Motoki Nomachi
Hokkaido University

Dative of external possession in Croatian: From an areal-typological perspective[1]

External possession constructions are defined as constructions in which a semantic possessor-possessum relation is expressed by coding the possessor as a core grammatical relation of the verb and in a constituent separate from that which contains the possessum. One construction representative of this phenomenon is that with the dative case as a marker of the possessor, which is known as the dative of possession (DP) and is widely attested in European languages as an areal feature. In this article, I analyze the DP in Croatian, both its standard variety and dialects, particularly from a (micro-)areal-typological perspective, to locate the place of Croatian among Slavic, paying special attention to the correlation between the use of DP and its areal tendency. My analysis led me to conclude that Croatian occupies a place between West Slavic and Slovene, which tend to have a narrower sphere of the use of DP, and Balkanized Slavic, which has a wider sphere of it. This finding can be explained by the fact that West Slavic and Slovene are more *habere*-type languages than Croatian, which still preserves more *esse*-type language features that can be also found in the Balkanized Slavic languages.

Key words: possession; dative; Croatian; Standard Average European; Balkan Sprachbund.

1. Introduction

Motoki Nomachi:
Dative of external possession in Croatian:
From an areal-typological perspective

External Possession (henceforth EP) is a term relating to a cross-linguistically at-tested phenomenon. According to Payne and Barshi (1999: 3), core instances of EP are "constructions in which a semantic possessor-possessum relation is expressed by coding the possessor (henceforth PR) as a core grammatical relation of the verb and in a constituent separate from that which contains the possessum (henceforth PM)." Cross-linguistically, as Payne and Barshi (ibid.) point out, "the PR may be expressed as subject, direct object, indirect object (or dative), or as ergative or ab-solutive, depending on the language type."

To illustrate, consider an example from Croatian (Kuna 2012: 135). Example (1) is a case of EP in which the PR is coded in the dative case, while in (2) the PR is expressed by the possessive adjective, syntactically depending solely on the noun in the accusative case.

(1) *Ivan je poljubio **dami** ruku.* (dative)
   John is kissed   to lady hand
   'John kissed the lady's hand'

(2) *Ivan je poljubio **daminu** ruku.* (possessive adjective)
   John is kissed   lady's   hand
   'John kissed the lady's hand'

In Croatian linguistics, to the best of my knowledge, this notion was first applied to syntactic analysis in Branko Kuna's recent monograph (2012).[2] According to Kuna (2012: 125–183), Croatian has three main external possessive construction (EPC) patterns, namely (i) PR in the nominative case (with four sub-patterns classified in terms of verb semantics), (ii) PR in the dative case, and (iii) PR in the accusative case.

Among these three patterns, the PR in the dative case (or the dative of EP; henceforth DEP), which has been called the "dative of possession" in traditional grammatical descriptions of Croatian (and other varieties of this former Serbo-Croatian language), has received particular attention. This attention is due to the denotative meanings of (1) and (2) being close, and the syntactic relations with the dative case being potentially ambiguous, especially when enclitic forms are used.[3]

---

[2] However, it is noteworthy that Kučanda (1985: 52) clearly states, in his insightful article analyzing the so-called "empathetic dative" (ED), that there are striking cross-linguistic similarities between ED, the *have* construction, and topic markers, in that they all fulfill the function of separating the possessor from the possessed for pragmatic purposes.

[3] For instance, Brabec et al. (1965: 228) describe this usage as follows: "the dative case sometimes means possession … Instead of the dative we can take a possessive genitive or possessive pronoun.

Indeed, the dative case seems in some cases to be dependent on the noun only. For example, following Maretić's grammar published in 1899, Katičić (2002: 466) gives the example in (3) as an instance of the attributive function of the dative case with possessive meaning.

(3) *Ljutica   Bodan i   sestra* **mu**
     Ljutica   Bodan and sister   to him
     'Ljutica Bogdan and his sister'

The use of the dative case in (1) and (3) should not be regarded as reflecting the same phenomenon. The structure in (3) is a syntactic archaism, presumably used as an independent syntagma. Thus, a syntagma such as *sestra mu* cannot be incorporated into a sentence as it stands (cf. (4)).

(4) ??*Bojim se sestre* **mu**.[4]
      I fear   sister to him
     'I am afraid of his (lit: to him) sister'

This is not the case with Macedonian, in which the dative clitic functions as a noun modifier, as in (5). In contrast, (6) is an example of the DEP, in which the dative clitic does not syntactically depend on the noun (Mišeska-Tomić 2008: 31).[5]

There would be no semantic differences." Citing examples such as *Prijateljica* joj *zaostajaše nekoliko koraka iza nje* 'Her friends lagged behind her in a few steps,' Težak and Babić (1973: 252) label this as dative attributive. In a similar manner, Barić et al. (1990: 424) try to justify the attributive function of the dative case, explaining that the sentence *Psetu glas ukleto odzvanja selom* 'The dog's bark is heard around the village' is the result of unifying two sentences *Glas ukleto odzvanja selom* 'The bark is heard around the village' and *Glas pripada* psetu 'The bark belongs to the dog.' However, this explanation seems difficult. First, one has to reconstruct the sentence with the "missing" verb *pripadati* 'to belong.' Second, the verb *pripadati* is used exclusively for inalienable possession, which means that *Glas pripada psetu* may be grammatically correct, but from a semantic viewpoint, the sentence is too unnatural to be integrated into *Psetu glas ukleto odzvanja selom*. In addition, one has to pay attention to the use of the dative case from a viewpoint of neutrality of utterance. As pointed out by Matasović (2002: 153), in pragmatically and stylistically neutral utterances, possessive pronouns are replaced by the DEP, particularly when the PM is a body part, while the use of nouns in the DEP is marked, in contrast to the unmarked use of pronouns.

[4] This example was provided by Jadranka Gvozdanović (personal communication). According to Gvozdanović, because of the Wackernagel law, the enclitic form *mu* should have been placed before the reflexive morpheme *se* in (4) in order for the sentence to be correct, which is the norm in Croatian. The sentence in (4) would ultimately be possible as a sort of "echo" of a preceding utterance with a negative connotation. Consider in this regard the following dialogue: A: *Sestre mu se trebaš bojati.* 'You should be afraid of his sister.' B: *Da, bojim se sestre mu*. 'Yes, I am afraid of his sister.' However, this kind of situation is far from neutral and rather rare.

Motoki Nomachi:
Dative of external possession in Croatian:
From an areal-typological perspective

(5) *Bolna e žena **mi**.*
    sick   is wife to me (my)
    'My wife is sick'

(6) *Bolna **mi**   e ženata.*
    sick   to me is the wife
    'My wife went and got sick (lit: My wife is ill to me)'

This syntactic characteristic of the dative case in Croatian reminds us of two areal patterns. On the one hand, (1) seems to be more common and shared with other European languages; on the other hand, (3) is related to a syntactic feature of Balkan languages (cf. Joseph 2013: 622; Lindstedt 2000: 233; Mišeska-Tomiḱ 2006; Sandfeldt 1930: 185–191; Vaillant 1977: 88).[6]

In other words, analysis of this phenomenon could serve to identify a possible areal feature that characterizes Croatian among the cluster of other languages with which it coexists in an area or areas. It is already known that such dative case usage as in (3) is decidedly marginal; furthermore, according to some scholars (cf. Pancheva 2004: 183), modern (Serbo-)Croatian does not allow this use inside the determiner phrase.[7] Taking these points into account, I analyze below only the DEP in the context of areal typology (the dative case in (3) not being a target of analysis in this article) to explore the place of Croatian in this grammatical and semantic category, with special attention to other Slavic languages.

In section 2, I give an overview of certain problems in defining areal features as a framework for this article. In section 3, the usage of the DEP is considered based on the four grammatical and semantic hierarchies advanced by Haspelmath (1999). In this section, particular attention is paid to the Situation Hierarchy and two verbs

---

[5] According to Victor Friedman (personal communication), (5) stresses the fact that my wife is ill, i.e., her illness is the focus, while in (6) the emphasis is on MY wife being sick, with her illness affecting me in some way. The English translations of (5) and (6) are also provided by Friedman.

[6] For contra contrasting argument for the merger of the genitive and dative cases as a Balkanism, see particularly Catasso (2011). In terms of the reason for the merger of these cases, Topolinjska (2000: 1235) is of the opinion that in many cases, both dative and genitive show semantically the same distinctive features, i.e., /+def, + hum/ or /+def, +anim/, unlike other cases.

[7] In this context, it is interesting to note that in contemporary Croatian grammars, such as those of Silić and Pranjković (2007) and Belaj and Tanacković-Faletar (2014), this type of possessive dative is not mentioned at all. In addition, according to Palić (2010: 162), this type of dative can be found in old sources and in works whose authors use a language strongly influenced by the vernacular, and is not a productive category in Bosnian.

are analyzed in case studies, mainly in comparison to other Slavic languages. Section 4 summarizes the findings and issues identified in sections 2 and 3.

2. Problems in defining areal features

According to Haspelmath (2001: 1493–1501), the DEP is one of twelve features "that are the characteristic of the core features that together define the Standard Average European (SAE) or (Western) European *Sprachbund*."[8] However, one may wonder whether this feature can be regarded as an areal feature, rather than as a genetic feature inherited from Proto-Indo-European, because, as already shown by Havers (1911) and others, the DEP is attested in all classical languages (see also Haspelmath 1998: 282). According to Haspelmath (2001: 1498), there are three reasons to treat this phenomenon as an areal feature. First, there are non-Indo-European languages in Europe that share the feature. For instance, Basque, Maltese, and Hungarian have the DEP, which could be explained as an instance of areal convergence due to language contact.[9] Second, not all Indo-European languages of Europe have the DEP. Haspelmath (ibid.) regards Welsh, Breton, and English as such languages. Third, Indo-European languages outside of Europe, such as Kurdish, Persian, and Hindi, lack the DEP.

Haspelmath's explanation seems to be convincing from a macro perspective, and is useful for drawing the boundaries of the Sprachbünde. However, this kind of typological profiling of languages based only on the existence or nonexistence of a

---

[8] These twelve features can be summarized as follows (Heine and Kuteva 2006: 23–24): (i) definite and indefinite articles; (ii) postnominal relative clauses with inflected, resumptive relative pronouns; (iii) a possessive perfect ("have"-perfect) formed with a "have" verb plus a passive participle; (iv) a preponderance of generalizing predicates that encode experiencers; (v) a passive construction formed with a passive participle plus an intransitive copula-like verb; (vi) prominence of the anti-causative in inchoative-causative pairs; (vii) dative external possessors; (viii) verbal negation with a negative indefinite; (ix) particle comparatives in comparisons of inequality; (x) equative constructions based on adverbial-relative clause structures; (xi) subject person affixes as strict agreement markers; and (xii) differentiation between intensifiers and reflexive pronouns. According to Heine and Kuteva (ibid.), Croatian has five of these features, but they leave them unspecified. In some cases, the criteria could be ambiguous. For instance, Croatian does not have the fully grammaticalized possessive perfect of feature (iii), which is found in German and French, but it does have a resultative construction with the verb *imati* 'to have,' such as *imam sve napisano* 'I have written everything.' Indeed, some scholars tend to include this construction in feature (iii), but others do not.

[9] For Hungarian, see Nikolaeva (2002: 272–285). According to Nikolaeva (ibid.), there is no DEP attested in the Uralic languages, except for Hungarian, which could be explained as the influence of Latin, although the influence of neighboring languages cannot be denied.

Motoki Nomachi:
Dative of external possession in Croatian:
From an areal-typological perspective

given criterion does not seem to suffice to classify languages from a micro perspective. To put it differently, it is also important to investigate the sphere of usage (or the degree of grammaticalization) of the phenomenon in question to properly locate a target language within any given area. When it comes to analyzing smaller areas, such as that of Central Europe or the Balkans, the question of degree can be of particular importance for identifying the areal distribution of each linguistic phenomenon that may be regarded as an areal feature.[10] In the case of Croatian, this seems to be particularly significant, as Croatian is situated on "the crossroads of the Sprachbund" (Hamp 1989), regarded as a transitional member of the Danube and the Balkan Sprachbund (Haarman 1976: 98), or a peripheral member of the Balkan Sprachbund (Feuillet 2012: 48).

3. The DEP and its degree of usage

As has repeatedly been pointed out (cf. Bally 1926; Havers 1911; Wierzbicka 1999; and many others), the sphere of usage of the DEP is closely related to the notion of affectedness, and this is one condition on the use of the dative case. According to Haspelmath (1999: 113), cross-linguistically, DEPs are favored if they are high on hierarchies. These hierarchies can serve as a basis for measuring the sphere of DEP use. Below is a reproduction of Haspelmath (ibid.):

a. The Animacy Hierarchy
(EP constructions are favored if the possessor is a)
1st/2nd p. pronoun < 3rd p. pronoun < proper name < other animate < inanimate

b. The Situation Hierarchy
(EP constructions are favored if the predicate is)
patient-affecting < dynamic non-affecting < stative

c. The Inalienable Hierarchy
(EP constructions are favored if the possessum is a)
body part < garment < other contextually unique item

d. The Syntactic Relations Hierarchy

---

[10] In areal typology, there are several different ideas (both membership of languages and linguistic criteria for classification) about the Central European (or Danube) Sprachbund. However, the DEP is usually not treated as one of the criteria. The reason is that the DEP exists in all of the Central European languages, and thus it cannot serve as a distinctive areal feature, notwithstanding possible differences in spheres of usage.

(EP constructions are favored if the syntactic relation of the possessum is)
prepositional phrase < direct object < unaccusative subject < unergative subject < transitive subject

The validity of hierarchies a. and c. has already been argued by Kučanda (1985, 1996), as seems agreeable, particularly in regard to c. With regard to hierarchy a., however, an inanimate PR is usually impossible, but Kuna (2012: 180) suggests that the DEP can sometimes appear in Croatian, as in (7).

(7) ***Puškama*** *su   cijevi   iznutra dobro očuvane   jer   ih   je*
    to rifles   are barrels inside   well   protected because them is

 zaštitila masnoća.
 coated   grease

 'The rifles' barrels were well protected on the inside because they were coated with grease'

With regard to hierarchy d., in most European languages (with the rare exception of Albanian, according to Haspelmath (1999: 115), the DEP construction is not used when the subject is the argument of an unergative verb. In Croatian, although it does not appear often, one can find examples like that in (8).

(8) *Oči* ***joj***   *idu lijevo, desno, desno, lijevo.*[11]
    eyes to her go left   right   right   left
    'Her eyes are moving from left to right and from right to left'

To the best of my knowledge, hierarchy b. is yet to be sufficiently discussed. I show below that it is this hierarchy that can demonstrate the areal and typological position of Croatian.

3.1. *Situation Hierarchy in Central European Slavic languages: The verb "to see"*

According to Haspelmath (1999: 114), "usually only verbs denoting an event may occur in this construction in Europe, i.e., states are generally excluded." This appears to be true for the Slavic languages. For example, Wierzbicka (1999: 358–

---

[11] In Old Church Slavonic, the following is attested: *drugъ mi pride sъ pǫti kъ mьně* 'a friend of mine has come to me from a journey' (Luke 11.6: Codex Marianus). The enclitic form of the pronoun in the dative case *mi* can be understood as either a DEP or an adnominal dative, but in this sentence, it is impossible to choose only one interpretation. However, if it is a DEP, then Croatian preserves this archaic feature attested in Old Church Slavonic.

Motoki Nomachi:
Dative of external possession in Croatian:
From an areal-typological perspective

360) shows this difference in Polish using *patrzyć* 'to look' and *widzieć* 'to see,' as in (9) and (10).

(9) *Patrzył **ci** na nogi.*
    looked to you on legs
    'He looked at your (lit: to you) legs'

(10) **Widział **ci** nogi.*
     saw   to you legs
     'He saw your (lit: to you) legs'

The difference is that the verb *patrzyć* in (9) is an action targeting the person coded in the dative case, and this action can affect the addressee in one way or another, while the verb *widzieć* in (10) rather refers to a state, which cannot affect the addressee. This is why the use of the dative case is excluded. Following Wierzbicka (ibid.), let us take the verb *to see* as an example here.[12] According to my informants, Czech (see (11)) shares this feature with Polish and the DEP is basically excluded.[13] In Slovene, one could eventually find an example like (12), but the use of the DEP is rather unusual and at least stylistically marked, which means preference is given to the use of the possessive pronoun *tvoj* in this instance. This difference becomes clear when the PM is an alienable possession (see the above-mentioned The Inalienable Hierarchy) as in (13).

(11) *Viděl jsem *ti / tvou tvár.*[14]
     saw   am   to you/ your face

(12) *Videl sem ti / tvoj obraz.*
     saw   am   to you/ your face.
     'I saw your face'

---

[12] For these examples, I consulted with the following native speakers, who are also linguists: Alojzije Jembrih and Kristian Novak (Kajkavian dialects), Sanja Vulić (Čakavian dialects), Ivo Szucsich (Burgenland Croatian), Elżbieta Kaczmarska and Romuald Huszcza (Polish), Karolína Skwarska (Czech), Miroslav Dudok and Gabriela Múcsková (Slovak), Andreja Žele, Marko Stabej, and Tatjana Marvin (Slovene), Marjan Markoviќ (Macedonian), and Ruselina Nitsolova (Bulgarian).

[13] It is interesting to note that in Slovak the sphere of the DEP is wider. According to my informants, a sentence such as *videl som mu tvár* 'I saw his (lit: to him) face' is is possible, though today this type of sentence sounds archaic and it can be found particularly in a written variety of Slovak. This is a feature that unites Slovak with South Slavic (Lekov 1958: 77; Mrazek 1990: 48).

[14] According to Fried (2009: 228), one can say *vidí lidem do kapes* 'see into people's pockets,' but not **vidí lidem kapsy* 'he sees people's pockets.' The difference is explained such that the former verb is not used in its purely perceptual meaning of "having a visual experience," which would require an accusative-marked perceptum (Fried: ibid.).

(13) *Videl sem   *ti /   tvoje izdelke.*
      saw   am   to you/ your products.
      'I saw your products'

In contrast, standard Croatian presents a wider sphere of use for the DEP, notably extending to the lowest level of the Situation Hierarchy, namely the stative, as shown for Standard Croatian in (14).

(14) *Vidio sam **ti**   lice.*
      saw   am to you face
      'I saw your (lit: to you) face'

What about Čakavian dialects? According to Lisac (2009: 28), the DEP occurs in the Čakavian dialects in general. However, Vulić (personal communication) points out that in North Western Čakavian, if one needs to express the possessor in the abovementioned constructions, one uses the possessive adjective or the genitive case, while the same usage pattern for the DEP is found in the South Eastern dialects, as in (14).

(15) *Vidija san **mu**   oca.*
      saw   am to him father
      'I saw his (lit: to him) father'

Although more examples and further research on this topic are clearly needed, one could at this stage assume this phenomenon as a result of close contact with the local Štokavian dialects, in which the same type of construction as in standard Croatian occurs (see also Lisac 2009: 154).

The situation seems to be similar in some of the Kajkavian dialects. According to Novak (personal communication), it is impossible to use the DEP in the construction in question in North-Western Kajkavian, as in (16).

(16) *Vidio sem ***mu** /   jegovo lice.*
      saw   am   to him/ his   face
      'I saw his face'

In this context, note that Burgenland Croatian shows parallels with Kajkavian and Čakavian, as in (17).

(17) *Vidio sam ***mu** /   njegov obraz.*
      saw   am   to him / his   face
      'I saw his face'

In contrast, this feature in standard Croatian is shared with Macedonian and Bul-

Motoki Nomachi:
Dative of external possession in Croatian:
From an areal-typological perspective

garian, in which the dative can also function as an attributive to a noun, reflecting one of the Balkan-Sprachbund features, but not in structures that use the DEP. Consider the Macedonian example in (18) and the Bulgarian example in (19).

(18) ***Mu*** *go vidov liceto*.[15]
    to him him saw the face
    'I saw his (lit: to him) face'

(19) *Vidjax **mu** liceto*.
    saw him the face
    'I saw his (lit: to him) face'

Judging from the usage of the DEP with the perceptive verb *to see* in Slavic languages,[16] standard Croatian is closer to Balkan Slavic languages (Bulgarian and Macedonian). On the other hand, its closest neighbors and generically related languages, such as Kajkavian, Čakavian, Burgenland Croatian, and, to a lesser extent, Slovene, share this feature (or similar tendencies) with Czech and Polish. This seems to be suggestive in areal-typological terms, with languages using the DEP less as one moves geographically in a north-western direction.[17]

In light of this areal differentiation, the diachronic aspect of the DEP may also be important for understanding the characteristics of Croatian and Balkan Slavic languages. It is noteworthy that Old Church Slavonic seems to have a decidedly wide sphere of DEP use, as pointed out by Mrazek (1963: 240), with a similar construction using the DEP and the verb *viděti* 'to see' as in Croatian (see (20)).

(20) …*vidětъ lice **отьси** mi*… (Matthew 18.10: Savva's book)
    see face to father to me
    '(angels in heaven always) see the face of my Father …'

---

[15] According to Mišeska-Tomiḱ (2008: 32), one can use the dative case twice: *Ti ja vidov sestra ti* 'I saw you (lit: to you) sister on her (lit: to you)'. The first *ti* is DEP, the second *ti* is adnominal dative.

[16] Due to the page limitation, I cannot here provide examples of the DEP with other perceptive verbs, such as *to hear*, but it seems that Croatian shares more with Balkan Slavic languages.

[17] In this sense, it is also suggestive that the German **Ich habe ihm Gesicht gesehen* 'I saw his (lit: to him) face' is not acceptable, similar to Central European Slavic languages. For a comparison of German and Serbo-Croatian, see also Šnel-Živanović (1997: 26).

If the situation in Old Church Slavonic is close to that of Common Slavic, it would be logical to assume that the Croatian situation (together with Balkan Slavic languages) may be one of syntactic archaism, rather than innovation.[18]

3.2. *Situation Hierarchy in Central European Slavic languages: The verb "to be"*

To support the view that the wider sphere of the aforementioned DEP is a sort of archaism, I discuss in this section another areal-typological feature of Croatian with attention to two points: first, the nature of modified predicative possession in EP; second, the interpretation of modified predicative possession from the viewpoint of the Situation Hierarchy. By "modified predicative possession" I mean here the possessive construction whose focus has changed from a statement of possession in a wide sense of this term to a description of the possessed item.[19]

3.2.1. *"Ambiguous constructions" of predicative possession*

For the purpose of illustration, let me compare Russian and Croatian. According to Holvoet (2005), the difference between attributive and predicative possession can sometimes be ambiguous in Baltic and Slavic languages. To illustrate this issue, let us begin with Holvoet's (2005: 58) example from Russian, given in (21) and (22).[20]

(21) *Glaza **u neë** byli zelënye.*
      eyes   at her were green
      'Her eyes were green'

---

[18] It may be worth mentioning that other Slavic languages had a tendency in which the sphere of the DEP became narrower (cf. Minčeva 1964: 11). Certain usages of the DEP have simply been excluded or replaced by a prepositional phrase. For Polish, see Brodowska (1955) and for East Slavic languages, especially Russian, see Keršiene (1968). Furthermore, according to Luraghi (forthcoming), the decay and renewal of the DEP is possible, as in the history of Greek, in which the DEP declined but started to reappear much later. This instability can also be said for Latin, non-Indo-European languages, and West Germanic. Generally speaking, Slavic languages are, according to Luraghi, stable over time.

[19] According to Arutjunova (1999: 750), this type of modification is the actualization of qualitative determination.

[20] Generally, as has been discussed by Gustavsson (1976: 343), the word order has a certain influence on the interpretation of such a case. When the PM noun is topicalized and the adjective occupies the predicate position, such as *tovarišči u menja xorošie* 'colleagues of mine are good,' the adjective is more likely interpreted as the predicate.

Motoki Nomachi:
Dative of external possession in Croatian:
From an areal-typological perspective

(22) **Eë** *glaza byli zelënye*.
　　her eyes　were gleen
　　'Her eyes were green'

According to Holvoet (ibid.), (21) is ambiguous and can be interpreted in two different ways, namely as predicative possession with the topicalized PM *glaza* 'eyes', or as non-predicative possession with EP *u neë* 'at her.' Holvoet (ibid.) suggests that the second reading is possible because (22), with the possessive pronoun *eë* 'her,' is structurally equivalent to (21), in which the noun *glaza* is in a topical position, and *zelënye* 'green' is a predicative adjective.[21] As a token of the correct interpretation, the predicative adjective can be replaced with its short form *zeleny*, which is used predicatively only in contemporary Russian, or with the same adjective in the instrumental case, *zelënymi*.

As pointed out by Holvoet (2005: 59), (21) seems to be closer to the Croatian sentence in (23) on the levels of both syntax and semantics. In (23), the PM occupies the topical position and the dative is used for marking the PR.

(23) *Noge su* **mu** *krvave*.
　　feet　are to him bloody
　　'His (lit: to him) feet are bloody'

Given that (Serbo-)Croatian is typologically classified as a "habere" language (cf. Issatchenko 1974; Mrazek 1990), Holvoet (2005: 60) opines as follows:

> [be]tween this use of a predicative possessive construction of this type and a widespread use of external possessors there is no necessary connection, as shown by the fact that the Balkan languages, which have constructions of the 'habeo' type, are characterized by an extremely wide scope of external possession.[22]

However, although one could agree that Croatian, together with other West and South Slavic languages, belongs to the group of *habere*-type languages, in contrast

---

[21] Some scholars, such as Mološnaja (1975: 69), treat "the noun + the prepositional phrase with *u*" like *golova u rebënka* (lit: 'head at baby,' which could in some cases be translated into English as 'baby's head') as an independent substantive syntagma (*substantivnoe slovosočetanie* in the Russian terminology), but as is pointed out by Weiss and Raxilina (2002: 184), "the noun + the prepositional phrase with *u*" cannot be integrated into a sentence as it stands. According to Weiss and Raxilina (ibid.), in the following sentence, it is grammatically impossible to replace *u menja* with the possessive pronoun *moë*: *I na xrena ja vremja svoë na tebja traču? Ono u menja (*moë), čto beslatnoe.* 'And why, damn it, am I wasting my time for you? Is it (=my time) free (=not paid) lit. at me?'

[22] Holvoet takes (Serbo-)Croatian as an example of a Balkan language, though this terminology seems to be misleading.

to Russian, which is a typical "esse" language, this does not mean that Croatian is a typical *habere* language. This is because Croatian does have the *esse* predicative possessive, in which the PR is coded by oblique case, as do some South Slavic languages. In this regard, Rešetar (1911: 160) explains as follows: "Das Verbum *biti* 'sein' mit dem Dative eines Nomen oder Pronomen hat haeufig die Bedeutung von 'haben': da su *meni* krila labudova."

Almost the same explanation can be drawn from other Neo-Štokavian literary languages. For instance, in the syntax of the Serbian literary language, Piper et al. (2005: 699) state that the aforementioned *esse* construction is not used often, but is productive in the form of predicative possession.[23]

Historically speaking, as discussed by Grković-Mejdžor (2013: 116–133), Proto-Slavic had *esse* predicative possession.[24] Later, in West and South Slavic languages, *habere* predicative possession arose in the course of time, excluding the *esse* predicative possession.[25] Therefore, one could regard (23) as a result of topicalization of the PM in a similar manner as in the Russian sentence in (21), with the difference that Russian uses the prepositional phrase *u kogo-to* 'at someone' as a marker of EP. This means that, contrary to Holvoet (2005), one could suggest that there is a certain correlation between the predicative possessive construction and its derivational form, i.e., an "ambiguous construction."

3.2.2. *Predicative possession in the context of Situation Hierarchy*

From the viewpoint of the aforementioned Situation Hierarchy, the Croatian use of the DEP in (23) is quite unique, because the verb *to be* is absolutely "stative," and the DEP does not usually surface with it in most European languages, according to Haspelmath (ibid). Therefore, it comes as no surprise that the DEP cannot appear in similar constructions in Polish and Czech, as shown in (24) and (25), respectively.

---

[23] Piper et al. (2005) provide examples, such as *Ani je kosa gusta* 'Ana has the dense hair' (lit: To Ana is thick hair) and *Peri su noge duge* 'Pera has the long legs (lit: To Pera are long legs).'

[24] It is agreed that Proto-Indo-European did not have a *habere* verb for expressing possession. Instead, *essere* predicative possession was used. See Gamkrelidze and Ivanov (1984: 288-289). This type of predicative possession is attested in Old West Slavic languages. See Minčeva (1964: 12).

[25] This typological change could be explained by the orientation of the nominative type and the orientation of the agentive (subject) type from the topic type. This was presumably brought about both by internal and contact-induced changes, depending on the language. According to Grković-Mejdžor (2013: 131), for Serbian, and partially Croatian, Macedonian, and Bulgarian, the local Romance language had a significant effect on this change, while for West Slavic languages and Kajkavian, this change was due to close contact with German.

Motoki Nomachi:
Dative of external possession in Croatian:
From an areal-typological perspective

(24) *Vlasy jsou **mu** dlhé.
  hair are to him long

(25) *Ręce są **mu** brudne.
  hands are to him dirty

Instead of the DEP structure, the same effect as in Croatian (23) is expressed in these languages using the equivalent of the English verb *to have*, with the noun detached from the adjective and topicalized, as in (26) for Czech and (27) for Polish.

(26) *Vlasy má dlhé.*
  hair has long
  'His/her hair is long'

(27) *Ręce ma brudne.*
  hands has dirty
  'His/her hands are dirty'

Slovene, in turn, has two strategies. As shown by Vidović-Muha (2000: 262), the most typical one is the topicalization of the PM, as in (28), in the same manner as in Czech and Polish. The other strategy is the use of the DEP, as in (29), like in Croatian:

(28) *Roke ima krvave.*
  hands has bloody
  'His/her hands are bloody'

(29) *Lica so **mu** bila polna in rdeča.* (I. Cankar)
  cheeks are to him were full and red
  'His cheeks were full and red'

In contemporary Slovene, the type in (29) is rather rare and can be regarded as an archaism. In addition, it is important to note that the DEP is generally used with pronouns only, and not with nouns (see (29)), which is different from Croatian (see (7) and footnote 22).[26]

(30) *Janezu so lica bila polna in rdeča.*
  to John are cheeks were full and red

---

[26] However, in the Slovene grammar written in the 19th century, Janežič (1900: 188) gives such an example, namely *Laži je plitko dno* 'A lie has a shallow bottom' (lit: To a lie is shallow bottom), explaining that a person or a thing in the dative case appears with the copula *to be* when the substitute of the verb *to have* expresses the person or the thing within whose influential area something exists.

'Lit: To John cheeks were full and red'

For Croatian, this topicalization of the PM with the use of the verb *to have* may be grammatically possible, but is at least not typical. Obviously, the effect is not the same as in Czech, Polish, and Slovene when using *to have*. Compare the Slovene in (31) to its literal translation into Croatian in (32).

(31) *Usta je imel povsem suha, niti pljuniti ni mogel.* (D. Šnigoj)
     mouth is had completely dry not even spit is not could
     'His mouth was completely dry, he could not even spit'

(32) ?*Usta je imao potpuno suha, ni pljunuti nije mogao.*
     mouth is had completely dry not even spit is not could
     'Lit: Mouth he had completely and dry, he could not event spit'

The situation in North-Western Kajkavian seems to be similar to that in Standard Croatian, i.e., the DEP is used when the noun is topicalized as in (33). However, according to my informants, only personal pronouns in the form of the dative case enclitic can surface here, as in (34). In addition, the strategy of using the verb *to have*, as in West Slavic languages and Slovene, does not seem to be accepted, as shown by (35).[27]

(33) *Luasi so **mu** douge.*
     hair are to him long
     'His hair is long'

(34) ?*Ivanu so kruatke noge.*
     to John are short legs
     Lit: To John are short legs

(35) ?*Luase ima douge.*
     hair has short
     Lit: Hair s/he has short

As for Bulgarian and Macedonian, they share the similar set of predicative possessive constructions and the same strategies found in Croatian. It is worth emphasizing here that Bulgarian and Macedonian, unlike Slovene and the West Slavic languages, exclude the use of the verb *to have*, as shown in (36) and (39), but as in (37) and (40) do not exclude *esse* predicative possession with PR in the preposi-

---

[27] For Čakavian, I could not find any reliable data. According to Vulić (personal communication), in Čakavian, on the one hand, no DEP is used and the possessive pronoun appears in a sentence like (33). On the other hand, there does not seem to be any possibility of using the verb *to have*, as in (35).

Motoki Nomachi:
Dative of external possession in Croatian:
From an areal-typological perspective

tional phrase *na* that has developed from the dative case, although this is not typical.[28] Consider the Bulgarian examples in (36) to (38) and the Macedonian in (39) to (41).

(36) *Očite   mi   sa černi.*
the eyes to me are black
'My eyes are black'

(37) **Očite   imam černi.*
the eyes have black
Lit: The eyes I have black

(38) *Na mene očite   mi   sa černi.*
to me   the eyes to me are black
'I have the black eyes'

(39) *Kosata i   e dolga.*
hair   to her is long
'Her hair is long'

(40) **Kosata ima dolga.*
hair   has long
Lit: Hair s/he has long

(41) *Na Marija i   e dolga kosata.*
to Mary   to her is long   the hair
'Mary has long hair'

To sum up, Croatian shares most features with Bulgarian and Macedonian with regard to the strategy for topicalizing the PM in the predicative possessive construction. In this context, it is interesting to note that Slovene and Kajkavian have a transitional character, though the distribution of the constructions in question is different.

On the diachronic level, according to Grković-Mejdžor (2013: 125), in the history of each Slavic language, the dative case in the *esse* predicative possession was reanalyzed and the dative case was reinterpreted as a recipient or "possessive dative," which is the DEP in this case. In Old Church Slavonic, one can find a parallel with Croatian, as in (42).

(42) *I   rǫka desnaa **emou** bě souxa* (Luke 6.6 Codex Marianus)
and hand right   to him was dry

---

[28] On the other hand, this phenomenon is also explained as a case of the clitic left dislocation.

'and his right hand was crippled'

If this is true, Croatian and Balkan Slavic may have preserved the archaic features that West Slavic languages and Slovene had already lost in the process of HAVE DRIFT (cf. Stassen 2009: 208–243).

4. Concluding Remarks

I have analyzed in this article two issues on the topic of the Croatian dative, which seem to be internally linked from both areal and typological perspectives based on Slavic data. What I have shown can be summarized as follows:

1. According to the hierarchy proposed by Haspelmath (1999), Croatian is salient in the sense that the DEP can be combined with verbs with stative meanings, including verbs of perception, which is rather unusual from the perspective of SAE. Croatian is genetically classified as a South-West Slavic language, together with Slovene. However, in this respect, one might say that Croatian is closer to Macedonian and Bulgarian. From a diachronic perspective, the wider sphere of usage of the DEP is seemingly not an innovation in Croatian. It may be an archaic feature also attested in Old Church Slavonic.

2. Typologically, Croatian is usually classified as a *habere*-type language, together with the West Slavic languages and the remainder of the South Slavic languages. However, with regard to the strategy of the reorganization of predicative possession by topicalizing the PM and the use of the DEP, Croatian can be classified as an *essere*-type language, again together with Bulgarian and Macedonian. In contrast, other *habere*-type Slavic languages, such as Czech and Polish, use another strategy, namely topicalization of the PM by detaching it from the adjective and placing it in a subject position, while at the same time preserving the verb *habere*. According to the areal point of view, Slovene reveals a transitional feature, even closer to West Slavic languages. From a diachronic point of view, this could also be an archaic feature, as Proto-Slavic is known as an *esse* type language, whose relics are also found in Croatian.

In the context of the topics covered in this article, we might suggest that Croatian shares, at least to some extent, certain features with the Balkan Slavic languages. However, the question remains as to whether these are Balkanisms, as has been discussed by some scholars (for instance, Minčeva 1987; Birnbaum 1996). Considering the related syntactic changes, it might be difficult to regard these phenomena in Croatian simply as Balkanisms, because they could be archaisms that

Motoki Nomachi:
Dative of external possession in Croatian:
From an areal-typological perspective

existed in Slavic languages in general and are not the result of structural convergence caused by language contact.

Last but not least, note that the intermediateness of Croatian is not new idea. It is well-known, on the one hand, that the Štokavian dialects of Croatian present such typical Balkan features as *volo*-future, although to lesser degree than Serbian, merger of goal/location, the use of *da*-construction instead of the infinitive, etc., which seems to be explained in the context of language contact. On the other hand, there are other features that may imply the intermediate position of Croatian, such as verbal aspect, as has been pointed out by Dickey (2000). Thus, more thorough areal and typological studies of Croatian should explore the transitional nature of Croatian in more detail.

References

Arutjunova, Nina D. 1999. *Jazyk i mir čeloveka*. Moscow: Jazyki russkoj kultury.

Belaj, Branimir; Tanacković Faletar, Goran. 2014. *Kognitivna gramatika hrvatskoga jezika, knjiga 1. Imenska sintagma i sintaksa padeža*. Zagreb: Disput.

Birnbaum, Henrik. 1996. Language contact and language interference: the case of Greek and Old Church Slavonic. *Suvremena lingvistika* 41–42. 39–44.

Brabec, Ivan; Hraste, Mate; Živković, Sreten. 1965. *Gramatika hrvatskosrpskoga jezika* (4th. edn.). Zagreb: Školska knjiga.

Brodowska, Maria. 1955. Historyczne procesy przekształceń polskiego celownika w formy przyimkowe. *Studia z filologii polskiej i słowiańskiej* 1. 1–55.

Catasso, Nicholas. 2011. Genitive-dative syncretism in the Balkan Sprachbund: An invitation to discussion. *SKASE Journal of Theoretical Linguistics* 8(2). http://www.skase.sk/Volumes/JTL19/pdf_doc/04.pdf.

Dickey, Stephen. 2000. *Parameters of Slavic aspect: A cognitive approach*. Stanford: CSLI Publications.

Fried, Mirjam. 2009. Plain vs. situated possession in Czech: A constructional account. In McGregor, William (ed.), *The expression of possession*, 213–249. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Feuillet, Jack 2012. *Linguistique Comparée des Langues Balkaniques*. Paris: Institute d'études slaves.

Gamkrelidze, Tomas, & Ivanov, Vjačeslav. 1984. *Indoevropejskij jazyk i indoevropejcy* I. Tbilisi: Izdatelstvo tbilisskogo universiteta.

Grković-Mejdžor, Jasmina. 2013. *Istorijska lingvistika: Kognitivno-tipološke studije*. Sremski Karlovci-Novi Sad: Izdavačka knjižarnica Zorana Stojanovića.

Gustavsson, Sven. 1976. *Predicative Adjectives with the Copula* byt' *in Modern Russian.* Stockholm: Almqvist &Wiksell.

Hamp, Eric. 1989. Yugoslavia – A crossroads of Sprachbünde. *Zeitschrift für Balkanologie* 1. 44–47.

Haspelmath, Martin. 1998. How young is Standard Average European? *Language Sciences* 20(3). 271–287.

Haspelmath, Martin. 1999. External possession in a European areal perspective. In Payne, Doris, & Barshi, Immanuel (eds.), *External Possession*, 109–135. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company 109–136.

Haspelmath, Martin. 2001. The European linguistic area: standard average European. In Haspelmath, Martin, & König, Ekkehard, & Oesterreicher, Wulf, & Raible, Wolfgang (eds.), *Language typology and language universals* (Volume 2), 1492–1510. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Heine, Bernd, & Kuteva, Tania. 2006. *The changing languages of Europe*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Holvoet, Axel. 2005. Attributive and predicative possession: some cases of ambiguity in Baltic and Slavonic. *Zeitschrift für Slawistik* 50(1). 58–67.

Issatchenko, Alexander. 1974. On 'have' and 'be' anguages (A typological sketch). In Flier, Michael (ed.), *Slavic forum: Essays in linguistics and literature*, 43–74. The Hague: Mouton.

Joseph, Brian. 2013. Language contact in the Balkans. In Hickey, Raymond (ed.), *The handbook of language contact*, 618–633. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

Katičić, Radoslav. 2002. *Sintaksa hrvatskoga književnog jezika* (3rd. edn.). Zagreb: Nakladni zavod Globus/HAZU.

Keršiene, Rufina. 1968. Datelnyj padež. In Borkovskij, Viktor (ed.), *Sravnitelno-istoričeskij sintaksis vostočnoslavjanskix jazykov: členy predloženija*, 178–204. Moscow: Nauka.

Kučanda, Dubravko. 1985. Some thoughts on the dative of possession. *Zbornik pedagoškog fakulteta (Humanističke i društvene znanosti)* 1. 37–55.

Kučanda, Dubravko. 1996. What is the dative of possission? *Suvremena Lingvistika* 41–42. 319–332.

Kuna, Branko. 2012. *Predikatna i vanjska posvojnost u hrvatskome jeziku*. Osijek: Filozofski fakultet.

Lisac, Josip. 2009. *Hrvatska dijalektologija* 2. *Čakavsko narječje.* Zagreb: Golden Marketing-Tehnička knjiga.

Lindstedt, Jouko. 2000. Linguistic Balkanization: Contact-induced change by mutual reinforcement. In Gilbers, Dicky Gilbers, & Nerbonne, John, & Schaeken, Jos (eds.), *Languages in Contact.* 231–246. Amsterdam, Atlanta: Rodopi.

Lekov, Ivan. 1958. *Obštnost i mnogoobrazie v gramatičeskija stroj na slavjanskite ezici.*

Motoki Nomachi:
Dative of external possession in Croatian:
From an areal-typological perspective

Sofia: Izdatelstvo na Bălgarskata Akademija na Naukite.

Luraghi, Silvia. fc. External possessor constructions in Indo-European. In Barðal, Jóhanna, & Lujon, Eugenio, & Gildea, Spike (eds.), *Reconstructing Syntax*. Leiden: Brill.

Matasović, Ranko. 2002. Otuđiva i neotuđiva posvojnost u hrvatskome jeziku. *Rasprave Instituta za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje* 28(1). 151–60.

Minčeva, Angelina. 1964. *Razvoi na datelnija pritežatelen padež v bălgarskija ezik.* Sofia: Izdatelstvo na Bălgarskata Akademija na Naukite.

Minčeva, Angelina. 1987. *Starobălgarskijat ezik v svetlinata na balkanistikata.* Sofia: Nauka i izkustvo.

Mišeska-Tomić, Olga. 2006. *Balkan Sprachbund Morpho-syntactic Features*. Dordrecht: Springer.

Mišeska-Tomiќ, Olga. 2008. *Makedonskite klitiki vo balkanskoto okruženie.* Skopje: Makedonskata Akademija na Naukite i Umetnosti.

Mološnaja, Tatjana. 1975. *Substantivnyje slovosočetanija v slavjanskix jazykax.* Moskva: Nauka.

Mrazek, Roman. 1963. Datelnyj padež v staroslavjanskom jazyke. In Kurz, Josef (ed.), *Issledovanija po sintaksisu staroslavjanskogo jazyka*, 225–261. Praga: Izdatelstvo čexoslovackoj akademii nauk.

Mrazek, Roman. 1990. *Sravnitelnyj sintaksis slavjanskix literaturnyx jazykov.* Brno: Univerzita J.E. Purkyně v Brně.

Nikolaeva, Irina. 2002. The Hungarian external possessor in a European perspective. In Blokland, Rogiel, & Hasselblatt, Cornelius (eds.), Finno-Ugrians and Indo-Europeans: Linguistic and literary contacts, 272–285. Maastricht: Shaker.

Palić, Ismail. 2010. *Dativ u bosanskome jeziku*. Sarajevo: Bookline.

Pancheva, Roumyana. 2004. Balkan possessive clitics: The problem of case and category. In Mišeska-Tomić, Olga (ed.), *Balkan syntax and semantics*, 175–219. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Payne, Doris L., & Barshi, Immanuel. 1999. External possession: What, where, how, and why. In Payne, Doris, & Barshi, Immanuel eds. *External Possession*, 3–29. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Piper, Predrag, & Antonić, Ivana, & Ružić, Vladislava, & Tanasić, Sreto, & Popović, Ljudmila, & Tošović, Branko. 2005. *Sintaksa savremenoga srpskog jezika: prosta rečenica*. Beograd: Institut za srpski jezik SANU.

Sandfeld, Kristian. 1930. *Linguistique balkanique: Problèms et rézultats*. Paris: Librairie ancienne honoré Champion.

Silić, Josip, & Pranjković, Ivo. 2007. *Gramatika hrvatskoga jezika za gimnazije i visoka učilišta*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.

Stassen, Leon. 2009. *Predicative Possession*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Težak, Stjepko, & Babić, Stjepan. 1973. *Pregled gramatike hrvatskoga književnog jezika za osnovne i druge škole* (4th. edn.). Zagreb: Školska knjiga.

Topolinjska, Zuzana. 2000. Odnosot Genitiv-Dativ vo balkanskite padežni sistemi. *Južnoslovenski filolog* 56(3–4). 1229–1236.

Vaillant, André. 1977. *Grammaire comparée des langues slaves*. T. 5. Paris: Klincksieck.

Večerka, Radoslav. 1993. *Altkirchenslavische (Altbulgarische) Syntax II. Die innere Satzstruktur.* Freiburg: U. W. Weiher-Freiburg I. Br.

Vidovič-Muha, Ada. 2000. *Slovensko leksikalno pomenoslovje.* Ljubljana: Znanstveni inštitut Filozofske fakultete.

Weiss, Daniel, & Raxilina, Ekaterina. 2002. Forgetting one's roots: Slavic and non-Slavic elements in possessive constructions of modern Russian. *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* 55(2). 173–205.

Wierzbicka, Anna. 1999. *Język – umysł – kultura.* Warszawa: Wydawnictwo naukowe PWN.

Žaža, Stanislav. 2010. *Latina a řečtina v slovní zásobě, gramatice a terminologii slovanských jazyků.* Brno: Masarykova univerzita.

Author's address:

Slavic-Eurasian Research Center
Hokkaido University
Kita 9 Nishi 7
Kita-ku Sapporo 060-0809, Japan
E-Mail: mnomachi@slav.hokudai.ac.jp

DATIVNA VANJSKA POSVOJNA KONSTRUKCIJA U HRVATSKOM JEZIKU S AREALNO-TIPOLOŠKOG STAJALIŠTA

Konstrukcije za vanjsku posvojnost određuju su kao konstrukcije u kojima semantička veza između posjednika i posjedovanoga nije ostvarena izravnom gramatičkom vezom, već su sastavnice posvojnoga odnosa razdvojene glagolom. Jedna od konstrukcija koja predstavlja taj fenomen jest tzv. posvojni dativ koji je široko potvrđen u europskim jezicima kao arealna osobina. U ovome se članku analizira posvojni dativ u standardnom hrvatskom jeziku, ali i njegovim dijalektima, posebno iz (mikro)arealne i tipološke perspektive, s ciljem lociranja hrvatskoga među slavenskim jezicima, obraćajući posebnu pozornost na korelaciju između uporabe posvojnog dativa i njegovih arealnih tendencija. Kao rezultat analize jest zaključak da hrvatski zauzima mjesto između zapadnoslavenskih jezika zajedno sa slovenskim za koje je svojstvena uža uporaba posvojnog dativa te balkaniziranih slavenskih jezika u kojima te konstrukcija ima najširu značenjsku uporabu. To se opažanje može

Motoki Nomachi:
Dative of external possession in Croatian:
From an areal-typological perspective

objasniti činjenicom da su zapadnoslavenski i slovenski tipološki pretežito *habere* jezici, a hrvatski još uvijek tipološki zadržava osobine *essere* jezika koje se također mogu naći u balkaniziranim slavenskim jezicima.

Ključne riječi: posvojnost; dativ; hrvatski jezik; europski jezični savez; balkanski jezični savez.