1. The phenomenon ‘External Possession’

• Increased interest in the external possessive structures over the past has brought empirical evidence demonstrating that this phenomenon is common cross-linguistically.

• The puzzle: Landau (1999:2) ‘[External possession represent a structure, in which] *an argument in the clause (the possessor) derives its semantic role from another argument (the possessee), but its syntactic behavior from the predicate*.’

• i.e. the overt syntactic position and the Case marking (usually oblique (Dative) Case) of the external possessor is that of a typical verbal dependent, while its semantic interpretation is that of a typical nominal dependent:

(1) Meine Schwester hat dem Papa / ihm [dp das Auto ] zu Schrott gefahren [German]
   my sister has the.DAT dad /he.DAT the car to scrap driven
   ‘My sister totaled dad’s/his car’

(2) Ha yalda kilkela le-Dan [dp et ha-radio] [Hebrew]
   the-girl spoiled to.DAT Dan ACC the-radio
   ‘The girl broke Dan’s radio’

(3) Haama-pim hi- nees-wewkuny-e’ny-O-e ha-haacwal-na lawtiwaa [Nez Perce]
   man-ERG 3SUBJ-O.PL-meet-φ-P-REM-PAST PL-boyOBJ friend.NOM
   ‘The man met the boys’ friend’ (Deal, to appear)

(4) Je lui ai pris [dp la main]. [French]
   I he.DAT have taken the hand.
   ‘I took his hand’

• Crucially, these DP-external possessors contrast syntactically with the so-called DP-internal possessors:

(5) Meine Schwester hat [dp sein Auto ] zu Schrott gefahren [German]
   my sister has he.GEN car to scrap driven
   ‘My sister totaled his car’

(6) J’ai pris [dp sa main]. [French]
   I have taken he.GEN hand
   ‘I took his hand’
• Previous research: Is the external possessor-element an argument of the verb (Borrer and Grodzinsky 1986, Hole 2005, Lee-Schoenfeld 2006) or an argument of the noun (Backer 2001, Landau 1999, Deal to appear)?
• no conclusive evidence that would favor one of the camps.
• Deal 2013: both camps have valid arguments if we assume distinct subtypes of parallel existing structures;

2. Deal’s typology of external possession

• Deal 2013 typology clusters the variety of structures into two major types: Type A and Type B. The type A provides empirical evidence for possessor raising, possessor binding, and/or possessor control, while type B covers language-specific structures that trigger possessor movement due to information structure (see Deal 2013:15).

(7) Deal’s typology of external possession

Type A: external possessor is akin to control/raising/binding/ECM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does the possessor phrase move?</th>
<th>Does the possessor receive an additional theta-role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>A-Movement to thematic position (affectee reading)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>A-Movement to an athematic position (no affectee reading)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Binding analysis (syntactically independent base-generated anaphora)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Possessor government analysis ??</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Type B: external possessor is trigger by information structure and discourse (A-bar dependencies)

• The current paper looks into the external possessives in Bulgarian through the prism of Deal’s (2013) typology and attempts the identification of several distinct structures.

3. The Bulgarian possessive structures

• two surface structures: one with a possessor embedded internally into the nominal expression (8) and one with a possessor positioned externally of the nominal expression (9). In both cases, the possessor is understood as the argument of the nominal expression:

(8) DP-internal possession

a. (Az) xaresvam [dp naj-nova(*ta) mu naučna statija]
   I like.1P.SG est-new.the he.DAT scientific article
   ‘I like his newest scientific article’

b. (Az) xaresvam [dp tazi mu naj-nova naučna statija]
   I like.1P.SG this he.DAT est-new.the scientific article
   ‘I like his newest scientific article’
(9) **DP-external possession**

(Az) mu xaresvam [DP naj-nova(*ta) naučna statija]
1 him-DAT like.1.P.SG est-new.the scientific article
‘I like his newest scientific article’

- **Properties of Bulgarian external possessors:**
  - the possessie (head-noun) in Bulgarian needs to be definite; i.e. the possessive pronouns and demonstratives/(postpositional) definite articles are not in a complementary distribution;
  - both the external and the internal possessors are marked Dative because of the so-called **Balkan Dative/Genitive syncretism** as discussed in Pancheva (2004). Recall, that DP-internal possessors in English, German and French bear Genitive Case marking (see the examples in (5) and (6)).

- In addition to the dative possessors, Bulgarian has morphologically **specified full possessive pronouns** and so-called **adjectival possessors** that are derived via the relational morphemes –ov/-in. These morphemes are lexically restricted to proper names and kinship nouns (Pancheva 2004). Morphosyntactically, this group of possessors in Bulgarian agrees with the number and gender of the possessie the same way modifying adjectives do and they appear strictly in a pre-nominal position (following quantifiers, but preceding numerals and adjectives)(see 9a/b). Finally, the full possessive pronouns and –ov/-in possessive adjectives CANNOT extract/appear outside the DP under any condition (9b):

  (9) a. (Az) haresvam [DP vsički-(te) Ivan-ov/-negovi novi naučni statii]
  1 like.1.P.SG all(the) Ivan’s.PL/his.PL new.PL scientific.PL article.PL
  ‘I like all of Ivan’s/his new scientific articles’

  b. *[DP Ivanovi-(te)/negovi-(te) vsički novi naučni statii]
  c. * (Az) Ivan-ov/-negovi haresvam [DP vsički-(te) novi naučni statii]

4. Discerning two types of external possessors in Bulgarian

4.1. Previous analyses

- Previous analyses mainly ask whether the dative clitic is the same syntactic unit in all structures: Dimitrova-Vulchanova/Guisti (1998, 1999), Stateva (2002), Pancheva (2004), as well as Harizanov (2011) all assume that the external construction is the result of movement out of the DP into an a-thematic clausal position.

4.2. Distinguishing two types of locality effects

- However, compare the following two external structures:

  (10) Az mu xaresvam/vidjax [DP majka*(ta) / râce*(te)/ kola*(ta)]
  1 he.DAT like/saw.1.P.SG mother.the / hands.the /car.the
  ‘I like/saw his mother/hands/car’

  (11) Az mu sčupix/izbodox [DP prast*(a)/oko*(to)]
  1 he.DAT broke/picked.1.P.SG finger.the/eye.the
  ‘I broke/picked his finger/eye’
• While (10) sounds good with both internal and external possessor, (11) is judged more natural with the external possessor. In fact, native speaker translate (11) always with an external possessor, while there is some variation in the preference of (10).

4.3 The semantic role of the external possessive relation in Bulgarian

• Krapova (2013) suggests that the reason for the variance among native speakers lies in the semantics of both structures. In (10), we are dealing with a possessive (the head-noun) that is either a simple non-relational/extrinsic/alienable common noun phrase (kola ‘car’) or an inherently/lexically/inalienable relational noun phrase (majka ‘mother’, răcete ‘hands’). In the data in (11), on the other hand, we are dealing strictly with inherently relational noun-phrases, such as finger, eye etc.

• Partee and Borshev (1998), propose to treat possessive common noun phrase like intersective modifiers:

(12)  
\[ [[\text{car}]] = \lambda x. x \text{ is a car} \]

\[ [\text{DP } \text{kola.ta na Ivan}] \ 'Ivan’s \ car' \]
\[ \lambda P. (P(x) \& R(\text{Ivan})(x)) \]
\[ = \lambda P. (P(x) \& R(\text{Ivan})(x)) (\text{car}) \]
\[ = \lambda x [(\text{car})(x) \& R(\text{Ivan})(x)] \quad \text{(by } \lambda \text{ conversion)} \]

• For inherently relational noun phrases, on the other hand, they propose to treat the argument as being indirectly provided by the lexical meaning of the head-noun (see Partee and Borshev 1998):

(13)  
\[ [[\text{mother}]] = \lambda x . \lambda R. R \text{ is the mother of } x \]

\[ [\text{DP } \text{majka.ta/răcete na Ivan}] \ 'Ivan’s \ mother/mentality' \]
\[ \lambda R. (\lambda x [R(\text{Ivan})(x)]) \]
\[ = \lambda R. (\lambda x [R(\text{Ivan})(x)]) (\text{mother}) \]
\[ = [\lambda x [\text{mother}(\text{Ivan})(x))] \quad \text{(by } \lambda \text{ conversion)} \]

• The crucial cut in Bulgarian possessives, however, according to Cinque and Krapova 2009 and Krapova 2013 lies not so much in the type of the head-noun, but in the valence of the clausal predicate. In (10), we are dealing with transitive predicates, which does not affect its objects (‘like’, ‘saw’, ‘remember’, ‘know’, ‘received’), while in (11) we are dealing with predicates that allow optional affectee arguments and interpretation (‘broke’, ‘picked’, ‘tear’, ‘hit’, etc.).

4.4 The affectedness reading in Bulgarian external possessors

• The availability of affectee reading in external possession has been empirically shown to exist in many well-know languages and has been taken as a major argument in favor of the non-movement approach to external possession (for German see Lee-Schoenfeld 2006 or Hole 2005, for Spanish see Kempchinsky 1992, for Hebrew see Borer and Grodzinsky 1986, for French see Barnes 1985).

• As defined in Hole (2005:220): ‘Affectees are causally affected by the eventuality at hand, i.e. they have one property of the Patient Proto-Role. . .
Contributing properties for the Patient Proto-Role:
(i) undergoes change of state
(ii) incremental theme
(iii) causally affected by another participant
(iv) stationary relative to movement of another participant
(v) does not exist independently of the event, or not at all

• For Bulgarian, if we create a situation, in which the possessor is dead and cannot be affected by the event, we obtain ungrammatical structure with affectee predicates:

(14) [Ivan počina] ‘Ivan died’
   a. Togava počina i [kuče.to mu]
      Then died also dog.the he.DAT
      ‘Then his dog died, too’
   b. *Togava mu počina i kuče.to

(15) [Ivan počina] ‘Ivan died’
   a. Togava vidjax [dp.kuče.to mu]
      Then saw.1SG dog.the he.DAT
      ‘Then I saw his dog’
   b. Togava mu vidjax [dp.kuče.to]

⇒ The predicate in (14) is allowing for a malefactive interpretation but cannot support a possessive clitic in the verbal spine if the possessor is dead and cannot be affected by the event of the predicate. As a result, a regular DP-internal possessive clitic is the only possible structure.
⇒ The transitive predicate in (15), on the other hand, does not contribute to an affectee reading and is happy with an external possessor clitic.
⇒ Both structures are not equivalent;

4.5 The Syntax and morphology of the Bulgarian external possessors

• More evidence to supports the heterogeneous argument of Bulgarian external possessive structure:

4.5.1 Extraction out of PPs (that is otherwise not possible in the language)

• As the wh-movement data in (16) show, prepositional phrases (PP) are islands for extraction in Bulgarian. However, examples like (17) demonstrate external possessors despite the PP in object position:

(16) *Na kogo govoreše [pp s [dp učitel.ja___]]? (adapted from Krapova 2013)
      of who.DAT spoke.2P with teacher.the
      ‘To whose teacher did you talk?’

(17) Az mu se izsmjax [pp v [lice.to ]]. (locative PP)
     I he.DAT Refl laughed.1SG in face.the
     ‘I laughed in his face’
• Crucially, if we employ a transitive verb, which does not assign affectee theta role, the external possessor is suddenly bad out of the PP:

(18)  *Az mu čux [PP za [DP kuče.to__]]
I he.DAT heared.1SG for dog.the
‘I heard about his dog’

(19)  *Az mu zavisja [PP ot [DP nastroenie.to__]]
I he.DAT depend from mood.the
‘I depend on his mood’

4.5.2 Preservation of idiomatic interpretation

• Cinque and Krapova (2009) (C&K) also observe that Bulgarian has possessive idioms with external possesses clitics that lack an equivalent with a DP-internal clitic:

(20)  a. Toj mi xodi [PP po [DP nervi.te]]
he me.DAT walk.3SG on nerves.the
Lit. ‘You are walking on my nerves’ (‘You are getting on my nerves’)

b. *Toj xodi [PP po [DP nervite mi]] (no idiomatic interpretation)

(21)  a. Tja mu razbi [DP sârce.to]
she he.DAT broke.3SG heart.the
‘She broke his heart’

b. Tja razbi [DP sârce to]mu (no idiomatic interpretation)

(22)  a. Tja mu zarjaza [DP konj.a v rekata]
she he.DAT abandoned.3SG horse.the in river.the
Lit. ‘She abandoned his horse into the river’ (‘She gave up on him’)

b. Tja zarjaza [DP konj.a mu ] v rekata (no idiomatic interpretation)

4.5.3 Distinct requirement for definiteness

• all DP-internal possessor clitic (except certain kinship nouns (Pancheva 2004)) must appear with definite head-nouns.

• DP-internal possessor clitic always follows the DP element that bears the postpositional definite article (Dimitrova-Vulchanova and Guisti 1999, Franks 2000, Stateva 2001, Harizanov 2011):

(23)  Az sčupix [DP malki.ja/tozi/*edin mu prâst] (malef.predic.+ body part)
I broke.1SG little.the/this /one he.DAT finger
‘I broke his little finger/this finger of his’

I saw.1SG little.the/this/one he.DAT finger/ cell phone
‘I saw his little finger/cell phone’
• But in the external variant suddenly an indefinite reading becomes available with the malefactive predicate:

(25) Az mu sčupix [DP edin prast]
    I he.DAT broke.1SG one finger
    ‘I broke one finger of his’

(26) *Az mu vidjax [DP edin prast / telefon]
    I he.DAT saw.1SG one finger /cell phone
    ‘I saw one finger/cell phone of his’

• Also, in the exceptional case of kinship possessories, a DP-internal clitic CANNOT appear with a definite article:

(27) Az provalix [DP majka/lelja/dăšterja (*ta) mu]
    I he.DAT ruined mother/aunt/daughter he.DAT
    ‘I ruined his mother/aunt/daugther’

(28) Az mu provalix [DP majka/lelja/dăšterja *(ta)]
    I he.DAT ruined mother/aunt/daughter
    ‘I ruined his mother/aunt/daugther’

☞ To sum up:
- the distinct definiteness requirements suggest that possessive structures differ based on the predicate; affectee predicates allow for an indefinite reading with an external dative clitic, while transitive predicates do not support an indefinite reading with an external clitic.
- In addition, DP-external and DP-internal possessor clitics in structures with affectee predicates do not derive from the same underlying structure, since kinship nouns, which are exceptionally not marked with overt definite article, suddenly need an article when the possessor is in the clausal spine.

☞ Affectee predicate - ‘(proper) dative clitic’ is base-generated in the clausal spine and marks the oblique argument; ‘possessive dative clitic’ is base-generated in DP-internal;
☞ Transitive predicate – has only ‘possessive dative clitic’ that either remains DP-internal or raises into the pre-verbal clitic position;

4.5.4 Clitic doubling
• Finally, predicates that affect their objects allow a structure, in which a dative clitic is doubling the dative-marked argument:

(29) Az mu sčupix prast.a na Ivan/na nego;
    I he.DAT broke.1P.SG finger.the of Ivan/of him
    ‘I broke Ivan’s/his finger meaning ‘I caused the breaking of a finger to him’

(30) Az mu xodja po nervi.te na Ivan/na nego;
    I he.DAT walk.1SG on nerves.the of Ivan/of him
    ‘I laughed in Ivan’s face’ (idiom)
• Such structure is not possible with transitive predicates; i.e. an otherwise possible external possessive clitic, cannot clitic-double a DP-internal possessor:

(31) *Az mu vidja na kola.ta Ivan/na nego,
  I he.DAT saw.car.the of Ivan/of him
  ‘I saw Ivan’s car’

• In fact, despite an identical surface linear order, the na-DP in (29) and (30) is an argument of the predicate and is located within the verbal spine, while the na-DP in (31) is an argument of the noun phrase and is located within the DP. This is so because the na-DP in (29) and (30) can be substituted with na+pronoun (na nego), while in (31) it cannot. As Franks (2000) and Krapova (2013), show na+pronoun CANNOT mark a DP-internal possessor, as it is exclusively reserved for the {goal} of deverbal nouns. Therefore the na-DP phrase in (29-30) cannot be part of the DP.

5. Conclusions

• Cinque and Krapova 2009, Krapova 2013, and the current paper provide support for two distinct external possessive constructions in Bulgarian, thus supporting Deal’s proposal that external possession is a heterogenic phenomenon across and within languages.

• For Bulgarian, we can now show that while one structure constitutes raising out of a DP-generated possessive clitic, a second structure constitutes a VP-generated dative clitic. The homophony in the Bulgarian possessive and dative clitics is just a result of a historical Dative-Genitive syncretism.

To sum up the evidence that allows us to discern the two structures that have a Dative clitic in the clausal domain in Bulgarian:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>malefactive/benefactive predicate</th>
<th>transitive predicate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>brake/pick/tear</td>
<td>see/like/love/hate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>affectedness reading</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>external clitic with PP object</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indefinite reading</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>idiomatic reading</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clitic doubling</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>substitute with ‘na nego’</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• The external possessive reading with the affectee predicates is available with inherently possessive noun phrases in Bulgarian. This type of phrases already comes with relational semantics and is able to provide the abstraction rule for the variable identification. No syntactic movement of the dative clitic is taking place in these structures.

• The external possessive reading with transitive predicates, on the other hand, is most probably the result of movement out of a DP-internal position into an a-thematic position in the clausal domain. Native speakers, for example, strongly prefer external possessors with transitive and unaccusative verbs, while unergative verbs produce ungrammatical structures. Stateva (2002) shows that external possessors cannot be associated with a possessie that is the external argument of the verb. Consider the following examples, in which the definite subject [babata] ‘the grandmother’ is kept in a post-verbal
position while the sentence begins with a temporal adverb to provide a lexical host for the (second-position) dative clitic:

(32) Včera mu e potársila [baba.ta] [baraban.a]  
yesterday he.CL.DAT AUX looked for.3SG.f. grandmother.the drum.the  
‘Yesterday the grandmother looked for his drum’  
*’Yesterday his grandmother looked for the drum’

5. Possessors under Focus

• Finally, Deal 2013 discusses data from Japanese external possession, for which speakers report discourse distinctions:

(33) [Kono class-no dansei-ga] yoku dekiru  
this class-GEN male-NOM well are-able  
‘It is the boys in this class that do well’ (originally from Kuno 1973:72)

(34) [Kono class-ga] [dansei-ga] yoku dekiru  
this class-NOM male-NOM well are-able  
‘It is this class that the boys that do well’ (originally from Kuno 1973:72)

• In Bulgarian, a non-prenominal possessor can extract out of the DP and move to the pre-verbal focus position:

(35) a. (Az) xaresvam [dp naj-nova.ta naučna statija na Ivan/* na nego]  
I like.1P.SG est-new.the scientific article of Ivan/of him  
‘I like Ivan’s new scientific article’ (lit. [the new scientific article of Ivan])

b. (Az) na Ivan/* na nego xaresvam [dp naj-nova.ta naučna statija]  
I of Ivan/ of him like.1P.SG est-new.the scientific article  
‘It is Ivan’s newest scientific article that I like (not Peter’s)’

What needs to follow is a working Binding analysis, Raising analysis and A-bar movement analysis in order for Bulgarian to serve as an example of a language with heterogenic external possessor structures.
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