

Competition between Nominal Possessive Constructions and the Possessive Dative in Macedonian

Liljana Mitkovska

In Macedonian, prototype possession is expressed by internal possessive constructions (IPC), marking the possessive relation explicitly in the NP (*kolata na Stefan* ‘Stefan’s car’; *negovata kola* ‘his car’) and by external possessive constructions (EPC) which imply possessive relation between two participants coded in the same core clause. The most widespread EPC is the Possessive Dative construction:

Vesna mu ja rasipa kolata (na Stefan).
Lit. Vesna him broke the car (of Stephan).

The IPC and the Possessive Dative tend to express the same semantic content. However, although they may refer to the same actual situation, they do not construe it in the same way. Each of them presents the possessive relation from a different point of view: the IPC from the point of view of the possessed and the Possessive Dative from the point of view of the possessor.

The aim of this paper is to discuss the syntactic-semantic properties and distribution of these two constructions in contemporary Macedonian, relying on the cognitive grammar approach to language analysis and some related theories with functional orientation. It is based on an examination of a large corpus of examples from literary and journalistic texts and investigates the discourse-pragmatic and stylistic conditions which govern the choice of one or the other construction, highlighting the consequences of this choice for the meaning of the utterance.

Keywords: possession (external/internal), possessive dative, reference point, prototype, affectedness, empathy, cognitive grammar, grammaticalization

1. Introduction

This paper examines the relation between the internal possessive constructions (IPCs) and a particular type of external possessive construction (EPC), namely the Possessive Dative Construction (PDC) in Macedonian. The term EXTERNAL POSSESSION is used, relying on Payne & Barshi's article,¹ for syntactic constructions in which the possessive relation is implied between two participants in a clause, unlike INTERNAL POSSESSION which suggests that the possessor and the possessed are expressed in the same NP. The conclusions are based on an analysis of a large corpus of examples from literary and journalistic texts, as well as attested examples from conversation and from the spoken media.² Only by considering the function of the two constructions in the wider contexts in which they are used can we draw conclusions about their specific roles in discourse.

The most common means of expressing possession on the NP level in contemporary standard Macedonian is the *na*-construction, which is also the most productive.³ It has taken over most of the functions of the genitive case in adnominal position after the loss of the case system in Balkan Slavic (Macedonian and Bulgarian). Apart from possession, the preposition *na* is also used for marking the indirect object as well as

1 Doris L. Payne and Immanuel Barshi "External Possession: What, Where, How and Why," in Doris L. Payne and Immanuel Barshi, eds., *External Possession* [Typological Studies in Language No. 39] (Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1999), pp. 3–29.

2 The examples presented in this paper are mainly from this corpus and the source is duly indicated. Where needed, examples were simplified or provided by the author, without indication of the source.

3 The Possessive Adjective in *-ov/-in* is also present, but it is far more restricted, both formally and functionally. See Liljana Mitkovska, "The Functional Distribution of the Possessive Suffixes *-ov/-in* in Macedonian and in Bulgarian," *Balkanistika* 13 (2000), pp. 113–130.

for various spatial and temporal meanings.⁴ The basic spatial relation it conveys is that of contact and/or support.⁵ Syntactically the possessive *na*-construction represents a noun phrase constituted by a head and a modifying prepositional phrase following it. The head noun encodes the POSSESSED (Pd) and the complement of the POSSESSOR (Pr) (*knigata na Ana* ‘Ann’s book’). For anaphoric and deictic use, the Pr is expressed by a possessive pronoun marked for person and number, and additionally for gender in the third person singular. The possessive pronoun precedes the head noun and agrees with it in number and gender, so structurally it behaves like an adjective (*moj/-a/-e/-i, tvoj, negov, nejzin, nash, vash, nivni*) (*nejzinata kniga* ‘her book’).⁶ Macedonian also uses postnominal dative clitics, but their use is restricted to close kin relations (*majka mi* ‘my mother,’ *brat mu* ‘his brother’).⁷

Possessive Dative refers to constructions in which the dative (i.e. indirect object (IO))⁸ referent is interpreted as a possessor of another par-

4 According to Angelina Minčeva, *Razvoj na datelnija pritežatelen padež v bŭlgarskija ezik* (Sofija: Izdatelstvo na Bŭlgarskata akademija na naukite, 1964), pp. 114–117; and Blaže Koneski, *Istorija na makedonskiot jazik* (Skopje: Kultura, 1986), pp. 164–165, among others, diachronically the indirect object function of the preposition *na* precedes the possessive one. See Liljana Mitkovska, “Izrazuvanje posesivnost na nivo na imenskata sintagma vo makedonskiot i vo angliski ot jazik,” Skopje: University “Ss Cyril and Methodius” dissertation. (2005), pp. 47–51.

5 Cf. Alan Cienki, “The Semantics of Possessive and Spatial Constructions in Russian and Bulgarian: a Comparative Analysis in Cognitive Grammar,” *SEEJ* 39:1 (1995), p. 97 for Bulgarian.

6 In this respect the possessive pronoun in Macedonian is not different from the other South Slavic languages.

7 See, Olga Mišeska-Tomić, “Clitic and Non-clitic Possessive Pronouns in Macedonian and Bulgarian,” in Mila Dimitrova-Vulchanova and Olga Mišeska Tomic, eds., *Investigations in the Bulgarian & Macedonian Nominal Expression* (Trondheim: Tapir Academic Press, 2009), pp. 95–120, on the relation between the possessive and IO clitics.

8 Macedonian has lost the nominal case markers on nouns. There are only distinct accusative and dative case pronoun forms, which are associated with the direct and the indirect object respectively. For this reason, the terms dative and indirect object, when referring to Macedonian, are used interchangeably in this paper.

participant in the predication which may be expressed in various syntactic positions⁹ (example 1). Macedonian has lost the nominal case markers, so the IO is expressed by the common form of the noun in a prepositional phrase headed by the preposition *na*. It has nevertheless kept the distinction in the pronominal paradigm, so the dative forms of both full and clitic pronouns are preserved (*mene mi, tebe ti, nemu mu, nejze i, nam ni, vam vi, nim im*).¹⁰ The clitic precedes the verb and can stand alone in neutral contexts, but it is also obligatory when, in contrastive or emphatic context, the full pronominal form is used, as well as with a nominal IO, as shown in example (1).

(1) Vesna *mu* ja rasipa kolata (*na Stefan/nemu*).

Lit. ‘Vesna him broke the car (to Stefan/to him).’

The IO construction is used for expressing various related meanings, extending from the central¹¹ threevalent situation with the third participant acting as a recipient: the subject referent acts upon the DO referent and as a result the DO is transferred into the dative referent’s domain. In such ditransitive construction the dative constituent is obligatory, it is licensed/required by the verb and has a syntactic position of an indirect object (example 2).

9 Also known as *Dativus Sympatheticus*, dative of interest, *dativus commodi/incommodi*, inalienable dative. James S. Levine “Remarks on the Pragmatics of the ‘Inalienable Dative’ in Russian,” in Richard D. Brecht and James S. Levine, eds., *Case in Slavic* (Columbus, OH: Slavica, 1986), pp. 437–451. See Dubravko Kučanda, “What Is the Dative of Possession?” *Suvremena lingvistika* 41/42 (1996), pp. 309–318 for illustration of the terminological variation.

10 Western dialects keep the synthetic forms, which have also entered the standard, but in the East- and North-Macedonian dialects as well as in the colloquial standard analytic forms of the long pronouns (*na mene, na tebe, na nego* etc. ‘to me, to you, to him’) are more common.

11 See Brygida Rudzka-Ostyn, “The Polish Dative,” in William van Belle and Willy van Langendonck, eds., *The Dative, Vol. 1: Descriptive Studies* (Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1996), pp. 341–394; Laura A. Janda, *A Geography of Case Semantics: The Czech Dative and Russian Instrumental* (Berlin-New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 1993).

(2) Ana *mu* ja dade knjigata *na Mirko*. ‘Ana gave the book to Mirko.’

There are however dative constructions in which the dative constituent is not part of the valence of the verb and is thus syntactically non-obligatory (free dative). In such situations the subject referent acts upon the DO referent which is situated within the domain of the dative referent, thus the latter is not a recipient of a concrete or abstract object, but a recipient of the effects of the event as an interested entity. Consequently, it is reinterpreted as a beneficiary/maleficiary (example 3a) or experiencer (example 4a). Both situations present favourable conditions for the third participant to be interpreted as a possessor (example 3b and 4b) as in such capacity it is most likely to be indirectly affected.

(3) a. Ana *mi* ja zatvori *vrata*. ‘Ana closed the door for me/on me.’

b. Ana *mi* ja izmi/izvalka *kolata*. ‘Ana washed my car/made my car dirty.’

(4) a. *Mi* se isturi *mlekoto*. ‘The milk spilt on me.’

b. *Mi* se svitka *nogata*. ‘My leg got twisted on me.’

Before I proceed to explaining the circumstances in which the possessive interpretation in the dative construction occurs in Macedonian (section 4), I will first outline the theoretical background and the definition of the notion of possession (section 2). Then I will briefly consider the possessive meanings coded by the basic IPCs (i.e. the *na*-construction and its pronominal counterparts) (section 3). In section 5 the differences in the distribution of IPCs and PDC will be discussed in order to pinpoint the functional properties of each construction and its role in discourse. At the end a short conclusion is presented.

2. Theoretical Background

Possession seems to be one of the central concepts of human cognition. According to Seiler’s monograph¹² “Possession is fundamental in human life and it is fundamental in human language.” This claim is

12 Hansjakob Seiler, *Possession as an Operational Dimension in Language* (Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag, 1983), p. 1.

supported by the fact that its expression is widespread throughout human languages. Often one language has more than one structure for expressing possession. On the other hand, each possessive construction typically codes more than one of the related meanings. Broadly speaking, possession embodies a relation between two entities,¹³ called possessor and possessed. Their relationship can be so versatile that it is tempting to claim that any relationship between two entities can be expressed as possessive. However, that is not the case, since the possessive relationship is asymmetric and it is normally not possible to reverse the referent roles without affecting the meaning in some way (compare: *Tom's hat* and (?) *the hat's Tom*). The nature of the relation depends on the type of the referents the two entities represent.

The present analysis of the possessive constructions in Macedonian will be based on Langacker's account of possessive relations. He proposes two types of underlying structure for the possessive category: (1) a reference-point model as an abstract image schema underlying the wide range of possessive meanings; and (2) conceptual archetypes which have a strong experiential base and define the category prototypes (ownership, kinship and part-whole).

According to Langacker's article,¹⁴ "The reference-point model is simply the idea that we commonly invoke the conception of one entity for the purpose of establishing mental contact with another." In possessive constructions the entity coded in the possessor is always the more salient entity in the given situation and thus the 'reference point.' It serves to ensure identification of the possessed, which is the 'target entity.' This accounts for the wide range of possessive construction as well as the striking asymmetry of the possessive relations, no matter how distant they are from the prototype. It also explains the tendency of the possessive constructions to be definite. Thus, this cognitive ability has

13 A binary relation according to Seiler, *Possession as an Operational Dimension*.

14 Roland W Langacker, "Possession and Possessive Constructions," in John R. Taylor and Robert E. MacLaury, eds., *Language and Cognitive Construal of the World* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995), p. 58.

a direct effect on linguistic organization, which proves one of the basic claims of cognitive linguistics.

The image schematic ability is inherent in the conception of the archetype, which defines the category's prototype. Langacker gives prototype status to the three central categories (ownership, kinship and physical part/whole relations) explaining that "each involves a clear and clearly defined reference point relationship."¹⁵ For example, possessions are normally defined in reference to the people who own them, while the reverse is quite unusual. Parts, especially body-parts, cannot be conceived of without invoking the conception of the whole. Equally, a kinship term only makes sense in relation to a given individual.¹⁶ Structures expressing these central relations can nevertheless spread to expressing meanings which depart from the prototype on the base of certain cognitive principles, such as family resemblance, metaphor or metonymy. The abstract reference point schema serves as a unifying force.

Relying on the outlined theoretical principles I consider both the possessive *na*-construction and the IO construction as polysemous categories structured according to cognitive principles. I also adopt the cognitive grammar tenet that languages can construe the same situation from different points of view.¹⁷ By reordering the participants along the

15 Roland W. Langacker, *Grammar and Conceptualization* [Cognitive Linguistics Research 14] (Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 2000), pp. 176–177.

16 Langacker considers as primary the notion of ownership in its general meaning of "having something at one's exclusive and permanent disposal." Roland W. Langacker, "Reference-point Constructions," *Cognitive Linguistics* 4:1 (1993), pp. 1–38. Zuzana Topolinjska, *Makedonskite dijalekti vo Egejska Makedonija. kniga I, Sintaksa, Tom II* [Macedonian dialects in Aegean Macedonia, book 1, Syntax, vol. II] (Skopje: MANU, 1997), considers the same three functions as the possessive prototype, but she gives primacy to the part-whole meaning. See also Maria Koptjevskaja-Tamm, "Adnominal Possession in the European Languages: Form and Function," *Sprachtypol. Univ. Forsch. (STUF)* 55:2 (Berlin, 2002), pp. 141–172, who gives no primacy to any of the three types of relations.

17 Roland W. Langacker, *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar, vol. I: Theoretical prerequisites* (Stanford University Press, 1991), p. 294.

syntactic positions and changing the profile, speakers may express a varied attitude towards the predication. Considering IPC and PDC in Macedonian as means for such variation, a discourse-pragmatic view of their relation cannot be avoided. In this respect I rely on authors¹⁸ who have taken into account pragmatic inferences and discourse functions in their description of EPCs in various languages.

3. The Nature of the Internal Possessive Constructions (IPCs) in Macedonian

I argue that the category of the possessive *na*-constructions is compatible with Langacker's reference point model regarding both the prototype meanings and those departing from them.¹⁹ The subcategories of the *na*-constructions represent a grammaticalization continuum, ranging from less grammaticalized to more grammaticalized as they depart from the prototype.²⁰ The relations expressed by the central senses are relatively concrete and situated in the external situation, whereas those construed by the more remote ones tend to express internal relations exhibiting progressively growing degrees of subjectivity. This is in accord

18 Such as Katerina P. King, "The Czech Dative of Interest: The Hierarchical Organization of Possession in Discourse and pragmatics," unpublished Dissertation (Harvard University, 1998); Miriam Fried, "From Interest to Ownership: A Constructional View of External Possessors," in Payne and Barshi, eds., *External Possession*, pp. 473–504; Maura Velasquez-Castillo, "Body-Part EP Constructions: A Cognitive/Functional Analysis," in Payne and Barshi, eds., *External Possession*, pp. 77–108; Mary Catherine O'Connor, "External Possession and Utterance Interpretation: A Crosslinguistic Exploration," *Linguistics* 45:3 (2007), pp. 577–613, among others.

19 Liljana Mitkovska, "The Conceptual Network of the Possessive *na*-constructions in Macedonian," <http://www.seelrc.org/glossos/issues/5/> (2004).

20 In line with Bernd Heine, Ulrike Claudi and Friederike Hünemeyer, *Grammaticalization: A Conceptual Framework* (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1991); Paul Hopper and Elizabeth Closs Traugott, *Grammaticalization* (Cambridge University Press, 1993).

with Traugott's view of the pragmatic strengthening of speaker involvement along the grammaticalization cline.²¹

The three prototype subcategories expressed by the IPCs are exemplified in (5). However, they are not uniform structures but also exhibit prototype effects, in having a central meaning and more distant meanings gradually departing from it.

- (5) a. ownership: *knigata na Ana* 'Ana's book'; *nejzinata kniga* 'her book'
 b. body part relations: *rakata na Ana* 'Ana's arm'; *nejzinata raka* 'her arm'
 c. kinship relations: *bratot na Ana* 'Ana's brother'; *nejziniot brat* 'her brother'

Thus, in the OWNERSHIP subcategory, while the referent of the Pr remains a person, the referent of the Pd can be not only a concrete object, which has a prototype status, but also a place, institution or some abstract notion (such as name – *imeto na Ana/nejzinoto ime*, idea – *idejata na Ana/nejzinata ideja*, role – *ulogata na Ana/nejzinata uloga* etc.). Moreover, in each of these subgroups there is a possibility for most of the relationships to be interpreted as more or less permanent, depending on the context (for example with concrete objects and places legally owned vs. having at one's disposal). In the subcategory of BODY PARTS there is also extension along the line concrete – abstract referents of the Pd, as personality features (*glasot na Ana/nejziniot glas* 'Ana's/her voice,' *kreativnosta na Ana/nejzinata kreativnost* 'Ana's/her creativity') and psycho-physiological states/ experiences (*lutinata na Ana/nejzinata lutina* 'Ana's anger,' *bolestana Ana/nejzinata bolest* 'Ana's/her illness') can also be expressed as possessed. In the subcategory of KINSHIP, apart from family relations the referent of the Pd can also express social relations (*prijatelkata na Ana/nejzinata prijatelka* 'Ana's/her friend') and less permanent supporting relations (*pejačot na Ana/nejziniot pejač* 'Ana's/her singer' (the one she likes)).

21 Elizabeth Closs Traugott, "From Polysemy to Internal Semantic Reconstruction," *BLS* 12 (1986), pp. 539–550; Elizabeth Closs Traugott, "Pragmatic Strengthening and Grammaticalization," *BLS* 14 (1988), pp. 406–416.

Extensions from the central possessive meanings follow in two directions: PART-WHOLE RELATIONS map on the central body parts relations (example 6) and PARAMETERS OF NOMINALIZED PREDICATION on the more abstract ownership relationships (example 7). In both the possessive pronoun can be used, but it is more common with human/animate Prs.

- (6) Part-whole – concrete parts: *račkata na šoljata* ‘the handle of the cup’; part of a place: *vrvot na planinata* ‘the top of the mountain’; abstract relations: *pravcot na glasot* ‘the direction of the voice,’ *osnova na sistemot* ‘the basis of the system’; parameters of an inanimate entity: *bojata/ kvalitetot na kolata* ‘the color/ quality of the car’
- (7) Parameters of nominalized predication – initiator: *pristignuvanje to na Ana* ‘Ana’s arrival,’ patient or goal: *popravkata na kolata* ‘repair of the car,’ *vospituvanje to na decara* ‘the children’s education’

From these subcategories, more abstract meanings have developed which are quite remote from the central possessive meanings. In the WHOLE-CONTENTS subcategory (example 8) the relation involves two aspects of the same participant. In that respect it resembles apposition and the use of the possessive pronoun is ruled out. When the speaker chooses to use them it is only for the purpose of the text: the speaker brings in a hierarchy between the notions. The reference point schema is further stretched and schematized. The salience of the Pr in regard to the Pd results from the level of abstractness, which assures the required asymmetry.

- (8) Whole-contents: *izložba na knigi* ‘an exhibition of books’; *grupa na naučnici / lekovi* ‘a group of scientists/ medicines’; *čuvstvo na strav* ‘a feeling of fear’; *relacija na posesivnost* ‘relation of possessivity’

In some marginal meanings the subjective view of the speaker has been grammaticalized.²² The DOMINATING CONTENTS constructions of the type *zemjata na snegot* ‘the country of snow’; *svetot na bajkite* ‘the world of fairy tales,’ emphasize the importance of the entity coded in the Pr for the classification of the entity coded in the head noun. The SUPERLA-

22 Ibid.

TIVE constructions (*vest na denot* ‘news of the day’; *sportiest na godinata* ‘sportist of the year’) convey the special status of the entity coded in the head noun among all other entities of that type in regard to the Pr. In both constructions the special input by the Pr is due to its reference point role.

This brief overview illustrates the vast array of relations that can be expressed by the IPCs. They are not an accidental collection, but derive from one another. The explication of the cognitive processes underlying their connection, though, is beyond the scope of this paper.²³

4. The Constraints of Use for the PDC

The IO construction is a well established means for expressing possessive relations in Macedonian.²⁴ Its distribution is similar to that of the other South Slavic languages, Croatian and Serbian in particular,²⁵ as well as Czech²⁶ and Polish.²⁷ The analysis in this paper is based on the assumption that although formally PDC does not differ from other dative constructions it is associated with a unique semantic-pragmatic construal which has been conventionalized and is utilized by speakers in appropriate situations. It is obviously a complex construction which

23 A detailed analysis is presented in Mitkovska, “The Conceptual Network.”

24 Cf. Zuzana Topolinjska, *Studii od makedonsko-bugarskata jazichna konfrontacija* (Skopje: MANU, 1996), pp. 11–38; Marija Najčeska-Sidorovska, “Sintagmi so *Dativus Sympatheticus* i negovoto razgraničuvanje od drugite značenja vo ruskiot, makedonskiot, srpskohrvatskiot i bugarskiot jazik,” *Makedonski jazik XXIV* (1973), pp. 119–130; Liljana Mitkovska, “On the Possessive Interpretation of the Indirect Object in Macedonian,” *Linguistica Silesiana* 21 (2000a), pp. 85–101; Mitkovska, “Izrazuvanje posesivnost”; Liljana Mitkovska, “Why Double Marking in Macedonian *Dativus, Sympatheticus*,” in Dagmar Divjak and Agata Kočańska, eds., *Cognitive Paths into the Slavic Domain* (Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 2007), pp. 55–79.

25 Ljiljana Šarić, “On the Semantics of ‘Dative of Possession’ in the Slavic Languages: An Analysis on the Basis of Russian, Polish, Croatian/Serbian and Slovenian Examples,” <http://www.seelrc.org/glossos/issues/3/> (2002)

26 Fried, “From Interest to Ownership”; King, “The Czech Dative of Interest.”

27 Ewa Dąbrowska, *Cognitive Semantics and the Polish Dative* (Berlin-New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 1997).

functions simultaneously on several language levels: syntactic, semantic, pragmatic and discourse.²⁸ To determine the constraints of the PDC in Macedonian at each level I will apply the implicational hierarchies defined by Haspelmath,²⁹ used in his investigation of this construction in European languages. The four hierarchies are:

- a. The Animacy Hierarchy – discourse level (empathy)
- b. The Situation Hierarchy – pragmatic level (affectedness)
- c. The Inalienability Hierarchy – semantic level (divisibility)
- d. The Syntactic Relations Hierarchy – structural level

According to these hierarchies, the PDC is more developed in a language if it is possible and encountered with components at the higher end. I will consider each in turn in reference to Macedonian PDC.

4-1. The Syntactic Relations Hierarchy

PDC is favoured if the syntactic relation of the Pd is: PP < direct object < unaccusative subject < unergative subject < transitive subject

The dative referent in Macedonian can be coded in both transitive and intransitive situations. The most common positions for the Pd are the DO (9), PP (10) or subject of an unaccusative (often marked as reflexive in Macedonian (11)) or a passive verb. However, we also encounter examples with unergative subjects (12–13), especially when body parts and kinship terms are concerned.

(9) Isto taka *si gi znam greškite*³⁰ i kolku učam od niv. (Antena, 12.05.2000:29)

‘Also, I know my errors and how much I learn from them.’

28 Cf. Michael D. Kliffier, “Interpretation of Linguistic Levels: French Inalienable Possession,” *Lingua* 62 (1984), pp. 187–208; King, “The Czech Dative of Interest”; Fried, “From Interest to Ownership”; O’Connor, “External Possession.”

29 Martin Haspelmath, “External Possession in European Areal Perspective,” in Payne and Barshi, eds., *External Possession*, p. 113. All these hierarchies have been applied by other authors with small variations.

30 If there are more clauses in the example sentence, the underlying indicates the clause within which the IO and another participant enter in possessive relation. The indirect object (clitic and pronoun/noun) and the participant it is related to are shown in italic.

- (10) Vetrot sè posilno *mi* bieše v *lice*. (Izbor:119)
 ‘The wind beat stronger and stronger in *my face*.’
- (11) Koga zastanala na binata štiklata i se zaglavila megju dve štici i se skršila. (Ekran, 26.12.96:40)
 ‘When she stepped onto the stage her heel got stuck between two boards and broke.’
- (12) *Nozete mu* doprea do vodata. ‘*His legs* touched the water.’
- (13) ... ama patot barem da go napravat ..., za da ni doagjaat decata, veli baba Vaska. (NM, 26/27.09.98:14)
 ‘... if they at least fixed the road ..., so that our children could come to visit us, says grandma Vaska.’

It is though not usual for the subject referent of a transitive construction to be understood as a Pd of the dative referent as in (14), where the only possible choice for expressing possession is the possessive pronoun. This is expected, as transitive subjects are usually initiators. Isolated cases are nevertheless encountered when body parts or kinship terms are concerned, as in example (15).

- (14) **Tragičnata sudbina*₁ *im*₁ go mačeše. /*Nivnata* tragična sudbina go mačeše. (Izbor: 25)
 ‘*The tragic destiny to them tormented him.’ / ‘Their tragic destiny tormented him.’
- (15) *Očite mi* pravat problemi. / *Sinot mu* ja popravi kolata. (attested in conversation)
 ‘*My eyes* cause me problems.’ / ‘*His son* fixed his car.’

4-2. *The Inalienability Hierarchy*

PDC is favoured if the possessed is: body part < inherent attribute < garment (<kinship term) < domestic animal < product < other type of possessed item.

In accounts of various languages, it has often been pointed out that the possessive relation is easily expressed in dative constructions if the Pd is closely connected to the Pr.³¹ In some, for example Russian, it is

31 Šarić, “On the Semantics of ‘Dative of Possession’”; Charles Bally, “The

claimed to be the only possibility.³² Table 1 shows the distribution of the types of Pd in the Macedonian corpus I have compiled: out of the 720 examples with PDC, 297 (41%) featured concrete body parts as Pd,³³ 145 (20%) were concrete personal belongings, 101 (14%) abstract possessed items, 91 (12.5%) inherent attributes, 36 (5%) terms for relatives and 23 (3%) social relations. There were also 27 examples (3.5%) expressing non-prototypical possession, mainly subject of nominalized predication (example 16) and part-whole relations (see examples 33–35 below).

PDC	Body parts		Ownership		Kinship		Other
	Concrete	At-tributes	Concrete belong-ings	Abstract belong-ings	Relatives	Social relations	Non-pro-totypical
720	297	91	145	101	36	23	27
100%	41%	12.5%	20%	14%	5%	3%	3.5%

Table 1. Occurrences of Types of Possessed in PDCs Attested in the Corpus

Although concrete body parts are the predominant Pd it is obvious that in Macedonian the PDC is high on the inalienability hierarchy and that it is quite common with alienably possessed items. With body parts and inherent attributes the possessive relation is immediately evoked (in fact often the only possible interpretation) (example 10 and 12) while for concrete objects stronger support from the context is required. Often the first interpretation is possessive and the hearer would expect explicit indication if it is otherwise. Thus in (17) we assume possessive relation, which need not be a permanent one. Often the Pd is understood as being

Expression of Concepts of the Personal Domain and Indivisibility in Indo-European Languages,” in Hilary Chappel and William McGregor, eds., *The Grammar of Inalienability: A Typological Perspective on Body-part Terms and Part-whole Relation* (Berlin-New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 1996), pp. 31–64.

32 Levine “Remarks on the Pragmatics.”

33 Šarić has found that in 87.6% of the attested examples in Croatian/Serbian the Pd was a body part, which is far more than in my corpus. The rest of the Pd she found denoted human qualities, other abstract concepts, clothes and other concrete nouns. Šarić, “On the Semantics of ‘Dative of Possession’,” p. 7.

at the disposal of the Pr (18). Possession is easily understood when the Pd is closer to the Pr (*cf.* example (11), where the shoe is on the Pr), but that is not a necessary requirement (see example (1) above, where the car owner need not even be aware of the damage).

- (16) Majka mu verojatno dobro mu go poznavashe čukanjeto. (GM:14)
 ‘His mother obviously distinguished *his knocking* well.’
- (17) Šišeto ì se istrkala duri na sred ulica. (GM:84)
 ‘*Her bottle* rolled up to the middle of the street.’
- (18) - Kate, sega *ke ti* stanam od *stolčeto*. (A colleague saying to another one who was previously sitting there.) (attested in conversation)
 ‘- Kate, I will immediately stand up from *your chair*.’

Constructions with alienable Pd are often ambiguous between possessive and benefactive interpretation and the definite article may play a crucial role: an indefinite referent is understood as transferred object in (19a), but if definite, it has to be a Pd (19b).

- (19) Koga imaše 12 godini roditelite a. *mu* kupija *pijano*./ b. *mu* go kupija *pijanoto*.
 ‘When he was 12 his parents a. bought *him a piano*./ b. bought him *the/his piano*.’

4-3. The Situation Hierarchy

PDC constructions are favoured if the predicate is: patient-affecting < dynamic non-affective < stative

PDC implies that the dative referent (Pr) is negatively or positively affected by the predication. It has been cross-linguistically reported by many authors that EPCs tend to be used with predicates implying physical affectedness.³⁴ The involvement of the Pr in the predication is easier to achieve if the predicate is dynamic and transitive. Indeed, central PDC contains verbs of change of state (*break, spoil, twist, wash, clean* etc.) (example 20) or change of place (*take out, steal, lose, put, send, bring*) (example 21).

34 Payne and Barshi, “External Possession,” p. 13.

(20) Mamo, dedo *ni gi izgore trenerkite na mene i na Teodora*. (attested in conversation)

‘Mom, grandpa stained *our pants* on the fire, *mine and Teodora’s*.’

(21) Znaesh li deka možeme da ti ja isečeme glavata ... (DP:82)

‘You know that we could cut off your head.’

However, as it has been noted by Shibatani,³⁵ the concept of affectedness in PDCs is not of syntactic, but of semantic nature. In intransitive constructions where the DO has been demoted to a modification, affectedness is easily evoked (22). It has to be pointed out, though, that the PDC does not so much stress the physical nature of the affectedness, but focuses on the psychological effects for the Pr, so the verb need not per se denote an affecting event. In Macedonian affectedness is commonly triggered with typically intransitive dynamic verbs, such as *enter, come, sit down, stand up* (example 18 above and 23) and reflexive verbs of middle diathesis (example (11) – *se zaglavi* & (17) – *se strkala*, above).

(22) Se luteše koga decata mu gazea po trevata. (attested in conversation)

‘He was angry when the children walked on his grass.’

(23) Igor počuvstvuva kako čadot mu navleguva vo nozdrite, potoa vo grloto. (DP:69)

‘Igor felt the smoke getting into his nostrils, then in his throat.’

It is obvious in such predications that the affectedness effect is not part of the semantic meaning of the predicate, but constitutes a particular input of the construction. It is even more obvious in PDC with intransitively used verbs when the Pd in a subject position is a material possession, as in example (24). Without the dative complement, these sentences are just general statements about the properties of the subject. The IO referent cannot be interpreted as beneficiary/maleficiary, because they are not understood as the participants using the objects, thus leaving the possessive interpretation as the best choice. The use of the IO in such

35 Shibatani, Masayoshi, “An Integrational Approach to Possessor Raising, Ethical Datives, and Adversative Passives,” *Berkeley Linguistic Society* 20 (1994), pp. 461–486.

situations, instead of the possessive pronoun, suggests that the speaker implies that the Pr is somehow affected by this disposition.³⁶

(24) - Znaeš, *ostrilkata* ne *ti* ostri. / *Telefonot* ne *im* raboti. (attested in conversation)

‘- You know, *your pencil sharpener* doesn’t sharpen well.’/‘*Their telephone* doesn’t work.’

Even though the nature of the predicate is not the crucial factor for the affectedness effect in PDC, cross-linguistically³⁷ it is not common with verbs expressing states, such as perception, cognition or volition.³⁸ In such situations there are no obvious effects which may affect the Pr, but the affectedness entrenched in the PDC on the basis of its prototype instances may be reinterpreted, depending on the situation, thus allowing states in the construction. This is in fact possible in Macedonian.³⁹ Without any significant restrictions PDC can be used with verbs of perception (25), cognition (26 and 9 & 16 above), and especially with the verb *sum* ‘to be’ (27 and 28). The verb *ima* ‘have’ is not common, but it is possible in colloquial speech (example 29).

(25) Potoa klekna i *mu* ja pogledna *nogata*. Ja izmi ranata. (DP:122)

Then she bent down and looked at his leg. She cleaned the wound.

(26) Možebi e toj samo običen kradec što ti go proučuva stanot pred da vleze za da ti go ispokrade? (ON Pr:21)

‘Maybe he is only an ordinary thief who is checking out your flat before entering to rob it?’

(27) Tuka *edinstvena želba mi* e da pišuvam. (attested on TV)

‘Here *my only wish* is to write.’

(28) *Site košuli ti* se za perenje. (attested in conversation)

‘*All your shirts* are for washing.’

36 Negative properties are more frequently commented on, but this type of construction can also be used to talk about positive characteristics.

37 See Fried, “From Interest to Ownership,” p. 485, for Czech.

38 Haspelmath, “External Possession,” p. 114.

39 As well as in Serbian and Croatian, according to Šarić, “On the Semantics of ‘Dative of Possession’,” p. 8.

(29) Neli vi velev jas: snagata da vi ja imam, umot da vi go nemam.
(MJB:279)

‘Didn’t I tell you: I wish I had your strength, but not your brains.’

In the PDCs with sative verbs the term “affectedness” has been stretched and assumes a rather abstract meaning. The role of the dative there is to present an objectively static situation as dynamic,⁴⁰ by importing directionality in the predication and, as a result, the dative referent is viewed as affected in some way, the nature of the affectedness being subject to contextual interpretation. For example, (25) suggests special care for the Pr; (26) indicates concern for the owner of the flat; (27) stresses the strong attitude of the Pr, while (28) warns the person that he may come into an unpleasant situation.

This analysis shows that the Macedonian PDC is open to various types of predicates. Almost any situation can be construed as in some way affecting the dative referent, i.e. the possessor of some other entity present in the situation.

4-4. Animacy Hierarchy

EP is favoured if the possessor is: 1st/2nd person pronoun < 3rd person pronoun < proper name < other animate < inanimate

Havers⁴¹ claims that *Dativus Sympatheticus* in Indoeuropean languages developed along this hierarchy. Another proof for its validity is Bally’s claim⁴² that the possessive dative with nouns is an innovation in European languages. In Macedonian, names and nouns denoting human beings are commonly used (30 and 31), although pronouns of all persons (especially the clitic form) are far more frequent.

(30) ... nejzinata sestra Meg e snimena kako mu ja trese jakata na avijatičarot Piter Tusend. (Denes 167:73)

‘... her sister Meg was recorded shaking off dust from *pilot Peter Tusend’s collar.*’

40 Rudzka-Ostyn, “The Polish Dative,” p. 360.

41 According to Kučanda, “What Is the Dative of Possession?” p. 327.

42 Bally, “The Expression of Concepts,” p. 44.

(31) - A ti tate neli nema veќе da im gi dupiš topkite na decata? (GM:35)

‘- And you dad, you will no more puncture the *children’s balls*, will you?’

Thus the central characteristic of the dative object in the Macedonian PDC is personality. The dative Pr is typically a conscious being capable of feeling the effects of the predication, even though its awareness in that particular situation is not a necessary requirement (Cf. *Vesna ne znae deka i ja izgubiv knjigata*. ‘Vesna doesn’t know that I have lost her book.’). These properties are easily transferred to animals and personified objects, such as dolls. Macedonian PDC also allows plants (32), machines (33) and some abstract notions (34) as Prs, thus extending to less prototypical possessive relations.

(32) - A zošto, Kole, na drvjata vo esen im pagjaat lisjata? (GM:53)

‘- And why, Kole, do *the leaves of the trees* fall in autumn?’

(33) Vodata go ispiraše (kamionot), noktite na branovite mu ja lupea bojata, ... (Izbor:105)

‘The water washed (the truck), the nails of the waves peeled *its paint*.’

(34) Ako go izbegnuvaš rizikot, ì go poprečuvaš patot na sreќata. (Nash svet, 3.05.2000:17)

‘If you avoid risks, you obstruct *the way of happiness*.’

The prototypical properties of the possessive dative object as an affected person integrated in the situation are transferred upon the non-personal referent evoking some kind of effects for it. This is especially common when verbs and nouns usually associated with people are used (Cf. example 33 and 34).

4-5. Concluding Remarks

The analysis has shown that Macedonian PDC is high on all proposed hierarchies, which indicates that it has developed further from the central, prototypical construction. I have shown that all restrictions can be overcome if the speaker decides to use PDC in order to present the situation from the point of view of the Pr. This indicates that the re-

strictions are not of syntactic or pragmatic nature (i.e. imposed by the context), but rather stem from the way the speaker wants to organise the information and his/her subjective stance in that particular situation. Many authors⁴³ have pointed out that PDC is used as a means for topicalisation of the Pr and expressing empathy with him/her.⁴⁴ The real situation may genuinely affect the Pr and yet the speaker does not have to use the PDC. In the same vein, the speaker may choose to use the PDC in neutral situations, thus presenting the predication as directed towards the Pr and taking his/her point of view. This indicates that empathy is an integral part of the PDC. Where does it come from?

Following Velazquez-Castillo's article,⁴⁵ I accept that the two key elements of the semantics of PDC which enable for the interest of the speaker to focus on the Pr as a whole are: (a) AFFECTEDNESS, which is associated by the dative as a marker of the indirectly involved human participant in the situation; and (b) POSSESSION, which represents an asymmetric relation with the possessor as a more prominent participant. Both elements are part of the semantic structure of the PDC, but depending on the situation one of them may be more emphasised.⁴⁶ In situations when the predicate is low on the Situation Hierarchy (directed towards the object) and the Pd is low on the Inalienability Hierarchy (Pd is a body part, psychological attribute or close kinship term), both elements are equally present in the PDC expressing them. This represents the prototype of the construction, the properties of which are transferred to other situations which may depart from the central ones. As it has been shown, if the Pd is higher on the hierarchy, more contextual support is needed for the possessive interpretation to arise, while the focus is on the affectedness (Cf. example (18) *Āe ti stanam od stolĀeto.*). On the other hand, if the

43 King, "The Czech Dative of Interest"; Velazquez-Castillo, "Body-Part EP Constructions"; Shibatani, "An Integrational Approach"; KuĀanda, "What Is the Dative of Possession?" among others.

44 "Empathy is the speaker's identification, which may vary in degree, with the person/thing that participates in the event or state that he describes in a sentence." King, "The Czech Dative of Interest," p. 193.

45 Velazquez-Castillo, "Body-Part EP Constructions," p. 95.

46 See Mitkovska, "On the Possessive Interpretation," pp. 85–101.

predicate expresses a state, where there is no directionality, the possessive element comes to the fore, while the affectedness is reanalyzed as some kind of negative or positive outcome for the Pr (examples 25–29). For such situations we can use O’Connor’s observation⁴⁷ that “... the *speaker’s stance or judgment* with respect to the outcome of the event for the possessor is more important than any actual effect on the possessor.” Thus in example (35) the speaker conveys a general positive attitude towards the Pr and suggests that the look of the dress contributes to the overall appearance. Using IPC would be quite unusual (*Tvojoj fustan e navistina ubav.*), even offending, as it would imply that the dress looks good, but that has nothing to do with the person.

(35) *Fustanot navistina ti e ubav.* ‘Your dress looks really nice.’

5. PDC Compared to IPCs

From the discussion so far it is clear that even though the IPCs and the PDC in Macedonian can both be used to express possessive relations, they are not in free variation, but have distinct properties making it possible to present the same possessive relation from different perspectives. I will discuss some of those properties in order to examine the conditions which govern speakers in their choice of one or the other construction.

(a) In the IPC the Pr is a modifier of the head constituent of the NP, thus the Pd enters into relation with the other constituents of the clause, while the Pr is a dependent constituent. This gives the Pd a more independent status and produces the effect of alienability. Thus IPC puts the Pd in focus and the utterance concentrates on what happens to it. This explains why IPCs are especially common with Pd which stand out otherwise, by virtue of some specific, often unusual or intense, properties (36 and 37) or because they are being contrasted (38).

(36) Mudurot nesakajki gi pogledna svoite bedni, natečeni prsti, i gi turna racete pod masata. (Izbor:18)
 ‘The prison chief inadvertently looked at *his humble, swollen fingers*, and tucked his hands under the table.’

47 O’Connor, “External Possession.” p. 598.

- (37) ... bidejki mnogu se zdodevni *tie naši sostanoci*. (GM:37)
 ‘... because *those meetings of ours* are very boring.’
- (38) Kaj užina vreme komandirčeto ja postroi *i nivnata četa*. (MJB:260)
 ‘At recess time the commander lined up *their company as well*.’

Using the IPC the speaker zooms in on the Pd, abstracting it from its Pr, as illustrated in example (39). In this situation the speaker leads the hearer to follow the arm, because the event evolves around it at that moment. This property of the IPC is also used to present the situation generally and objectively (example 40), which may give the utterance a more formal tone.

- (39) *Ja sledev razmavtanata raka na Grujo...* tu levo, tu desno, tu gore, tu dolu ... i zad nea vo eden mig ja dohledav Grkinkata ... (Izbor:36)
 ‘I followed *Grujo’s gesticulating arm* ... going left, then right, up and down ... and at one moment behind it I spotted the Greek woman ...’
- (40) *Kukata na O.K.* ponovo beše osvetlena samo na katot. (ON:130)
 ‘*O.K.’s house* was again lit only at the first floor.’

(b) In the PDC the Pr has the position of an argument more or less directly involved in the situation, thus it is more likely to be affected by the predication. Even though the situation certainly affects the Pd, by using this construction the speaker does not focus on the consequences for it, but rather on the dative referent as an entity in whose domain the affected participant is situated. Thus it evokes the unity between the Pr and the Pd, zooming out and focusing on the whole. This enables the speaker to present the situation from the point of view of the Pr, empathizing with him/her. In (41) the utterance is about the person, implying strongly the unpleasant feeling he has. Using the IPC will shift the attention to his body parts, sounding uninterested and distancing.

- (41) Muvite mu zdodevaa *lepejki mu se vrz liceto i racete*. (DP:28) (...
lepejki se vrz negovoto lice i racete)
 ‘The flies bothered him, *sticking on his face and hands*.’

In affective predications PDC does not bring in any new information, but only shifts the focus from the Pd to the Pr. But sometimes the situation itself may not express affectedness and this feature will not be

present in the adnominal possessive construction (as in example 42a). In such situations the affectedness can be imposed by the dative, and the sentence with PDC may differ considerably in meaning from the one with the possessive NP. The example in (42b) suggests forceful overtaking, which is not implied in (42a).

- (42) a. A štom ne sakaš da go prezemeš *mojot prekar*, togaš bidi maž, imaj svoja boja, svoja mirizma na vekov, za lugeto da ti priznaat nov. (Izbor:66)
 ‘And if you don’t want to take over *my nickname*, then be strong, have your own flavour, leave your own trace in the world, so that people can accept a new one for you.’
- b. A štom ne sakaš da *mi* go prezemeš *prekarot*, ...
 ‘And if you don’t want to snatch *my nickname* (from me), ...’

Certain situations are more prone to presentation from the Pr’s point of view than others. This may not always be for objective reasons, but is part of the conventionalization of the construction, as it has been noticed by O’Connor.⁴⁸ Thus the examples in (43) are almost impossible with IPC (except for a contrastive situation *I tvojata glava može da letne*. ‘You may also lose your head.’). They feel like idiomatic expressions.

- (43) *Može da ti letne glavata.* (GM:16) ? *Može da letne tvojata glava.*
 ‘You may lose *your head*.’
- Kako će mu poglednam v oči?* (ON Pr:40) ?*Kako će poglednam vo negovite oči.*
 ‘How could I look him in the eyes?’

I have shown that the two constructions expressing possessive relations discussed above construe a situation from different perspectives and cannot easily replace each other in certain contexts. The contribution of the PDC to utterance interpretation was defined in the light of the affectedness of Pr, the special status of Pr as a topic and the speakers’ empathy towards the Pr. Another factor which may influence the choice between these two constructions is the style. It was Bally⁴⁹ who first mentioned that the different ways of presenting the personal domain should also be

⁴⁸ Ibid.

⁴⁹ Bally, “The Expression of Concepts,” p. 48.

viewed from a sociolinguistic aspect.⁵⁰ The evidence from my corpus of possessive constructions (shown in Table 2⁵¹) proves that the PDC is not favoured in the press, which represents more formal writing. It is quite rare in serious newspapers and magazines, but it is not more present in entertainment press either. We find it more in fiction, where the tone may be less formal, and as expected, more in children's prose than in that for adults. PDC is a colloquial strategy, employed for evoking familiarity and closeness. It is thus quite suited for use with children and is common in children's discourse.

	IPC	PDC	Other
Fiction for children	52 %	24 %	24%
Fiction for adults	28%	21 %	51%
Entertainment press	77%	11 %	12%
Serious press	88%	8 %	4%

Table 2. Occurrence of Possessive Constructions Expressing Prototype Relations in the Corpus

Newspapers tend to present situations objectively and so the use of the IPCs is more suitable. PDC is used in life stories and interviews, usually for specific purposes, especially where the author takes side with one party, launching an attack on another. In (44a) the author evokes the readers' sympathy for those affected by the inadequate supply of medicines. The IPC (44b) would present the situation objectively.

50 "We have already mentioned that the variation depends in great part on the relative intensity of communication. Could it also be assumed that in the same language, the expressions of this tendency would be more established and frequent in informal colloquial speech than in the written language, more apparent in the rural than in the urban dialects? In the same way, the more generalised in the use a language becomes, the more it will try to express impersonally what it has formerly expressed subjectively." Bally, "The Expression of Concepts," p. 57.

51 In the statistical analysis other types of possessive constructions were also considered (not relevant for this presentation). Cf. The more comprehensive tables in Mitkovska, "Izrazovanje posesivnost," pp. 136–137.

- (44) a. Dodeka nadležnite se raspravaat, onie što moraat da konzumiraat lekovi se nadevaat deka nema da naletaat na nekoj neregistriran što će im se odrazi vrz i onaka narušeno to zdravje. (Denes 167:4)
 ‘While the authorities are arguing, those who need to use the medicines hope that they will not come across some non-registered which may affect *their already poor health*.’
 b. ... što će se odrazi vrz *nivnoto i onaka narušeno zdravje*.
 ‘... which may affect *their already poor health*.’

Columnists often employ this construction for ridicule or criticism, especially when directed towards the authorities. The examples in (45) and (46) sound colloquial, but that is exactly the intention of the journalists.

- (45) Za volja na vistinata, pazarot ni e malku mističen, no cenite si funkcioniraat. (Denes 167:31)
 ‘To tell the truth, *our market is a bit mystical*, but the prices function somehow.’
- (46) A žrtvi ne ni trebaat. Da ne go razgoruvame ognot, podobro će bide. I taka ni izgore državava. (MD 16.08.2000:13)
 ‘And we don’t need victims. It would be better not to stir the fire. *Our state* has anyway almost burned down upon us.’

6. Conclusion

In this paper I have examined two ways of expressing possession in Macedonian: the NP construction with the preposition *na* and its pronominal equivalents and the construction coding the Pr in an IO construction (both nominal and pronominal). I have shown that the former has extended its use to functions further remote from the possessive prototype than the latter, which is largely limited to prototypical possessive relations (body parts, ownership and kinship). However, the PDC is far from rare in Macedonian: it is encountered with categories high on all hierarchies suggested as a standard for estimating the level of development of this construction.

It has also become clear that the choice between the two constructions is subject to various syntactic, semantic and discourse-pragmatic factors which govern the choice of one or the other in particular situa-

tions. The corpus examples suggest that the first factor that influences the choice is the sociolinguistic one: if the style is appropriate the speaker may choose to empathise with the Pr and use the PDC. Empathy and topicality of the Pr go together and complement each other as the second factor determining the speaker's choice, while affectedness of the Pr is a feature that the PDC can impose on a wide range of situations regardless of the objective circumstances. In Macedonian, syntactic and semantic factors seem to have a very limited role as they can often be overcome.

The research reported in this paper has proven the high frequency of the DPC in Macedonian, highlighting some of the crucial factors of its use and its relation to the IPC. As pointed out, the discourse-pragmatic factors seem to be of utmost importance and further research in this area should investigate the conversational implicatures associated with each construction and the conventional limitations on their use. Different research methods, such as speaker's reactions to constructions not possible in particular situations or more intuitive psycholinguistic investigations may bring to light some important features of these constructions.⁵² On the other hand, in order to determine the position of the DPC in the language it should also be investigated in relation to the other dative constructions it overlaps with, which was, for lack of space, only marginally addressed in this paper. In the same vein, the DPC needs to be viewed not only in relation to its counterpart IPC, but also to the other constructions in the language expressing external possession.⁵³

Of equal importance would be a contrastive view of these Macedonian constructions, both in relation to other Slavic and South-Slavic languages, as well as to genetically non-related languages. As a Balkan

52 O'Connor suggests that the EPC in Northern Pomo are associated with a *conventional* implicature and tries to prove that this is of cross-linguistic relevance. It may be worth investigating this claim in relation to PDC, both in Macedonian and in other Slavic languages. O'Connor, "External Possession."

53 See Liljana Mitkovska, "Possessive Locative Constructions in Macedonian," in Marcin Grygiel and Laura A. Janda, eds., *Slavic Linguistics in a Cognitive Framework* (Peter Lang Internationaler Verlag der Wissenschaften, 2011), pp. 199–209; Frančiška Lipovšek, "The Meaning of EPCs: Possessive Dative and Possessive Locative Juxtaposed." (in this volume)

language Macedonian has been structurally influenced in various ways by the neighbouring non-Slavic languages, thus the fact of how they relate in respect to the use of PDC merits further investigation.⁵⁴ As the implicational hierarchies employed here offer a standardised tool for comparison, the findings of this research could serve as a relevant starting point for all types of contrastive analysis.

This paper is a contribution to the investigation of the complex category of possession and its various expressions in the human language, in particular the relation between the internal and external possessive constructions. The theoretical significance of the investigation of the relation between IPC and its counterpart DPC lies in the particular nature of this relation, which cannot be captured by strictly structural means.

Abbreviations for Sources

- (Antena) - Weekly addition to the daily newspaper *Dnevnik*.
- (Denes) - *Denes*, weekly magazine.
- (GM) - Smačoski, Boško. *Golemi i mali*. Skopje: Detska radost, Kultura, Makedonska kniga, Mislja, Naša kniga. (1988)
- (Izbor) - Stalev, Georgi (ed.). (1990) *Izbor*, Skopje: Detska radost, Kultura, Makedonska kniga, Mislja, Naša kniga.
- (MD) - *Makedonija denes*, daily newspaper.
- (MJB) - Jovanovski, Meto (1985) *Budaletinki*, in: Meto Jovanovski, *Izbor*, Skopje: Makedonska kniga.
- (ON) - Nikolova, Olivera. (1993) *Preminot ne e osvetlen*. Skopje: Detska radost.
- (TV) - television

54 See Olga Mišeska-Tomić, “Nominal and Clausal Clitics Expressing Possession in Balkan Languages,” *Balkanistika* 23 (2010), pp. 389–413, for some findings on this topic.