

Possessor and Possessum as Arguments of the Nonpossessive Predicate Realized as Nominative and Accusative NPs in Possessive Relation *Body/body Part* (Macedonian ~ Polish)

Sonja Milenkovska

0. This contrastive research addresses possessive relations that are realized at the sentence level. In particular, it examines a special type of sentence constructions that are part-way between predicate and nominal possessive constructions. This means that the possessor is not a dependent within the noun phrase (NP) and the possessum is not a head, but rather both are arguments of the same constituent predicate. The predicate in these kinds of constructions does not express a possessive relation, but instead it transmits the relation implied by the possessum. This variety of possession is known as “external possession” and Payne and Barshi define it in the following way: “We take core instances of *external possession* (EP) to be constructions in which possessor-possessum relation is expressed by coding the possessor (PR) as a core grammatical relation of the verb and in a constituent separate from that which contains the possessum (PM).”¹ In the sentence construction, the possessor may be realized in the syntactic position of the nominative, accusative, or da-

1 Doris L. Payne and Immanuel Barshi, “External Possession: What, Where, How and Why,” in Doris L. Payne and Immanuel Barshi, eds., *External Possession* (Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1999), p. 3.

tive NP,² whereas the possessum in the same sentence may be realized as an accusative NP, a prepositional phrase, or as a nominative NP in a passive sentence construction. This paper focuses on sentence structures where the possessor can be realized as a nominative NP, and the possessum as an accusative NP and vice versa.

It is assumed that not all possessive structures can be realized externally, which is a result of a series of constraints. In view of this issue Herslund and Baron claim: “There are two main constraints on external possession. The first of these is that the link between Possessor and Possessum is, or can be construed as, a Part – Whole relation, i.e. an inalienable possessive relation. The second constraint [...] is that the verb must be dynamic.”³ So, the subject of more focused analysis here is those constructions with an implied possessive relation in which the possessum is a part of the body. This concerns inalienable, i.e. inherent possession and the relation *body/body part* in which “the part may be conceptualized only in relation to the whole, since the parts of the body function as one organic whole. Since one may only arrive at the part through the whole [in the case of a person], it is thus entirely natural that the possessive construction is engaged in that function by which the whole is a point of reference (possessor) and the part is the target (possessum).”⁴ My attention in this analysis is directed toward the concrete parts of the human body (in Macedonian and Polish, respectively) – *glava/glowa*

2 The cases, as used here, refer to the function of the noun phrases in the sentence and not to the morphological form. In this way, we can bridge typological differences between the two languages under consideration.

3 Michael Herslund and Irene Baron “Introduction: Dimensions of Possession,” in Irene Baron, Michael Herslund and Finn Sorensen, eds., *Dimensions of Possession* (Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2001), p. 15.

4 “delot može da se koncipira samo vo odnos na celinata, bidejki delovite na teloto funkcioniraat kako edna organska celina. Zatoa do delot na teloto može da se dojde samo preku celinata (odnosno, čovekot), pa sosema prirodno posesivnata konstrukcija se angažira vo taa funkcija, pri što celoto e točka na referencija (znači posesorot), a delot e celta (posesumot),” in: Liljana Mitkovska, “Izrazuvanje posesivnost na nivo na imenskata sintagma vo makedonskiot i vo angliskiot jazik.” Diss. (Skopje: Sts. Cyril and Methodius University, 2005), p. 38.

'head,' *noga/noga* 'leg,' *raka/ręka* 'hand,' *oko/oko* 'eye,' *prst/palec* 'finger,' *kosa/włosy* 'hair' – as well as their emanations – *solza/lza* 'tear,' *glas/głos* 'voice,' *senka/cień* 'shadow,' *plukanica/ślina* 'spittle,' etc.⁵

As mentioned earlier, predicates that mediate these kinds of relations, implying the possessum as a part of the body, are most often realized with dynamic verbs, i.e. (i) transitive verbs of movement (according to Żelazko's classification schema): "verbs that indicate transitive movement, that is to say an activity initiated by the subject by means of which he sets the object in motion (*verba transitiva movendi*),"⁶ in this case a part of the body: *gi zatvori očite/zamknął oczy* 'he closed his eyes,' *gi raširi racete/rozszerzył ręce* 'he spread his hands,' *gi niša nozete/kołysze nogami* 'he swings his legs,' *ja vrti glavata/kręci głową* 'he turns his head'...; as well as verbs that indicate natural physical activities of the body: *gi okokori očite/wytrzeszczył oczy* 'his eyes bulged' (literally 'he bulged the eyes'), *go namurti liceto* 'he frowned' (literally 'he frowned the face,' similar to this example in Polish is *zmarszczył czoło*). Although not frequently, we can find verbs of perception realized in Macedonian and Polish sentences through appropriate markers. In Macedonian, these markers can be either possessive pronouns or dative possessive clitics, whereas in the Polish equivalents only possessive pronouns are available: *si ja vide rakata/ja vide svojata raka* 'he saw his own hand' (in Polish *zobaczył/spostrzegł swoją rękę*) etc.

The goal of this investigation is to examine how this type of possessive relations (*body/body part*) is realized at the level of the sentence construction in the two languages and to see the possible differences at the typological level. In the Slavic linguistic world the two languages analyzed in this paper represent two utterly polarized systems from the perspective of their typological differences (Balkan analytic versus Slavic synthetic systems). This refers in particular to the morpho-syntactic

5 Further examples will always be listed in the order Macedonian/Polish, followed by an English translation.

6 "czasowniki oznaczające ruch przechodni, czyli czynność podmiotu, uprawiającą w ruch przedmiot zewnętrzny (*verba transitiva movendi*)," in: Kazimierz Żelazko, *Czasowniki przechodnie o składni wielorakiej w języku polskim* (Wrocław: Ossolineum, 1975), p. 45.

level, that is exponents of the semantic relations and grammatical interdependence between the textual components.⁷

The classification of the examples has been done on the basis of the positions that the possessor and the possessum may occupy in the sentence, in this case, the positions of nominative and accusative NP. Their hierarchy in the sentence (according to anthropocentric theory)⁸ is based on the fact that the human being (the possessor) normally has control over the actions that he or she performs upon and with the human body. In actuality, the human being in general performs the activities of the parts of his body as lead by his consciousness and volition, which is the essence of this theory. Unconscious activities such as blinking, breathing, crying, etc. are controlled autonomically by the so-called vegetative nervous system, which is not under the purvey of human volition.

1. Following the above-stated facts, in both languages, the most common position of the possessor in relation to the parts of the body is the position of the subject (nominative NP), and the most common position of the possessum is the position of the object (accusative NP) in the sentence. These are situations in which the part of the body (the possessum) undergoes the activity that the body (the possessor) performs upon it.

- (1) ***Supermodelot Melisa Sata ja pokažala⁹ sovršenata zadnica.***
<http://www.time.mk/read/NONE/9506d102d3/index.html>
 (20.06.2010)
 ‘The supermodel Melissa Sata displayed her perfect derriere.’

7 For further details see: Zuzanna Topolińska and Božidar Vidoeski, *Polski-macedoński* [Gramatyka konfrontatywna 1] (Wrocław: Wprowadzenie, 1984), p. 27.

8 Anthropocentric theory presupposes that the human being is primarily the performer of actions that occur in reality, while the material arguments are objects of human activity, in Zuzana Topolinjska, *Makedonskite dijalekti vo Egejska Makedonija, Kniga 1, Sintaksa, Tom I* (Skopje: MANU, 1995), p. 14.

9 The secondary meaning of the verb *покажува/pokazać* “demonstrate” includes a kind of movement intending to attract attention.

- (1') *Magda Frąckowiak pokazuje nogi.*
<http://www.plotek.pl> (20.06.2010)
 'Magda F. shows her legs.'
- (1'') *Korotkowa pokazała w uśmiechu wszystkie pozostałe przy życiu zęby.*
<http://korpus.pwn.pl> (18.06.2010)
 'K. smiled showing all the teeth she had left.'
- (2) *A koga se setiv što da storam, gi zatvoriv očite i spokojno zaspav.*(SJ, p. 18)
 'And when it occurred to me what to do, I closed my eyes and fell asleep peacefully.'
- (2') *Położył się w trawie i zamknął oczy.* <http://korpus.pwn.pl>
 (18.06.2010)
 'He lay down on the grass and closed his eyes.'
- (3) *Štom gi vide mačinjata, Jane gi okokori očite i klekna da gi gali.*
 'When he saw the cats, Jane stared goggle-eyed and bent down to stroke them.'
- (3') *Kiedy dostrzegł kocęta, Jane wytrzeszczył oczy i ukląkł aby je pogłaskać.*
 'When he saw the cats, Jane stared goggle-eyed and bent down to stroke them.'
- (4) *Deteto go vide svoeto lice vo ogledalo i pocna da plače.*
 'The child saw his face in the mirror and started to cry.'
- (4') *Dziecko zobaczyło swoją twarz w lustrze i zaczęło płakać.*
 'The child saw his face in the mirror and started to cry.'

In the second situation (2) and (2') wider context will show the possessor (in this case the referent of the nominative NP).

1-1. In some situations the possessum is represented via an accusative NP in Macedonian construction, while in the Polish equivalents it is realized as an instrumental NP.

- (5) *Spasovka koja i samata raboti kako bolničarka na infektivna klinika ke ja tuži Traumatologija. Obvinuva deka poradi nevnimanie sega ne može da ja dviži desnata raka.*
<http://www.a1.com.mk/vesti/default.aspx?VestID=124611>
 (23.06.2010)
 ‘Spasovka, who herself works as a nurse at a clinic for infectious diseases, will sue the Intensive Care department. She has made the accusation that, because of carelessness, she can no longer move her right hand.’
- (5’) *Dziś już zaczął ruszać rękami, podniósł głowę...*
<http://info.wiadomosci.gazeta.pl> (20.06.2010)
 ‘Today he began to move his hands and he raised his head.’
- (6) *Senkata javaše na visoka granka i gi nišaše nozete.* (SJ, p. 27)
 ‘The shadow rode on a high and was swinging its legs.’
- (6’) *Cień ... kołysał nogami.*
 ‘The shadow ... was swinging its legs.’

As an explanation for the differences between the Polish and Macedonian constructions we can use the M. Ivić’s claim that when it comes to relations of the part to the whole (in this case *body/body part*) the part is reduced to an unusual means by whose help the whole realizes its role in the completion of the action.¹⁰ Also, she argues that the modern Indo-European languages are not equally specific in regards to these two situations.¹¹ As an example, she cites the Serbian language in which instrumental NPs are regularly used, whereas in the equivalents in English translation, accusative NPs regularly appear.

1-1-1. From the examples that follow it may be observed that in Polish constructions the possessum is realized as an instrumental NP, and in Macedonian constructions the possessum in the same position also is realized as an instrumental NP.

10 Milka Ivić, *Lingvistički ogledi* (Beograd: Prosveta, 1983), p. 219.

11 Ibid., p. 220.

- (7) *Rosko, kako da me razbira, mavtaše so opavčeto i legnuvaše kraj moite noze.* (SJ, p. 9)
 ‘Rosko, as if he understood me, wagged his tail and lay beside my feet.’
- (7’) *Unta zamerdala ogonem.* <http://korpus.pwn.pl> (18.06.2010)
 ‘Unta began to wag its tail.’
- (7’’) ... *pies macha ogonem* *kiedy jest zadowolony.*
<http://www.szkoleniepsow.fora.pl> (20.06.2010)
 ‘A dog wags its tail when it is happy.’
- (8) *Karamba-Baramba se potpre so dlanki na kolenicite i se zagleda vo smešnoto čoveče.* (SJ, p. 28)
 ‘Karamba-Baramba supported himself with his palms on his knees and gaped at the strange person.’
- (8’) ...*podparł się dłońmi o kolana...*
 ‘...supported himself with his palms on his knees...’

Another implication worth noting is that in the Macedonian constructions (as in examples (7) and (8)) the possesum can be realized in two variants, both as an instrumental as well an accusative NP, e.g. *mavta so opašot – go mavta opašot* ‘he wags his tail’; *se potpre so dlanikite – gi potpre dlankite* ‘he planted his hands’ ... etc., which is not the case in Polish. For this kind of situations M. Ivić says that some languages have the possibility of a free choice between the two. So, according to this data, likewise in Macedonian it seems that there is a free choice as M. Ivić proposes, and that the choice of whether the NP will appear as an accusative or instrumental NP depends on the type of lexical unit realized in its position within the sentential predicate.¹²

From the examples of both subtypes it can be summarized that both languages contain the element of alternation between the accusative and the instrumental case, with the instrumental case being predominant in Polish, or, according to Topolińska: (a) “the old semantically motivated alternation has still been existing in both languages, while the differences are primarily lexical, and (b) the Polish language demonstrates a

12 Ibid.

tendency towards expansion – by way of syntactic analogy – of the constructions with their argument in instrumental case relation.¹³

1-2. This subtype is illustrated by constructions (with possessor and possessum realized as nominative NP and accusative NP) where the dative reflexive clitic *si* is likely to appear in Macedonian structures, and the pronoun *sobie* in the Polish translation equivalents. The clitic *si* has expressive meaning and with that meaning appears especially in constructions where the possessum is a body part due to the unambiguous possessive relation *body part/body*. In other cases, where the possessum is lower on the hierarchy of inalienability, the clitic *si* is mandatory for indicating the possessive relation. Otherwise, when the clitic *si* is used secondarily, i.e. expressively, then “it appears next to verb-exponents of the predicate that do not imply a dative argument [...] with an expressed tendency to accompany certain verbs (e.g. verbs of movement).”¹⁴ With the pronominal form *sobie* is expressed the same meaning in the Polish equivalents.

- (9) ...*Ariton* so svojot odgovor go zadovolj, i silno si *gi* trieše *racete* dlanka od dlanka. (TG, p. 36)
 ‘Ariton satisfied him with his answer, and he rubbed the palms of his hands together vigorously.’
- (9’) ...*Ariton*...*tarl* sobie *reče*...
 ‘Ariton rubbed his hands together.’
- (10) *Čistačkite*, ..., si *gi* brišea očite. (BS, p. 12)
 ‘The cleaning ladies... were rubbing their eyes.’
- (10’) *Sprzątaczki*... *ocierały* sobie *łzy*.
 ‘The cleaning ladies ... wiped away their tears.’

13 Zuzana Topolinjska, *Polski-makedonski* [Gramatička konfrontacija 3, Studii od morfosintaksata] (Skopje: MANU, 2000), p. 29.

14 “se pojavuva do glagoli-ekspONENTI na predikati koi ne impliciraat dativen argument [...] so izrazena tendencija na zacvrstuvanje kaj neкои glagoli (na pr. glagolite na dviženje),” in: Topolinjska, *Makedonskite dijalekti*, p. 77.

In such situations it is known that this relates to the conscious action of the referent of the nominative NP, i.e. the person, upon a part of his body (the referent of the accusative NP).

1-2-1. There are situations which correspond to the semantic scheme *na X mu se sluči toa deka...* ‘something happened to X...,’ i.e. situations in which the person loses control over a certain part of his own body and an unfortunate accident occurs.

- (11) *Eva si ja udri glavata.*
‘Eva hit her head.’
- (11’) *Ewa uderzyła się w głowę.*¹⁵
‘Eva hit her head.’
- (12) *Eva si ja iseče rakata.*
‘Eva cut her hand.’
- (12’) *Ewa skaleczyła się w rękę. (Ewa skaleczyła sobie rękę.)*
‘Eva cut her hand.’
- (13) *Eva si ja šina nogata.*
‘Eva sprained her ankle.’
- (13’) *Ewa zwichnęła nogę. (Ewa zwichnęła sobie nogę.)*
‘Eva sprained her ankle.’
- (14) *Eva si ja skrši rakata.*
‘Eva broke her hand.’
- (14’) *Ewa złamała rękę. (Ewa złamała sobie rękę.)*
‘Eva broke her hand.’

15 The Polish examples 11’ and 12’ were taken from: Anna Wierzbicka, *Dociekania semantyczne, IV. Ciało i umysł – z punktu widzenia semantycznego* (Wrocław-Warszawa- Kraków: PAN: 1969), p. 82.

In such situations, the Polish language admits only constructions like those in examples (11'), (12'), (13') and (14'), only rarely with *sobie* and then only facultatively, while in Macedonian, constructions with *si* are used regularly. In addition, examples show that in the Macedonian constructions possessum is realized regularly as accusative NP, while in the Polish equivalents as accusative NP (13') and (14'), and locative NP (11') and (12'). Realization of the possessum as locative NP in the Polish constructions is a result of the semantics of the verbs such as *skaleczyć się*, *uderzyć się*, etc. which open locative position in the Polish sentence. This model of adaptation of the possessum can be connected with statements provided by Topolińska that in the Polish language during the process of change of the functional networks of the case relations, which in its turn caused the establishment of new semantic distinctions in verbs, the accusative was affected, that is locative relations have taken the predominant role at the expense of the accusative case.¹⁶

2. There are situations, like in the examples that follow, in which the possessor appears in the accusative NP position and possessum in nominative NP position.

- (15) ...*koga nozete ja ponesoa negovata golema snaga, kon dolinata, seto toa se pretvori vo nasmevka na negovite usni.*
(TG, pp. 9, 10)
'...when his legs carried along his great strength, toward the valley, all of that was transformed into a smile on his lips.'
- (15') *Nogi same zaprowadziły go do domu.*
'His legs took him home by themselves.'
- (16) *Koga pak go ostavila grneto so rakija, senkata go preripala zaspaniot Karamba-Baramba i izlegla od kolibata.* (SJ, p. 27)
'When it had filled the jug with brandy again, his shadow leaped across Karamba-Baramba, who had dozed off, and left the cabin.'

16 Topolinjska, *Polski~makedonski*, p. 45.

- (16') *Cień przeskoczył zaspanego Karambę.*
 'The shadow jumped over the sleeping Karamba.'

These are situations of real occurrences, in which the possessor does not have control over the possessum, that is to say the parts or the emanations of the body, or unreal situations in which everything is possible and which are the product of the speaker's imagination. In these situations the possessum takes the control over the possessor.

Conclusion

The results of the analyzed possessive relation *body~body part*, with possessor and possessum (arguments of non-possessive predicate) that can be realized as nominative NP and accusative NP, demonstrate several situations:

- when the possessor is realized as nominative NP, possessum besides an accusative can alternatively be realized as an instrumental NP in both languages. The tendency of expansion towards instrumental NP is stronger in the Polish language. It is assumed that the possible motivation might be reducing the body part as a means of accomplishing a particular act by way of drawing analogy with other referents of the instrumental NP.
- when Macedonian and Polish structures with expressive use of the dative reflexive clitic *si*, or the pronominal form *sobie* express situations of an accident situation, the usage of *sobie* in Polish is optional, while the usage of *si* in Macedonian is regular. Additionally, the possessum in these situations, besides as an accusative NP, can also be realized as a locative NP, but only in Polish structures. These realization can be attributed to the semantics of a kind of Polish verbs which open a locative position.
- in situations where the possessor has no control over the possessum, or the possessum takes the control over the possessor (in real or unreal situations), then the possessor is realized as accusative, and the possessum as nominative NP.

This leads to a possible conclusion that variations of the analyzed possessive relation, as well as differences between the two languages are without any typological basis, but that they are in fact differences in the semantic structure of the respective predicates, that is in the hierarchy of arguments of the given predicates.

Sources

Slavko Janevski, *Marsovci i gluvci* (Skopje: Mislá, 1989).

Taško Georgievski, *Luđe i volci* (Skopje: Mislá, 1989).

Boško Smakoski, *Polna Mesečina* (Skopje: Mislá, 1984).

<http://korpus.pwn.pl>

<http://www.szkoleniepsow.fora.pl/>

<http://www.a1.com.mk/vesti/default.aspx?VestID=124611>

<http://info.wiadomosci.gazeta.pl>

<http://www.time.mk/read/NONE/9506d102d3/index.html>

<http://www.plotek.pl>