

The Possessor that Came Home

Mila Tasseva-Kurktchieva, University of South Carolina

1. Introduction

This paper focuses on the Bulgarian nominal system and takes the minimalist approach to the discussed phenomena. Bulgarian provides evidence for the existence of a functional projection Possessor Phrase (PossP) between the lexical Noun Phrase (NP) and the top functional Determiner Phrase (DP). The present paper shows that the proposed PossP is the insertion point for the possessive (dative¹) clitic but not for the Adjectival or Prepositional Phrase (PP) possessive structures which exhibit different distributional properties. Evidence for this claim comes from both syntactic distribution and semantic properties of the different types of possessive structures in Bulgarian. On the other hand, this paper does not attempt to explain all the facts about the structure of Bulgarian NP in depth. Some of the phenomena are left as open ended questions for future consideration.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 presents the basic facts about the structure and distributional properties of the Bulgarian noun phrase and its components. Special attention is paid to the representation and distribution of the possessive structures and their implication for Abney's (1987) proposal. Section 3 presents an analysis of possessive structures² in Bulgarian. The language shows evidence for two types of possessive structures. For lack of a better term, I will call the first type SYNTACTIC POSSESSORS, as they are syntactically (and to an extent semantically) restricted to the PossP functional projection. I refer to the second type as SEMANTIC POSSESSORS as they can function semantically as possessors but are not syntactically restricted to a specific projection and thus share the distributional and functional properties of either Adjectival Phrases (APs) or PPs. While the syntactic possessors are base-generated in PossP and remain there after spell out, the semantic possessors may (but do not have to) raise to the Spec, PossP position in the derivational process.

* I would like to thank Stanley Dubinsky, the audience of the Workshop on the Semantics/Syntax of Possessive Constructions and in particular Barbara Partee, Ji-Yung Kim, Yury Lander, Carmen Dobrovie-Sorin and Daniel Hole for their insightful comments. Needless to say, all remaining problems and omissions are the sole responsibility of the author.

¹ The overlap between genitive and dative case is a feature shared by the languages in the Balkan Sprachbund. Pancheva (to appear) shows that in Bulgarian, Macedonian and Romanian the morphological genitive was lost and replaced by the dative, while in Greek the dative case was replaced by the genitive.

² The term 'possessive structures' is used in this paper to cover all types of possessive phrases, including those in which the syntactic possessives do not denote semantic possession. Such cases will be discussed in Section 3.

D⁰ where it competes for the same node with other determiners such as articles, demonstratives and numerals. Bulgarian poses some questions and problems here. The Standard Modern Bulgarian has very few traces of the former case system, namely accusative and dative case in the pronominal system and vocative and genitive case on proper names and animate nouns⁴. In this language possession can be expressed in four different ways: (i) with a genitival adjective (3); (ii) with a pronominal adjective (4); (iii) with an N + PP construction (5); and (iv) with a dative clitic (6):

- | | | |
|-----|---|---|
| (3) | Ivan-ova-ta kniga
Ivan-GEN-DEF book
'Ivan's book' | <i>genitival adjective</i> |
| (4) | neg-ova-ta kniga
his-GEN-DEF book
'his book' | <i>(pronominal) genitival adjective</i> |
| (5) | kniga-ta na Ivan/?na nego ⁵
book-DEF of Ivan/ of him-DAT
'Ivan's book' | <i>PP</i> |
| (6) | kniga-ta mu
book-DEF his-DAT
'his book' | <i>dative clitic</i> |

We will now take a closer look at the distributional properties of each of these possessive structures. The examples in (3)-(6) show a striking, yet somewhat superficial, pattern—where genitive inflection appears, the possessor is pronominal and there is gender and number agreement between the possessor and the rest of the elements in the DP ((3) and (4)), but where the dative case can be used, the possessor is in postnominal position and does not agree in gender and number with the rest of the DP ((5) and (6)). The first similarity holds across the board when the noun is modified by a sole possessive structure. Adjectival possessors⁶ can appear in any pronominal position within the DP. They can be in

⁴ In past decades, the vocative has not been considered as a separate case marking form either.

⁵ Grammaticality judgements differ on forms like *knigata na nego* 'his book'. The pronominal adjective in dative case is not grammatical in Standard Modern Bulgarian. However, some users render it acceptable in the colloquial form of the language. I will leave the question open for further investigation.

⁶ Traditional grammarians call the possessive structures in (4) and (6) respectively 'full' and 'short' forms of the possessive pronoun, but I would prefer, following Dimitrova-Vulchanova & Giusti (1998), to call them pronominal adjectives and dative clitics. First, the pronominal adjectives show the same distribution and features as any other type of adjective. They are part of the DP, they do not compete

[Spec, DP] (7a), in [Spec, NP] (7b), or in an intermediate position between those two (7c). This last occurrence of the adjectival possessive structure will be discussed in Section 3:

- (7) a. **moja-ta/Ivan-ova-ta** nova šapka [Spec, DP]
 my-DEF/ Ivan-GEN-DEF new hat
 ‘my/Ivan’s new hat’
- b. *njakolko-to novi moi/Ivan-ovi* šapki [Spec, NP]
 several-DEF new my/ Ivan-GEN hats
 ‘several of my/Ivan’s new hats’
- c. *njakolko-to moi/Ivan-ovi* novi šapki b/n [Spec, DP] and [Spec, NP]
 several-DEF my/ Ivan-GEN new hats
 ‘several of my/Ivan’s new hats’
- d. **njakolko(-to) novi šapki moi/Ivan-ovi*
 several(-DEF) new hats my/ Ivan-GEN
 ‘several of my/Ivan’s new hats’

Note that in (7b) there is an intervening adjective (*novi* ‘new’) between the quantifier *njakolko* ‘several’ and the possessor *moi/Ivanovi* ‘mine/of.Ivan’. The only position the adjectival possessors cannot take is the postnominal position as in (7d). Consider also the definiteness in all of the examples in (7)—in Bulgarian, unlike in English, the possessor and the definite article can co-occur. The non-definite counterparts of the same DPs are shown in (8a-c):

- (8) a. (enda) **moja/Ivan-ova** bjala šapka
 (one) my/ Ivan-GEN white hat
 ‘(one) white hat of mine/Ivan’s’
- b. *njakolko novi moi/Ivan-ovi* šapki
 several new my/ Ivan-GEN hats
 ‘several new hats of mine/Ivan’s’
- c. *njakolko moi/Ivan-ovi* novi šapki
 several my/ Ivan-GEN new hats
 ‘several new hats of mine/Ivan’s’

The comparison between (7) and (8) shows that the possessor and the determiner do not compete for the same slot because they can co-exist. In such case Abney’s (1987) proposal that D^0 is the insertion point for both the definite article and the possessive clitic is not suitable for Bulgarian. Furthermore, if the dative clitic is examined, we are led to believe that there are syntactic reasons for the co-occurrence of a possessor and a determiner. Consider (9) where examples (a) and (b) show the same word order of constituents with the only difference being that

with the definite articles for the slot under D^0 , and they are inflected for gender, number, and case in the same way as the adjectives. Second, it has been argued that the possessive clitics are actually the dative clitic pronouns (cf. Stojanov 1983:194 and Pancheva (to appear) for further details).

the ungrammatical example in (b) omits the definite article. Furthermore, the acceptability pattern is the same in constructions with more than one modifier of the noun (cf. (15a and b) where, in addition to the possessive structure, there is also a modifying adjective):

- (9) a. kniga-**ta mu**
 book-DEF his
 ‘his book’
 b. *kniga **mu**
 book his
 ‘his book’

- (10) a. goljama-ta mi šapka
 big-DEF my hat
 ‘my big hat’
 b. *goljama mi šapka
 big my hat
 ‘my big hat’

Let us now consider the distribution of the PP possessives. Examples (5-6) above suggest that there are some similarities between PP possessives and the clitic possessive structures. In all the examples, both possessors surface in DP-second position and (can) appear in dative case. However, further data reveals a different picture. As (11) shows, the dative clitic can appear only in DP-second position. Note here that the (non-)appearance of the definite article does not play any role in the grammaticality of the examples in (b) and (c). On the other hand, as (12) reveals, the PP possessor has to be in the DP-edge position. It can surface in the right-most position in its unmarked usage (12a) or in the left-most position if the possessor is focused and thus extraposed outside the DP (12b)⁷. In contrast, surfacing of the PP possessor in any intermediate position is prohibited (cf. (12c and d)):

- (11) a. xubava-ta **mu** kniga
 good-DEF his book
 b. ***mu** xubava(-ta) kniga
 his good(-DEF) book
 c. *xubava(-ta) kniga **mu**
 good(-DEF) book his
 ‘his good book’

- (12) a. nova-ta kniga **na Ivan**
 new-DEF book of Ivan

⁷ For a different view on the left-edge position of the PP possessive structures see Stateva (2002).

- b. **na Ivan** nova-ta kniga
of Ivan new-DEF book
- c. *nova-ta **na Ivan** kniga
new-DEF of Ivan book
'Ivan's new book'
- d. *nova-ta xubava **na Ivan** kniga
new-DEF good of Ivan book
'Ivan's new good book' (as opposed to the old one which was not that good)

To summarize this section, the distributional facts about the different types of possessive structures in the Bulgarian nominal system are presented in Table 1 (where X stands for any element, such as adjective or nominal, that modifies the head noun):

Dative Clitic in DP second position	X >> Dat. Clitic >> (N)
PP in edge position	X >> N >> PP or PP >> X >> N
Pronominal and Genitival Adjectives anywhere pronominally	Spec, DP: Adj >> X >> N between DP and NP: Q >> Adj >> X >> N Spec, NP: Q >> X >> Adj >> N but not complement of NP: *Q >> X >> N >> Adj

Table 1. The distribution of possessive structures in Bulgarian.

2.3. *Adjective movement–head or phrasal?* I adopt the view that there is constituent movement within the Bulgarian DP⁸. In his dissertation, Abney proposes that in English the pronominal descriptive adjectives are base-generated in head of AP position and select for NPs as their complements. He finds evidence for this in the fact (illustrated in (13)) that the pronominal adjectives cannot take complements.

- (13) a. the man [proud of his son]
b. *the [proud [of his son]] man

However, Bulgarian facts reveal a different picture. As (14) shows, in Bulgarian not only can the preposed adjective take as its complement a PP (14 a), but also it can simultaneously be modified by an intensifier such as 'many' or 'completely' (14b):

⁸ For a different view see Dimitrova-Vulchanova & Giusti (1999 a, b) who claim that there is no sufficient evidence for any movement within the Bulgarian DP. Instead, they treat the suffixed definite article as a special case of inflection on the left-most element in the DP.

- (14) a. [_{DP} [mnogo/ napəlno [_{AP} gord-ijat [_{PP} səs svøe-to dete]]_I [_{NP} t_I bašta]]
 very/ completely proud-DEF with self-DEF child father
 ‘the father (very) proud of his child’
- b. mnogo gordiyat bašta
 very proud-DEF father
 ‘very proud father’

The fact that it is not simply the first constituent in the NP but rather the first modified constituent that raises up to DP leads us to the conclusion that movement within the Bulgarian DP is phrasal, rather than head movement⁹. This view will be adopted below in the analysis of the possessive structures in Bulgarian.

3. Analysis of Bulgarian possessive structures

3.1. *Syntax* In Section 2.2 I have outlined the distributional facts about the possessive constructions in Bulgarian. The striking syntactic pattern for the clitic possessive is that it appears in second (Wackernagel) position in an obligatorily definite context. Consider again (9) and (11). The contrast between (9a) and (9b) shows that the dative clitic has to appear in definite context. As for (11), the examples in (b) and (c) show that displacement of the clitic in the surface word order leads to an ungrammatical construction. Note that the overtiness of the definite article does not change the grammaticality of the examples with a dative clitic in second position.

None of the other three possessive structures are that restrictive in either surface word ordering or in the definiteness conditions. We already saw that the genitival and the pronominal adjectives are unrestricted in word ordering as long as they precede the head noun. In (15) we observe that both of them can surface in either definite or indefinite environments. Simultaneously, (16) shows that the dative clitic cannot surface even in the indefinite environments marked by the numeral ‘one’:

- (15) a. (edna) xubava Ivan-ova/ neg-ova kniga
 (one) good Ivan-GEN/his-GEN book
 ‘a good book of Ivan’s/his’

⁹ Based on the facts in (14 a), Arnaudova (1995) proposes that the adjective ‘proud’ is in head of AP (which in its turn dominates NP) while its complement ‘of his child’ is in Spec, AP; thus to her the DP internal movement is head rather than phrasal. However, her analysis cannot account for the facts in (14 b) where the definite article attaches to the adjective rather than to the modifying intensifier.

- b. xubava-ta Ivan-ova/ neg-ova kniga
 good-DEF Ivan-GEN/his-GEN book
 ‘Ivan’s/his good book’
- (16) *edna mu xubava kniga
 one his good book
 ‘(one of) his good book(s)’

The situation with the PP possessives is somewhere in between adjectival and clitic possessive structures. On one hand, the PP possessor is much more restricted in terms of surface word order than the adjectival possessor but a little less restricted than the dative clitic. Recall that PPs can appear only in either of the edge positions within DP. On the other hand, PPs resemble the adjectival possessives with respect to definiteness as they can also appear in indefinite contexts (cf. (17)):

- (17) a. Na pod-a leži (edna) kniga na Ivan
 on floor-DEF lies (one) book of Ivan
 ‘A book of Ivan’s lies on the floor.’
- b. Na pod-a leži (edna) Ivan-ova kniga
 on floor-DEF lies (one) Ivan-GEN book
 ‘A book of Ivan’s lies on the floor.’

In short, in terms of definiteness and word-order restrictions, the dative clitic possessives are strictly limited to the Wackernagel position in a definite environment, while each of the other three structures appear to be unrestricted in some way (cf. Table 2):

	Restricted to definite environments	Restricted position within the DP
Dative clitic	√	√ (second)
Genitival adjectives	--	--
PP possessives	--	√ (edge)

Table 2. Definiteness and word-order restrictions.

3.2. *Semantics* Dimitrova-Vulchanova & Giusti (later D-V & G) (1999b) work on the connection between a type of possessive structure in Bulgarian and the θ -role it can play with the DP. They look at the possessor>>agent>>theme hierarchy (Cinque 1980) and its implications on possessive structures in Bulgarian. The authors find that with object denoting nominals each of the four structures can express the possessor role, but the roles of Agent and Theme are split—only *na*DPs (PP possessives in this paper) can express themes, and *na*DPs are the only ones that cannot surface as agents. In this section I show that all four types of possessive structures can serve any of the three θ -roles at hand. D-V & G look also at object denoting DPs with two or three possessive structures. They stress that the

very fact that the co-occurrence of two or three possessive structures is possible raises questions concerning the base-generation of the ‘possessors’, as well as whether or not those different types of arguments should be unified under the same label. According to them, possessors can co-occur only if they are from different types and serve different θ -roles in accordance with the Uniform Theta Assignment Hypothesis (UTAH). I will show that while the dative clitics cannot indeed co-occur in the same DP, the rest of the possessive structures can, but only if they play different θ -roles, again in accordance with UTAH. As the theme θ -role does not play a significant part in the current analysis, I will focus further on the possessive and the agentive functions only.

First, let us consider examples with only one possessive structure. As we see in (18), all four possessive structures can play either of the two roles—possessor or agent. So the reading of the examples can be either ‘Ivan’s book’ or ‘the book by Ivan (that Ivan wrote)’:

- (18) a. kniga-ta na Ivan/mu
 book-DEF **of/by** Ivan/him
 ‘Ivan’s/his book’
 b. Ivan-ova-ta/ neg-ova-ta kniga
 Ivan-GEN-DEF/ his-GEN-DEF book
 ‘Ivan’s/his book’

However, the situation is not the same in examples where more possessive structures co-occur. The examples in (19a and b) show that adjectives and PPs can express either possessive or agentive roles. Although the first readings of the examples are the preferred (unmarked) ones, the second readings are also possible. On the other hand, in (19c-e), where the dative clitic is one of the multiple possessives, only the possessor reading is possible for this dative clitic.

- (19) a. moja-ta kniga na Ivan
 my-DEF book by/of Ivan
poss agent ‘my book by Ivan’
agent poss ‘Ivan’s book by me’
 b. Ivan-ova-ta moja kniga
 Ivan-GEN-DEF my book
agent poss ‘my book by Ivan’
poss agent ‘Ivan’s book by me’
 c. Ivan-ova-ta **mi** kniga
 Ivan-GEN-DEF **my** book
agent poss ‘my book by Ivan’ but **NOT**
**poss agent* ‘Ivan’s book by me’
 d. na Ivan kniga-ta **mi**
 of Ivan book-DEF my
agent poss ‘my book by Ivan’ but **NOT**
**poss agent* ‘Ivan’s book by me’

roles as we saw to be the case with adjectives and PPs. The only reason for the prevention of two occurrences of the dative clitic is that they compete for the possessor role, which is related to a specific syntactic node.

Another interesting fact is that the dative clitic possessors play the role of agent only in structures with one possessor. The examples in (22) show that *mi* ‘my’ can stand for either the person who owns the book or the person who wrote the book.

- (22) a. kniga-ta mi
 book-DEF my
 poss/agent
 ‘my book’
 b. njakolko-to mi novi knigi
 several-DEF my new books
 poss/agent
 ‘several of my new books’

As we see in (22b) the function of the clitic pronoun does not change regardless of the fact that the head noun is modified by an adjective and a quantifier. The fact that it is possible for the dative clitic to be treated as agent only in single possessive structures and the fact that in double and triple possessive structures it can be regarded only as a possessor (cf. (19c-e) and (20)) leads to the conclusion that it stands on its own in semantic, as well as in syntactic terms. However, the leading role in determining its function is played by the syntax.

3.3. Analysis In what follows I will propose an analysis of Bulgarian possessive DPs that differentiates between two types of possessive structures. Under this analysis the dative clitics are SYNTACTIC POSSESSORS as they appear to be restricted to a functional projection directly dominated by DP. The genitival adjectives and PP possessives are SEMANTIC POSSESSORS as they can function semantically as possessors but are not syntactically restricted to a specific projection and thus share the distributional and functional properties of either Adjectival Phrases (APs) or PPs¹².

¹² The current analysis is close to that in Embick & Noyer (2001) and Franks (1998) in the sense that they also show that the dative clitic is directly dominated by DP at spell out. However, it differs from those analyses in (i) the position in which the clitic is base generated (in both analyses it is generated as right adjunct in head of DP), (ii) the directionality of the movement (both analyses propose PF lowering of the lexical element + determiner + dative clitic compound to the head of the next functional projection), and (iii) the account for the other types of possessive structures.

This analysis is also close to that in D-V&G (1999a and b) in its account for the thematic as well as syntactic differences between the possessive DPs in Bulgarian. It differs from what D-V&G propose in two aspects. First, unlike D-V&G, I propose that in Bulgarian there is DP-internal movement which helps us

If a possessor θ -role is to be assigned to a possessive structure, the DP selects for a PossP. While the syntactic possessors are base generated in head of PossP (which is directly dominated by DP) and remain there after spell out (23a), the semantic possessors may (but do not have to) raise to the [Spec, PossP] position in the derivational process (23b):

- (23) a. $[_{DP} \text{ nova } [_{D}^0 \text{ -ta } [_{PossP} t_1 [_{Poss}^0 \text{ mu } [_{NP} t_1 [_{NP} \text{ kniga}]]]]]]]$
 new -DEF his book
 ‘his new book’ (the one he owns)
- b. $[_{DP} \text{ Ivanova/negova}_1 [_{D}^0 \text{ -ta } [_{PossP} t_1 [_{Poss}^0 \emptyset [_{NP} t_1 [_{NP} \text{ kniga}]]]]]]]$
 Ivan /his -DEF book
 ‘Ivan’s/his book’ (the one he owns)

In (23 a) the DP, in this case overtly realized by *-ta* ‘the’, selects for a PossP. The strong syntactic possessor *mu* ‘his’ is base-generated in the head of PossP. In this case the highest XP below $Poss^0$ can move over the head of the functional projection to its specifier position and then further raise to [Spec, DP] to check off the [+def] feature of the determiner phrase. At spell out the bound definite morpheme undergoes PF affixation and is pronounced as a suffix to the constituent residing under [Spec, DP]. On the other hand, in (23 b) the genitival adjective is base generated in [Spec, DP] and undergoes phrasal movement to [Spec, PossP] where it is assigned the possessor θ -role, and further to [Spec, DP] where it checks the [+def] feature of the DP and attracts the bound definite morpheme at spell out. The raising of the genitival adjective is not mandatory. Recall that the genitival adjective can be preceded by a descriptive adjective in the surface word order (8b). In this case PossP is not projected and the first constituent moves directly to [Spec, DP] to check its [+def] feature.

As I showed above, the possessive structures in Bulgarian can also assume the agentive θ -role. In this case, the DP selects for an nP^{13} which is headed by the overt possessive clitic (24a) or attracts the genitival adjective to its Spec position so the agent θ -role can be assigned (24b). In this case PossP is not projected. I follow Szabolcsi (1987) and assume that the two cases in which possessive structures are found in Bulgarian reside under two different projections. DP checks the genitive case of pronominal and genitival adjectives (cf. (23b) and (24b)). The

explain facts about the attachment of the definite article such as in (14). Second, D-V&G suggest that the functional projection CIP (which holds the clitic possessive) dominates DP. While DP-external movement can account for the surface word-order facts of Bulgarian, the proposal cannot account for either θ -role assignment or the strong preference for definite environments that the dative clitics show.

¹³ Davies and Dubinsky (2001) propose nP as a nominal parallel to vP . If the similarities between the two functional projections hold then one would expect that [Spec, nP] would be the subject position (usually associated with agentive θ -role) in the nominal system. In this case, the whole NP assigns the θ -role to the possessive structure.

dative case of the clitics is checked in the second highest functional projection (cf. (23a) and (24a)):

- (24) a. $[_{DP} \text{nova} [_{D}^0 \text{-ta} [_{NP} t_1 [_{n}^0 \text{mu} [_{NP} t_1 [_{NP} \text{kniga}]]]]]]]$
 new -DEF his book
 ‘his new book’ (the one he wrote)
- b. $[_{DP} \text{Ivanova/negova}_1 [_{D}^0 \text{-ta} [_{NP} t_1 [_{n}^0 \emptyset] [_{NP} t_1 [_{NP} \text{kniga}]]]]]]]$
 Ivan /his -DEF book
 ‘Ivan’s/his book’ (the one he wrote)

When PossP and nP co-exist, the former dominates the latter and only the head of the former, but not that of the latter, can host the dative clitic. Thus, on one hand, we allow for structures with more than one possessive (25), but on the other hand we can explain why two dative clitics cannot appear in the same DP (26)—the second one is not directly selected by DP:

- (25) $[_{DP} \text{Ivanova/negova}_1 [_{D}^0 \text{-ta} [_{PossP} t_1 [_{Poss}^0 \text{i} [_{NP} t_1 [_{n}^0 \emptyset] [_{NP} t_1 [_{NP} \text{kniga}]]]]]]]]]$
 Ivan /his -DEF her book
 ‘her book by Ivan’
- (26) $*[_{DP} \text{nova}_1 [_{D}^0 \text{-ta} [_{PossP} t_1 [_{Poss}^0 \text{mu} [_{NP} t_1 [_{n}^0 \text{i} [_{NP} t_1 [_{NP} \text{kniga}]]]]]]]]]$
 new -DEF his her book
 ‘his her new book’

The other semantic possessors (the PPs) are base-generated as right adjuncts to the head noun as in (27).

- (27) $[_{DP} \text{nova}_1 [_{D} \text{-ta} [_{NP} t_1 \text{kniga} [_{PP} \text{na Ivan}]]]]]$
 new -DEF book of Ivan
 ‘Ivan’s new book’ (the one he either wrote or has)

As an adjunct, the PP does not bear any relation to either PossP or nP and needs not move in syntax. The possessive or agentive θ -role is assigned by the preposition *na* which has either the ‘of’ or ‘by’ reading (consider again (19a) which shows both readings of the preposition).

7. Conclusion

This paper proposes that Bulgarian DP shows evidence for the existence of a functional projection between NP and DP which is headed by the dative clitic. We saw both syntactic and semantic evidence that the possessive clitic is unique among the possessive structures in Bulgarian. While the adjectival and PP possessors have a freer distribution, do not require a definite environment, and can serve as both possessor and agent within the DP, the dative clitic opts for a definite en-

vironment, occurs in DP-second position only, plays only the possessor role in constructions with two or three occurrences of possessives, and can express agentivity only in structures where it is the single possessor.

This gave us a reason to propose that the dative clitic is a strong syntactic possessor. In the cases where the agentive role is drawn during the Numeration, the functional projection PossP is replaced by nP. The light nP then assigns the agent θ -role. The strong bond between the dative clitic and a mandatorily definite environment was explained by the selectional restrictions—the clitic needs to reside in the head of a functional projection directly dominated by DP. This also accounts for the ungrammaticality of two dative clitics in the same DP.

The proposed analysis is a step further into our understanding of the structure of possessives. The work of Szabolcsi (1983) and Abney (1987) establishes our fundamental understanding of the structure of the DP but cannot account for the co-occurrence of determiners and possessors. The clitic-lowering account of Franks (1998) and Embick & Noyer (2001) can explain the distribution of clitics only but not of the other three types of possessives. Finally, Dimitrova-Vulchanova & Giusti's analysis (1999a, b) falls short in explaining both the θ -role assignment with the DP in Bulgarian and the bond between clitic possessives and definite environments.

References

- Abney, Steven. 1987. The English noun phrase in its sentential aspect. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Arnaudova, Olga. 1995. Bulgarian DPs and noun (adjective) movement to D. *Proceedings of the 1995 Annual Conference of the Canadian Linguistic Association*: 1-12.
- Bernstein, Judy. 1993. Topics in the syntax of nominal structure across Romance. Doctoral dissertation, CUNY.
- Bianchi, Valentina. 1992. On the functional structure of the Italian pronominal syntagm. *Rivista di Grammatica Generativa* 17: 39-64.
- Bowers, John. 1991. The syntax and semantics of nominals. *Proceedings from Semantics and Linguistic Theory 1*: 1-30.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1965. *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1970. Remarks on nominalization. In *Readings in English Transformational Grammar*, ed. R Jacobs and P. Rosenbaum. Waltham, Mass: Ginn.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1986. *Barriers*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
- Cinque, G. 1980. On extraction from NP in Italian. *Journal of Italian Linguistics* 5: 47-99.
- Dimitrova-Vulchanova, Mila and Giuliana Giusti. 1999 a. Fragments of Balkan nominal structure. *Studies on the Determiner Phrase*, ed. Artemis Alexiadou and Ch. Wilders. 333-360. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Dimitrova-Vulchanova, Mila and Giuliana Giusti. 1999 b. Possessors in the Bul-

- garian DP. *Topics in South Slavic Syntax and Semantics*, ed. Mila Dimitrova-Vulchanova and Lars Hellan. 163-192. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Dobrovie-Sorin, C. 1987. A propos de la structure du la groupe nominal en Romain. *Rivista de Gramatica Generativa* 12: 123-152.
- Embick & Noyer. 2001. Movement operations after syntax. *Linguistic Inquiry* 32: 4. 555-595.
- Franks, Steven. 2000. Clitics in Slavic. Available at <http://www.indiana.edu/~slavconf/linguistics/frnks.pdf>
- Halpern, Aaron. 1995. *On the Morphology and Placement of Clitics*. CSLI Publications: Stanford.
- Ionin, Tania. 2003. Article semantics in second language acquisition. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Jackendoff, Ray. 1977. *X' Syntax: A Study of Phrase Structure*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Mišeska-Tomić, Olga. 1996. The Balkan Slavic nominal clitics. *Approaching Second: Second Position Clitics and Related Phenomena*, ed. Aaron Halpern and Arnold Zwicky, 511-535. CSLI Publications: Stanford.
- Musan, Renate. 1997. *On the Temporal Interpretation of Noun Phrases*. New York: Garland.
- Nunez del Prado, Zelmira. 1997. Spanish accusative clitics as strong determiners. *Cornell Working Papers in Linguistics* 15: 261-281.
- Pancheva, Roumyana. To appear. Balkan possessive clitics: the problem of case and category. In *Balkan Sprachbund Properties*, ed. Olga Mišeska-Tomič. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Picallo, M. Carme. 1991. Nominals and nominalization in Catalan. *Probus* 3: 279-316.
- Ritter, Elizabeth. 1991. Two functional categories in noun phrases: Evidence from modern Hebrew. *Syntax and Semantics* 26: 37-62.
- Stateva, Penka. 2002. Possessive clitics and the structure of nominal expressions. *Lingua* 112: 8. 647-690.
- Stoyanov, Stoyan, ed. 1983. *Gramatika na suvremennia Bulgarski knijoven ezik. Tom II: Morfologiya. (Grammar of Modern Literary Bulgarian Language. Vol 2: Morphology)*. Sofia, Bulgaria: BAN.
- Szabolcsi, Anna. 1983. The possessor that ran away from home. *The Linguistic Review* 3: 89-102.
- Szabolcsi, Anna. 1987. Functional categories in the noun phrase. In *Approaches to Hungarian: Theories and analyses*, ed. Istvan Kenesei, 167-189. Szeged: JATE.
- Tasseva-Kurktchieva, Mila. To appear. Possessives, Theta Roles, and the Internal Structure of Bulgarian DPs. *Proceedings of FASL 12*, ed. Olga Arnaudova, Wayles Browne, Maria-Luisa Rivero, and Danijela Stojanovic. Ann Arbor, MI: Michigan Slavic Publications.
- Valois, Daniel. 1991 a. The internal syntax of DP and adjective placement in French and English. *NELS* 21: 367-382.
- Valois, Daniel. 1991 b. The internal syntax of DP. Doctoral dissertation, UCLA.