

Expressing Prototype Possessive Relations at the Noun Phrase Level in Macedonian and Bulgarian

Liljana Mitkovska
University of Skopje
Center for Areal Linguistics, MANU, Skopje
liljanam@mol.com.mk

Abstract

This article presents an overview of the NP constructions employed for expression of prototypical possessive relations in Macedonian and in Bulgarian. In particular, it focuses on the types of relations each construction can express, types of linearization within the possessive NPs, and their ability to express more than one semantic role. Throughout the analysis special attention is given to the consequence of the degree of prototypicality on the structural and functional properties of the possessive NPs. Furthermore, similarities and differences between the examined structures in the two languages considered are highlighted, and the possible reasons for divergence are discussed.

1. Introduction

Possession embodies a relation between two entities, called possessor (Pr) and possessed (Pd), such as those in (1).

- (1) a. *Mary's car*
b. *my brother*
c. *John's hair.*

This relationship could be quite versatile, but it is by no means arbitrary. In the core of this relation is its asymmetric structure: one of the participants (the possessor) is more prominent and as such facilitates the identification of the other (the possessed). According to Langacker (1993, 1995 and 2000), the underlying principle of this structure is an abstract image schema, which he calls 'reference-point model'. It reflects the common tendency of human beings to 'invoke the conception of one entity for the purpose of establishing mental contact with another' (Langacker 1995:58). In the possessive construction the entity coded in the Pr is always the more salient entity in the given situation and thus the reference point, which serves to ensure identification of the Pd, which is the target entity. The relations of 'ownership', 'body-part' and 'kinship relations' represent the central categories of the possessive domain, as they invoke a clearly +the.ined reference point relationship (Langacker 2000:176-177): the Pr is a human being and the Pd represents entities of his/her immediate surrounding.

However, the possessive subcategories of ownership, body-part and kinship are not uniform structures, but having a central meaning and more distant meanings gradually departing from them also exhibit prototype effects. Thus in the ownership category the division proceeds on two planes: concrete vs. abstract and permanent vs. temporary. Concrete, manipulable objects as Pd as in (2) establish relations with prototypical status. Prototypicality decreases when places and institutions as in (3), are in question, and even more with abstract possessions such as those in (4), or psychological and mental states that originate from the Pr, such as those in (5). The resultative nominalizations such as those in (6) can be treated as regular objects and then they can build possessive structures.

- (2) *kniga* 'book'; *čador* 'umbrella'; *kola* 'car' Mac
(3) *niva* 'field'; *uciliste* 'school'; *tim* 'team'; *partija* 'party' Mac
(4) *prezime* 'surname'; *nacionalnost* 'nationality' Mac

(5) *maka* ‘trouble’; *son* ‘dream’; *cel* ‘goal’; *zbor* ‘word’ Mac

(6) *pismo* ‘letter’; *slika* ‘picture’; *molba* ‘application’ Mac

There are certain peculiarities, though, which reflect the non-prototypical status of the resultative nominalizations. Moreover, there is a possibility for most of the relations to be interpreted as more or less permanent depending on the context, as for example for concrete objects as legally owned vs. having at one’s disposal as in (7)¹.

(7) a. *Toa e kolata na Mirko.* (*Ja pozajmi od brat mu.*) Mac
that is car+the.F.Sg of Mirko
‘That is **Mirko’s car**. (He borrowed it from his brother.)’

b. (*Ovde sedeše Ana.*) *Toa e nejzino mesto.* Mac
that is PP.3Sg.F seat
‘(Anna was sitting here.) That’s **her seat**.’

In the subcategory of body-part relations there is also extension along the line concrete-abstract, body parts as in (8a.) representing the former and physical and psychological properties (8b.) the latter. Psychological states such as those in (9), which are related to psychological properties, especially when expressing permanent states, are coded by nominalized adjectives or verbal adjectives and correlate with resultative nominalizations. Obviously, the relation between the body-parts and the person is more permanent, while most of the properties and states are subject to variation, and consequently build temporary relations with the person. The part-whole relations such as those in (11) represent conceptual extension from human, i.e. animate Pr to inanimate one, so that both relations of physical parts and abstract properties to inanimate objects can be incorporated in this relation. However, the conceptual differences also implicate structural disparity.

(8) a. *raka* ‘arm’; *glava* ‘head’; *kosa* ‘hair’ Mac

b. *visina* ‘height’; *karakter* ‘character’; *kreativnost* ‘creativity’ Mac

(9) *lutina* ‘anger’; *bolest* ‘illness’ Mac

(10) *pokrivot na kućata* Mac
roof+the.M.Sg of house+the.F.Sg
‘the roof of the house’

Kinship relations can represent both natural family ties (e.g. 11a.) and social relationships (e.g. 11b.), which are less permanent, as well as sporadic/ accidental relationships (e.g. 11c.). In the less prototypical relations among people the possessed entity (i.e. the person whose relation towards the Pr is +the.ined) is often embodied by a nominalization of the type *nomina agentis* (e.g. 12).

(11) a. *brat* ‘brother’; *sestra* ‘sister’ Mac

b. *drugar* ‘friend’; *šef* ‘boss’ Mac

c. *mojot avtor* Mac
PP.1Sg+the.M.Sg author
‘my author (i.e the one I like/ admire)’

(12) *mojot pomošnik* Mac
PP.1SG+the.M.Sg assistant
‘my assistant’

The essential difference between these three relations is that they employ different types of nouns as Pd. Kinship terms are inherently relational, which means that in their conceptual structure they implicitly contain reference to some other entity: someone is a father, daughter etc, only in relation to another human being. Body parts are relational in the sense that they are rarely used

¹ Abbreviations of the glosses are explained at the end of the article.

independently: the mention of a body-part immediately associates a human being, as parts are normally not conceptualized in isolation. Concrete objects, on the other hand, can be perceived on their own. However, it has been pointed out that they can be regarded as “relational in a weak sense” (Koptjevskaja-Tamm 2002:148)², in that a noun denoting a concrete object raises associations to all those entities to which it can be related, and which are result of our experience and knowledge of the world: a book, for instance, can be owned, written, published, sold, read, loved. Which of these relations will be realized in a concrete possessive construction depends on the context in which it is used and the communicative purpose it serves. Thus out of context concrete Pd build ambiguous possessive constructions. They are, however, often treated in the same way as the first two types of Pd and enter in the same type of construction.

This paper will be concerned with the strategies that are employed in contemporary Macedonian and Bulgarian for the expression of prototype possessive relations within the NP as +the.ined above. First, the types of relations which each structure can express will be look into (section 2). Then, the linear order within the NP containing a possessive phrase will be discussed (section 3) and finally the possibility of realization of more than one role will be investigated (section 4). Our aim is to show how different constructions code possession and to indicate their particular properties as manifested in these two related languages. The analysis also has a theoretical implication in that it attempts to prove that the prototype organisation of the possessive domain is reflected on the structural level.

The following structures for expressing prototype possessive relations will be discussed:

- (13) a. *na*-construction: *knigata na Ana* Mac
 book+the.F.Sg of Ana
 ‘Ana’s book’,
- baštata na Ema* Bulg
 father+the.M.Sg of Ema
 ‘Ema’s father’
- b. *od* (Mac.)/*ot* (Bulg.)-construction:
knigata od Ana
 Mac
 book+the.F.Sg from Ana
 ‘Ana’s book or the book by/ from Ana’,
- statija ot G.D.*
 Bulg
 article from G.D.
 ‘an article by G.D.’
- c. constructions with the Genitival Adjective in *-ov/-in*:
Aninata kniga Mac/Bulg
 Ana.GA+the.F.Sg book.F.Sg
 ‘Ana’s book’,
- d. constructions with pronominal Prs, i.e.
- d₁. the Possessive Pronoun and
mojata kniga Mac./Bulg.
 PP.1Sg+the.F.Sg book.F.Sg
 ‘my book’
- d₂. the Adnominal Possessive Clitic:
tatko mu Mac
 father Poss.Cl.3Sg.M

² See also Taylor (1989) and (1996).

‘his father’

<i>prvata</i>	<i>mi</i>	<i>misāl</i>	Bulg
first+the.F.Sg	Poss.Cl.1Sg	thought	
‘my first thought’			

The given structures exist in both languages, though not always with equal distribution. All these constructions constitute an NP. The Pr is realized in the dependant, which also bears the possessive marker, while the head expresses the Pd. Thus the possessor is realized as a type of modification³, either in a prepositional phrase or in an adjectival phrase. In NPs with neutral word order the possessive modification follows the head in prepositional phrases and precedes it in the adjectival ones. The reverse word order is nevertheless possible in all cases, but it is always communicatively marked.⁴

2. Functional properties

2.1 *na-* and *od/ot* - constructions

The *na*-construction is the most common and the most productive means of expressing possession within the NP with nominal Prs in contemporary standard Macedonian as well as in standard Bulgarian. It has taken over most of the functions of the adnominal genitive case after the loss of the morphological case system in Balkan Slavic (Macedonian and Bulgarian). Apart from possession, it is also used for various spatial and temporal meanings as well as for marking the indirect object (IO). This construction can be used for all types of prototype possession both in Macedonian and in Bulgarian, as shown in examples (14) – (16).

- (14) a. *Zagleduvajki gi očilata na svojot maž, ..., (pak se rasplaka.)* (GM:17) Mac
looking.Pt DOCl.Pl glasses+the.Pl of PP.Ref+the.M.Sg husband
‘Looking at **her husband’s proscription glasses**, ..., (she started crying again.)’
- b. *Razbivat apartmenta na edno semejstvo.* (GG:10) Bulg
break.3Pl flat+the.M.Sg of one.N.Sg family
‘**The flat of a family** is being broken into.’
- (15) a. *I pak Sime pogledna vo iliceto na Buba.* (GM:32) Mac
and again Sime looked.3Sg in face+the.N.Sg of Buba
‘Sime looked again into **Buba’s face**.’
- b. *..., verojatno poradi razsejanostta na avtora, ...* (GG:13) Bulg
probably because-of absent-mindedness+the.F.Sg of author+the.M.Sg
‘..., probably because of **the absent-mindedness of the author**.’
- (16) a. *Toa bea Milan, tatkoto na Buba, i bankarskiot službenik...* (GM:28) Mac
that were Milan father+the.N.Sg of Buba and bank.Adj+M.Sg clerk
‘Those were Milan, **Buba’s father**, and the bank clerk ...’
- b. *Baštata na Ema otsāstva ot snimkata.* (GG:60) Bulg
father+the.M.Sg of Ema is-absent from picture+the.F.Sg
‘**Ema’s father** is absent from the picture.’

In West-Macedonian dialects, apart from *na* the preposition *od* ‘from’, whose basic meaning is ablative, has been grammaticalized for expressing prototype possession and appears prominently in this domain. In these dialects *na* and *od* are synonymous and can be used in free variation, while in

³ The term ‘modification’ is used here to refer to all types of dependent phrases in a NP and should not be confused with a ‘modifier’, meaning an ‘adjunct’ as opposed to ‘specifier’, ‘complement’ or ‘argument’.

⁴ This will be discussed in more detail separately for each construction.

the other Macedonian dialects they are in complementary distribution (Topolinjska 1997:136). The latter dialects use *na* as grammaticalized form for expressing possession, while *od* is an alternative which even in its adnominal use has retained a part of the dynamic ablative component of source and/or origin. In standard Macedonian *na* is the accepted norm,⁵ but *od* is an alternative which is often employed in possessive use because of the conceptual affinity as well as the status of West-Macedonian dialects as a basis for the standard (Mitkovska 2001). The relation of source/ origin is directly connected to possession: “namely, while *na* indicates that the relation ... exists at the moment of speaking, *od* signals a relation which existed in the past, and whose existence at the moment of speaking is irrelevant”⁶ (Topolinjska 1997:151). Thus *knigata od Ana* while signaling that the book comes from Ana, also indicates that it belonged or still belongs to her. As Milka Ivić (2002:415-416) points out, *od* offers an alternative to view the possessive relation from a different perspective, presenting the Pr as the source of the Pd, which does not necessarily alter the nature of the relationship itself. Example (17) illustrates this: the speaker wants to point out where the object of clothing comes from, while expressing the possessor at the same time. Depending on the context, the same relation can be rendered either with *na* or with *od*. Compare the sentences in example (18a.) - (18b.). The actual relationship between the eggs and the grandmother is the same in both sentences, but the situation in the first requires pointing out the origin relationship, while the possessive one remains implied. On the other hand, the *na*-construction in the second sentence emphasizes the existing state. With abstract possession and psychological and mental states originating from the Pr *od* is less common, but nevertheless possible as illustrated in example (19).

(17) *Običnone izleguвам na ulica so trenerkive od Goran.* Mac
 usually not go-out.1Sg on street with bottoms+the.Prox.Pl from Goran
 ‘I normally don’t go out in the street in **these bottoms of Goran’s.**’

(18) a. (*Majka mi nè čekaše vo domot,*) *so košnicata so jajca od baba* Mac
 with basket+the.F.Sg with eggs from grandma
mi i so pletivo ...(ON:133)
 Poss.Cl.1Sg and with knitting
 ‘(My mother was waiting for us at the orphanage,) with the basket full of **eggs from my grandmother/my grandmother’s eggs** and with her knitting ...’

b. *I jajcata na baba mi poletaa vo nea črčorejki.* (ON:135) Mac
 and eggs+the.Pl of grandma Poss.Cl.1sg flew3Pl in DO.P.F3Sg sizzlingPt
 ‘And **granny’s eggs** flew in it sizzling.’

(19) *Se seќavaše na zborovite od ženata.* Mac
 Ref.Cl remembered.3Sg on words+the.Pl from woman+the.F.Sg
 ‘He remembered **the words of the woman.**’

In Bulgarian the preposition *ot*, corresponding to Macedonian *od*, is used only to clearly indicate source or origin and does not exhibit the same ambiguity. The difference is highlighted in example (20).

(20) a. (*Go sedna za sekogaš desno od sebe,*) *na mestoto od otec Stefan P. ...* Mac
 at place+the.N.Sg from father Stefan P.(PS:66)
 ‘(He placed him to his right,) **at the place of Father Stefan P.** (and that was to be his seat for ever).’

⁵ No strict rules are set out in the grammar books regarding the distribution of the prepositions *na* and *od* in possessive function, though authors often give examples for prototypical functions with *na*, while *od* exemplifies part-whole relations. In Korubin (1969:66), though, the distinction is clearly stated.

⁶ “... имено, додена *na* покажува дека релацијата ... е актуелна во моментот на зборување, *od* сигнализира една релација што била актуелна во минатото, а чија актуелност во моментот на зборување е ирелевантна;” (Тополинска 1997:151)

- b. (*Složi Filozofa da sedne otdjasno na sebe si,*) *na mĵastoto na otec Stefan P.,...* Bulg
 at place+the.N.Sg of father Stefan P. (PS:58)
 ‘(He placed the Philosopher to sit to his right,) **at the place of father Stefan P.**’

In particular, this variation between the prepositions *na* and *od* in Macedonian is frequent with concrete part whole relationship (21a.). Although possible, this is not equally widespread in Bulgarian, where the preposition *ot* always has a strong source/origin interpretation as in example (21b.). In the translation of the novel “The Belly Button of the World” from Macedonian into Bulgarian we find ample evidence that supports this claim. None of the Macedonian *od*-constructions in strictly part whole relation, such as example (22), is translated with *ot* in Bulgarian.

- (21) a. *Ja fati račkata od/na šoljata.* Mac
 DO.Cl.F.Sg took.3Sg handle+the.F.Sg from/of cup+the.F.Sg
 ‘He took **the handle of the cup.**’
- b. (*Edva togava razbrali, če gramatika e umrjal ošte pri prvata srešta s*) Bulg
bukvite ot nadpisa... (PS:45)
 letters+the.Pl from inscription+the.M.Sg
 ‘(It is only then that they realized that the professor had died at the first contact with) **the letters from the inscription ...**
- (22) a. (*Večerta, točno na polnok, otec Stefan Pismorodecot tropna*) Mac
na vratata od mojata odaja... (PS:44)
 door+the.F.Sg from PP.1Sg+the.F.Sg room
 on
- b. (*Večerta, točno na polunošt, otec Stefan potropa*) Bulg
na vratata na mojta odaja, ... (PS:39)
 door+the.F.Sg of PP1Sg+the.F.Sg room
 on
 ‘(That night, exactly at midnight, father Srefan knocked) **on the door of my room, ...**’

Because of this growing similarity in meaning between the prepositions *na* and *od* in Macedonian, they are often employed for stylistic variation, especially to avoid repetition of the preposition preceding the whole possessive phrase. This is characteristic for all types of possessive relations (see example 19 and 20 for human Prs), but in particular with concrete inanimate Prs (example 22). There is a strong tendency to use *od* as a possessive marker if the preposition preceding the possessive NP is *na* and *na* if *od* is the preceding preposition, as illustrated in example (23). This does not seem to be the case in Bulgarian, as the Bulgarian translations in the above examples (20 and 22) show.

- (23) a. *na karjot od gradot* Mac
 at end +the.M.Sg from town+the.M.Sg
 ‘at the end of the town’
- b. *od krajot na gradot* Mac
 from end +the.M.Sg of town+the.M.Sg
 ‘from the end of the town’

Bulgarian and Macedonian show similar distribution of *na* and *od*-construction in the result nominals expressing creation⁷. Namely, in both languages *na* and *od/ot* alternate equally in expressing the author of a creation (examples in 24).

- (24) a₁. *Ja pročitav statijata na Langacker za posesivnosta.* Mac
 DO.Cl.3Sg.F read.Past.1Sg article+the.F.Sg of Langacker about possession+the.F.Sg
 ‘I read **Langacker’s article** on possession.’

⁷ This term is used for nominals which denote a result of a creation process and can invoke the person that brought about the object, such as poem, novel, picture, statue. Such nouns are not necessarily a result of derivation.

- a₂ (*Prosto kažah, če sam čel*) *dnevnice na Torga.* (GG:76) Bulg
 diaries+the.Pl of Torga
 ‘(I simply said that I had read) **Torga’s diaries.**’
- b₁ *izložba na slici od S. Lafrozanovski* Mac
 exhibition of paintings from S. Lafrozanovski
 ‘an exhibition of **paintings by S. Lafrozanovski**’
- b₂ ...*kapak ot šokoladovi bonboni s brezovskite ovčari* Bulg
 cover from chocolate.Adj.Pl bonbons with Brezovo.Adj.Pl+the.Pl shepherds
ot Z.Bojadžiev, ... (GG:66)
 from Z. Bojadžiev
 ‘... a cover of a chocolate box with **Brezovo shepherds by Z. Bojadžiev,**...’

While *na* is ambiguous and can designate the possessor, the creator (Agent) or the represented entity (Theme⁸), *od/ot* is more specifically interpreted as the creator. In Macedonian the represented entity can also, though marginally, be expressed in an *od*-construction. This is possible only with *slika* (picture) and *fotografija* (photograph), but not with other representation nominals⁹ such as *portret*, *skulptura* (portrait, sculpture). This choice does not seem to be usual in Bulgarian. Compare Macedonian and Bulgarian examples in (25).

- (25) a. (*Jas sam ke gi podredam parčencata*) *i slikata posledna od* Mac
 and picture+the.F.Sg last from
kerkata tvoja ke ti ja dadam cela. (PS:39)
 daughter+the.F.Sg PP.2Sg will.Cl IO.Cl.2Sg DO.Cl.3SgF give.1Sg whole
- b. (*Az sam šte podredja parčencata*) *i poslednija obraz na dāštera*
 and last +the.M.Sg picture of daughter
ti šte ti go dam cjal. (PS:35) Bulg
 Poss.Cl.2Sg will.Cl IOCl.2Sg DOCl.3Sg.M give.1Sg whole.M.Sg
 ‘I will myself order the pieces and will give you **the last picture of your daughter** complete.’

In conclusion we can say that the potential of the preposition *od* to be used for possessive relations is enhanced in standard Macedonian under the influence of the situation in West-Macedonian dialects. This has resulted in its acceptance for functions that depart from its basic meaning of source/origin. Bulgarian *ot*, on the other hand, still adheres to it more consistently.

2.2 The Genitival Adjective

The Genitival Adjective (GA) in *-ov/-in* is present both in Macedonian and in Bulgarian and with human referents it expresses all types of prototypical possessive relations (examples in 26).¹⁰ As it can be observed in the examples, the GA agrees in gender and number with the head noun it modifies, but it has to refer to a uniquely identified person in order to function as a possessive modification. It is further restricted in the sense that it can refer to only one person and it occurs only with limited modification. In both Macedonian and Bulgarian the Pr can be specified with a kinship term, and in Bulgarian also with an Adnominal Possessive Clitic, as illustrated in (26).

⁸ This term indicates the core argument which is most closely related to the verb. With transitive verbs it is realized as a DO and with intransitive as a Subject.

⁹ The term representation nominals is used for result nominals which designate an object that represents the Theme of the nominalized predication (e.g. picture, portrait, sketch, sculpture), sometimes also referred to as ‘picture nouns’.

¹⁰ We will not go into detail here regarding the formal characteristics of the GA and the differences in its distribution with inanimate referent in the two languages. See more about it in Mitkovska (2000).

- (26) a. *dedo Janevata kuća* Mac
 grandpa Jane.GA+the.F.Sg house.F.Sg
 ‘grandpa Jane’s house’
Aninite drugarki
 Ana.GA+the.Pl friend.Pl
 ‘Ana’s friends’
- b. *bratovata mi pouka,* Bulg
 brother.GA+the.F.Sg PP.1Sg advice.F.Sg
 ‘my brother’s advice’
čičo Dimevija sin
 uncle Dime.GA+the.M.Sg son.M.Sg
 ‘unkle Dime’s son’

In modern Macedonian and Bulgarian the use of GA for expressing possession has withdrawn considerably, remaining more common only in religious, historic or literary style, but the speakers have the structure at their disposal and can always resort to it.

GA is a construction particularly suited for expressing a prototypical Pr and as such has a pronounced determinative function. Apart from this, it is also used in expressing semantic roles to result nominals¹¹. GA is, however, considerably more common for coding the creator (Agent) (example 27), and only rarely for the represented entity (Theme). In fact, for Bulgarian, Dimitrova-Vulčanova & Giusti (1998:170) claim that GA cannot be interpreted as Theme of the nominalized predicate in NPs with object denoting nominals, i.e. representational nominals. It is true that the first interpretation of the GA in such phrases is overwhelmingly agentive (or possessive), but contextual and pragmatic circumstances can influence its perception as a Theme. For instance in example (28), the represented persons are well known and cannot be interpreted as creators, i.e. Agrnts, but only as Themes.

- (27) a. *Brehtovite drami* Mac
 Brechr.GA+the.Pl play.Pl
 ‘Brecht’s plays’
- b. *Rembrandovija portret* Bulg
 Rembrandt.GA.+the.M.Sg portrait.M.Sg
 ‘Rembrandt’s portrait’
- (28) a. *Na ploštadot stoi Leninovata statua.* Mac
 on square+the.M.Sg stands Lenin.GA+the.F.Sg statue.F.Sg
 ‘On the square stands **Lenin’s statue.**’
- b. *Na dzidot e zakačena Sultanova fotografija.* Mac
 on wall+the.M.Sg is hung.Pt.F.Sg Sultan.GA.F.Sg photograph.F.Sg
 ‘On the wall is hung **the Sultan’s photograph.**’

In languages in which the GA is still active, such as Serbian, it is commonly encountered as an expression of Theme of representation nominals (example 29), which proves the ability of this structure to render such functions.

- (29) (*Juče britanski umjetnik L. F. otkrio je*) *šokantan kraljičin portret ...* Serbian
 shocking queen.AG.M.Sg portrait.M.Sg
 ‘Yesterday the British artist L. F. uncovered **a shocking portrait of the Queen ...**’

¹¹ The term ‘result nominals’ is used for nouns which express the material result of an event and encompasses both the nominals of creation, such as *kniga* ‘book’, *pesna* ‘song’, *slika* ‘painting, picture’ and those of representation, such as *slika* ‘picture’, *portret* ‘portrait’, *skulptura* ‘sculpture’.

The fact that GA is rarely employed for this function in Macedonian, and even less so in Bulgarian, can be explained in view of the prototype organization of the possessive domain. Expression of participants of nominalized predications is among the peripheral possessive functions and the expression of the Theme is especially remote from prototypical possession. As the construction is receding from the language, it is probable that the more distant functions are the first to be dropped. We assume that for the same reason GA is also extremely rarely encountered as a Theme of event nominals in Macedonian and Bulgarian.

2.3 Pronominal Possessors

Macedonian and Bulgarian employ two types of strategies for expressing the Pr in a pronominal form: Possessive Pronouns and Adnominal Possessive Clitics. In both languages the Possessive Pronoun can be employed for expressing all types of prototypical possessive relations and can be interpreted both as a creator (Agent) and as the Theme of the result nominals, as illustrated in example (30).

- | | | | | | | |
|------|----------------|--|--|-----------------|--|------|
| (30) | a ₁ | <i>negovite</i> | | <i>idei</i> | | Mac |
| | | PP.3Sg.M+the.Pl | | idea.Pl | | |
| | | ‘his ideas’ | | | | |
| | a ₂ | <i>tehnite</i> | | <i>roditeli</i> | | Bulg |
| | | PP.3Pl.+the.Pl | | parent.Pl | | |
| | | ‘their parents’ | | | | |
| | b. | <i>nejziniot</i> | | <i>portret</i> | | Mac |
| | | PP.3Sg.F+the.M.Sg | | portrait.M.Sg | | |
| | | ‘her portrait (the one she owns/she made/which is a representation of her.)’ | | | | |

The Adnominal Possessive Clitic has a limited functional range in Macedonian, being used only for expressing close family relations (example 31). These terms have special prototype significance in the kinship sub-category, which explains their marking in a special way.¹² In Bulgarian, on the other hand, both forms are equally used for expressing all kinds of possessive relations, including Agents and Themes of result nominals (*cf.* 32).

- | | | | | | | | |
|------|--|-----------------|-------------------|----------------|---------------|---------------|------|
| (31) | a ₁ | <i>majka</i> | <i>mi</i> ; | a ₂ | <i>brat</i> | <i>mu</i> | Mac |
| | | mother | Poss.Cl.1Sg | | brother | Poss.Cl.3Sg.M | |
| | | ‘my mother’ | | | ‘his brother’ | | |
| (32) | <i>mojata</i> | <i>kăšta /</i> | <i>kăštata</i> | <i>mi</i> | | | Bulg |
| | PP.1Sg+the.F.Sg | house.F.Sg | house+the.F.Sg | Poss.Cl.1Sg | | | |
| | ‘my house’ | | | | | | |
| | <i>negoviat</i> | <i>portret/</i> | <i>portretăt</i> | <i>mu</i> | | | Bulg |
| | PP.3Sg.M+def.M.Sg | portrait.M.Sg | portrait+the.M.Sg | Poss.Cl.3Sg.M | | | |
| | ‘his portrait – the portrait he owns or the one he made or the portrait that represents him’ | | | | | | |

In Macedonian the clitic renders the NP definite, so usually it does not occur with the definite article.¹³ In standard Macedonian it does not tolerate other adjuncts added to the same head¹⁴.

¹² Special treatment of close kinship terms is encountered in other languages worldwide.

¹³ . In more formal styles the article is added with the term *husband*: *mažot mi* ‘my husband’, which is sometimes explained as a form of distancing (see for example Koneski 1987:337).

¹⁴ It may appear with a limited number of adjectives in some Macedonian dialects, and such combinations are felt like set phrases (examples (i) and (ii)).

- | | | | | |
|-----|-----------------|-------------|--------------|-----|
| (i) | <i>starata</i> | <i>mi</i> | <i>majka</i> | Mac |
| | old+the.F.Sg | Poss.Cl.1Sg | mother.F.Sg | |
| | ‘my old mother’ | | | |

Bulgarian Adnominal Possessive Clitics, on the other hand, are mainly used with the definite article and allow various other modifications in the same NP (example 33).

- (33) a. *novata mu kniga* Bulg
 new.Adj+the.F.Sg Poss.Cl.3SgM book.F.Sg
 ‘his new book’
- b. *tazi mu nova kniga* Bulg
 that Poss.Cl.3Sg.Mnew.Adj+the.F.Sg book.F.Sg
 ‘that new book of his’

It is interesting that with many common kinship terms, mainly for closest relatives, with the exception of *sin* ‘son’ and *măž* ‘husband’, the clitic does not need overt definite marker in Bulgarian, as well (cf. 34a and 34b) (Hauge1999:48).¹⁵ This proves, again, the special status of this type of kinship terms.

- (34) a₁ *maika im* a₂ *dăšterja ti* Bulg
 mother Poss.Cl.3Pl daughter Poss.Cl.2Sg
 ‘their mother’ ‘your daughter’
- b₁ *sinăt ni* b₂ *măžăt mi* Bulg
 son+the.M.Sg Poss.Cl.1Pl husband+the.M.Sg Poss.Cl.1Sg
 ‘our son’ ‘my husband’

In connection with Adnominal Possessive Clitics, both Bulgarian and Macedonian exhibit a characteristic model of double marking the Pr in one NP: once in the head with the clitic and once in a *na*-construction (cf. 35a and 35b). This strategy is optional and the phrases in (35c.) are both good constructions with the same conceptual meaning. The double marking strategy is, however, more often encountered in spoken register.

- (35) a. *majka mu₁ na Mirko₁* Mac
 mother Poss.Cl.3Sg.M of Mirko
 ‘Mirko’s mother’
- b. *kăštata mu₁ na Ivan₁* Bulg
 house+the.F.Sg Poss.Cl.3Sg.M of Ivan
 ‘Ivan’s house’
- c₁ *majkata na Mirko* Mac
 mother+the.F.Sg of Mirko
 ‘Mirko’s mother’
- c₂ *kăštata na Ivan* Bulg
 house+the.F.Sg of Ivan
 ‘Ivan’s house’

3. Linear order of the constituents in the possessive NP

3.1. Linearization in Macedonian

According to Topolinjska (this volume) the prototypical syntactic form of an NP is a construction whose constituent member (Ca) is realized as a noun in surface structure and is optionally accompanied by adjectival modifiers and/or subordinate NPs (NP modifiers) and/or the so called relative clauses. This represents the nuclear NP. The maximally elaborate NP is a sequence the

-
- (ii) *postariot/ pomaliot mi brat* Mac
 more-old+the.M.Sg more-young+the.M.Sg Poss.Cl.1Sg brother.M.Sg
 ‘my older/younger brother’

¹⁵ See also Pašov (2002:102) for similar remark.

order of whose components is fixed. In Macedonian the unmarked order of the constituents is the following: in first position are referential determiners (R), represented in the syntactic structure by referential quantifiers (Kr), then come quantifiers (Q), represented in the syntactic structure by quantitative quantifiers (Kq), followed by nuclear NP. Within the nuclear NP, the adjectival modifiers (AM) usually precede the N and the prepositional NP modifiers (NPM) follow it. The model is shown in (36) exemplified with an elaborate NP.

(36) Semantic structure						
(R)	Q)	Ca				
<u>tie</u>	<u>dvajca</u>	<u>naši stari nezaboravni prijатели</u>	<u>od detstvoto</u>	<u>što ne sme gi videle odamna</u>		
<u>those</u>	<u>two</u>	<u>our old unforgettable</u>	<u>friends</u>	<u>from childhood</u>	<u>whom we haven't seen for a long time</u>	
Kr	Kq	AM	N	NPM	Relative clause	
Syntactic structure						

Possessive NPs constitute a nominal structure in which the head noun embodies the Pd and the Pr is coded in some type of a dependent phrase: the *na-/od (ot)*-construction is a subordinate NP-modification, the Genitival Adjective and the Possessive Pronouns have a form of adjectival modifications and the Adnominal Possessive Clitic is a modification with semi autonomous status. In this section we look at the possible linear order of possessive NPs in Macedonian and compare it with the possible alternatives in Bulgarian.

In unmarked word order the prepositional possessives in Macedonian (both *na* and *od*-constructions) follow the head (*cf.* 37a and 38a). According to Topolinjska (1997:135) this is the inherited Slavic word order, while fronting of the prepositional possessive modifier, as exemplified in (37b.) and (38b.), has been influenced by the Balkan environment. The latter is characteristic for the colloquial spoken register and is rarely encountered in writing.

(37) a. *Dojdovme do kuќata na Mirko.* Mac
 came.1Pl to house+the.F.Sg of Mirko

b. *Dojdovme do na Mirko kuќata.*
 came.1Pl to of Mirko house+the.F.Sg

‘We came up to **Mirko’s house.**’

(38) a. *Go znaeš li brojot od Vesna?* Mac
 DO.Cl.3Sg.M know.2Sg Q.Cl number+the.M.Sg from Vesna

b. *Go znaeš li od Vesna brojot.*
 DO.Cl.3Sg.M know.2Sg Q.Cl from Vesna number+the.M.Sg

‘Do you know **Vesna’s number?**’

It is not common to front the prepositional phrase in a more elaborate NP, but if that happens, the prepositional phrase will generally be placed at the very beginning of the elaborate NP, in front of the adjectival modifier, and also before the referential determiner (demonstrative pronoun) and/or the quantifier (*cf.* 39). Obviously the fronting is used as a means of topicalization of the Pr.

(39) *Dojdovme do na Mirko taa edna nova kuќa vo šumata.* Mac
 came.1Pl to of Mirko that.F.Sg one.F.Sg new.F.Sg house.F.Sg in woods+the.F.Sg
 ‘We came up to that one new house of Mirko’s in the woods.’

The Genitival Adjective and the Possessive Pronoun are placed in front of the head in unmarked possessive NPs. Their place among the preposed nominal modifications is after the Q, but before the descriptive and relational adjectival phrase (*cf.* 40).

- (40) *tie dva para moi/ Vesnini novi kožni patiki* Mac
 those two pairs PP.1Sg VesnaGA.Pl new.Pl leather.Adj.Pl sneakers
 ‘those two pairs of new leather sneakers of mine/Vesna’s’

Topolinjska (1997:119) attributes this word order to the special semantic feature of the Possessive Pronoun and Genitival Adjective to function as a kind of determiners, i.e. to uniquely identify the entities they refer to. For that reason their scope extends over the scope of the whole nuclear NP. There are, however, other possibilities. Depending on the nature of the adjectival modifier and/or its scope the adjectival modifier can appear to the right (*cf.* 41a) or to the left (*cf.* 41b) of the Genitival Adjective in Macedonian. If the Genitival Adjective has a closer connection with the head, building a more or less tight unit with it, the Genitival Adjective will preferably stay closer to the head and be preceded by a descriptive, or even by a relational, adjective. This is in accordance with the specific ability of the Genitival Adjective to designate things and can be reinterpreted as part of the name for the designated entity.

- (41) a₁ *Racinovoto poetsko tvoreštvo* Mac
 RacinAG+the.N.Sg poetic.Adj.N.Sg work.N.Sg
 ‘Racin’s poetic work’
- a₂ *Sultanovata najsilna vojska*
 SultanGA+the.F.Sg most-strong.F.Sg army.F.Sg
 ‘the Sultan’s strongest army’
- b₁ *neobičniot Mocartov genij*
 Mac
 unusual+the.M.Sg Mozart.GA.M.Sg genius.M.Sg
 ‘Mozart’s unusual genius’
- b₂ *najizveduvanoto Betovenovo delo*
 most-performed+the.N.Sg Beethoven.AG.N.Sg work.N.Sg
 ‘Beethoven’s most often performed work’

Placing the Genitival Adjective after the head also exists as a possibility (*cf.* 42), but it is highly marked and employed in certain styles only, such as religious or historic texts for evoking archaic or bucolic nuance.

- (42) a. ... *pred liceto Gospodovo.* (PS:13) Mac
 in-front-of face+the.N.Sg God.GA.N.Sg
 ‘... in front of **God’s face**’
- b. *Kralicata Olimpija, majkata Aleksandrova,*
 Queen+the.F.Sg Olimpia mother+the.F.Sg Alexander.GA.F.Sg
 (*beše mnogu zagrižena.*) (Žena, jan98:58) Mac
 ‘Queen Olimpia, **Alexander’s mother**, (was very much worried.)’

The position of the Possessive Pronoun is more stable in Macedonian and all deviations are felt as strictly marked. It is possible, however, to place the descriptive adjective in front of the Possessive Pronoun, but this puts special emphasis on the adjective (*cf.* 43).

- (43) a. *kutrata moja majka* Mac
 poor+the.F.Sg PP.1Sg.F.Sg mother.F.Sg
 ‘my poor mother’
- b. *najgolemite nejzini hitovi* Mac
 most-great+the.Pl PP.3Sg.F.Pl hit.Pl
 ‘her greatest hits’

There is some flexibility, though, in combination with the numerals: in definite NPs the Possessive Pronoun preferably precedes the number (44a.), but in indefinite ones the reverse order is more

usual (44b.)¹⁶. With quantifiers like *site* (all), *mnogu* (many), *malku* (few), *cel* (whole) there is no such option, but the Possessive Pronoun always follows the quantifier (*cf.* 44c)

- (44) a₁ *negovite dve deca* (unmarked) Mac
 PP.3Sg.M+the.Pl two children
 a₂ *dvete negovi deca* (marked)
 two+the.Pl PP.3Sg.M.Pl child.Pl
 ‘his two children’
- b₁ *Pročitav dve nejzini statii.*
 read.Past.1Sg two PP.3Sg.F.Pl article.Pl
 b₂ ?? *Pročitav nejzini dve statii.*
 read.Past.1Sg PP.3Sg.F.Pl two article.Pl
 ‘I read two articles of hers.’
- c₁ *site negovi sliki*
 all PP.3Sg.M.Pl picture.Pl
 ‘all his paintings’
 c₂ **negovi site sliki;*
 PP.3Sg.M.Pl all picture.Pl
 ‘*his all paintings’
- d₁ *mnogu nejzini statii*
 many PP.3Sg.F.Pl article.Pl
 ‘many of her articles’
 d₂ ??*nejzini mnogu statii,*
 PP.3Sg.F.Pl many article.Pl
 ‘??’her many articles’
- e₁ *celiot svoj život*
 whole+the.M.Sg PP.Ref.M.Sg life.M.Sg
 ‘all my life’
 e₂ ??*svojot cel život*
 PP.Ref+the.M.Sg whole life.M.Sg
 ‘*my all life’

In colloquial style, the Possessive Pronoun can be placed after the head (45a.), but this position is highly marked and often used in contexts which express intense emotions or contrast, especially in combination with the demonstrative pronoun or with the vocative, as illustrated in examples (45b) and (45c).

- (45) a. *Toj rabotata svoja da si ja gleda.* Mac
 he work+the.F.Sg PP.Ref.F.Sg to IO.Ref.Cl DO.Cl.F.Sg watch.3Sg
 ‘He had better mind his own business.’
- b. *Dosta so tie poplaki tvoi glupavi/ poplaki glupavi tvoi.* Mac
 enough with those complaints PP.2Sg.Pl silly.Pl complaints silly.Pl PP.2Sg.Pl
 ‘We’ve had enough of those silly complaints of yours.’
- c. “*Sinko, sine moj, (zošto na ognot me predade?!)*” (PS:72) Mac
 son.Voc son.Voc PP.1sg.
 ‘My dear son, (why did you hand me over to the fire?!)

In Macedonian the Adnominal Possessive Clitic always follows the noun it modifies. In spoken language there is a possibility for double marking of possession: both by a clitic and by a Possessive Pronoun (*cf.* 46). In such constructions the Possessive Pronoun always follows the clitic and it is

¹⁶ Rappaport (2000:7 and 31) notices similar situation in Russian.

never used with the definite article, since the clitic renders the NP definite, as explained above. This type of constructions are always used for the purpose of special emphasis.

- (46) a. *Sin ti tvoj neka ti pomogne.* Mac
 son Poss.Cl.2Sg PP2Sg let IO.Cl.2sg help.3Sg
 ‘It is your son who should help you.’
- b. *Sin mu negov neka mu pomogne.* Mac
 son Poss.Cl.3Sg.MPP.3Sg.M let IO.Cl.3Sg.M help.3Sg
 ‘It is his own son who should help him.’

When the clitic refers to third person, the referent can also be expressed in a *na*-construction which follows the clitic in the neutral word order (47a.). This is not necessarily an emphatic construction, being mainly used when the explicit identification of the Pr is needed as he/she has not been mentioned before. In these constructions the complement of the preposition *na* needs to be marked for definiteness, as the clitic implies definite possessor. In spoken language the *na*-construction can be fronted, just like in its other uses, mainly to topicalize the Pr, as exemplified in (47b.).

- (47) a. *Tatko mu na Petar nè prečeka.* Mac
 father Poss.Cl.3sg.M of Peter DO.Cl.1Pl met.3Sg
- b. *Na Petar tatko mu nè prečeka.*
 of Peter father Poss.Cl.3Sg.M DO.Cl.1Pl met.3Sg
 ‘Peter’s father met us.’

Obviously, the Possessive Pronoun and the possessive *na*-construction do not have the same status in constructions in which they combine with the Adnominal Possessive Clitic: while the Possessive Pronoun virtually doubles the same information contained in the clitic, the *na*-construction also adds new information. This explains the difference in their communicative functions.

3.2 Linearization in Bulgarian and comparison with the situation in Macedonian

The linearization in Bulgarian demonstrates similar characteristics. Dimitrova-Vulcanova & Giusti (1998:169) have shown that the unmarked surface order of the elements in the Bulgarian NP complies with the hierarchy in (48), which mainly corresponds to the hierarchy proposed by Topolinjska (illustrated above in 36).

- (48) Q>Dem>pronominal AP>descriptive AP>genitival AP>relative AP>N>*na*-DP

Dimitrova-Vulcanova & Giusti (1998) show that fronting of *na*-constructions is also possible in Bulgarian (example 49). However, in this position the *na*-construction is restricted to Possessors and does not assume either the role of Agent or Theme of the result nominals of the picture type or complex event nominals of the destruction type (ibid.:180-181). This corroborates with the Macedonian data we have collected, where fronting appears mainly with ownership of more or less concrete objects and with kinship relations. Fronting the Theme sounds very unusual with picture nominals (50a.) and it is even less usual with complex event nominals (50b.). Fronting of Agents is more acceptable, especially with simple event nominals (nomina acti), but it is not very common (50c.). It is also not usual in Macedonian with inanimate Prs, which is considered quite regular in Bulgarian (51).

- (49) *na Ivan vsički tezi novi knigi* Bulg
 of Ivan all those new.Pl book.Pl
 ‘all those new books of Ivan’s’
- (50) a. *na umetnikot portretot (?Agent/ ??Theme)* Mac
 of artist+the.M.Sg portrait+the.M.Sg
 ‘the portrait of the artist’
- b. *na pretsedatelot ranuvanjeto (??Theme)*

of president+the.M.Sg wounding+the.N.Sg
 ‘the wounding of the president’

c. *na Mirko rabotata* (Agent)
 of Mirko work+the.F.Sg
 ‘Mirko’s job’

- (51) a. *na kăštata pokrivăt* Bulg
 b. ?? *na kukata pokrivot* Mac
 of house+the.F.Sg roof+the.M.Sg
 ‘the roof of the house’

According to the hierarchy in (48) the Genitival Adjective in Bulgarian follows the descriptive adjective. In fact, Dimitrova-Vulcanova & Giusti (1998:166) find that the reverse order is normally not acceptable. In Macedonian, as explained above, order of linearization depends on the relation the Genitival Adjective builds with the head noun. If its scope stretches over the head noun as modified by the descriptive adjective, the Genitival Adjective before the descriptive adjective is also encountered in Bulgarian, as shown in example (52). In unmarked context the position of the Possessive Pronoun seems to be more stable in Bulgarian, just like in Macedonian. In emphatic situations Bulgarian also accepts the other possibilities. In vocatives, for instance, the Possessive Pronoun usually follow the head (36).

- (52) *Zaradva se Ceninoto tăžno sărce, ...* (BR:21) Bulg
 rejoiced.3Sg Ref.Cl Cena.GA+the.N.Sg sad.N.Sg heart.N.Sg
 ‘Cena’s sad heart rejoiced, ...’

- (53) - *Sinko, sine moj, (zašto me predade na ogănja?!)* (PS:64) Bulg
 son.Voc son.Voc PP.1sg
 ‘My dear son, (why did you hand me over to the fire?!)

The Adnominal Possessive Clitic in Bulgarian departs from the Macedonian one in that it can appear in NPs which contain adjectival phrases, determiners or quantifiers. The clitic changes the position as it always follows the first element in the NP, i.e. the one that carries the definite article (54).

- (54) a. *knigata mi* Bulg
 book+the.F.Sg Poss.Cl.1sg
 ‘my book’
 b. *novata mi kniga*
 new+the.F.Sg Poss.Cl.1sg book.F.Sg
 ‘my new book’
 c. *tazi mi nova kniga*
 that. F.Sg Poss.Cl.1sg new.F.Sg book. F.Sg
 ‘that new book of mine’
 d. *vsički mi tezi novi knigi*
 all Poss.Cl.1sg those new.Pl book.Pl
 ‘all those new books of mine’

Doubling of the clitic referent in a *na*-construction following the clitic is a regular option, and fronting of this prepositional phrase is also possible, but according to Dimitrova-Vulcanova & Giusti (1998:183) restricted to Possessor role only (55)¹⁷.

- (55) a. *knigata mu na Ivan* Bulg

¹⁷ Example (55) is from Dimitrova-Vulcanova & Giusti (1998:183), with my glosses.

book+the.F.Sg Poss.Cl.3Sg.Mof Ivan
 ‘Ivan’s book’

b. *na Ivan knjigata mu*
 of Ivan book+the.F.Sg Poss.Cl.3sg.M
 ‘Ivan’s book’

c. *na Ivan portretăt mu* (Possessor/*Agent/*Theme)
 of Ivan portrait+the.M.SgPoss.Cl.3sg.M
 ‘Ivan’s portrait’

3.3 Concluding remarks

Regarding the linear order of constituents within possessive NPs Macedonian and Bulgarian exhibit similar properties, especially in the unmarked word order. There are only certain idiosyncrasies in the marked alternatives. Constructions for more prototypical possessive relations show greater flexibility in the word order. This may be due to the fact that they are more characteristic of the less formal styles and the spoken language where emphasis and expressiveness is achieved by shift in word order.

4. Distribution and order of semantic roles within the possessive NP

From semantic point of view the Possessor is defined as the semantic role of the more salient participant in prototypical possessive relations. In nominalized NPs it is usually interpreted as the Agent or the Theme. It is often difficult to make clear distinction between these two roles and thus between the prototypical possessive constructions, which reflect objective relations in the world, and the nominalized NPs, which reflect structural relations of participants in a nominalized predication. Nominalizations can have a more or less reified meaning. They can range from designating concrete objects, such as *pismo* (letter), *test* (test), an abstract notion, as for instance *plan* (plan), *son* (dream), an episode *poseta* (visit), *napad* (attack) or an activity in progress *opišuvanje* (describing), *razurnuvanje* (destroying). We assume that the first two engage in prototype possessive relations with a human referent and the possessive NPs they build will express the role of Possessor, while the last two build nominalization NPs expressing an Agent and/or a Theme in a possessive type of construction. The result nominals which express representation and/or creation show ambivalent characteristics as they represent objects that can be possessed, but also strongly imply the represented entity (Theme) and/or the creator (Agent).

Prototypical possessive NPs allow only one possessive modifier, even though in the ownership sub-category they can express various types of possession. For example, the phrase in (56a) can mean that Vesna permanently owns the car, or that she uses it, but it belongs to her brother. In the latter interpretation, expression of both these relations in one NP is ruled out (*cf.* 56b). But it is possible to express the relation more precisely in a transparent adjunct construction, as in (56c).

(56) a. *nejzinata/ Vesninata kola* Mac
 PP.3Sg.F+the.F.Sg Vesna.GA+the.F.Sg car.F.Sg
 ‘her/Vesna’s car’

b. **Ova e nejzinata/ Vesninata kola na brat i.*
 this is PP.3Sg.F+the.F.Sg Vesna.GA+the.F.Sg car.F.Sg of brother Poss.Cl.3Sg.F
 ‘*This is her/Vesna’s car of her brother.’

c. *Ova e nejzinata/ Vesninata kola od brat i.* (Possessor–Source)
 this is PP.3Sg.F+the.F.Sg VesnaGA+the.F.Sg car from brother Poss.Cl.3Sg.F
 ‘This is her/Vesna’s car from her brother.’

In the same vain, possessive NPs with resultat nominals can be ambiguous. Thus the phrase in (57a.) can either mean that Mirko sent the invitation/designed the test or that Mirko received the invitation/did the test, but we cannot clarify the ambiguity with two possessive modifications in the same NP. As shown in (57b.), with *pokana* (invitation) meaning a piece of paper, it is not possible

to indicate the different types of relation in possessive constructions, but only in an indirect way (57c.). Thus result nominals behave as regular nominals denoting objects, which build ambiguous possessive constructions, but keep the binary character of prototypical possession. When *pokana* is interpreted as an act of inviting, the second possessive construction will be interpreted as the Theme and the first as the Agent (57d). Since the argument structure of the nominalization predication is prominently felt in the nominalization NPs, it allows two different types of possessive constructions for expression of different arguments.

- (57) a. *Pokanata/ testot na Mirko* Mac
 invitation+the.F.Sg test+the.M.Sg of Mirko
 ‘Mirko’s invitation/test’
- b. **Ova e negovata/ Mirkovata pokana na Vesna.*
 this is PP.3Sg.M+the.F.Sg Mirko.GA+the.F.Sg invitation of Vesna
 ‘*This is his/Mirko’s invitation of Vesna.’ (‘invitation’ meaning a card)
- c. *Ova e negovata/ Mirkovata pokana za Vesna.* (Possessor – Goal)
 this is PP.3Sg.M+the.F.Sg Mirko.GA+the.F.Sg invitation for Vesna
 ‘This is his/Mirko’s invitation for Vesna.’
- d. *Negovata/ Mirkovata pokana na Vesna* (Agent – Theme)
 PP.3Sg.M+the.F.Sg Mirko.GA+the.F.Sg invitation of Vesna
 (*gi iznenadi site.*)
 ‘His/Mirko’s invitation of Vesna (surprised everyone.)’ (‘invitation’ meaning an act)

Creation type resultative nominals such as picture, photograph, portrait, sculpture, novel, book can build possessive NPs which have an intermediate status between prototypical possessive NPs and nominalization NPs. They can build NPs with more than one possessive modifier, which can express both Possessor and argument roles (Agent and Theme). It has been proposed in some formal frameworks that in such cases there are certain constraints which regulate the possible combinations. In Dimitrova-Vulcanova & Giusti (1998:171), the hierarchy in (58) is proposed to be valid for Bulgarian, both for the so called representation nominals and for event nominals.

(58) Possessor > Agent > Theme

This hierarchy predicts that if all roles are to be expressed, this will be the most acceptable word order of the constituents. Dimitrova-Vulcanova & Giusti (1998:172) illustrate this by the Bulgarian example in (59a.). As shown in (59b.) it is also applicable for Macedonian.

- (59) a. *negovijat star Rembrandov portret na Aristotel* Bulg
 PP.3Sg+the.M.Sg old.M.Sg Rembrandt.AG.M.Sg portrait.M.Sg of Aristotel
 ‘his old Rembrandt’s portrait of Aristotel’
- b. *nejziniot Tarnerov portret na Kralicata* Mac
 PP.3Sg+the.M.Sg Tarner.AG.M.Sg portrait.M.Sg of Queen+the.F.Sg
 ‘her Tarner’s prtrait of the queen’

The hierarchy also predicts that the patterns (Possessor/Agent>Theme) and (Possessor>Agent) are possible, but rules out (Agent>Possessor) or (Theme>Agent/Possessor). As for Macedonian it is true that the first two possibilities are the most natural ones, as illustrated in example (60a.). When two roles are expressed in NPs with representation nominals, one preceding and the other following the head, the latter is preferably interpreted as the Theme. However, constructions in which Possessor is placed before an Agent do not sound quite acceptable (example 60b. and c.). The roles of Agent and Possessor are felt as quite similar and a construction like this causes a contradicting interpretation. The creator is conceptualized as Possessor of the created object even when the object is legally in someone else’s possession, hence the awkwardness of the examples in (60b. and c.).

This is in correlation with the fact that NPs expressing Agents of nominalised NPs are closer to prototypical possession than those which express the Theme.¹⁸

(59) a. (Agent/Possessor>Theme)

Meštrovićevata/ mojata skulptura na Krale Marko Mac
 MeštrovićGA+the.F.Sg PP1Sg+the.F.Sg sculpture.F.Sg of Prince Marko
 ‘Meštrović’s/my sculpture of Prince Marko’

b. (??Possessor>??Agent)

moite/ Vesninite drami na Šekspir Mac
 PP1Sg+the.PI VesnaGA+the.PI plays of Shakespeare
 ‘my/Vesna’s plays of Shakespeare’

c. (??Possessor>??Agent)

našiot pejsaž na Martinovski Mac
 PP1PI+the.M.Sg landscape.M.Sg of Martinovski
 ‘our landscape of Martinovski’

Agent in Genitival Adjective and Possessor in the *na*-construction, on the other hand, is a quite natural way of expressing the two roles in Macedonian, as illustrated in (61a. and b.). Notice that the hierarchy in (58) predicts that this would be unacceptable in Bulgarian, and indeed, it is marked as such in example (61c.), taken from Dimitrova-Vulcanova & Giusti (1998:171).

(59) a. (Agent>Possessor)

Šekspirovite drami na studentite po angliski Mac
 ShakespeareGA+the.PI plays.PI of students+the.PI of English
 ‘Shakespeare’s plays of the students of English’

b. (Agent>Possessor)

Pikasovata slika na eden poznat kolekcioner Mac
 PicassoGA+the.F.Sg painting of one renowned collector
 ‘Picasso’s painting of a well known collector’

c. (*Agent>*Possessor)

Rembrandovijat portret na Ivan Bulg
 RembrandtGA+the.M.Sg portrait of Ivan
 ‘??Rembrandt’s portrait of Ivan’

The author of a creation can be used to characterize an object and name it. The Genitival Adjective is especially suited for that function.¹⁹ In such cases the possessive meaning of the Genitival Adjective is considerably weakened. The phrases in (61a. and b.) are judged as acceptable most probably because the creator’s role there is of this type and, consequently, not in conflict with the Possessor role. The difference between the two functions becomes obvious in phrases where Genitival Adjective is clearly only a name and has no connection with the creator in the current context as in example (62), where Ana can be either the creator or the possessor.

(60) *Vasinata torta na Ana (bese mnogu dobra.) Mac*
 Vasa.GA+the.F.Sg cake.F.Sg of Ana
 ‘Ana’s ‘Vasa’s cake’ (was very good.)’

¹⁸ Rappaport (2000:8) claims that Agent and Possessor roles are “not mutually exclusive”, showing in Minimalist framework that they are licenced at the same place in the tree (ibid.:10-11).

¹⁹ The creator in phrases such as *Ajfelovata kula* (Eiffel Tower), *Keplerov zakon* (Kepler’s Law), expressed in the Genitival Adjective, functions as a designator of the head noun rather than a creator.

The Theme preceding either the Possessor or the Agent is not the most natural way of expressing these relations either, but the limitations can be circumvented by pragmatic factors. Compare the examples in (61a. and b.), which are quite acceptable in Macedonian even though the Theme precedes the Agent or the Possessor.

(61) a. (Theme>Agent)

Kraličinot *portret* *na Rembrant* (*beše postaven vo golemata sala.*) Mac
QueenGA+the.M.Sg portrait.M.Sg of Rembrandt

‘The Queen’s portrait of Rembrandt (was put up in the big hall.)’ (*Theme>Agent)

b. (Theme>Possessor)

Kraličinot *portret* *na eden* *kolekcioner* Mac
QueenAG+the.M.Sg portrait.M.Sg of one.M.Sg collector
(*beše prodaden za 1mil dolari.*)

‘The Queen’s portrait of a collector (was sold for \$1mil.)’ (*Theme>Possessor)

This is completely in contrast with event nominalizations (both simple and complex), where when both participants are expressed the prenominal one is always interpreted as Agent, never as Theme. No matter how hard we try we cannot tease out an interpretation of (62) in which Igor was abducted by the pirates, but, although practically less probable, it unambiguously suggests that Igor abducted the pirates.

(62) *Site zboruvaa za Igorovoto grabnuvanje na gusarite.* (*Theme>*Agent) Mac

all talked.3Pl about IgorGA+the.N.Sg abduction of pirates+the.Pl

‘Everyone talked about **Igor’s abduction of the pirates.**’ (*Theme>*Agent)

In some rare cases representation nominals in Macedonian are modified by two *na*-constructions following one another, the first one coding the Theme, the second the Agent, as illustrated in examples (63a. and b.).

(63) a. (Theme>Agent)

portret na gospođa na 60 godini na Van Gog Mac
portrait of lady at 60 years of Van Gough
‘Van Gough’s portrait of a 60 year old lady’

b. *Spomenikot na neznajniot junak na Meštović* Mac
monument+the.M.Sg of unknown+the.M.Sg hero of Meštović
‘Meštović’s monument of the unknown soldier’

This is not only in contradiction to the proposed hierarchy, but also breaks the rule which forbids two possessive constructions of the same type to be dependent on one head. How can this be explained? It seems that the Theme in these phrases is conceived as a name for the object, thus allowing another *na*-construction with a different role. Objects are usually named after some salient properties and the object of representation is salient enough. Rappaport (2000:8) also notices that in some Slavic languages two genitives (Theme>Agent) can appear with nominals of representation, as shown in the Russian example in (66) from Rappaport (2000:8).

(64) *fotografija krest’jan Smirnova* (Theme>Agent) Russian

the photograph of the peasants.GEN of Smirnof.GEN

‘the photograph of the peasants by Smirnof’

He explains that the first genitive “is an instance of *inherent* case not only because the source of its case marking and thematic role are the same ..., but the choice of case is actually related to the thematic role assigned. For example, the noun *fotografija* naturally suggests the question of its content: a photograph of what?” (ibid.). The contention here is that the object is characterized

through its Theme, but the Theme is analyzed as a kind of property, not as an argument.²⁰ We can apply the same explanation to the Macedonian examples in (63) above and thus account for this deviation from the hierarchy. Notice that the English literal translation of the sentences in (63) does not allow the same interpretation. The reason could be that the English possessive genitive does not evoke the same attributive meaning as the Macedonian Genitival Adjective. Furthermore, in English the Genitive possessive construction is more strongly associated with the Possessor and Agent role and the *of*-construction with the Theme. When both appear in one NP, no alternative interpretation is allowed.

We can conclude that the distribution of the roles the possessive NP modifications can express parallels the semantic distinction between the prototype possession and the structural possession. The analysis indicates that the creation/representation nominals take an intermediate position: they resemble the event nominalizations in that they are able to accept more possessive modifications with different roles, but those roles do not have equal properties. The roles that the possessive constructions can express with creation/representation nominals diverge from those expressing thematic roles of a predication, which is reflected in the way they are coded in the possessive NP. The conceptual affinity between the roles of Possessor and Agent as creator affects the proposed hierarchy of roles in the possessive NP rendering the [Possessor>Agent] combination not as acceptable as predicted. The properties of the Genitival Adjective in Macedonian to name things and the possibility to interpret the Theme of representation nominals as a characteristic also make it possible for the hierarchy to be flouted.

5. Conclusion

To sum up, the analysis of the Macedonian and Bulgarian constructions for expressing possession at the NP level shows that each of the several constructions available can express various relations, but as long as they remain within the prototype possessive relations they are restricted to one possessive modification in a NP. Less prototypical constructions allow deviations from this rule more easily. Typically, representation nominals show properties that are in concord with their intermediate status. Furthermore, possessive NPs expressing more prototypical functions tend to exhibit a more flexible word order.

Macedonian and Bulgarian employ similar strategies for expressing possessive relations and show similar variation regarding the possessive continuum. Nevertheless, two significant differences are immediately noticed: (a) the tendency in Macedonian to employ *od*-construction for possessive relations where the cause/source meaning is weak, which is not common for Bulgarian; and (b) the widespread use of Adnominal Possessive Clitics in Bulgarian for all types of possessive relations in contrast to their limited use in Macedonian.

Abbreviations:

Adj	-	adjective
Cl	-	clitic
DO	-	direct object
F	-	feminine (gender)
GA	-	genitival adjective
IO	-	indirect object

²⁰ Rappaport (2000:8) compares this type of genitive to the one in pseudo-quantitative constructions where it designates “the component parts of a collective whole”. There also a second genitive is possible, and equally a second *na*-construction in Macedonian, as shown in example (iii).

(iii)	<i>kolekcijata</i>	<i>na moneti</i>	<i>na</i>	<i>tatko</i>	<i>mi</i>	Mac
	collection+the.F.Sg	of coin.Pl	of	father	Poss.Cl.1Sg	
	‘my father’s collection of coins’					

M	-	masculine (gender)
N	-	neuter (gender)
P	-	pronoun
Past	-	past tense
Pl	-	plural
Poss	-	possessive
PP	-	possessive pronoun
Prox	-	proximate
Pt	-	participial
Q	-	question
Ref	-	reflexive
Sg	-	singular
Voc	-	vocative

References

- Dimitrova-Vulchanova, Mila and Giuliana Giusti. 1998. "Possessors in Bulgarian DP". In: Dimitrova-Vulchanova, Mila and Lars Hellan eds. *Topics in South Slavic Syntax and Semantics*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 163-192.
- Hauge, Kjetil Rå. 1999. *A Short Grammar of Contemporary Bulgarian*, Bloomington: Slavica.
- Ivić, Milka. 2002 "Povodom makedonskih konstrukcija tipa *kola na brat mi /kola od brat mi*" [On Macedonian constructions of the type *kola na brat mi* (my brother's car)/*kola od brat mi* (the car of/from my brother)]. In: Gjurčinov, Milan i dr. red. *Deloto na Blaže Koneski, Ostvaruvanja i perspektivi*. Skopje: MANU. 413-418
- Koneski, Blaže. 1987. *Gramatika na makedonskiot literaturni jazik* [Grammar of the Macedonian Literary Language]. Skopje: Kultura.
- Koptjevskaja-Tamm, Maria. 2002. "Adnominal possession in the European languages: form and function". *Sprachtypol. Univ. Forsch. (STUF)*, Berlin 55, 2.141-172.
- Korubin, Blagoja. 1969. *Jazikot naš denešen: Kniga 1* [Our contemporary language: Book1]. Skopje: Naša kniga.
- Langacker, Roland W. 1993. "Reference -point constructions". *Cognitive Linguistics 4-1.1-38*.
- Langacker, Roland W. 1995. "Possession and possessive constructions", In: John R. Taylor & Robert E. MacLaury eds. *Language and Cognitive Construal of the World*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 51-79.
- Langacker, Roland W. 2000. *Grammar and Conceptualization*. [Cognitive Linguistics Research 14]. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Mitkovska, Liljana. 2000. "The Functional Distribution of the Possessive Suffixes *-ov/-in* in Macedonian and in Bulgarian", *Balkanistica* 13. 113-130.
- Mitkovska, Liljana. 2001 "Za upotrebata na predlozite *na* i *od* vo posesivna funkcija vo makedonskiot standarden jazik" [On the use of the prepositions *na* and *od* in possessive function i the Maceonian standard language]. *Makedonski jazik* LI-LII. 123-133.
- Pašov, Petăr. 2002. *Bălgarska gramatika* [Bulgarian Grammar], Plovdiv: Hermes.
- Rapaport, Gilbert C. 2000. "The Slavic Noun Phrase in Comparative Perspective". In George Fowler ed. *Comparative Slavic Morphology*. Bloomington: Slavica Publishers.
- Taylor, John R. 1989. "Possessive genitives in English". *Linguistics* 27. 663-686.

Taylor, John R. 1996. *Possessives in English: An Exploration in Cognitive Grammar*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Topolinjska, Zuzana. 1997 *Makedonskite dijalekti vo Egejska Makedonija* [Macedonian dialects in Aegean Macedonia], Kniga 1, Sintaksa, Tom II. Skopje: MANU.

Sources:

Macedonian

Andonovski, Venko. *Papokot na svetot* [The Bellybutton of the World]. Skopje: Kultura. 2004. (PS)

Nikolova, Olivera. *Preminot ne e osvetlen* [The passage is not lit]. Skopje: Detska radost. 1993. (ON)

Smačoski, Boško. *Golemi i mali* [Big and small] Skopje: Detska radost, Kultura, Makedonska kniga, Misl, Naša kniga. 1988. (GM)

Weekly magazin *Žena* [Woman]. (Žena)

Bulgarian

Andonoski, Venko. *Păpăt na sveta* [The Bellybutton of the World]. Sofija: IK "ATON". 2003. (PS)

Gospodinov, Georgi.) *Estestven roman* [Natural novel]. Plovdiv: ŽANET-45. 2000. (GG)

Hristov, Boris. ed. *Bălgarski razkazi, Antologija ot Ivan Vazov do Emilijan Stanev* [Bulgarian stories, Antology from Ivan Vazov to Emilijan Stanov]. Sofija: Izdatelstvo Ljak. 1995. (BR)