

LILJANA MITKOVSKA  
University of Skopje

## ON THE POSSESSIVE INTERPRETATION OF THE INDIRECT OBJECT IN MACEDONIAN

The subject of interest in this paper are the Macedonian indirect object (IO) constructions which acquire possessive interpretation, i.e. constructions in which a possessive relationship between the IO referent and one or more other participants in the predication is implied. The syntactic-semantic conditions that allow the possessive interpretation are investigated, as well as the relationship between the possessive component and the meaning of indirect affectedness. The analysis shows that both components of meaning are present in certain constructions. Contextual and/or pragmatic circumstances may weaken one of them which results in the other one coming into focus. Although there are constructions in which the possessive component prevails the conclusion is that the possessive IO construction is not a fully grammaticalized construction in Macedonian, but remains a contextual variation of the adverbial IO construction

### 1. Introduction

In this paper the indirect object (IO) possessive construction in Macedonian is examined. This construction implies a possessive relationship between the IO participant and one or more participants in the predication. Traditionally it is called the *Dativus Simpatheticus* (DS). The following basic assumptions provide the foundation for the ideas presented here.

The IO constructions are a polysemous category exhibiting a number of related meanings (Wierzbicka 1986, Langacker 1991, Rudzka-Ostyn 1996). The most central among the meanings is: recipient of concrete and abstract objects and recipient of effects (experiencer). The term *IO component* will be used for all these meanings.

Possession is understood as a complex notion, involving a broad array of relationships clustered around the prototypes: ownership, part whole and kinship relationships (Langacker 1991 and 1995, Topolińska 1985; 1997).

According to recent theories on grammaticalization (Traugott 1988, Sweetser 1990, Heine et al. 1991, Hopper and Traugott 1993) a contextually inferred meaning can be spread to other contexts by analogy. What starts as contextual and conversational implicature can be conventionalized through contextual manipulation and metaphor. The

implications of possessive relationships in an IO construction are no surprise since the dative and genitive are conceptually very close. As Topolińska (1996:14-15) points out, their semantic characteristics overlap considerably, even though they are not equally motivated. Furthermore, both the dative and the genitive are used to encode the second human participant in the predication and it can often be the same referent in the situation. In fact, the conceptual transfer of a language form from dative into genitive has been attested in many languages (Heine et al. 1991:167).

On the basis of a large number of examples of DS, both from spoken and written Macedonian, a conclusion can be reached that in most cases the IO sense component and the possessive one co-exist. Contextual and pragmatic circumstances can weaken one of them and this results in the other coming into focus. The aim of this paper is to investigate the syntactic-semantic conditions that allow the possessive interpretation in the IO construction and how the possessive sense component relates to the IO component.

## 2. Syntactic-semantic environments in which the possessive interpretation of the IO occurs in Macedonian

Almost any verb in Macedonian can enter into a construction with the IO which expresses a possessive relationship. According to the role of the participant in subject position three groups of constructions can be differentiated:

1) Another entity, a third party, is encoded in subject position and the Possessed is encoded in the Direct Object (DO) and/ or in the Locative Phrase (LOC).

- (1) Protivnicite        **nu**        ja        zapalija        *kolata*.  
 opponents<sub>SUBJ</sub>    he<sub>IO.CL</sub>    she<sub>DO.CL</sub>    burn<sub>3.PL.PAST</sub>    car<sub>DEF.DO</sub>  
 The opponents set his car on fire.
- (2) Kradecot        **mi**        go        izvadil        parichnikot    od    *torbata*.  
 thief<sub>DEF.SUBJ</sub>    I<sub>IO.CL</sub>    he<sub>DO.CL</sub>    pull<sub>3.SG.PAST</sub>    wallet<sub>DEF.DO</sub>    from    bag<sub>DEF</sub>  
 The thief has pulled my wallet out of my bag.

2) The Possessed is in subject position (example 3 and 5) and there could even be a second object of possession, belonging to the same possessor, coded in the DO, LOC or Instrumental Phrase (INST) (example 4).

- (3) *Kuk'ata*        **im**        se        zapali.  
 house<sub>DEF.SUBJ</sub>    they<sub>IO.CL</sub>    REFL<sub>CL</sub>    set on fire  
 Their house got on fire.
- (4) *Kosata*        **mu**        se        krena        na    *glavata*.  
 hair<sub>DEF.SUBJ</sub>    he<sub>IO.CL</sub>    REFL<sub>CL</sub>    raise<sub>3.SG.PAST</sub>    on    head<sub>DEF</sub>  
 His hair stood on end [on his head].
- (5) *Ochite*        **i**        se        zeleni.  
 eyes<sub>DEF.SUBJ</sub>    she<sub>IO.CL</sub>    AUX<sub>3.PL</sub>    green<sub>ADJ</sub>  
 Her eyes are green.

3) The Possessor is in subject position (these are reflexive constructions) and the Possessed is coded in DO, LOC or INST, or a combination.

- (6) Si go povrediv okoto so noktot.  
 REFL<sub>IO,CL</sub> he<sub>DO,CL</sub> hurt<sub>1.SG,PAST</sub> eye<sub>DEF,DO</sub> with nail<sub>DEF</sub>  
 I hurt my eye with my nail.
- (7) Ana si gi stavi kluchevite vo  
 Ana<sub>SUBJ</sub> REFL<sub>IO,CL</sub> they<sub>DO,CL</sub> put<sub>3.SG,PAST</sub> keys<sub>DEF,DO</sub> in  
 dzebot i zamina.  
 pocket<sub>DEF</sub> and left  
 She put the keys in her pocket and left.

What follows is a detailed analysis of these three types of constructions.

### 2.1. Third party participant in subject position

In the first type the third party participant in subject position should be a potent and primarily human; but non-human entities can also metaphorically acquire potent-like properties. This is especially the case with natural and psychological forces (example 8)

- (8) Vetrot í bieshe v lice.  
 wind<sub>DEF,SUBJ</sub> she<sub>IO,CL</sub> beat<sub>3.SG,PAST</sub> in face<sub>DEF</sub>  
 The wind was beating into her face.

Possessive relationship can occur between the IO and the DO referents or between the participants in IO and LOC position.

#### 2.1.1. Possessive relationship between the participants in DO and in IO position

In all transitive constructions that allow second human participant in the position of the IO a possibility of possessive linking between the DO and the IO participant occurs. However, the likelihood of a possessive link depends on the nature of the predicate and the properties of the referents.

The possessive interpretation is more probable (and in some cases the only one possible) with dative constructions in which the IO is an experiencer of the effects of the action, no matter whether they are intended to benefit (wash, clean) or to harm (damage, break, kill) it. From our knowledge of the world we know that one is usually more affected by an activity carried out on his/her property, than when it concerns other people's property. Thus, if there are no other indications in the context, the possessive relationship is automatically inferred (example 9). In example 10 the possessive phrase *na Sonja* blocks the possessive interpretation of the IO.

- (9) Igor mi go rasipa aparatot.  
 Igor<sub>SUBJ</sub> I<sub>IO,CL</sub> he<sub>DO,CL</sub> break<sub>3.SG,PAST</sub> camera<sub>DEF,DO</sub>  
 Igor broke my camera.
- (10) Igor mi go rasipa aparatot na Sonja.  
 Igor<sub>SUBJ</sub> I<sub>IO,CL</sub> he<sub>DO,CL</sub> break<sub>3.SG,PAST</sub> camera<sub>DEF,DO</sub> of Sonja<sub>POSS</sub>  
 Igor broke Sonja's camera while I was responsible for it.

Moreover, if the activities are directed to a part of the body or a person related to the IO referent, the possessive interpretation imposes itself (example 11 and 12). In such cases the indirectly affected entity coincides with the owner of the directly affected entity and

there can be no other interpretation. Both the IO component (i.e. the experiencer of effects) and the possessive component are equally present here:

- (11) **Mu** gi izmiv racete **na deteto.**  
 he<sub>IO,CL</sub> they<sub>DO,CL</sub> wash<sub>1.SG.PAST</sub> hands<sub>DEF,DO</sub> to child<sub>DEF,IO</sub>  
 I washed the child's hands./ I washed the hands to the child.
- (12) Vesna **mi** go povredi okoto.  
 Vesna I<sub>IO,CL</sub> he<sub>DO,CL</sub> hurt<sub>3.SG.PAST</sub> eye<sub>DEF,DO</sub>  
 Vesna hurt my eye./ Vesna hurt the eye to me.

With verbs of perception and cognition, the component of indirect affectedness is much weaker. The person encoded in the IO, whose object of possession is in focus, can only marginally be affected. Often the person doing the activity is more affected, as is the case in examples (13)-(15). Then the possessive component gains in strength. The use of the IO in certain situations can, nevertheless, code the Possessor as more affected, as in example (16). There the affected component and the possessive one are equally present.

- (13) Se iznenadiv koga **mu** go chuv imeto.  
 REFL<sub>DO,CL</sub> surprise<sub>1.SG.PAST</sub> when he<sub>IO,CL</sub> he<sub>DO,CL</sub> hear<sub>1.SG.PAST</sub> name<sub>DEF,DO</sub>  
 I was surprised to hear his name.
- (14) **Mu** go vidov testot. Mnogu e losh.  
 he<sub>IO,CL</sub> he<sub>DO,CL</sub> see<sub>1.SG.PAST</sub> test<sub>DEF,DO</sub> very AUX<sub>3,SG</sub> bad  
 I saw his test. It's lousy.
- (15) Ne **i** go razbiram rakopisot **na Ana.**  
 NEG she<sub>IO,CL</sub> he<sub>DO,CL</sub> understand<sub>1.SG.PRES</sub> handwriting<sub>DEF,DO</sub> Ana<sub>IO</sub>  
 I can't decipher Ana's handwriting. [So I can't read her letter.]
- (16) Vednash **mu** go prepoznav glasot i javiv vo policija.  
 immediately he<sub>IO,CL</sub> he<sub>DO,CL</sub> recognize<sub>1.SG.PAST</sub> voice<sub>DEF,DO</sub> and called the police  
 I recognized his voice immediately and called the police. [He was probably disguised, but the voice gave him away.]

In dative constructions that represent the more prototypical cases (Rudzka-Ostyn 1996), i.e. when the IO referent is a recipient of an object, accessible via physical transfer (e.g. give, send, bring), commercial transfer (e.g. sell, lend, buy), creation (e.g. build, make, cook) or through communicative and/or cognitive acts (e.g. show, say, read) the possessive link does not typically occur. However, the possessive interpretation can arise in certain circumstances, hence in isolation ambiguity occurs. Still, the default interpretation is IO as recipient. The possessive interpretation needs more contextual support. Compare examples (17)-(19).

- (17) **Mu** ja vrati li knjigata **na Vasil?**  
 he<sub>IO,CL</sub> she<sub>DO,CL</sub> return<sub>2.SG.PAST</sub> QUEST book<sub>DEF,DO</sub> to Vasil  
 a. Did you return the book to Vasil. (The book may be Vasil's or somebody else's, but that is not important in this interpretation.)  
 b. Did you return Vasil's book (to the library). (Here the possessive relationship comes to the fore.)



- (18) Sakash li da mi go pročitash *napisot*?  
 want<sub>2.SG.PRES</sub> QUEST INF PART I<sub>IO.CL</sub> he<sub>DO.CL</sub> read<sub>2.SG.PRES</sub> article<sub>DEF.DO</sub>  
 a. Would you like to read the article to me (because I don't have my glasses).  
 b. Would you like to read my article (to give me some suggestions).
- (19) Jas k'e ti gi ispratam *dokumentite*.  
 I<sub>SUBJ</sub> FUT PART you<sub>IO.CL</sub> they<sub>DO.CL</sub> send<sub>1.SG.PRES</sub> documents<sub>DEF.DO</sub>  
 a. I'll send you the papers.  
 b. I'll send your papers for you (because I'm just going to the post office.)

These cases illustrate the difference between the prototypical indirect object meaning and the meaning of *Dativus Simpatheticus*. In the possessive interpretation the IO is not a recipient of objects, but recipient of the effects of the transfer.

With verbs of creation (e.g. make, build) the probability of the possessive interpretation occurring depends on the nature of the object of transfer. The possessive component is much stronger if the object becomes a permanent possession. The use of the definite article also increases the possessive interpretation. In the following examples (20 and 21), the cake is soon gone, but the house remains a permanent fixture. However, in the construction with an indefinite object, in both situations, the affectedness component is more pronounced.

- (20) a. Ana mi napravi torta za rodenden.  
 Ana<sub>SUBJ</sub> I<sub>IO.CL</sub> make<sub>3.SG.PAST</sub> cake<sub>DEF.DO</sub> for birthday<sub>DEF</sub>  
 Ana made me a birthday cake.
- b. Ana mi ja napravi tortata za rodendenot.  
 Ana<sub>SUBJ</sub> I<sub>IO.CL</sub> she<sub>DO.CL</sub> make<sub>3.SG.PAST</sub> cake<sub>DEF.DO</sub> for birthday<sub>DEF</sub>  
 Ana made the cake for my birthday.
- (21) a. Stojan mu izgradi kuk'a na sinot.  
 Stojan<sub>SUBJ</sub> he<sub>IO.CL</sub> build<sub>3.SG.PAST</sub> house<sub>DEF.D</sub> to son<sub>DEF.IO</sub>  
 Stojan built a house for his son. [maybe his son only lived in it, but didn't own it]
- b. Stojan mu ja izgradi kuk'ata na sinot.  
 Stojan<sub>SUBJ</sub> he<sub>IO.CL</sub> she<sub>DO.CL</sub> build<sub>3.SG.PAST</sub> house<sub>DEF.DO</sub> to son<sub>DEF.IO</sub>  
 Stojan built his son's house.

In the second sentence the implication that the son owned the house after it was built is much stronger.

## 2.1.2. Possessive relationship between the participants in IO and in LOC

### 2.1.2.1. Transitive constructions

In transitive constructions with a locative adjunct, a possessive relationship can occur between the participant in IO position and the one in the locative phrase. Verbs of transfer of an object are mainly involved in situations that encode movement of an entity towards or away from the possessor. In such cases the DO participant can also belong to the IO (example 22 to 25)<sup>1</sup>, but that is not obligatory (example 26 and 27).

<sup>1</sup> In these examples it is also possible to interpret the DO as belonging to someone else.

- (22) **Mu** ja stavi *knigata* vo tashnata.  
 he<sub>IO.CL</sub> she<sub>DO.CL</sub> put<sub>3.SG.PAST</sub> book<sub>DEF.DO</sub> in bag<sub>DEF</sub>  
 She put the book in his bag.
- (23) **Í** ja zakachi *pandelkata* vo kosata.  
 she<sub>IO.CL</sub> she<sub>DO.CL</sub> pin<sub>3.SG.PAST</sub> ribbon<sub>DEF.DO</sub> in hair<sub>DEF</sub>  
 She pinned the ribbon in her hair.
- (24) **Í** go otrgrnaa *deteto* od pregratkata.  
 she<sub>IO.CL</sub> it<sub>DO.CL</sub> tear<sub>3.PL.PAST</sub> child<sub>DEF.DO</sub> from embrace<sub>DEF</sub>  
 They tore the child out of her embrace.
- (25) Neko**j** **mi** gi zemaal *kluchevite* od *dzebot*.  
 someone I<sub>IO.CL</sub> they<sub>DO.CL</sub> take<sub>3.SG.PAST</sub> keys<sub>DEF.DO</sub> from pocket<sub>DEF</sub>  
 Someone has taken the keys out of my pocket.)
- (26) Taa **mu** ja plesna *vistinata* v *ochi*.  
 she<sub>SUBJ</sub> he<sub>IO.CL</sub> she<sub>DO.CL</sub> slap<sub>3.SG.PAST</sub> truth<sub>DEF.DO</sub> in eyes<sub>DEF</sub>  
 She shoved the truth in his face [literally:eyes].
- (27) Cela nok' **mu** shepoteshe lagi na *uvo*.  
 all night he<sub>IO.CL</sub> whisper<sub>3.SG.PAST</sub> lies<sub>DEF.DO</sub> on ear<sub>DEF</sub>  
 All night long she whispered lies in his ear.

The possessive interpretation does not arise automatically in these constructions, but is contingent upon the context and the relationship of the participants. The strength of the possessive interpretation depends on various factors, with the nature of the Possessed being of major importance. Body parts in LOC are always interpreted as belonging to the indirectly affected entity, and possessed objects closely connected with the possessor are more likely to invoke possessive interpretation than ones loosely associated with them. Compare the following example (28 a.) with (25) above. A pocket is more closely connected to the person owing it than a mail box. Thus it is more likely to interpret the pocket as belonging to the affected person (expressed in the IO), while the mail box can easily be conceived as belonging to someone else.

- (28) a. Igor **í** gi ostavashe pismata vo *sandacheto*.  
 Igor<sub>SUBJ</sub> she<sub>IO.CL</sub> they<sub>DO.CL</sub> leave<sub>3.SG.PAST</sub> letters<sub>DEF.DO</sub> in mailbox<sub>DEF</sub>  
 Igor left the letters in her mail box. or Igor left the letters in the mail box for her.

Moreover, if the LOC is not marked [+ definite] but is only specified, the possessive interpretation is ruled out. Compare example (28) b., in which the mail box can not be interpreted as belonging to the participant in IO position.

- (28) b. Igor **í** gi ostavashe pismata vo *edno sandache*.  
 Igor<sub>SUBJ</sub> she<sub>IO.CL</sub> they<sub>DO.CL</sub> leave<sub>3.SG.PAST</sub> letters<sub>DEF.DO</sub> in one mailbox<sub>DEF</sub>  
 Igor left the letters in a mail box for her. or Igor left her letters in a mail box.

In colloquial speech, however, body parts tend to be used without the definite article (example 26 and 27). Since they are by default interpreted as belonging to the IO referent, the definite article is rendered superfluous.

### 2.1.2.2. Intransitive constructions

Intransitive dative constructions with an active entity in subject position acquire a possessive interpretation only if there is a locative adjunct which could be interpreted as belonging to the participant in IO position. The LOC can be goal (29), starting point (30) or a location for the activity (31).

- (29) Kucheto go stigma volkot i **mu**  
 dog<sub>SUBJ</sub> he<sub>DO,CL</sub> reach<sub>3,SG,PAST</sub> wolf<sub>DEF,DO</sub> and he<sub>IO,CL</sub>  
 se frii na *grbot*.  
 REFL<sub>DO,CL</sub> throw<sub>3,SG,PAST</sub> on back<sub>DEF</sub>  
 The dog reached the wolf and through himself on his back.
- (30) **Mi** se oddalechija od *kuk'ata*.  
 I<sub>IO,CL</sub> REFL<sub>DO,CL</sub> distance<sub>3,PL,PAST</sub> from house<sub>DEF</sub>  
 They went away from my house.
- (31) Mnogu ergeni **mu** se vrtkaa okolu *k'erkata*.  
 many bachelors<sub>SUBJ</sub> he<sub>IO,CL</sub> REFL<sub>DO,CL</sub> swarm<sub>3,PL,PAST</sub> around daughter<sub>DEF</sub>  
 Many bachelors swarmed around his daughter.

These constructions contain mainly verbs of motion and are linked with those expressing activities that direct their effects (beneficial or harmful) on the IO (compare: *Decata mi gi unishtija cvek'injata*. The children destroyed my flowers. and *Decata mi gazele po cvek'injata*. The children have trodden on my flowers.). With parts of the body and close relatives the possessive interpretation is automatic (example 29 and 31). In other cases, the strength of the possessive interpretation is contingent mainly upon the nature of the relationship between the referents of the IO and the LOC. The affectedness component is always present, but there are circumstances in which it is weakened. Compare the following pair of sentences.

- (32) Goce ne sakashe da razgovara so nego, no toj **mu** vleze vo restoranot i go iznatepa.  
 Goce didn't want to talk to him, but he went [literally: to Goce] in the restaurant and beat him up.
- (33) Goce ne beshe doma. Toj **mu** vleze vo *sobata* i mu gi zede pismata.  
 Goce was not at home. He went into his room and took his letters.

In example (32) the restaurant could be Goce's property or just one he happened to be at, but that is not important because the interpretation is solely concerned with the effects upon the IO participant. In example (33), since Goce was not in the room when this happened, he was affected only through the fact that it was his room and the possessive interpretation is more strongly pronounced.

## 2.2. Possessed in subject position

Constructions in which the IO participant is frequently in a possessive relation with the participant in subject position involve constructions with a full verb and with the copula.



## 2.2.1. Constructions with a full verb

In the constructions with a full verb the Possessed in subject position can be an agent (example 34-38) or an affected entity (example 39-53).

When the Possessed is an agent it is a personal referent actively involved in the situation. Such participants are relatives or persons entering in different types of relations with the IO participant.

- (34) *Sinot*            **im**            studira            vo Amerika.  
 SON<sub>DEF.SUBJ</sub>    they<sub>IO.CL</sub>    study<sub>3.SG.PRES</sub>    in America  
 Their son is studying in America.
- (35) *Shefot*            **ni**            se            vrak'a            utre.  
 BOSS<sub>DEF.SUBJ</sub>    we<sub>IO.CL</sub>    REFL<sub>DO.CL</sub>    return<sub>3.SG.PRES</sub>    tomorrow  
 Our boss is returning tomorrow.
- (36) *K'erkata*            **í**            se            samoubila.  
 daughter<sub>DEF.SUBJ</sub>    she<sub>IO.CL</sub>    REFL<sub>DO.CL</sub>    kill<sub>3.SG.PAST</sub> herself  
 Her daughter has committed suicide.
- (37) *Kucheto*            **mu**            izbegalo            **na Igor.**  
 dog<sub>DEF.SUBJ</sub>    he<sub>IO.CL</sub>    escape<sub>3.SG.PAST</sub>    to Igor<sub>IO</sub>  
 Igor's dog up and ran away on him.

The strength of the possessive interpretation can vary depending on the nature of the predicate. Some activities of a related person can be construed as affecting the Possessor more than others. In such cases the IO component is stronger. What is more, if the IO participant is presented as being responsible for the activity (as in example 36), the possessive component is so diminished that it can be signaled separately<sup>2</sup> (*K'erka í í se samoubila*, literally: Her daughter has committed suicide on her.). Compare also example (38)<sup>3</sup>. In (38) a. the two components (the possessive and the affected one) are strictly divided, thus the two clitics are not only possible, but also necessary. In (38) b. the doubling of the clitic sounds unusual, because the affectedness component is closely connected with the possessive one.

- (38) a. *Sestra*            **mi**            **mi**            izbega.  
 sister<sub>DEF.SUBJ</sub>    I<sub>POSS.CL</sub>    I<sub>IO.CL</sub>    run<sub>3.SG.PAST</sub> away  
 My sister ran away on me. i.e. I could not catch her.
- b. ? *Sin*            **mi**            **mi**            studira            vo Amerika.  
 SON<sub>DEF.SUBJ</sub>    I<sub>POSS.CL</sub>    I<sub>IO.CL</sub>    study<sub>3.SG.PRES</sub>    in America  
 literally: My son is studying to me in America.

The constructions in which the possessed entity in subject position is an affected entity are primarily decausative, i.e. coding an autonomous activity.

<sup>2</sup> This is the case with terms where IO clitics are used for close family relations. Otherwise the possessive component is separately signaled by the possessive adjective.

<sup>3</sup> The question mark (?) in front of the sentence indicates that it is possible, but considered unusual by many speakers; the asterisk (\*) indicates that the sentence is felt as ungrammatical.



In the majority of the examples of this type the possessed entity is part of the body. They express some autonomous processes in the Possessor's body, which he/she can not control. Another object of possession belonging to the same Possessor can take part in the process, acting as location (40) and/or instrument (41).

- (39) *Nozete*            **mu**            dzemnea.  
 legs<sub>DEF.SUBJ</sub>    he<sub>IO.CL</sub>       freeze<sub>3.PL.PAST</sub>  
 His legs were freezing.
- (40) *Glavata*            **mu**            padna            na *ramoto*.  
 head<sub>DEF.SUBJ</sub>    he<sub>IO.CL</sub>       fall<sub>3.SG.PAST</sub>    on shoulder<sub>DEF</sub>  
 His head fell on his shoulder.
- (41) *Ochite*            **í**            se            napolnija    so *solzi*.  
 eyes<sub>DEF.SUBJ</sub>    she<sub>IO.CL</sub>    REFL<sub>DO.CL</sub> fill<sub>3.PL.PAST</sub>    with tears<sub>DEF</sub>  
 Her eyes filled with tears.

The Possessor is only an experiencer in these processes, but depending on the type of the process the degree to which he/she will be affected varies. Therefore, some constructions are interpreted as affecting the Possessor (39) and some just as happening in the Possessor's body (41). In the latter the possessive interpretation prevails.

In decausative constructions with kinship terms as Possessed, the dative construction can acquire a possessive interpretation, the strength of which will depend on the type of the activity and the overall situation. In example (42) the possessive and the affected component are equally present (they are affected by the fact that it is their child that got sick), while example (43) could have a dual interpretation. In the first interpretation the possessive component is pronounced because the IO referent is not presented as responsible for the event. That participant may not at all be present when it happens. In the second interpretation the IO referent bares responsibility for the accident, thus the affected component is more prominent. In this interpretation the IO referent can be, but is not necessarily, the Possessor.

- (42) *Deteto*            **im**            se            razbole            od zoltica.  
 child<sub>DEF.SUBJ</sub>    they<sub>IO.CL</sub>    REFL<sub>DO.CL</sub>    get<sub>3.SG.PAST</sub> sick    from jaundice.  
 Their child got jaundice.
- (43) *Sinot*            **im**            padna            od skalite.  
 son<sub>DEF.SUBJ</sub>    they<sub>IO.CL</sub>    fall<sub>3.SG.PAST</sub>    from stairs<sub>DEF</sub>  
 Their son fell down the stairs. Or Their son went and fell down the stairs on them.

Decausative constructions coding material referents in subject position express processes that are more or less autonomous. The IO participant in such constructions is conceived as experiencer in whose domain the activity happens, despite the fact that in some cases they may have a more active role (i.e. higher responsibility for the event). These processes are construed as accidents and the persons are disclaimed of any responsibility. The possessive interpretation occurs depending on the nature of the referent in subject position and the type of activity. Often the possessive interpretation is automatic if the context does not indicate otherwise (example 44-46), but it is not always the case (example 47 and 48). As these examples indicate, the possessive interpretation gains in strength as the experiencer's role decreases.

- (44) **Na Ana í** se skrshi aparatot.  
 to Ana<sub>IO</sub> she<sub>IO.CL</sub> break<sub>3.SG.PAST</sub> camera<sub>DEF.SUBJ</sub>  
 Ana's camera broke [while she was handling it or just like that by itself].
- (45) **Mi** se izgubi kluchot.  
 I<sub>IO.CL</sub> REFL<sub>DO.CL</sub> lose<sub>3.SG.PAST</sub> key<sub>DEF.SUBJ</sub>  
 My key got lost on me.
- (46) **Ni** zavrshi shek'erot.  
 we<sub>IO.CL</sub> finish<sub>3.SG.PAST</sub> sugar<sub>DEF.SUBJ</sub>  
 We're out of sugar. [literally: Our sugar has finished on us.]
- (47) **Na Goce mu** preteche mlekoto.  
 to Goce<sub>IO</sub> he<sub>IO.CL</sub> boil<sub>3.SG.PAST</sub> over milk<sub>DEF.SUBJ</sub>  
 The milk went and boiled over on Goce. [Maybe it was his milk, but not necessarily, and this is not important.]
- (48) **Mi** se skrshi chashata.  
 I<sub>IO.CL</sub> REFL<sub>DO.CL</sub> break<sub>3.SG.PAST</sub> glass<sub>DEF.SUBJ</sub>  
 The glass went and broke on me. [Maybe it was my glass or somebody else's, but this is not important.]

One more type of decausative constructions that deserves attention is the one that involves verbs of appearance or disappearance as in the following examples (49-52). The responsibility of the owner is minimal and the possessive interpretation is more prominent.

- (49) **Togash mi** ja snema parata.  
 then I<sub>IO.CL</sub> she<sub>DO.CL</sub> disappear<sub>3.SG.PAST</sub> coin<sub>DEF.SUBJ</sub>  
 Then my coin disappeared on me.
- (50) **Mene mi** ja nema gumata.  
 I<sub>IO.PRON</sub> I<sub>IO.CL</sub> she<sub>DO.CL</sub> is not here eraser<sub>DEF.DO</sub>  
 My eraser is not here.
- (51) **Nasmevkata** pak **mu** se pojavi na liceto.  
 smile<sub>DEF.SUBJ</sub> again he<sub>IO.CL</sub> REFL<sub>DO.CL</sub> appear<sub>3.SG.PAST</sub> on face<sub>DEF</sub>  
 The smile appeared again on his face.
- (52) **Ovcite mu** stanaa povek'e.  
 sheep<sub>DEF.SUBJ</sub> he<sub>IO.CL</sub> become<sub>3.PL.PAST</sub> more.  
 His sheep increased.

In some decausative constructions the experiencer interpretation of the IO becomes rather weak in certain situations when the process does not even happen in the IO referent's domain. Consequently, the possessive interpretation remains the only choice. Compare the situation in (53) below. The Possessor is not using the object and so she is not affected at the moment, but only generally, as an owner of the object.

- (53) (Philip is sharpening his pencil with Simona's pencil sharpener.)  
 Philip: **Znaesh, ostrilkata ti** krshi.  
 You know, pencil sharpener<sub>DEF.SUBJ</sub> you<sub>IO.CL</sub> break<sub>3.SG.PRES</sub>  
 You know, your pencil sharpener breaks [the lead of the pencil].

Simona: E, pa, takva e, shto da í pravam?  
 Yeah, like that AUX<sub>3.SG.PRES</sub> what INF<sub>PAR</sub> she do<sub>1.SG.PRES</sub>  
 Yeah, it's like that, what can I do about it.

Other examples of this type are: *Ne mi raboti kasetofonot.* (My cassette recorder doesn't work.); *Ne vi seche nozhot.* (Your knife doesn't cut well. [Your knife is dull.]). Although they look dynamic, these constructions are essentially static, describing not an event, but a property.

### 2.2.2. Constructions with the copula

The use of the IO with the copula is common in Macedonian (*Toj mi e veren.* – He is faithful to me. *Toa ne mi e poznato.* – literally: That is not known to me.). In most cases the subject referent is a person or thing related to the IO referent, so the possessive interpretation arises. IO occurs in combination with nominal (including *da*-clauses), adjectival and locative predicates.

In constructions with nominal predicate the participant in subject position is defined in relation to the participant in IO position. The possessive relation (in a broad sense) automatically imposes itself. Most common are relationships between people (example 54-56). However, relations between things and people can also be expressed (example 57-59).

- (54) Jas sum **mi** vnuk na K.K., rekov.  
 I<sub>SUBJ.PRON</sub> AUX<sub>1.SG.PRES</sub> he<sub>IO.CL</sub> nephew<sub>.DEF.PRED</sub> to K.K.<sub>IO</sub> say<sub>1.SG.PAST</sub>  
 I'm K.K.'s nephew, I said.
- (55) Ana í e sestra na Vera.  
 Ana<sub>SUBJ</sub> she<sub>IO.CL</sub> AUX<sub>3.SG.PRES</sub> sister<sub>.DEF.PRED</sub> to Vera<sub>IO</sub>  
 Ana is Vera's sister. Or Ana is a sister to Vera.
- (56) Jas sum **mi** prijatel i zatoa se grizam.  
 I<sub>SUBJ.PRON</sub> AUX<sub>1.SG.PRES</sub> he<sub>IO.CL</sub> friend<sub>.DEF.PRED</sub> and that's why I'm worried  
 I'm his friend/I'm a friend to him, and that's why I'm worried.
- (57) Koja marka **vi** e kolata?  
 what make<sub>.DEF.PRED</sub> you<sub>IO.CL</sub> AUX<sub>3.SG.PRES</sub> car<sub>DEF.SUBJ</sub>  
 What make is your car?
- (58) Taa kutija **mi** e edinstvenoto nasledstvo.  
 that<sub>DEM</sub> box<sub>SUBJ</sub> I<sub>IO.CL</sub> AUX<sub>3.SG.PRES</sub> the only inheritance<sub>PRED</sub>  
 That box is my only inheritance.
- (59) Najgolemata ambicija í e da stane slavna.  
 the greatest ambition<sub>SUBJ</sub> she<sub>IO.CL</sub> AUX<sub>3.SG.PRES</sub> INF<sub>PART</sub> become famous  
 Her greatest ambition is to become famous.

The use of the IO with the verb *sum* (to be) construes a static situation as dynamic (Rudzka-Ostyn 1996). The IO is presented as suffering/experiencing the effects of the supposed transfer. The nature of the referents and the type of the relationship render the construction more or less dynamic. In the latter case the possessive relationship is more prominent. It has also been noticed (Topolińska 1996; Sidorovska 1970:200) that the definite article enhances the possessive interpretation. Compare the following examples:



- (60) a. Toa                    **mi**        e                    problem.  
 it<sub>SUBJ.PRON</sub>        I<sub>IO.CL</sub>    AUX<sub>3.SG.PRES</sub>        problem<sub>DEF.PRED</sub>  
 That's a problem for me.
- b. Toa                    **mi**        e                    *problemot.*  
 it<sub>SUBJ.PRON</sub>        I<sub>IO.CL</sub>    AUX<sub>3.SG.PRES</sub>        problem<sub>DEF.PRED</sub>  
 That's my problem.

With adjectival predicates the referent in subject position is qualified in relation to the IO referent. They are often connected with some kind of possessive relation, but that is not obligatory. The occurrence of the possessive interpretation depends on the context. The following example demonstrates this:

- (61) a. Kapata            **mu**        beshe            golema.  
 cap<sub>DEF.SUBJ</sub>        he<sub>IO.CL</sub>    AUX<sub>3.SG.PAST</sub>        big<sub>ADJ</sub>  
 The cap was too big for him. Or His cap was too big.

Without broader context it is ambiguous. In the first interpretation the point is that the cap was too big for him, but it is not clear whether it was his own cap or not. It could have been one he tried on in a shop (example 61b.). If we are describing the person, then the possessive interpretation comes to the fore (example 61c.).

- (61) b. Toj go kupi shalot, no *kapata mu* beshe golema.  
 He bought the scarf, but the cap was too big for him.
- (61) c. Celiot beshe oblechen vo shareni boi. *Kapata mu* beshe golema i svetlikava.  
 He was all dressed up in various colours. His cap was big and shiny.

When describing parts of the body the possessive interpretation is automatic and it is much stronger than the affected one (example 62 and 63).

- (62) *Ochite*            **mu**        se                    zeleni.  
 eyes<sub>DEF.SUBJ</sub>        he<sub>IO.CL</sub>    AUX<sub>3.PL.PRES</sub>        green<sub>ADJ</sub>  
 His eyes are green.
- (63) *Prstite*            **í**            bea                    dolgi        i        tenki.  
 fingers<sub>DEF.SUBJ</sub>        she<sub>IO.CL</sub>    AUX<sub>3.PL.PAST</sub>        long<sub>ADJ</sub>    and thin<sub>ADJ</sub>  
 Her fingers were long and thin.

On the whole, permanent characteristics are less likely to be presented as an asymmetric relationship. Since they are felt as states the possessive component is more prominent, while the affected one is pretty weak. As a result, in *sum* constructions which qualify a person it is less possible to double the IO clitic (one for possession and one for IO) if the adjective describes a permanent feature of the person<sup>4</sup>. Compare the following examples.

<sup>4</sup> The examples with reduplicated dative clitic (like example (64b) and (65b) can acquire the meaning She looks young/ tall to me, but that is a separate dative function.

- (64) a. ? *K'erka* **mi** **mi** e bolna.  
 daughter<sub>DEF.SUBJ</sub> I<sub>POSS.CL</sub> I<sub>IO.CL</sub> is ill  
 My daughter is ill on me.  
 vs. *K'erkata* **mi** e bolna. and *K'erka* **mi** e bolna.  
 daughter<sub>DEF.SUBJ</sub> I<sub>IO.CL</sub> is ill daughter<sub>DEF.SUBJ</sub> I<sub>IO.CL</sub> is ill  
 My daughter is ill.
- b. \* *K'erka* **mi** **mi** e mlada.  
 daughter<sub>DEF.SUBJ</sub> I<sub>POSS.CL</sub> I<sub>IO.CL</sub> is young  
 literally: My daughter is young to me.  
 vs. *K'erkata* **mi** e mlada. and *K'erka* **mi**  
 daughter<sub>DEF.SUBJ</sub> I<sub>IO.CL</sub> is young daughter<sub>DEF.SUBJ</sub> I<sub>IO.CL</sub>  
 e mlada.  
 is young  
 My daughter is young.
- (65) a. ? *Drugarka* **mi** **mi** e razocharana. vs. *Drugarkata* **mi** e razochatana. and  
*Drugarka* **mi** e razocharana.  
 My friend is dissapointed on me. My friend is disapointed.  
 b. \* *Drugarka* **mi** **mi** e visoka. vs. *Drugarkata* **mi** e visoka. and *Drugarka* **mi** e visoka.  
 My friend is tall.

The verb *sum* with a locative phrase express location in Macedonian, but not existence (e.g. *Knigata e na masata*. The book is on the table.)<sup>5</sup>. In constructions with the IO, the subject referent can be interpreted as belonging to the IO referent. Contingent upon the nature of the referent, the location can also be in possession of the IO. If it is part of the body, this is a default interpretation (example 69).

- (67) *Kluchevite* **ti** se na masata.  
 keys<sub>DEF.SUBJ</sub> you<sub>IO.CL</sub> AUX<sub>3.PL.PRES</sub> on table<sub>DEF</sub>  
 Your keys are on the table./ The keys are on the table for you.
- (68) *Slikata* **mi** e vo pasoshot.  
 picture<sub>DEF.SUBJ</sub> I<sub>IO.CL</sub> AUX<sub>3.SG.PRES</sub> in passport<sub>DEF</sub>  
 My photograph is in my/the passport.
- (69) *Sinot* Peco **mu** beshe vo racete.  
 son<sub>DEF.SUBJ</sub> Peco he<sub>IO.CL</sub> AUX<sub>3.SG.PAST</sub> in arms<sub>DEF</sub>  
 His son Peco was in his arms.

Macedonian also locates things with the demonstratives *eve* (here is/are) and *ene* (there is/are). In dative constructions the IO is in possessive relation with the located entity only if it is marked [+ definite].

- (70) a. Eve **mi** go molivot.  
 here<sub>DEM</sub> I<sub>IO.CL</sub> he<sub>DO.CL</sub> pencil<sub>DEF.DO</sub>  
 Here is my pencil.

<sup>5</sup> For existence the verb *ima* ('have') is used (e.g. *Na masata ima kniga* 'There is a book on the table').

- b. Eve            **mi**            moliv.  
 here<sub>DEM</sub>    I<sub>IO,CL</sub>    pencil<sub>DEF,DO</sub>  
 Here is a pencil for me.
- (71) a. Ene            **ti**            ja            *prijatelkata*.  
 there<sub>DEM</sub>    you<sub>IO,CL</sub>    she<sub>DO,CL</sub>    friend<sub>DEF,DO</sub>  
 There is your friend.
- b. Ene            **ti**            prijatelka.  
 there<sub>DEM</sub>    you<sub>IO,CL</sub>    friend<sub>DEF,DO</sub>  
 There is a friend for you.

### 2.3. Possessor in subject position

In reflexive constructions, in which the IO is coreferent with the subject, the dative reflexive clitic *si* is used. In such situations the Possessor is also represented by the subject. In certain cases, and especially when the Possessed is part of the body, the possessive relationship is inferred and there is no need for the dative clitic to appear. It is, however, often used for special expressiveness. (example 72) There are situations, though, when the dative clitic is required to ensure possessive interpretation (example 74).

- (72) Goce            ja            povredi            rakata.  
 Goce<sub>SUBJ</sub>    she<sub>DO,CL</sub>    hurt<sub>3,SG,PAST</sub>    arm<sub>DEF,DO</sub>  
 Goce            **si**            ja            povredi            *rakata*.  
 Goce<sub>SUBJ</sub>    REFL<sub>IO,CL</sub>    she<sub>DO,CL</sub>    hurt<sub>3,SG,PAST</sub>    arm<sub>DEF,DO</sub>  
 Goce hurt his arm.
- (73) ?Jas            ja            kazhav            zhelbata.  
 I<sub>SUBJ,PRON</sub>    she<sub>DO,CL</sub>    state<sub>1,SG,PAST</sub>    wish<sub>DEF,DO</sub>  
 Jas            **si**            ja            kazhav            *zhelbata*.  
 I<sub>SUBJ,PRON</sub>    REFL<sub>IO,CL</sub>    she<sub>DO,CL</sub>    state<sub>1,SG,PAST</sub>    wish<sub>DEF,DO</sub>  
 I stated my wish.
- (74) a. Go            vide            liceto            vo ogedaloto.  
 he<sub>DO,CL</sub>    see<sub>3,SG,PAST</sub>    face<sub>DEF,DO</sub>    in mirror<sub>DEF</sub>  
 She saw the face in the mirror. [probably someone else's].
- b. **Si**            go            vide            *liceto*            vo ogedaloto.  
 REFL<sub>IO,CL</sub>    he<sub>DO,CL</sub>    see<sub>3,SG,PAST</sub>    face<sub>DEF,DO</sub>    in mirror<sub>DEF</sub>  
 She saw her (own) face in the mirror.

The possessed object can appear in DO, LOC or INST or a combination of those (example 6 and 7) and with all kind of predicates, both transitive or intransitive. However, because of the nature of the reflexive construction the dative clitic here always bears a more or less emphasized nuance of expressiveness. The possessive component is always mixed with some other meaning. As a result, it is possible to separate these two components and we often have both the reflexive dative clitic and the possessive pronoun in the same clause (example 75). This is not common for non-reflexive dative constructions<sup>6</sup>.

<sup>6</sup> It is not usual to say *Toj mi ja skina mojata kniga* (literally: 'He tore my book to me'); the more common possibilities are *Toj mi ja skina knigata* or *Toj ja skina mojata kniga* ('He tore my book').



- (75) Toj                    si                    ja                    svrshi                    svojata  
 he<sub>SUBJ.PRON</sub>        REFL<sub>IO.CL</sub>        she<sub>DO.CL</sub>        finish<sub>3.SG.PAST</sub>        REFL<sub>POSS.ADJ.DEF</sub>  
*rabota.*  
 work<sub>DO</sub>  
 He finished his own work [as far as he is concerned].

### 3. Conclusion

Dativus Sympathetic functions as a more or less contextually motivated modification of the IO construction in Macedonian. The possessive interpretation is automatically implied in certain contexts, parallel to the indirect affectedness component, and by analogy with those it is inferred in other situations where the indirect affectedness component is weakened by the immediate or broader context. The strength of the possessive interpretation is contingent upon an interplay of several factors, mainly: (1) the nature of the Possessed; (2) the role of the IO participant as experiencer or possessor; and (3) the type of predicate.

#### (1) The nature of the Possessed

The more closely the Possessed is connected to the Possessor, the more likely the possessive interpretation is to be implied. With parts of the body and closely connected objects of possession (such as, clothes worn at the moment of the event and close family members) the possessive interpretation is often a default inference. Examples 11, 12, 29, 39-41 illustrate this.

It has also been shown that definiteness plays a role in strengthening the possessive interpretation: a definite Possessed invokes a possessive interpretation, while indefinite ones leave the interpretation open or rule out possession (Examples 20, 21, 70 and 71). This is hardly surprising since the Possessed is often automatically defined by being qualified as belonging to a certain Possessor (Langacker 1991:171).

#### (2) The role of IO participant as experiencer or possessor

The IO participant as experiencer is foregrounded, i.e. it is part of the energy flow chain and thus it acquires a more dynamic role (recipient of effects). In such cases the possessive component is only marginal. But in certain situations the endpoint role is diminished and thereby the possessive interpretation arises. Such are the situations in example 33, 53 and 61c. The IO participant is not coded as part of the action chain (does not take an active part in the energy transfer), but only as part of the background scene and its role of Possessor is advanced. This affects the semantic interpretation of the whole construction. Its meaning shifts from dynamic activity to static property.

#### (3) Type of predicate

*Verbs of transfer* encode situations in which an object is affected by being transferred into the IO participant's 'domain of control' (Rudzka-Ostyn 1996). With such verbs the possessive interpretation can only occur if they are reinterpreted as affecting an object which is already in the IO participant's domain of control (example 17, 18 and 19). This happens by analogy to *change of state verbs*, which, when used in IO constructions, modify the IO role from 'endpoint-receiver' into 'endpoint-experiencer'. The DO then suffers the effects of the energy flow and the IO participant is affected only by being in some kind of relationship with the DO participant. In such circumstances the possessive relationship is naturally implied. This construal is mapped onto some less active predicates, like those of *perception* and *cognition*. However, the role of the IO participant has

to be modified further given the differences in the roles of the participants (examples 13-16). With verbs of perception and cognition the participant in subject position is an experiencer (not an agent), thus the IO referent is not the most affected person and the possessive interpretation comes to the fore. The 'endpoint-experiencer' function of the IO is further extended to *verbs of motion*. Since change of place verbs encode situations similar to those expressing change of state the possessive relationship between the participants in IO and DO position can arise under similar conditions. Furthermore, with verbs of motion which contain location as a constitutive part of the predication, a possessive relationship between the IO referent and the LOC can be inferred, depending on contextual circumstances (examples 29-33).

*Decausative predicates* usually encode processes of the type 'change of state' and 'change of place' similar to the active predicates of this kind, but they represent different situations and consequently impose further modifications of the IO role. Since the agent is not at all present in the semantic representation of these predicates, the IO referent bears more responsibility. Where contextual or situational circumstances lower this responsibility, the possessive interpretation becomes stronger (example 42 and 43, 49-52). It is especially prominent in generalized statements where a dynamic event is presented as a state (example 53). The copula *sum* (to be) is another example of this: in contexts where the dynamicity of the event is diminished, the 'endpoint-experiencer' role of the IO participant weakens and the possessive component gains strength. Therefore, the possessive component is more prominent with permanent characteristics than with temporary ones (examples 61-65).

It is obvious that in Macedonian the interpretation of the IO construction intrinsically depends on context. An important question which arises, however, is: is the possessive meaning in the Macedonian IO construction fully grammaticalized? According to Hopper and Traugott (1993:76-77), conventionalisation (i.e. grammaticalization) of contextual implicatures occurs when the form is frequently attested in environments where its original meaning is blocked.

As can be seen from the examples in this paper the 'endpoint-experiencer' role of the Macedonian IO is complex and manifold. Certainly, in stative constructions the possessive component is much stronger, but the role of the IO to dynamize them is still felt in most cases (i.e. the metaphor is still alive). In many contexts ambiguity between the IO and the possessive component is present: which of the two senses is implied usually is dependent on relevant communication situation.

However, despite the fact that the Macedonian possessive dative is quite widespread, extending to all kinds of situations, it has not yet been reinterpreted into purely possessive construction (as is the case in Bulgarian). It is still tied to the verb phrase and, with the exception of a few family terms, cannot be attached to a noun.

## References

- Brecht R., Levin J.S. (1986). *Case in Slavic*. Columbus, OH: Slavica.
- Golovacheva A.V. (1993). Головачева А.В., Семантико-синтаксические посессивные структуры в западнославянских и русском языках (Syntactic-semantic possessive structures in West-Slavic languages and in Russian). In: *Этюды по типологии грамматических языках*. Коллективная монография. Российская академия, Институт славяноведения и балканистики.

- Heine B., Claudi U., Hünnemeyer F. 1991. *Grammaticalization: A Conceptual Framework*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Hopper P., Closs Traugott E. (1993). *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Koneski B. (1986). Конески Б., *Историја на македонскиот јазик* (History of the Macedonian Language). Skopje: Kultura.
- Langacker R.W. (1991). *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar. Vol. 1: Theoretical prerequisites*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Langacker R.W. (1995). Possession and possessive constructions. In: J.R. Taylor, R.E. MacLaury (eds), *Language and Cognitive Construal of the World*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, pp. 51-79.
- Levin J.S. (1986). Remarks on the Pragmatics of »Inalienable Dative« in Russian. In: R. Brecht, J.S. Levin (eds.), *Case in Slavic*. Columbus, OH: Slavica, pp. 437-451.
- Najcheska-Sidorovska M. (1970). Најческа-Сидоровска М., *Функции и значења на дативот и нивното изразување во современиот руски, српско-хрватски, македонски и бугарски јазик*. Докторска дисертација (Functions and Meanings of the Dative and Their Expression in Modern Russian, Serbo-Croatian, Macedonian and Bulgarian. Doctoral Dissertation). Kiril and Metodi University of Skopje.
- Rudzka-Ostyn B. (1996). The Polish dative. In: W. van Belle, W. van Langendonck (eds), *The Dative. Vol. 1: Descriptive Studies*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, pp. 341-394.
- Sweetser E. (1990). *From Etymology to Pragmatics: Metaphorical and Cultural Aspects of Semantic Structure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Taylor J.R. (1989). *Linguistic Categorization: Prototypes in Linguistic Theory*. Oxford: Clarendon Press
- Topolińska Z. (1996). Тополињска З., *Студии од македонско-бугарската јазична конфронтација* (Studies of the Macedonian-Bulgarian Language Comparison). Skopje: MANU.
- Topolińska Z. (1997). Тополињска З., *Македонските дијалекти во Егејска Македонија. Том 2: Синтакса* (Macedonian dialects in Aegean Macedonia. Vol. 2: Syntax). Skopje: MANU
- Wierzbicka A. (1986). The Meaning of a Case: A Study of the Polish Dative. In: R. Brecht, J.S. Levin (eds), *Case in Slavic*. Columbus, OH: Slavica, pp. 386-426.