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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 will argue, through a comparison with Romance. As it 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 and see if one can find it by decomposing the complexity of the data. This is what we shall attempt to do here.

Bulgarian clausal dative clitics can, as in other languages, be interpreted as external possessors of a DP (see (1)a-c), provided they are contained in the same minimal clause containing the DP (see (2)a vs. (2)b), and that they c-command the DP (or its trace) (see (3) vs. (4)) (cf. Guéron 1985,48, 2003,193f):¹

(1) a. Kučeto mu otxapa prästa
dog.the him dat bit  finger.the
‘The dog bit his finger’

---

* This paper is dedicated to Wayles Browne as a token of our appreciation and respect. A version of this article was presented in Paris, in December 2008, at the École Normale Supérieure. We thank the audience for their comments, and in particular Jacqueline Guéron, Richard Kayne, Hilda Koopman, and Dominique Sportiche. We also thank Richard Kayne and an anonymous reviewer for their comments on a previous version of the article.

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

University of Venice
Working Papers in Linguistics
Vol. 18, 2008
The two “possessor raising” constructions of Bulgarian

b. Te mu namerixa čadâra
   they him\textsubscript{dat} found umbrella.the
   ‘They found his umbrella’

c. Te ne mu săobštixa imeto
   they not him\textsubscript{dat} communicate name.the
   ‘They didn’t communicate his name’

(2) a. Kaza se [če sa mu namerili čadâra]
   said refl that are.3pl him\textsubscript{dat} found umbrella.the
   ‘It was said that they found his umbrella’

b. Kaza mu se [če sa namerili čadâra]
   was.said him\textsubscript{dat} that are.3pl found umbrella.the
   ‘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 glavata ot vinoto
   said.3sg that not him\textsubscript{dat} refl spins.evid. head.the from wine.the
   ‘He said his head was not spinning because of the wine’

b. Kaza, če glavata, ne mu se vârtjala ti ot vinoto
   said.3sg that head.the not him\textsubscript{dat} refl spins.evid. from wine.the
   ‘He said his head was not spinning because of the wine’

(4) *Jumrukâth ne mu udari masata Cf. Jumrukâth mu ne udari masata
    fist.the not him\textsubscript{dat} hit table.the
    ‘His fist did not hit the table’

    fist.the him\textsubscript{dat} not hit table.the
    ‘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; Schürrcks and Wunderlich 2003, section 4; Tomić to appear).

Here we will 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.\textsuperscript{2}  
To see this it may be useful to start from a puzzling contrast between the Romance and the Bulgarian constructions.\textsuperscript{3}

2. A comparative puzzle

The Romance construction corresponding to (1) is subject to a number of well-known restrictions (see (I)a-c).\textsuperscript{4}

\begin{itemize}
  \item[(i) a.] *(Le) sacaron la muela del juicio a Juan
          \(him_{\text{dat}}\) pulled the tooth of the wisdom to Juan
          ‘They pulled out Juan’s wisdom tooth’
  \item[(i) b.] <Gli> hanno estratto il dente del giudizio <a Gianni>
          \(him_{\text{dat}}\) have.3pl pulled the tooth of the wisdom to Gianni
          ‘They pulled out Gianni’s wisdom tooth’
  \item[(i) c.] Ils lui ont arraché les dents de sagesse (*à Patrick)
          they \(him_{\text{dat}}\) have.3pl pulled the teeth of wisdom (to Patrick)
          ‘They pulled out Patrick’s wisdom teeth’
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{2}. With respect to these properties Romanian appears to pattern with Bulgarian rather than with the other Romance languages (see fn.16 below).

\textsuperscript{3}. We will 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 (see (i)a vs. b; in (i)b, either gli or a Gianni is possible, but not both), or the possibility vs. impossibility of a full prepositional dative (see (i)a-b vs. c):

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

See the contrast between (5) and (6) below:

(5) a. On lui a coupé les cheveux  \textit{French} (Kayne 1977,159)
    \begin{itemize}
    \item imp. him\(_{dat}/her\_{dat}\) has cut the hair
    \item ‘They cut his/her hair’
    \end{itemize}

b. El gato le arañó la cara  \textit{Spanish} (Sánchez López 2007,153)
    \begin{itemize}
    \item the cat him\(_{dat}\) scratched the face
    \item ‘The cat scratched his/her face’
    \end{itemize}

---

5. As noted in the literature (see, for example, Vergnaud and Zubizarreta 1992,597), inalienable possession extends to certain kinship terms and familiar objects (‘daughter’, ‘home’, ‘car’, ‘umbrella’, etc.), though variation exists among languages (and speakers) concerning the membership in the class of extended inalienables. To take one example, Italian ((i)a), but not French ((i)b), can apparently extend inalienable possession to (some) inanimate objects:

(i) a. Al tavolo, qualcuno gli ha segato tutte le gambe
    to.the table someone it\(_{dat}\) has sawn all the legs

b. *La table, quelqu’un lui a scie toutes les pattes (Lamiroy 2003,259 citing Leclère 1976)
    the table, someone it\(_{dat}\) has sawn all the legs
    ‘The table, someone has sawn off all its legs’

For further discussion, see Lamiroy (2003, sections 2.3 and 3).

6. It would be nice if we had a precise notion of ‘affectedness’ allowing us to tell which predicates affect their objects and which don’t. Attribution is not always straightforward (for some discussion, see Kayne 1977,158, and references cited there). Certain predicates appear to affect their objects under some conditions but not others. For example, voir, in French, and vedere in Italian, ‘see’, appear to be ‘affecting’ with strict inalienables (body-parts) but not with extended inalienables. For French, see Lamiroy (2003,fn5 and related text) and for Italian the contrast in (i):

(i) a. Le ho visto le gambe
    her\(_{dat}\) I have seen the legs
    ‘I saw her legs’

b. ??Le ho visto la madre/la macchina
    her\(_{dat}\) I have seen the mother/the car
    ‘I saw her mother/car’
c. Gli hanno rotto la macchina

\textit{Italian}  
\textit{him}$_{\text{dat}}$ have.\textit{3pl} broken the car

‘They broke his car’

(6) a. *Tu \textbf{lui} aimes bien les jambes  \textit{French} (Kayne 1977,159)

\textit{you \textit{him}$_{\text{dat}}$/\textit{her}$_{\text{dat}}$ love.\textit{2sg} well the legs}

‘You like his/her legs’

b. *Le odio el car\'acter  \textit{Spanish}  (Picallo & Rigau 1999,1015)

\textit{him$_{\text{dat}}$ hate.\textit{1sg} the character}

‘I hate his character.’

c. *Gli ho dimenticato il nome  \textit{Italian}

\textit{him$_{\text{dat}}$ have.\textit{1sg} forgotten the name}

‘I forgot his name’

(I)b Unique inalienable body-parts (and unique extended inalienable DPs), like ‘head’, ‘stomach’, ‘nose’, (‘mother’, ‘home’), etc., are obligatorily singular, whether they have a singular or plural possessor. In the latter case the interpretation of the singular body-part is distributive, implying a plurality of body-parts, one for each possessor (Kayne 1977,161; Vergnaud and Zubizarreta 1992, section 1). See (7)a-(8)a, which contrasts with (7)b-(8)b, containing a possessive inside the DP:

(7) a. Le médecin \textbf{leur} a examiné la gorge/*les gorges

\textit{(Vergnaud and Zubizarreta 1992,597,602)}

\textit{the doctor them$_{\text{dat}}$ has examined the throat/the throats}

‘The doctor examined their throats’

b. Le médecin a examiné \textbf{leur} gorge/leur gorges

\textit{(Vergnaud and Zubizarreta 1992,598,602)}

\textit{the doctor has examined their throat/their throats}

‘The doctor examined their throats’

(8) a. Hanno \textbf{loro} lavato la testa/*le teste

\textit{Have.\textit{3pl} them$_{\text{dat}}$ washed the head/the heads}

‘They washed their heads’

b. Hanno lavato la loro testa/le loro teste

\textit{they have washed the their head/the their heads}

‘They washed their head/heads’
(I)c The NP expressing inalienable possession may only be modified by a restrictive adjective, not by an appositive one ((9)a-(10)a - see Kayne 1977,161; Vergnaud and Zubizarreta 1992,603f). This again contrasts with the case containing a possessive inside the DP (see (9)b-(10)b).

(9) a. *Tu lui as photographé la belle bouche (Kayne 1977,161)
you him\textsubscript{dat}/her\textsubscript{dat} have.2sg photographed the beautiful mouth
‘You photographed his/her beautiful mouth’
b. Tu as photographé \textit{sa} belle bouche (Kayne 1977,161)
you have.2sg photographed his/her beautiful mouth
‘You photographed his/her beautiful mouth’

(10) a Gli hai fotografato la (\textit{*bella}> bocca (\textit{*bella}>
him\textsubscript{dat} have.2sg photographed the (beautiful) mouth
‘You photographed his beautiful mouth’
b. Hai fotografato la \textit{su}a <bella> bocca <bella>
have.2sg photographed the his <beautiful> mouth <beautiful>
‘You photographed his beautiful mouth’

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/malefactive 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 \textit{mu} xaresvam novata šapka (Stateva 2002,649)
I very much him\textsubscript{dat} like.1sg new.the hat
‘I love his new hat.’

\[7.\] As noted by Aoun (reported in Authier 1988,175,fn3) , appositive relatives, as opposed to appositive adjectives, can instead modify the NP expressing inalienable possession:

(i) Tu lui a photographé \textit{la bouche}, la quelle/qui était très belle
you her/him\textsubscript{dat} have photographed the mouth, which was 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).
b. Ne **mu** pomnja fizonomijata.
   not him\textsubscript{dat} remember.1sg face.the
   ‘I don’t remember his face’

c. Ne **mu** poznavam prijatelja
   not him\textsubscript{dat} know.1sg friend.the
   ‘I don’t know his friend’

d. Az **mu** polučix pismoto.
   I him\textsubscript{dat} received.1sg letter.the
   ‘I received his letter’

e. Boris Simeonov **mi** beše pârvijat profesor po ezikoznanie
   Boris Simeonov me\textsubscript{dat} was first.the professor in 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** napâlnite **stomaxa/stomasite** i posle šte vi stane lošo.
    if eat.2pl a lot refl\textsubscript{dat} fill.2pl stomach-the/stomachs-the and then will you\textsubscript{dat,pl}
    gets sick
    ‘If you(pl.) eat a lot, you(pl.) will fill your stomach/stomachs and you will feel
    sick’

Third, as shown by (13)a,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 xarakter.
    a lot you\textsubscript{dat} hate.1sg this bad character
    ‘I hate a lot this bad character of yours’

b. Ne moga da i opisha krasivata kosa. Ne săm poet.
   not can.1sg to her\textsubscript{dat} describe.1sg beautiful.the hair. Not 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
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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 we will see below, (1)a-b correspond to the Romance “possessor raising” construction, while (1)c 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 (6)c above and (14) below, a non affecting verb like dimenticare (or oublier in French) ‘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 construction. See in fact section 5 for evidence corroborating this conjecture. As we will also see, (15) and the like have all the hallmarks of a movement construction, just like the Romance ne/en construction (Belletti & Rizzi 1981, Burzio 1986, chapter 1):

(14) a. Ne ho dimenticato il nome  
    It$_{gen}$ have.1sg forgotten the name
    ‘I have forgotten his/its name’

    b. J’en ai oublié le nom
    I it$_{gen}$ have.1sg forgotten the name
    ‘I have forgotten his/its name’
    (cf. *Je lui ai oublié le nom ‘I him$_{dat}$ have forgotten the name’)

(15) Az sâm mu zabravit imeto
    I am him$_{dat}$ forgotten name.the
    ‘I have forgotten his/its name’

Even if Bulgarian is occasionally 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 will not push the resemblance that far, partly because of Mirchev’s (1978,189), GSE’s (1993,241), and Pancheva’s (2004) (diachronic) evidence that Bulgarian really has no genitive, but just dative, also for possession.8

8. This actually needs to be looked into more carefully as the DP-internal ‘dative’ clitic can quite generally correspond to the subject or object of a deverbal noun (agent/theme), or a subjective experience...
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, will be seen to involve no extraction of the possessor, exactly as their Romance counterparts in (5),(7), (8) and (10). This line of reasoning will thus lead 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 will 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 possessive dative clitic in Romance to raise from inside the DP expressing the inalienable body-part is the fact, observed in Kayne (1977,159f), that such extraction would sometimes have to cross a PP node ((16)). Given that PPs, as opposed to simple DPs, normally block extraction (see (17)a/(18)a vs. (17)b/(18)b), it is reasonable to infer from the contrast between (16) and (18)a 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 occhi]]**

h'm DAT have.3PL shouted in the ears

‘They shouted in his ears’

(17) a. *Di chi** hanno urlato **[PP ne[DP gli occhi]]**?

of whom have.3PL shouted in the ears?

‘Who was it that they shouted in his ears?’
b. Di chi hanno medicato [DP gli orecchi]?
   Of whom have.3pl treated the ears?
   ‘Of whom have they treated the ears?’

(18) a. *Ne hanno urlato [PP ne[DP gli orecchi]]
   him_gen have.3pl shouted in the ears
   ‘(intended meaning) They shouted in his ears’

b. Ne hanno medicato [DP gli orecchi]
   him_gen have.3pl treated the ears
   ‘They treated his ears’

Another difficulty for 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 possessor dative clitic ((19)b and (20)b) lack the restriction found in (19)a and (20)a according to which the possessed body-part must be singular even if the possessor clitic is plural:

(19) a. Le médecin leur a examiné la gorge/*les garges
   (Vergnaud and Zubizarreta 1992,597,602)
   the doctor them_dat has examined the throat/the throats
   ‘The doctor examined their throats’

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

(20) a. Hanno loro lavato la testa/*le teste
   have.3pl them_dat washed the head/the heads
   ‘They washed their heads’

b. Hanno lavato la loro testa/le loro teste
   have.3pl washed the their head/the their heads
   ‘They washed their head/heads’

This makes a derivation of the external possessive dative clitic in (19)a/(20)a via raising from the DP expressing the possessee rather dubious.
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 fallait pas]
    she him$_{dat}$ has put the hand there where it neg 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 (2005,2.4.2). 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$_{3pl}$ raised the hand
    ‘They raised their hands’

   b. Lei lo ha colpito sulla testa
    she him$_{acc}$ has struck on the 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 parasitic gap inside the PP, given the general inability of clitics to license parasitic gaps (see Chomsky 1982,65 based on an observation of Luigi Rizzi’s, and Burzio 1986,32f):

(ii) Gli ho spostato [il braccio ] [da sotto la testa ]
    him$_{dat}$ have$_{1sg}$ moved the arm from under the head
    ‘I 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 his arguments do not seem to us 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, hence 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 (2005) 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-externally or DP-externally:

(22) a. Tja mu ščupi [\_DP malkija pr\=\'ast]  
   she him\_dat broke.3sg little.the finger  
   ‘She broke his little finger’

   b. Tja ščupi [\_DP malkija mu pr\=\'ast]  
      she broke.3sg little.the 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 possessive clitic must be definite.\textsuperscript{10} No possessive dative clitic can appear inside a DP when this is indefinite (Pen\=\'\v{c}ev 1998,30; Dimitrova-Vulchanova and Giusti 1999,169; Franks and King 2000,282; Moskovsky 2004,221f). See the contrast between (22)b and (23) below:

(23) *Tja ščupi [edin mu pr\=\'ast]  
    she broke.3s a him\_dat finger  
    ‘She broke a finger of his’

As noted, no definiteness requirement holds of the DP external variant, (22)a, as can be seen from (24) which is the only possible way to render (23):

(24) Tja mu ščupi [edin pr\=\'ast]  
    she him\_dat broke.3sg a finger  
    ‘She broke a finger of his’

\textsuperscript{10} In this case, the clitic follows the demonstrative or whichever element is inflected with the definite article (Pen\=\'\v{c}ev 1993; Dimitrova-Vulchanova and Giusti 1999,169f; Franks 2000, 59ff; Franks and King 2000,275; Stateva 2002, 660; Schürcks and Wunderlich 2003,121).
This evidence suggests that (22)a and (22)b 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. 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,fn1). 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).12 See (25):

(25) Te säsipaxa [dăšterja(*ta) mu]/[žena(*ta) mu]/…
   they ruined.3pl daughter(.the) himdat /wife(.the) himdat /…
   ‘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:13

11. Also see Schürcks and Wunderlich (2003,135). Non movement mechanisms proposed in the literature are: (anaphoric) Binding by the possessive dative of the determiner of the DP expressing the body-part (Guérón 1985, Demonte 1988, among others), or of a pro subject of the DP expressing the body-part (Authier 1988, chapter 4), and Predication (Vergnau 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).

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.

13. For some reason other kinship terms (e.g. majka ‘mother’, bašta ‘father’, etc.) accept the definite article in such structures only rather marginally (??Te mu säsipaxa majkata). They are entirely natural however in colloquial expressions like (i):

(i) Njama da mi obiždaš majkata
   Not.have Mod me-dat insult.2sg mother.the
   ‘You should not insult my mother’.
(26) Te mu sásipaxa [dăšterja*(ta)]/[žena*(ta)]/
they him\textsubscript{dat} ruined.3pl daughter,(the) /wife,(the) /…
‘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.

Two more cases exist 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. The first is represented by idioms. 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 (27)a with (27)b:\textsuperscript{14}

\textsuperscript{14} Analogously, in Romance no variant exists with a possessive adjective internal to the DP, or with extraction of ne/en. See the French and Italian examples (i) and (ii) ((i)a-b are from Lamiroi\textsuperscript{ y} 2003,260f, who notes the same facts also for Spanish and Dutch):

(i) a. Luc lui casse les pieds
Luc him\textsubscript{dat} her\textsubscript{dat} breaks the feet
‘Luc bothers him/her’

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

c. Luc en casse les pieds
Luc him\textsubscript{gen} breaks the feet (no idiom interpretation available)

(ii) a. Gli hanno rotto le scatole
him\textsubscript{dat} they have broken the boxes
‘They annoyed him’

b. Hanno rotto le sue scatole
they have broken his boxes (no idiom interpretation available)

c. Ne hanno rotto le scatole
him\textsubscript{gen} they have broken the boxes (no idiom interpretation available)
(27) a. Ti mi xodiš po nervite
    you me\textsubscript{dat} walk.2sg on nerves.the
    lit. ‘You are walking on my nerves’ (‘You are getting on my nerves’)

b. *Ti xodiš po [nervite mi]
you walk.2sg on nerves.the me\textsubscript{dat}

The second case relates to the fact seen above with Romance that unique inalienable body-parts must be singular even in the presence of a plural possessor (see (7), (8), repeated here as (28), (29)):

(28) a. Le médecin leur a examiné la gorge/*les gorges
    (Vergnaud and Zubizarreta 1992,597,602)
    the doctor them\textsubscript{dat} has examined the throat/the throats
    ‘The doctor examined their throats’

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

(29) a. Ho loro lavato la testa/*le teste
    have.1sg them\textsubscript{dat} washed the head/the heads
    ‘I washed their heads’

b. Ho lavato la loro testa/le loro teste
    have.1sg washed the their head/their heads
    ‘I washed their heads’

The same contrast (albeit somewhat weakened) is found in Bulgarian.\textsuperscript{15} Compare (30)a, (31)a with (30)b, (31)b:

(30) a. Toj im razbi sārseto/?sārtsata
    he them\textsubscript{dat} broke.3sg heart.the/heart.s.the
    ‘He broke their hearts’

\textsuperscript{15} For some reason in Bulgarian, when the possessive clitic is inside the DP, the plural form is less available, although not ungrammatical.
b. Toj razbi särseto/särtsata im
   he broke.3sg heart.the/hearts.the them\textsubscript{dat}
   ‘He broke their hearts’

(31) a. Toj edva li ne im se izplju v lîtseto/*?ltatsa
   he almost them\textsubscript{dat} refl spac.3sg in face.the/*faces.the
   ‘He almost spat in their faces’
b. Toj edva li ne se izplju v lîtseto/ lîtsata im
   he almost refl spac.3sg in face./faces.the them\textsubscript{dat}
   ‘He almost spat in their faces’

Again, the clitic in (30)a,(31)a cannot have originated in the position of the clitic in
(30)b, (31)b for we would expect contrary to fact the body-part to be able to occur also
in the plural.

Given the evidence reviewed so far for the non movement character 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 (34) below):

(32) a. Toj mi se izkrajaska \textsubscript{[PP v [DP u xo to]]}
   he me\textsubscript{dat} refl shouted.3sg in ear.the
   ‘He shouted in my ear’
b. Az i se izsmjaj \textsubscript{[PP v [DP lîtseto]]}
   I her\textsubscript{dat} refl laughed.1sg in face.the
   ‘I laughed in her face’

All of this suggests that the 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 (1)c and (11), which, as noted above, do not share the
restrictions holding of the Romance “possessor raising” construction. First, they appear
to involve predicates that do not affect their objects; second, they do not impose a beneactive/maleactive interpretation on the external possessor and third, they do not necessarily take inalienable body-parts as their objects. 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 (11)c and d with (33)):

(33) a. *Ne **mu** poznavam **edin prijatel**
   Not him\_dat know.\_1sg one/a friend
   ‘I know a friend of his’
   b. *Az **mu** polučix **edno pismo**
   I him\_dat received.\_1sg one/a letter
   ‘I received a letter of his’

---

16. 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.

(i) a. **Iți** cunosc prietenii
   you\_dat I know friends.the
   ‘I know your friends’
   b. **Mi-a primit scrisoarea**
   me\_dat (s)he has received letter.the
   ‘(S)he received my letter’

We expect Romanian to also show evidence for the two “possessor raising” constructions of Bulgarian (see, for example, (ii), where the DP expressing inalienable possession in Romanian is modified by an appositive adjective, unlike the French and Italian cases in (9) and (10)), but will not pursue this question here:

(ii) **I-am** privit mániile (albe) (Manoliu-Manea 1996,727)
    her\_dat-have.\_1sg looked hands.the (white)
    ‘I looked at her white hands’
The two "possessor raising" constructions of Bulgarian

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. (33) contrasts 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.

That the ungrammaticality of (33) 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 (34) 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, the gap in (34) follows directly from the island character of the PP, which blocks the raising of the clitic. See (34), to be compared once again with comparable cases like (32) above, which are grammatical precisely because there no movement has taken place:

(34) a. *Az i mislja [PP za [DP očite __]]
   I her_daf think.1sg for eyes.the
   ‘I think of her eyes’
   
   b. *Az ne ti zavisja [PP ot [DP parite __]]
   I not you_daf depend.1sg from money.the
   ‘I don’t depend on your money’
   
   c. *Na kogo govori [PP sâs [DP zetja __]]
   to whom spoke.2sg with son-in-law.the
   ‘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 pronominalized. See the contrast between (35)a and (35)b:
(35) a. Question: A prästa mu? Answer: Kučeto mu go otxapa
and finger him\textsubscript{dat}
dog.the him\textsubscript{dat} it\textsubscript{acc} bit.3sg
‘And [what about] his finger?’ ‘The dog bit it on him’
and letter him\textsubscript{dat}
I (him\textsubscript{dat}) it\textsubscript{acc} received.1sg
‘And [what about] his letter? ‘I received it on him’

In (35)a and b, go ‘it.Acc’ pronominalizes 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 (35a), which contains the affecting verb ‘bit’, can it co-occur with the Accusative clitic ((36)a). No such possibility exists when the possessive clitic should have originated inside the DP that is pronominalized, as in (35b), since there is no room for the merger of the possessive clitic ((36)b):

(36) a. Kučeto mu go\textsubscript{i} otxapa [pro]\textsubscript{i}
dog.the him\textsubscript{dat} it\textsubscript{acc} bit.3sg
b. Az mu go\textsubscript{i} polučix [pro]\textsubscript{i}
I him\textsubscript{dat} it\textsubscript{acc} received.1sg

Another consequence is the contrast between (37) and (38), 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 co-occurrence with a DP-internal possessive clitic is expected to be possible (barring spell-out of traces).

(37) Umrja mu (..) konjat mu (..) (Schick 2000,191)
died.3sg him\textsubscript{dat} horse him\textsubscript{dat}
‘His horse died on him’

(38) *Az mu polučix pismoto mu
I him\textsubscript{dat} received.1sg letter-the him\textsubscript{dat}
‘I received his letter on him’

The last consequence that we consider here is the contrast seen in (39)a-b, the passive counterparts of (1)b-c:
The two "possessor raising" constructions of Bulgarian

(39) a. Čadarâti ne mu beše nameren ti
umbrella-the not him\textsubscript{dat} was.3sg found
‘His umbrella was not found’
b. *Imeto\textsubscript{i} ne mu beše sâobâšteno na Maria ti
name.the not him\textsubscript{dat} was.3sg communicated to Mary
‘His name was not communicated to Mary’
(cf. [Imeto mu], ne beše sâobâšteno na Maria ti)

If the possessive clitic in (39)b can only come from inside the DP object expressing the possessee (imeto), after which the object moves to preverbal subject position as part of the passivization process, we end up with the configuration in (40), in which the clitic trace is only bound by its antecedent under reconstruction:\textsuperscript{17}

(40) [DP imeto\textsubscript{k}], ne mu\textsubscript{k} beše sâobâšteno na Maria ti

Let us consider if this fact might be at the basis of the ill-formedness of (40).\textsuperscript{18} We know independently that an A-bar moved phrase containing an unbound A-bar trace leads to an unacceptable result. See e.g. (41) from Italian:

(41) *I Rossi, [regalare ti\textsubscript{i} ai quali]\textsubscript{k} non so cosa\textsubscript{i} potrei ti\textsubscript{k},...
the Rossis, to give to.the whom.pl not know what could.1sg
(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 (42) shows:

(42) [ venduto ti\textsubscript{i} ai Rossi]\textsubscript{k} (l’appartamento), non è stato ti\textsubscript{k}
sold to.the Rossis the apartment wasn’t

\textsuperscript{17}. Under a copy theory of movement (Chomsky 1995, chapter 3), the representation would be (i):

(i) [DP imeto\textsubscript{k}], ne mu\textsubscript{k} beše sâobâšteno na Maria[DP imeto\textsubscript{k}],

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

\textsuperscript{18}. If in (39)a no extraction of the clitic takes place, there is no clitic trace to worry about.
In this respect, the trace of a clitic behaves like the trace left by A-movement since it does not lead to unacceptability. See (43). If so, then in (40) we have a case analogous to that in (41) (modulo the A- instead of the A-bar traces).

(43) [ venduto ti 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).19  
The ungrammaticality of (39)b is in fact parallel to that of (44) in Italian with ne-extraction interacting with the A-movement of the object DP to subject position.20

(44) *[Il nome t_j]k non ne t_i è stato comunicato t_k  
the name not it_{gen} is been communicated
‘His name was not communicated’

In (39)a 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

---

19. The grammatical status of (42) and (43) suggests that Reconstruction of A-bar chains may feed Reconstruction of A-chains.

20. In both cases extraction of the clitic after the DP object has raised to preverbal subject position would involve an illicit downward movement. The possibility of so-called en-avant in French remains to be understood in relation to its impossibility in Italian (and Bulgarian).
possessor construction” appears to have the same properties of the Romance “possessor raising” construction, namely:

1. It is limited to inalienable possession (and its extensions);
2. It is limited to predicates which affect their objects and impose a benefactive/malefactive interpretation on the external possessor; and
3. 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:

4. It is not limited to inalienable possession;
5. It contains predicates that do not affect their object nor impose a benefactive/malefactive interpretation on the external possessor; and
6. 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 will be able to host via raising only clitics that have received a (Possessive, or other) theta-role inside the DP.21

Here we leave open the exact mechanism which can be held responsible for the added possessive interpretation that relates the external Benefactive/Malefactive Dative to the DP expressing the inalienable possession in Romance and Bulgarian.

---

21. Richard Kayne (p.c.) made the interesting suggestion that even the Romance-type construction might after all involve movement of the dative clitic doubling an overt (see (37) above) or silent DP inside the DP expressing the possessee from where the clitic is extracted. If that conjecture were to turn out correct, the differences that we have noted here between the two constructions would have to be derived in some other fashion.
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