Zuzanna Topolińska
Macedonian Academy of Science and Arts, Skopje
Eleni Bužarovska
University Ss Cyril & Methodius, Skopje

The Balkan Dative revisited

Abstract

The authors are interested in the semantic (= not formal) evolution of the dative case relationship. They carry their analysis in the framework of the anthropocentric case theory and argue that the referent of the dative NP (NP_D) is the second (in the communicative hierarchy) human protagonist of the event (*beneficiens* and/or *experiencer*). Also the D ~ G opposition is analyzed on the semantic plane, with the referent of the NP_G interpreted as the *possessor* in contexts when the *possessor* – *possessum* relation is realized at the level of a NP, and not at the sentential level. The syntactic, adverbal vs. adnominal position is understood as the basic, definitional difference between NP_D and NP_G at the formal plane.

Keywords:
dative, genitive, anthropocentricity, beneficiens, experiencer, possessor, possessum

Streszczenie

O datiwie w językach Bałkanów raz jeszcze

Autorki są zainetersowane semantyczną (= nie formalną) ewolucją datywnego stosunku przypadkowego. Prowadzą swoją analizę w ramach antropocentrycznej teorii przypadka i dowodzą, że referentem datywnej grupy imiennej (NP_D) jest drugi (w hierarchii komunikatywnej) człowiek – uczestnik zdarzenia, o którym mowa (beneficiens, adresat...).

Przedmiotem analizy jest również opozycja: G ~ D; referent NP_G jest interpretowany jako possessor w kontekstach, kiedy relacja: possessor ~ possessum jest realizowana na poziomie grupy imiennej, a nie zdania.

Pozycja syntaktyczna, adwerbalna vs. adnominalna, jest przedstawiona jako podstawowa, definicyjna różnica między NP_D i NP_G na płaszczyźnie formalnej.

Słowa klucze:
datiw, genetiw, antropocentryczność, beneficiens, patiens, possessor, possessum

Classical grammar taught us that the case is a morphological form of a noun. Our actual reconstruction of Indo-European tells us that it was a "synthetic" language with a rich nominal inflection, but says nothing about the functional load of particular case forms. The literature treating the process of deconstruction of the inherited case paradigm in

Balkan languages also focuses on the formal aspect of the process. We have numerous studies discussing the internal and external phonetic and morphological factors responsible for the reduction and/or for the total loss of morphological case paradigm in particular languages. We shall concentrate here on the question whether and how the factors of the higher, pragmatic and semantic level did influence the restructuring of the Balkan nominal systems. In the center of our interest is the semantic motivation and formal evolution of the morpho-syntactic construction labeled here as the dative case-relationship and representing the continuation of what is known as the Indo-European dative case.

Among the existing case theories – aside from different universal inventories of the semantic roles for argument expressions – there is only one founded on a uniform semantic principle: the so called localistic case theory. We are developing our discussion in the frame of the anthropocentric case theory which seems to accommodate and to interpret better all that we know about the evolution of the Balkan nominal systems (cf. Topolińska 1996, 2008). The theory is primarily based on Slavic facts. It applies to the "core cases": N(ominative), A(ccusative), D(ative), I(nstrumental) and G(enetive), and says that on the sentential level prototypical N is the case of the first (in the semantic hierarchy) human protagonist of the event (process, state, etc.), prototypical A is the case of the first inanimate object involved in the event, prototypical D is the case of the second human protagonist involved, prototypical I – the case of the second inanimate object, and prototypical G – representative of N (and D) at the NP-level. Peripheral cases, such as the Locative, the Ablative, and other stay mainly in the domain of the localistic motivation, which does not mean that there is no overlap between the anthropocentric and the localistic functional zone.

On the surface, or morphosyntactic level a case-relationship is understood as a syntactic relation of grammatical dependence between the NP and its grammatical controller, be it the constitutive predicative expression or – as in case of the genitive NP – another NP functioning as argumental expression.

It follows from what was said above that we shall concentrate on the opposition: N vs. G and D vs. G which means: on the cases primarily marked as /+ human/. Their second relevant semantic / pragmatic feature is that statistically nine times out of ten they appear in the discourse as /+ definite/.

Below we discuss some sentential patterns from present-day Standard Macedonian (which has the reputation of the "most Balkan" among the Balkan languages), illustrating the above described prototypical use of the NP$_D$.

On a morphosyntactic level Standard Macedonian distinguishes four different dative constructions: two for NPs with substantival heads and two for NPs with personal pronouns as a head. In NPs with substantival heads the pattern depends on the / +/- definite/ character of the NP in question. For /- definite/ NPs we have grammatical preposition _на_ + the so called dictionary form of the lexeme in question (i.e. _на човек, на жена, на дете, на луѓе_); for /+ definite/ NPs we have an indiscrete string composed of pronominal dative clitic ... grammatical preposition _на_ + the articled dictionary form (i.e. _му...на човекот, ѝ...на жената, му...на детето, им... на луѓето_; as can be seen, the form of the pronominal clitic depends on the grammatical gender of the head. In NPs with pronominal heads the pattern depends on whether

they stand under rhetorical stress or not. Outside of stress we have <u>clitics only</u> (cf. *дај ми!, му се спие,* etc.), under stress sequences of the type: <u>clitic + *full form*</u> (cf. *дај ми мене!, нему му се спие,* etc.). In the plural and with the so called personal pronouns of the 3rd person the morphological difference between the dative form and the *casus generalis* (= the old accusative form) is still preserved, albeit optional.

Here are some typical patterns with referents of NP$_D$s characterized as 'personal protagonist, second in the communicative hierarchy'.

Pattern 1: transfer schema/indirect dependency of the dative argument
(1) NP$_N$ + Vf + NP$_D$ + NP$_A$
(1**a**): In the position of the predicative expression (i.e. *verbum finitum* – Vf) appear verbs expressing change of possessor (such as *даде, дарува, предава, врачува, (од)зема, (у)краде,* etc.); the referent of the NP$_N$ appears as *agens,* the referent of the NP$_D$ as *experiencer / beneficiens,* and the referent of the NP$_A$ as *patiens/object,* cf. *Петре на Ана ѝ врачува книга, Мајката му го подаде јаболкото на детето, Крадците ми грабнаа чанта, Некој на човекот му го украде новчаникот,* etc.

In another variant of the same pattern the constitutive verb expresses some verbal contact between the referent of the NP$_N$ (*agens*) who is in control, the referent of the NP$_D$ who appears as *beneficiens* of the contact, and the referent of the NP$_A$ as *patiens / object,* cf. *Мајката му раскажува приказна на детето, Професорот им ја објаснува задачата на студентите, Директорот им го претстави новиот учител на учениците* – it is worth emphasizing that the characteristic /+human/, as in the last example, does not influence the passive role of the referent of the NP$_A$.

(1**b**) This pattern is formed from verbs that implicate two human participants: the agent and the recipient. The object of transfer is coded in the meaning of the verb, which means that it is not overtly expressed. The verb can often be decomposed into *give* + nominalized event (e.g., *resist – give resistance to*). The nominative agent exerts control over the recipient dative via transfer of physical, mental or verbal signals (*помага/help, советува/advise, се одмаздува/avenge*), emotion (*завидува/envy, се восхитува/admire*), state of the mind (*одолева/resist, се спротиставува/oppose*).

(1**c**) Pattern 1 accommodates the so called *pseudo-dative* constructions (1c). They are characterized by the presence of a dative referent not implicated by the verb. They are usually formed with verbs of creation and some abstract verbs which allow addition of a beneficiary argument to their propositional frame. The dative clitic in Macedonian and genitive in Greek convey the meaning that this optional participant benefited from the activity.

In contrast to canonical transfer event represented by pattern 1, the pseudo-dative construction codes a complex event. It consists of two sub-events: an event of creation involving two main participants (the agent and the patient) and the subsequent transfer event involving a third participant, the recipient. The dative case signals that its referent being the recipient of the accusative object has benefited from the event. The secondary status of the transfer event is syntactically marked by the adjunct function of the dative entity; hence the dative clitic 'me' in the following examples is not an indirect object: *ми направи кафе, ми отвори врата, ми изгради куќа*.

In pseudo-dative constructions possession is not overtly communicated, but implied. This can be seen from the ungrammaticality of the second example:

Му изградив куќа но тој не живее во неа (benefit)
*Му дадов книга но тој не ја зеде. (possession denied)

We presume that pseudo-dative constructions function as a semantic bridge between pattern 1 and pattern 2.

Pattern 2: possessive dative
(2) $NP_N + Vf + NP_D + NP_A / NP_L$
In this pattern the NP_D (labeled often as a "possessive dative") refers to the person who is the *possessor* of the *object* referred to in the NP_A. Sentences of this type should be distinguished from constructions where the *possessor* of the *object* is treated not as a protagonist of the corresponding event, but only as a means of identifying of the *object / possessum.* Cf. *Лекарот ѝ ја завитка раката на Ана* as opposed to *Лекарот ја завитка раката на Ана,* or *Учениците му влегоа во канцеларијата* as opposed to *Учениците влегоа во неговата канцеларија,* etc. Sentences with the demoted *possessor* are built after the pattern: $NP_N + Vf + (NP_A + NP_G) / (NP_L + NP_G)$) – the *possessor* is realized as an NP_G dependent from the NP_A / NP_L referring to the *object / possessum.* There is an important difference between the patterns (1) and (2): in (2) the NP_D is not implied by the predicate.

Pattern 3: agentless constructions
(3) (a) $NP_D + Vf / (Vcopula + nomen)$ or
      (b) $NP_D + Vf_{pass} + $ subjunctive clause
These are reduced patterns, *agentless* constructions. It is the predicate itself that stands at the top of the communicative hierarchy, while the referent of the NP_D has a secondary role. In other words: the realization of the respective process, action, etc. does not depend on the free will of the unique human protagonist. We have two different situations here: (3a) – the predicate expresses some physiological sensation, cf. *Ми се спие, Ми студи, Ми е жал* (as opposed to the "basic" hierarchy in *Сакам да спијам, Се смрзнувам, Жалам*) – the referent of the NP_D appears as *experiencer* of the respective sensation; in (3b) the predicate is in a passive mode and the referent appears as *patiens,* while the position for an NP_N (with a referent functioning as *agens/ controller,* etc.) is grammatically blocked, cf. *На Петре му е забрането да..., Ми се наложува да..., Не ни е дозволено да...*

Pattern 4: *dativus ethicus*
This construction is characterized by a special use of the dative clitics of personal pronouns in expressively marked utterances by promoting the protagonists of the speech event to the role of protagonist of the narrated / spoken of event. Cf. *Да си ми жив и здрав!, Ала си ми пораснал!, И токму тогаш тој да ти дојде..., И Ане да ти ја скрши ногата!* It goes without saying that the clitics are not implied and not grammatically dependent on the corresponding predicative expressions.

To the above inventory two characteristic Old Church Slavic constructions should be added:

(5) *dativus absolutus,* i.e. a transform of a subordinated temporal clause, cf. *sъšedъšu že jemu sъ gory vъ slědъ jego ido narodi mnozi* (Mt VIII 1), *sъpęštemъ že člověkomъ pride vragъ jego* (Mt XIII 25) (quoted after Moszyński 1984: 297).

(6) *dativus cum infinitivo,* i.e. a transform of a complementary clause, cf. *podobajetъ bo simъ prě`de byti* (Lk XXI 9), *Dastъ jimъ vlastъ čędomъ božijemъ byti* (Jn I 12) (Moszyński 1984: 297).

Both (5) and (6) demonstrate that in transforms with blocked nominative position it is an NP_D which refers to the sole human protagonist.

It is known that the first step toward the disintegration of the Balkan morphological case paradigm was the D = G syncretism. Thus, to complete the description of the Macedonian situation we will first answer the question whether and where the present day exponents of these two case relations overlap. The basic distinction which *ex definitione* can not be eliminated is the fact that the dative relation is realized at the sentential level, while the genitive relation is bound with the noun phrase. The "grammatical" preposition *na* appears as the main lexical exponent of both cases connoting *casus generalis.* Beside *na* in some genitive constructions where the *possessor* can be interpreted as a *source* (but never in the dative constructions), the preposition *od* also appears marking an *ablative* relation. An obligatory component of the /+ definite/ NP_Ds is the corresponding pronominal clitic absent in genitive constructions with the exclusion of a small number of kinship terms expressing genitive with the "dative" enclitic. Pronominal (and in some cases also substantival) genitive relation can be also expressed with the aid of possessive pronouns and/or possessive adjectives. Then, as mentioned above, in the pronominal paradigm some stressed dative forms still function without *na.* Consequently, as can be seen, the two case relations are formally distinguished not only at the syntactic, but – in numerous contexts – also at the lexical and/or morphological level.

The status of the **Bulgarian** NP_Ds can be construed in comparison to the Macedonian situation and reduced to the inventory of differences between the two languages. Patterns (1) to (4), more or less frequent, exist in all the Slavic languages. Differences between Macedonian and Bulgarian are mainly of a formal character. Generally speaking, aside from the basic syntactic "external" difference between the sentence as a frame for the dative and noun phrase as a frame for the genitive, other differences are less numerous, or – in other words – there is a greater overlap of lexical and/or morphological means in expressing the two relevant case relations. An inventory of relevant formal differences between the Bulgarian and the Macedonian NP_Ds (and NP_Gs) includes the following points:

– in Bulgarian the analytic tendencies are more advanced; the *na*-construction dominates in the pronominal paradigm; the old dative stressed forms are evaluated as archaic; the "accusative" clitics are expanding in our pattern (3);

– the dative enclitics represent frequent and important means for expressing the genitive case relation; no semantic restrictions of the pattern are known;

– there are no grammaticalized pronominal replicas in the /+ definite/ NP$_D$s with substantival heads; the "object doubling" is a stylistic phenomenon, depends on topicalization and on expressive markedness of the discourse.

Balkan Romance. On the semantic plane all our key patterns exist in the three Balkan Romance idioms: (Daco)Rumanian, Arumanian and Meglenorumanian.

On the formal plane the three idioms present an escalation from the "synthetical" to the "analytical" D-G constructions. The "synthetical" solution represents a post-position of the old dative article form, and "analytical" markers are prepositions and the proclise (instead of the enclise) of the reduced, non-inflected article form; going from north to south the analytical constructions prevail. The borderline between the enclise and the proclise of the article divides the main Arumanian areal (as in Kruševo dialect) and the southern Faršeroti dialect. In the latter, the postposition appears only with demonstrative pronouns (cf. Markoviḱ 2007: 77). It should be mentioned that in some peripheral West-Macedonian dialects the old dative form of some personal names is still alive; at the beginning of the XXth century also some NP$_D$s and NP$_G$s (not syncretized!) with postposed inflected article forms were registered.

Since it is the article dative form which functions as the dative ending, in all the Balkan Romance systems there is a basic difference between the /+definite/ and /- definite/ NP$_D$s.

As regards the D ~ G opposition, aside from the main positional difference (D – adverbal ~ G – adnominal) there is the regular doubling of all the /+ definite/ NP$_D$s with dative clitics, as in Macedonian.

In kinship terms – one more parallel with the Macedonian situation – the Arumanian D=G form can be marked as /+definite/ not only by the article, but also by a postposed dative "possessive" clitic. Also in Arumanian in the functional zone of the Genitive, beside the grammaticalized "dative" preposition *a,* we find some *di*-constructions corresponding to Macedonian "ablative" *od*-constructions.

In Albanian – from the point of view of our analysis – the main problem is presented by the different organization of the system of personal pronouns. Namely, (a) the category of adjectival possessive pronouns does not exist, and (b) there is one clitic in the case paradigm of the personal pronouns of the 1st and 2nd person. Consequently, our pattern (4) and the category of the ethical dative as such is non-existent, and in the pattern (3) – where the NPs with pronominal heads are considerably more frequent than those with substantival heads – the position of the NP$_D$s is weakened.

Otherwise, the position of the dative case relationship is stable and the status of the referent of the NP$_D$ as the second human protagonist of the event is confirmed as in patterns (1) to (3). The morphological dative form is preserved, the formal difference between the NP$_D$s and NP$_G$s is guaranteed by the obligatory presence of the proclitical "little article" *a* in NP$_G$s; /+ definite/ NP$_D$s regularly appear with pronominal replicas.

The morphological ablative form and a part of its functions are also preserved, including the *source*-role, which extends over the genitive functional zone.

In light of the aforementioned Slavic and Romance situation, it is worth emphasizing that the clitical possessive pronouns – otherwise appearing in enclyse – can also precede their substantival heads if the latter are kinship terms – the phenomenon is evaluated as archaic.

In **Greek** the loss of morphological dative case triggered the expansion of genitive relation from phrasal to sentential level. The adnominal genitive is restricted to phrasal level when coding possession. The genitive enclitics referring to the possessor follow the nominal head, the *possessum* (*o filos mou*/my friend). Their distribution has no semantic and grammatical restrictions with respect to the nominal head, as opposed to Macedonian where the dative enclitics are used only with singular nouns denoting kinship terms. The peculiarity of Greek is that the genitive case, assuming an adverbal function became isofunctional with the dative in Southern Greek dialects and the standard. Horrocks (1997: 216) points out during the Byzantine period the use of dative case in spoken language became restricted to the most formal speech of educated urban population and its functions were taken over by the accusative or genitive, and prepositional constructions. In indirect object uses the choice between the accusative in the northern dialects and the genitive in the southern dialects occurred in later period.

The four dative morpho-syntactic patterns in Macedonian correspond to the same number of genitive patterns in Greek but pattern 3 has a very limited distribution.

Pattern 1. Pattern 1a is found with verbal predicates that convey a transfer of the accusative patient argument from the nominative agent to the dative recipient. As a result of the transfer the object moves to the recipient's sphere of control thus becoming an object in recipient's possession. Thus the recipient acquires an additional role of a possessor. The transfer representation together with the dative morphology signal that the "possessor" recipient has become a potential agent in another future event of possession: *I Maria tu edose to vivlio* /Maria gave him the book implying that the recipient has the book.

The same syntactic model can be used with verbs of taking: *I Maria tu pire to vivlio* /Maria took the book from him implying that he does not have the book.

In standard Greek the transfer representation is realized by two syntactic variants: synthetic and prepositional. The choice depends on how the recipient participant is formalized: by an NP bearing morphological genitive case or by an allative prepositional phrase that consists of *se* + accusative noun (*casus generalis*). Both function as indirect objects:
  (a) synthetic: *O Kostas edose tis Annas to vivlio*. (Gen) Kosta gave Anna the book.
  (b) analytic: *O Kostas edose to vivlio stin Anna*. (PP) Kosta gave the book to Anna.

The patterns with substantival heads depend on the referential status of the nominal, as it is the case in Macedonian. Indefinite and specified NPs make use of the grammatical preposition *se* + NP in *casus generalis*, whereas with definite NPs *se* cliticizes onto the accusative definite article (*se+ton= ston*) in proclise. As a result, the prepositional strategy employs an inventory of six fused accusative case markers signaling dependency and definiteness; moreover, each agrees with its nominal complement in gender and number (*ston, stin, sto* vs. *stus, stis, sta*) as in the following example:

O Kostas edose to vivlio ston andra/stus andres.
Kosta gave the book to the man/to the men.

Other prepositions do not cliticise, as for instance, the benefactive *ya* (for); *ya* also never occurs with a pronominal dative clitic:

O Petros (*tis) ekane kafe ya tin Maria. Peter made coffee for Maria.

This indicates that only *se* is grammaticalized into a dative marker, whereas the benefactive *ya* preserves its prepositional properties.

There is dialectal variation in the use of dative. Thus, in the Northern dialects the accusative case markers are used to denote indirect dependency of definite nouns:

Ton milisa ton Kosta. I talked to Kosta.

It seems that there is no functional difference between the synthetic (case marked) and analytic (prepositional) strategy in coding the human recipient. Nevertheless, two characteristics should be pointed out:

a. The availability of two strategies in Greek allows for so called "dative shift" but with certain restrictions on the realization of the recipient in the indirect object position: it can be realized only as a PP if it follows the patient (NP_{ACC}), but both variants are possible if the recipient precedes the patient (NP_{ACC}):

O Kostas edose to vivlio (Acc) *stin Anna* (PP) /**tis Annas.* (Gen)
O Kostas edose tis Annas (Gen)/*stin Anna* (PP) *to vivlio.* (Acc)

This restriction helps to avoid ambiguity as to whether the referent of the genitive NP following the accusative object is a recipient or a possessor. As the following example illustrates the referent of the genitive may have both interpretations:

O Kostas edose to vivlio tis Annas. (Gen)
Kosta gave Anna the book. Kosta gave (to someone) Anna's book.

Only the use of a pronominal replica of the genitive NP resolves the ambiguity in favor of the recipient reading:

O Kostas tis edose to vivlio tis Annas. Kosta gave Anna the book.

b. The second property refers to the use of double object clitics with definite genitive NPs. It has already been mentioned that genitive NPs in indirect object position are in complementary distribution with prepositional phrases. However, the Greek genitive adverbal clitics co-occur only with definite genitive NPs. In other words, a pronominal clitic never precedes ("doubles") a prepositional phrase:

O Kostas tis edose tis Annas to vivlio. (Gen) Kosta gave Anna the book.
O Kostas *tis edose to vivlio *s-tin* Anna. (PP) Kosta gave the book to Anna.

Moreover, genitive proclitics are optional as they are used to create a contrastive meaning. In this respect, pronominal replicas in Greek (and Bulgarian) function as a pragmatic topicalization strategy in contrast to their grammatical function in Macedonian and Arumanian. However, clitic doubling in Macedonian is a feature of the standard language reflecting the grammaticalization of the optional clitic use in the dialects.

Pattern 2 represents the possessive dative which in Greek is expressed by genitive clitics preceding the verb. The clitic refers to the animate possessor realized as a genitive NP (isofunctional with a dative NP in Balkan Slavic) used with specified (a) and definite reference (b):
  (a) *Mias filis* (G) *mu tis* (G) *klepsane to tilefono*. A friend of mine got her telephone stolen.
  (b) *Tis Marias* (G) *tis* (G) *klepsane to tilefono*. Maria got her telephone stolen.

The use of genitive clitics is very similar to the use of dative clitics in Macedonian, though the Greek clitics seem to have a more narrow distribution because they are restricted to possessive contexts. The following minimal pair differs in the semantics of possession due to the metaphorical extension of the verb *figo* (leave). Only the second example is acceptable as the verb *figo* implies that the pain in my body is closer to my personal sphere (or more "possessive") than the train I travel with:
  *Mu efige to treno. My train left. *Mu efige o ponos*. The pain is gone.

Double marking of possession is also possible (Mitkovska 2005), though adverbal clitics (with objects in dative's sphere of control) convey affectedness rather than pure possession. This can be illustrated by an example form a folk song in which both adnominal (possessive) and adverbal clitics are used: *ke mu 'pese to fesi mu ke i funda tu spathiu mu*. And my cap fell off (to me) and the tassel of my sword.

Pattern 3
The agentless constructions with the information focus on the predicate are less numerous in Greek. The verbal predicate expresses a subjective state of the referent (a) or the speaker's subjective evaluation of the referent's state (b); this is coded by the genitive clitic and accompanied by a co-referential genitive NP in emphatic contexts (never a PP).
  (a) *Tis Annas den tis aresi to forema*. Anna does not like the dress.
  (b) *Tis Annas den tis pai to forema*. The dress does not suit Anna.

The most common verbs are: *pai*/suits, *aresi*/like, *terjazi*/fits, *armozi*/siutable, *fenete*/look, *lipi*/lack, *ftani*/be enough, *simveni*/happen, *tiheni*/happens by chance, *miazi*/resembles, *meni*/remain, *vgeni*/comes out, *erhete na*/be about to, etc.

Dative constructions with nominal and adjectival predicates do not exist in Greek in contrast to Macedonian ones: *ми е срам*/I am ashamed, *ми е жал*/I am sorry, *ми е е тешко*/I feel sick, *ми е убаво*/I feel good, etc.

Greek also lacks constructions that express experiencer's inclination for a certain physiological sensation or an urge/lack of desire for a certain activity. In Macedonian, this pattern, inherited from Slavic reflexive construction, is very productive: *ми се спие*/I feel sleepy, *не ми се работи*/I don't feel like working.

The third subtype of agentless constructions includes passives with a demoted agent where the clitic denotes the second participant – the recipient of the message: *му е забрането*/it is forbidden to him. Greek in such cases makes use of mediopassive verbs with the genitive proclitic: *tu apogorevete i isodos*/ *му се забранува влез*/ he is forbidden to enter.

Pattern 4

The so called *dativus ethicus* clitics do not constitute part of the argument structure of the verb. They function as pragmatic markers expressing speaker's empathy for the participant of the situation. Their inventory is reduced to a single marker: the 1st person singular genitive clitic *mu*, while the use of the marker *su* (2nd person sing) is disputable.

Here are some examples: *Ti mu kanis*? Што ми правиш? *Na su zisi to pedi su*! Да е жив син ти (lit.)

As a summary of our previous discussion on the differences between the Greek and the Macedonian several important points should be made:

– the two relevant case relations are expressed by similar syntactic patterns but different morphological means. Taking in consideration the fact that Greek has three cases (N, G, A) case analyticity is less advanced in Greek than in Balkan Slavic and Arumanian.

– in Greek the dative case was replaced by the morphological genitive case at the sentence level. The decline of dative started in the Hellenistic period when its functions were gradually taken over either by prepositional constructions or another case: accusative in the northern dialects and genitive in the south. According to Horrocks (1997: 216) during the Byzantine period the use of dative case in spoken language became restricted to formal speech, whereas the final choice between the genitive or accusative of indirect object took place in later period. In Modern Greek indirect dependency can be expressed synthetically (genitive in the standard) and analytically by (i) a locative preposition *se* with specific oblique NPs, and (ii) six case markers (fused se+ accusative articles) with definite oblique NPs.

– the genitive case relations are expressed by the genitive enclitics. This pattern represents the most common and unmarked way of marking possession;

– similarly to Bulgarian, the genitive pronominal replicas of the /+definite/ NP$_D$s with substantival heads are optional because object doubling in Greek serves stylistic purposes.

Conclusion

The analysis confirmed the status of the dative referent as a second human protagonist of the event and/or as in our pattern (3) – "absolute" second in the communicative hierarchy, i.e. subordinated to the relation constituting the event. Confirmed is also

the (fundamental for the Balkan nominal "case-paradigm") opposition between NPs with identified and non-identified referents. The /+ human/ and /+ definite/ character of the prototypical referent (*beneficiens* and/or *experiencer* as opposed to *possessor*) appears as a semantic base for the D=G syncretism. Such an arrangement is the most explicit in the Slavic variant of the Balkan nominal system.

It seems that the location of the border-line between the syntactic (case) relationships with the anthropocentric motivation and those with the localistic motivation follows basic criteria in the typological evaluation of nominal systems in languages with the basic Verb ~ Noun opposition. As regards the status of the dative relation and its means of expressing, it would be worth researching the functional zone of the "secondary" (= not implied by the constitutive predicate) NPs whose referents can be defined as *targets,* as in Macedonian *X му go дае на Z Y за R,* cf. *Ане на Пеɯре му даде книɡа за Маре,* etc.

The formal means of expressing the 'Balkan' dative relation (i.e. the structure of the NP_D) differs from language to language. As usual in Balkan linguistics, the picture would be fuller and more transparent if it was based on dialect materials. The majority of formal differences is a corollary of the influence of the two old classical languages, Greek (with the formal D ~ G opposition resolved in favor of G), and Latin (with the opposition resolved in favor of D). The Greek influence dominates in the eastern part of the peninsula, and the Latin (Romance) influence – the western. An interesting development in this connection is presented by the Slavic *dativus absolutus* as the equivalent of the Greek *genetivus absolutus,* and the Latin *ablativus absolutus.* Very interesting is the role of pronominal clitic in the "Balkan dative history" – they are always in the centre of the process and appear in all the structural variants of NP_Ds.

But why was the formal D ~ G opposition in Greek resolved in favor of G? In other words, why did the morphological dative case in Greek assume the form of the genitive?

Although such a substitution is a sign of a relatively close functional relationship between the two cases the genitive marking of the dative should be attributed to a complex interplay of structural and semantic factors.

1. Functional load of the Greek dative and paradigmatic levelling

The dative in Ancient Greek did not correspond closely to the dative in Latin. The Greek dative was more comprehensive – it expressed the locative and the instrumental functions of the Latin ablative. Generally speaking, the Greek dative case was a mixture of indirect object, locative and instrumental functions (Tsigou 1996). As the language moved towards analyticity, the "overloaded" dative case transferred its adverbial functions onto prepositional constructions, and the indirect object function either onto the genitive/accusative case or prepositional constructions. This was facilitated by phonetic processes whereby dative ending eroded rendering opaque formal distinctions between cases (cf. Barđdal et al.). Due to phonological changes, Greek dative case endings in some declensions collapsed with the accusative (Ilievski 1988: 101).

On the other hand, the existence of the genitive case in the Greek pronominal system (N, G, D, A) in contrast to Slavic (N, D, A) reinforced the position of the

genitive. The morphological genitive case had a stable semantic status in the Greek pronominal case system so it could assume the function of the multifunctional dative. Moreover, the phonetic resemblance between the Greek masculine genitive inflection (-u) and the Slavic dative of the same stem (-u) has increased the use of the possessive dative at the expense of the genitive (Ilievski 1988: 106).

2. Semantic affinity of Dative and Genitive resulting in a formal merge

Both cases in their semantic structure have the features /+human/, /+definite/, and /+affected/. They are subject to the animacy restrictions since only animates can be affected. The second human participant is affected by the activity of the first so that /+affected/ feature is characteristic for a recipient, beneficiary, or a possessor.

The difference between the two cases lies in the kind of possession, which means that the genitive case denotes possession, the dative only implies it. While the genitive case prototypically codes the possessor of an inanimate object, the dative case expresses the implicature of possession created in the context of the transfer schema. We may speculate that the choice of the genitive for marking a recipient strengthened the possession implicature of the transfer relation. Thus, the conceptualization of the second human participant is different in Balkan Slavic and Greek. The dative marking suggests that the second referent being the second partner in the transfer event is the affected participant. On the other hand, the genitive marking suggests that the affectedness is "total": the second human participant is presented not as a partner but as the object of the transfer event.

Bibliography

Atanasov Petar (1990): *Le mégléno-roumain de nos jours.* (= Balkan Archiv 7). — Hamburg: H. Buske.

Gogolewski Stanisław (1982): *Kategoria przypadka w słowiańskich i romańskich językach ligi bałkańskiej.* — Łódź: Acta Universitatis Lodziensis.

Gołąb Zbigniew (1984): *The Arumanian Dialect of Kruševo in SR Macedonia SFR Yugoslavia.* — Skopje: MANU.

Horrocks Geoffrey C. (1997): *Greek: A history of the language and its speakers.* — London–New York: Longmans.

Mindak Jolanta, Sawicka Irena (1993): *Zarys gramatyki języka albańskiego.* — Warszawa: Slawistyczny Ośrodek Wydawniczy.

Moszyński Leszek (2006): *Wstęp do filologii słowiańskiej.* — Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

Newmark Leonard, Hubbard Philip, Prifti Peter (1982): *Standard Albanian, A Reference Grammar for Students.* — Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Renzi Lorenzo (con la collaborazione di Giampaolo Salvi) (1987): *Nuova introduzione alla filologia romanza.* — Bologna: Mulino.

Topolińska Zuzanna (1996): Anthropocentric Language Theory as Organizing Principle of the Slavic Case System. — *Biuletyn Polskiego Towarzystwa Językoznawczego* 52, 57–72.

Tsigou Maria (1996): The Evolution of the Dative in Greek. — *Cahiers de l'Institut de linguistique de Louvain* 22 (3–4/1–2), 211–215.

Илиевски Петар Хр. (1988): Учеството на грчкиот и балканскиот латински во развојот на старословемнската деклинација. — [In:] *Балканолошки лингвистички студии со посебен осврт кон историскиот развој на македонскиот јазик*; Скопје: ИМЈ, 99–113.

Марковиќ Марјан (2007): *Ароманскиот и македонскиот говор од охридско-струшкиот регион во балкански контекст.* — Скопје: МАНУ.

Митковска Лилјана (2005): *Изразување на посесивност на ниво на именската синтагма во македонскиот и во англискиот јазик*. — Докторска дисератција, Скопје: УКИМ.

Тополињска Зузана (1988): Дативниот однос и кирилометодиевското јазично наследство. — [In:] *Кирило-методиевскиот (старословенскиот период и кирилометодиевската традиција во Македонија*; Скопје: МАНУ, 53–59.

Тополињска Зузана (2008): *Развитокот на граматичките категории*. (= Македонски – Полски. Граматичка конфронтација 7). — Скопје: МАНУ.

Electronic sources

Barðdal Jóhanna, Kulikov Leonid: *Case in Decline*, http://ling.uib.no/IECASTP/CaseInDecline.pdf.

Blake Barry: *Features of Case*, http://www.latrobe.edu.au/linguistics/LaTrobePapersinLinguistics/Vol%2005/02Blake.pdf.