic placement was obligatory, cf. Zaliznjak 2008; Zimmerling 2009; Zimmerling 2012.

Second, in sentences like (3a) repeated here as (19a) the Dative clitic *mi* is a clause-level element taking clausal 2P and not a raised DP-level possessive clitic, since such a derivation would involve extraction out of the PP [_{PP} v [_{uxoto}=*mi*]], in violation of island constraints, cf. Cinque & Krapova 2013 consequently, (19a) and (19b) have different syntactic structure and do not exhibit PR.

- (19) Bulgarian
- a. *Toj mi*= *se*= *izkrjaska* [_{PP} v [_{DP} *uxoto*]].¹⁵
 he me:DAT REF.ACC shouted:3SG in ear-the
 ‘He shouted in my ear.’
- b. *Toj se*= *izkrjaska* [_{PP} v [_{DP} *uxoto* =*mi*]].
 he REF.ACC shouted:3SG in ear-the me:DAT
 ‘He shouted in my ear.’

I claim that (19a) and (19b) differ both syntactically and semantically, (19b) being a true possessive sentence containing a DP [_{DP} *uxoto*=*mi*] and (19a) being a pseudo-possessive sentence where the Dative clitic *mi* is a verbal argument related to the main predicate *izkrjaska* ‘shouted’. In other words, pairs of sentences like (19a–b) are examples of Possessive Shift, despite the morphological similarity of the possessive and the quasi-possessive Dative clitics. Cinque and Krapova seem to arrive at a similar conclusion, albeit in a different way. They argue that in spite of the fact that a clause-level dative clitic and a DP-level dative clitic appear to be the in same case on the surface, they still have different underlying Cases. In their opinion, in (19a) the clause-level clitic *mi* expresses underlying Dative Case and the role of Addressee/Benefactor, while in (19b) the DP-level clitic *mi* expresses underlying Genitive Case and the role of Possessor. This explanation in terms of underlying Cases is possible but it may turn out to be redundant if no decisive proof is found for the fact that Bulgarian has PR in other types of constructions. Indeed, the PR hypothesis can be applied to Bulgarian sentences that do not involve extraction out of a island PP and express alienable possession, as in (2) restated below as (20).

- (20) Bulgarian
- a. *Tja nameri*= *li* [_{DP} *užasni-te*= *si* *greški*]?
 she found:3SG Q horrible-the REF.DAT mistakes
 ‘Did she find her horrible mistakes?’
- b. *Tja nameri*= *li*= *si_i* [_{DP} *užasni-te* *t_igreški*]?
 she found:3SG Q REF.DAT horrible-the mistakes
 ‘Did she find her horrible mistakes?’

15. For reasons specified above in the Footnote 3, I gloss Bulgarian pronominal and auxiliary clitics as enclitics. These forms are usually glossed as verb-adjacent proclitics: *toj mi=se=izkrjaska*.

In (20b) the dative reflexive *si* occupies a position in which Bulgarian clause-level clitics form a clusterclausal 2P and clusters there with another clause-level clitic, the question particle *li*. In Slavic languages, only clause-level clitics can cluster, cf. Zimmerling 2012; Kosta & Zimmerling 2013,¹⁶ but this important fact unfortunately does not provide an independent basis for the verification of the Raising analysis in Bulgarian. *Si* in (20b) could equally well be a base-generated element merged in 2P or a raised element extracted out of a DP.¹⁷ Consequently, one cannot prove whether the alternation (20a–b) exhibits PR or Possessive Shift.

Conclusions

Slavic data do not refute the hypothesis of Possessor Raising in Universal Grammar, but this hypothesis has a limited applicability in Slavic languages. The weak sides of the PR hypothesis are that it takes the mapping of syntax and possessive semantics to be iconic and that the rules/principles of extracting a NP/DP-level possessive operator out of the NP/DP are trivial. The analysis has shown that these assumptions are poorly justified. Universal semantic relations may correspond to similar yet not identical syntactic patterns. Constructions expressing alienable and inalienable possession often express other predicative meanings as well. Moreover, sentences with possessive predicates can be pragmatically equivalent to sentences with pseudo-possessive constructions. Slavic languages typically apply different case-marking for non-agreeing phrase-level possessive operators and non-agreeing clause-level possessive operators. A group of languages including Modern Russian lacks phrase-level possessive clitics: both Russian possessive datives and Russian possessive phrases of the type *u* + *gen* are clause-level operators. For this

16. The verification of this claim depends on the analysis of Bulgarian and Macedonian DPs containing combinations of a definite article and possessive clitics, cf. *užasni-te=si greški* in (20a). If we impose a condition that clusters are not occasional sequences of adjacent clitics but fixed combinations of clitics of the same level, combinations like Bulgarian $[[užasni-te]=si]$ *greški* ‘one’s awful mistakes’, Bulgarian $[[mlada-ta]=mu]$ *žena* ‘his young wife’ can be ruled out, since the definite article is likely merged at an earlier stage than the dative possessive pronoun.

17. Unlike Serbo-Croatian, Burgenland Croatian, Slovene, Vojvodina Rusin, Czech, and Slovak, Bulgarian lacks Clitic Climbing. Anonymous reviewer points out that the absence of Clitic Climbing in Bulgarian is due to the fact that Bulgarian lacks infinitives and suggests that Possessor Raising and Clitic Climbing instantiate one and the same mechanism. This observation sets an interesting perspective, though Clitic Climbing (i.e. extraction of clitics out of embedded non-finite clauses) finds a much better empirical support than PR.

group the PR hypothesis cannot be validated, unless we advance a special syntactic theory, for instance, postulate a mismatch of underlying and surface cases and rules transforming bare genitive NPs into preposition genitive phrases or dative NPs. As attested in modern South Slavic languages, Old Church Slavonic and Old Russian, dative pronominal and reflexive clitics are a special means of marking the possessive semantics. However, true NP/DP-level dative possessive clitics are found in an absolute minority of Slavic languages, notably Bulgarian, Macedonian and Old Church Slavonic, while clause-level dative possessive elements are a more common option. Most cases where the PR hypothesis has been proposed in previous Slavic studies do not conform to the definition of Raising as a syntactic operation, since the identity of structures with a clause-level or phrase-level possessive operator cannot be established. Such cases must be reanalyzed in terms of Possessive Shift, i.e. alternation of a true possessive construction with a NP/DP-level possessive element and its quasi-synonym, a pseudo-possessive construction with a case-marked verbal argument. The PR hypothesis is still possible for a subclass of Bulgarian constructions with alienable possession and a dative clitic, but the alternative hypothesis of Possessive Shift may be applied here as well, since there is no independent verification that the extraction of a possessive clitic has taken place. The most general explanation of the fact that Slavic languages for the most part block PR as a syntactic operation is that Slavic constructions with non-agreeing NP/DP-level dative possessive clitics seem to be secondary and less common than Slavic constructions with clause-level dative clitics. It is wrong to assume that a Slavic clausal clitic must/may be a raised NP/DP-level element just because the sentence has possessive semantics. A verification procedure is needed.

References

- Agbayani, Brian & Golston, Chris. 2010. Second-position is first-position. Wackernagel's law and the role of clausal conjunction. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 115: 1–21.
- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 1998. Warekena. In *Handbook of Amazonian Languages*, Vol. 4, Desmond C. Derbyshire & Geoffrey K. Pullum (eds), 225–440. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Arutjunova, Nadejda D. & Širjaev, Evgenij N. 1983. *Russkoe predloženie. Bytijnij tip*. Moscow: Nauka.
- Baker, Mark C. 1988. *Incorporation: A Theory of Grammatical Function Changing*. Chicago IL: The Chicago University Press.
- Benveniste, Emile. 1960. “Être” et “avoir” dans leurs fonctions linguistiques. *Bulletin de la Société de linguistique de Paris* 55(1): 113–134.
- Cinque, Guglielmo & Krapova, Iliyana. 2013. The case for genitive case in Bulgarian. In *Studies in Generative Grammar. Nominal Constructions. Slavic and Beyond*, Lilia Schürcks, Anastasia Giannakidou & Urtzi Etxeberria [Studies in Generative Grammar 116]. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

- Dimitrova-Vulchanova, Mila. 1999. Clitics in the Slavic languages. In *Clitics in the Languages of Europe*, Henk van Riemsdijk (ed.), 83–121. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Don-Won Lee. 2004. Possessor-raising in existential constructions. *Studies in Generative Grammar* 14(2): 235–242.
- Franks, Steven. 2008. Clitic placement, prosody and the Bulgarian verbal complex. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 16(1): 91–137.
- Franks, Steven, Junghanns, Uwe & Law, Paul. 2004. Pronominal Clitics in Slavic. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 12(1–2): 3–36.
- Franks, Steven & King, Tracey Holloway. 2000. *A Handbook of Slavic Clitics*. Oxford: OUP.
- Graščenkov, Pavel V. 2007. Tipologija possessivnyx konstrukcij. *Voprosy jazykoznanija* 3: 25–54.
- Herslund, Michael & Baron, Irène. 2001. Introduction: Dimensions of possession. In *Dimensions of Possession* [Typological Studies in Language 47], Irène Baron, Michael Herslund & Finn Sørensen (eds), 1–25. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Kibrik, Aleksandr E. 2000. Vnešnij possessor kak rezul'tat rasščepljenija valentnostej. In *Slovo v tekste i slovare, Sbornik statej k 75-letiju Ju. D. Apresjana*, Leonid Lejbovic Iomdin & Leonid Petrovic Krysin (eds), 434–446. Moscow: Jazyki russkoj kultury.
- Kibrik, Aleksandr E. 2003. *Konstanty i peremennye jazyka*. Sankt-Petersburg: Aletheia.
- Krejdlin, Grigorij E. 1979. Služebnye slova v russkom jazyke (semantičeskie i sintaksičeskie aspekty ix izučenija). Ph.D. dissertation, Moscow.
- Kosta, Peter & Zimmerling, Anton. 2013. Slavic clitic systems in a typological perspective. In *The Structure of Nominal Expressions. Slavic and Beyond* [Studies in Generative Grammar 116], Lilia Schürcks, Anastasia Giannakidou & Urtzi Etxeberria (eds). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Meščuk, Igor & Iordanskaja, Lidia. 1995. **Glaza Maši golubye vs Glaza u Maši golubye*: Two Russian constructions. In *Russkij jazyk v modeli "Smysl <=> Tekst"*, Igor Meščuk, 135–164. Moscow: Jazyki russkoj kultury.
- Mišeska Tomić, Olga. 2004. The South Slavic pronominal clitics. *Journal of Slavic linguistics* 12(1–2): 213–248.
- Pennington, Josh J. 2010. Kombinovanje objekta adnominalnog posesivnog dativa s dopunama glagola u jednoj klauzi u bosansko-hrvatsko-srpsko-crnogorskom. Ms, University of Ohio.
- Pei-Jung Kuo & Yi-An-Lin. 2008. Possessor raising, resumptive pronouns, and phases. Paper presented at *The 39th annual meeting of the North East Linguistic Society (NELS39)*, Ithaca, November 7.
- Progovac, Ljiljana. 1996. Clitics in Serbian/Croatian: Comp as the second position. In *Approaching Second: Second Position Clitics and Related Phenomena*, Aaron L. Halpern & Arnold M. Zwicky (eds), 411–428. Stanford CA: CSLI.
- Raxilina, Ekaterina V. 2000. *Kognitivnyj analiz predmetnyx imen: Semantika i sočetaemost'*. Moscow: Russkie slovari.
- Russkaja grammatika. 1982. *Russkaja grammatika*, Vol. 2: *Sintaksis*, Natal'ja Yul'evna Švedova (ed.). Moscow: Nauka.
- Rutkowski, P. 2002. Noun/pronoun asymmetries: Evidence in support of the DP hypothesis in Polish. *Jezikoslovje* 3(1–2): 159–170.
- Seliverstova, Olga N. 1990. *Kontrastivnaja sintaksičeskaja semantika*. Moscow: Nauka.
- Szabolcsi, Anna. 1983. The possessor that ran away from home. *The Linguistic Review* 3: 89–102.
- Schürcks, Lilia & Wunderlich, Dieter. 2003. Determiner-possessor relation in the Bulgarian DP. In *From NP to DP*, Vol. 2: *The Expression of Possession in Noun Phrases* [Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics Today 56], Martine Coene & Yves D'hulst (eds), 121–139. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

- Zaliznjak, Andrej A. 2008. *Drevnerusskie enklitiki*. Moscow: Jazyki slavjanskoj kul'tury.
- Zimmerling, Anton. 2000. Obladat' i byt' rjadom. In *Logičeskij analiz jazyka. Jazyki prostranstv*, Nina D. Arutjunova & Irina B. Levontina (eds), 179–188. Moscow: Indrik.
- Zimmerling, Anton. 2006. Encoding strategies in word order: The evidence of Slavic languages. *The 1st meeting of the Slavic Linguistic Society*, Bloomington, 8–10 September.
- Zimmerling, Anton. 2008. Porjadok slov v slavyanskix, germanskix i romanskix jazykax. In *Ot Imen k Faktam [Slavjano-germanskije issledovanija 3]*, Alexander A. Gugin & Anton V. Zimmerling (eds), 165–239. Sankt-Peterburg: Aleteia.
- Zimmerling, Anton. 2009. 'Klitiki v prostranstve drevnerusskogo jazyka.' Review of Zaliznjak (2008). *Ruskij jazyk v nauchnom osvesjčenii* 1(17): 259–277.
- Zimmerling, Anton. 2012. Sistemy porjadka slov s klitikami v tipologičeskom aspekte. *Voprosy jazykoznanija* 4: 3–38.
- Zimmerling, Anton & Kosta, Peter. 2013. Slavic clitics: A typology. *Language Typology and Universals (STUF)* 66(2).