The Bosnian-Croatian-Serbian Adnominal Possessive Dative at the Syntax-Pragmatics Interface

JAMES JOSHUA PENNINGTON

The Ohio State University, 400 Hagerty Hall, 1775 College Road, Columbus, Ohio 43210, pennington.106@osu.edu

V bosansko-hrvaško-srbskem jeziku je za izražanje lastnine ob zaimenskem svojilnem dajalniku (ASD) v rabi tudi imenska pridevniška konstrukcija. ASD je razumljen kot: (1) pojav v sociolingvistki/perceptivni dialektologiji, (2) formalni skladenjsko-pragmatični pojav. Anketiranci so označevali ASD-rabo kot »arhaično,« »staromodno«, »značilnost neizobraženih« ali kot »podeželsko govorico«. Glede na ASD-rabo v dialektih se zdi, da so pomenska vloga koristnika/prejemnika, raven sobesedilnih učinkov in obdelava podatkov za razumevanje svojilnih konstrukcij zelo odvisni od njihove sprejemljivosti. Predlagam model, ki ASD-rabo razume kot vzpostavljanje hierarhičnega odnosa med »prejemnikom/koristnikom« in »prejetim/koristjo«.

In Bosnian, Croatian, and Serbian, the adnominal possessive dative (APD) construction is used alongside the nominal adjectival construction to express possession. APD usage is double-edged – i.e., there are both issues of sociolinguistics/perceptual dialectology involved as well as more formal syntactic-pragmatic ones. My respondents consistently labeled APD usage as "archaic," "old-fashioned," "characteristic of the uneducated," or "country-talk". However, judging by very similar acceptance levels of APDs in particular contexts in all dialects, it appears that semantic role of the possessor and the level of contextual effects and processing load involved in interpreting possessive constructions weigh heavily on their acceptance. Therefore, I offer a model that attempts to capture APD usage in terms of a set of hierarchical relationships between the "possessor" and the "possessed".

Ključne besede: zaimenski svojilni dajalnik (pripadnostni dajalnik/dajalnik pripadnosti), bosansko-hrvaško-srbski jezik, skladenjsko-pragmatični vmesnik, percepcijska dialektologija, geolingvistika

Key words: Adnominal possessive dative (dative of interest/sympathy), Bosnian-Croatian-Serbian, syntax-pragmatics interface, perceptual dialectology, dialect geography

1 Introduction[1]

In all the Slavic languages, speakers can choose to avoid overtly 1st person (or in semantic terms, actor-centric) narration by using impersonal constructions which require dative case forms as logical subjects. These impersonal constructions (hereafter: ICs) typically passivize logical subjects of actions (actors), presumably in order to convey the sense of an actor having less control over an action. For example, Russian impersonal *Eto mne nravitsja* 'It pleases me' blurs the boundary of the cause/effect relationship between an actor and a patient. However, the egocentric *Ja eto ljublju* 'I like/love it' clearly relays the actor's central role in relationship with a patient due to the use of the transitive verb *ljubit'*. Moreover, many Slavic languages exhibit another construction, which conveys a similar sense of mutual inclusivity, or co-inherence, between two entities – the adnominal possessive dative (hereafter: APD).

For the Slavic languages that have the APD, in neutral contexts where one would expect a possessive adjectival construction (excluding Bulgarian and Macedonian, where the APD has become the normal possessive construction), such as 'my foot' or 'my mother', native speakers can choose to use the APD, e.g., BCS *noga mi*, literally 'foot to me' or *majka mi* 'mother to me'. This can be viewed as a pragmatic strategy which shifts the focus of the relationship between two entities from an actor-centric position to one of co-inherence, similar to the way in which impersonal constructions function. This pragmatic strategy has been referred to in the literature as the *dativus sympatheticus* or the 'sympathetic dative' (Gallis 1974: 57): a strategy which is employed by speakers to gain the sympathy of his/her interlocutor. Below are given examples from languages from each branch of Slavic that exhibits the APD. Early critique

1.1 The APD in Slavic[2]

(A) South Slavic: (i) Old Church Slavonic (Huntley 177) a) *lice otьcju mi* 'My father's face' (Gallis: 1972: 53); b) *prědanъ imatъ byti synъ člověčьsky vъ rǫcě člověkomъ* (Marianus) (Matthew 7: 22) 'the son of man will be betrayed into the hands of men'. (ii) Bulgarian (Scatton 237) *Tova sa knigite* **mu** 'These are **his** books.' (iii) Macedonian (Friedman 287)[3] *Ja sum* **mu** *prijatelj* 'I am **his**

---

[2] Examples of the APD for the Slavic languages, except Russian and Slovenian are taken from *The Slavonic Languages* (Comrie & Corbett 2006).

[3] In contrast to Bulgarian, in Macedonian the APD is used most frequently when referring to one's family members or close acquaintances. Also, the dative can be used emphatically when used alongside a possessive adjective, e.g., *Tatko mi moj* 'my *my*! father').

friend.' (iv) Slovenian[4] (Greenberg 2006: 109) *Zlomila **mi** je nogo* 'She broke **my** leg.' (v) Bosnian-Croatian-Serbian (Browne 371) *Poštar **mu** se javio na vratima*. '**His** postman showed up at his door'. (B) West Slavic: (vi) Czech (Short 518–9)[5] *Umyla **mu** vlasy.* 'She washed **his** hair.' (vii) Polish (Rothstein 747)[6] *Zarzała **mi** do gardła* 'She looked into **my** throat.' (viii) Cassubian (Stone 789)[7] ***Jëmu** bëło miono Karól* '**His** name is Karol.'(C) East Slavic: (ix) Russian (Nikolaevna & Tolskaya)[8] *On **mne** brat*. 'He is **my** brother.' (x) Belorussian (Mayo 935). ty vorah **mne** 'You are **my** enemy.'

1.2 The Central Problem of This Investigation: Combining Adnominal Possessive Dative Objects with Verbal Arguments Clause-Internally

Initially, this problem was brought to my attention while lecturing my first-year BCS students on impersonal constructions. Having introduced the construction *svideti se* 'to please', e.g., *Bratu se sviđa fudbal* 'My brother likes football', I was asked whether it was possible to combine such constructions with the APD, e.g., *Bratu **mi** se sviđa fudbal*. Unable to respond to my student's question confidently, I approached a native speaker for her opinion, and she was also unable to confidently say whether the combination of the APD with impersonal constructions was possible. This served as motivation to investigate the phenomenon further.

2 The origin of the APD in the Slavic languages – A Pragmatic Development

In his important, yet fairly obscure work "Da li je srpskohrvatski adnominalni dativ pripadnosti (posesivni dativ) balkanizam?" (Is the Serbo-Croatian adnominal dative of possession (possessive dative) a Balkanism?), Arne Gallis (1972) examined the hypothesis that the APD arose in Serbo-Croatian as a contact-induced feature from Balkan *Sprachbund* languages. In Albanian,

---

[4] Priestly notes that Slovenes consider the APD to be "stylistically marked and archaic" (Priestly 440).

[5] It is almost obligatory to use the APD when the object of the APD is a body part, e.g., Czech *rozbil si nohu* 'He broke his leg'). The use of the APD in Slovak is similar to Czech, but only when the speaker is referring to something or someone he/she has an intimate relationship with. However, Short (580) cautions that there exists a very thin line between distal and proximal relations.

[6] For inanimate objects of possession, it is almost obligatory to use the APD (Rothstein 747).

[7] According to Stone, the APD is encountered rarely in Cassubian (Stone 789).

[8] In his section of Comrie & Corbett, Timberlake does not mention the existence of the APD. Although it might be considered rare, it exists nonetheless.

Romanian, and Greek there is absolute syncretism of the dative and genitive (hereafter: D and G) cases (Sandfeld 1930: 12, 185–187). Furthermore, despite the total loss of nominal case, Bulgarian and Macedonian share a syncretism of the D and G in the semantic sense. The preposition *na* functions as a marker of the indirect object (D) and the possessor (attributive G). Moreover, while BCS does not exhibit morphological syncretism of the D and G, at times speakers can employ three different types of possessive phrases, which appear to have a pragmatic basis: (1) using possessive adjectives, e.g., *To je bratova kuća* 'This is (my) brother's house' (in the nominative). (2) using the G, e.g., *To je kuća mog brata* 'This is the house of my brother'. (3) or using the APD, e.g., *To je bratu kuća* 'This is the house to my brother' (generally, the APD is more likely to be used with a pronoun instead, e.g., *To mu je kuća* 'To him it is house/home.).

Wilhelm Havers (1911) first raised the question about the pragmatic basis for the APD, which he termed the "dativus sympatheticus". Interestingly, Havers created this term for the Indo-European language family, particularly for German, in which, after the loss of the genitive, two ways of forming possessive constructions (a former function of the genitive) arose: (i) with prepositions (*von* 'of', *zu* 'to') + dative case, e.g., *das Geld vom Mann*, lit. 'money of the man' or (ii) dative case + possessive pronoun, e.g., *dem Mann sein Geld*, lit. 'to the man his money'.[9]

Sandfeld (1930: 185–187) considered the usage of a clitic pronoun in place of a possessive pronoun (e.g., *To mu je kuća*) a Balkanism. In fact, from the South Slavic side of things, the clitic usage of the APD can be traced in extant texts all the way back to OCS in the following usage: *lice otьcju mi* 'my father's face' (Gallis: 1972: 53). Following Sandfeld, Gallis concludes, based on the evidence from German presented in Havers that the APD must have been an original feature of Indo-European; but he views the clitic usage of the APD as a specific Balkanism. However, if the reader remembers (cf. the examples in § 1.1.) that the clitic use of the APD is also a prominent feature of West Slavic,[10] then it is certainly makes the "Balkan hypothesis" less convincing.

Now, returning to Gallis' example of the APD in OCS, *lice otьcju mi*, 'my father's face', here the APD is used twice where we more commonly find a possessive adjectival expression in the genitive case in most contemporary Slavic languages. BCS exhibits a similar situation with examples such as: *To*

---

[9] Gallis (1972: 60).

[10] Interestingly, in Russian, the 2nd sg./dat. form for 'you' *tebe* can be reduced to the "clitic-like" pronoun *te* in commonly occurring informal expressions like: *Ty mne brat, ja te brat*! Moreover, this particular example (vouched for by my native Russian colleagues), seemingly demonstrates a "sympathetic" use of the APD, i.e., the speaker is perhaps using *te* as part of a bonding ritual. While it is likely that this usage represents an innovation in Russian (perhaps East Slavic?), one cannot rule out that this phonetic reduction of *tebe* has been a feature of Russian for a very long time, given that the environment for reduction (2nd position) and what is being reduced (a grammatical element – a pronoun) exactly matches Wackernagel's Position for Indo-European.

mu (bratu) je kuća ~ To je njegova (bratova) kuća. The use of the APD in such contexts appears to be a similar pragmatic strategy to the use of impersonal constructions, i.e., the APD imparts co-inherence of an actor and patient. However, instead of a usage relegated solely to kinship terms, body parts, or an intimate relationship between two entities (e.g., *otac mi* 'my father', *torba joj* 'her bag', etc.), according to Gallis, there are at least eight different categories of usage of the possessive dative in BCS, the three most common of which I include below (Gallis 1972: 53):[11] i) goal, intention (e.g., *cilj kretanju* 'goal of movement'). ii) cost, number (e.g. *cena je knjizi 70 dinara* 'the cost of the book is 70 dinars'). iii) end, completion, border, (e.g., *mojoj radosti nije bilo kraja* 'there was no end to my joy') …

Given that there exist doublet (and sometimes triplet) possessive constructions, it is necessary to discuss the pragmatics of choice of one possessive over another. Generally, when syntactic or morphological synonyms exist in language, linguists must determine whether the variants function in the same way; and when they do not, then we typically speak of this type of "synonymity" through the prism of pragmatics (the stylistic choice of one variant over another based on social criteria and nuanced relationships between a speaker and an interlocutor) (Schilling-Estes 2002: 375). Thus, when two correlates are deemed to be synonymous, generally speaking, there are semantic-pragmatic reasons for their correlation. Surprisingly, despite the apparent pragmatic basis for the APD, grammars continue to omit this critical aspect of its usage. The relevant grammars are presented below in the next section.

2.1 Literature Review of APD in BCS Grammars

One of the most widely cited grammars of the Croatian language, Barić et al. (2005), is considered the golden standard. However, unfortunately, the APD is only briefly mentioned in this work, and usage patterns are not explained whatsoever.[12] Moreover, in the newest grammar of Croatian, Raguž (2010), the author omits the subject altogether from his work. Given that the APD is used fairly frequently in all the BCS-speaking territories, it appears that Croatian grammarians consider it substandard for their language, and therefore

---

[11] While Gallis' division of the APD into eight different categories may seem a bit more like subdivision, the categorization of the APD in other Slavic languages has been taken to seemingly absurd lengths. Wierzbicka (1988), for example, believes there are at least 31 different semantic categories for the Polish APD. This highlights the ongoing issue of properly defining the semantics of the APD. Despite the preoccupation of linguists with these various categorizations of the APD, it will not be further discussed in this work, as it has secondary relevancy here. For detailed accounts to Wierzbicka (1988), cf. Kučanda (1996) and Šarić (2002).

[12] Barić et al. (2005: 562–563)

they choose to omit it from what they consider to be the standard or "literate" grammar of Croatian.

For BCS, as one grammar with collective similarities, Browne and Alt's 2004 grammar casts an interesting light on the APD. While they appear to recycle the earlier accounts of the semantics of the APD proposed by Gallis (1972) and Kučanda (1985: 38), who believe that the APD is a pragmatic strategy used by a speaker to elicit the sympathy of an interlocutor, Browne and Alt add one new *syntactic* wrinkle to the description of the clitic APD:

> …*dative enclitics, though associated with a noun phrase, occupy their usual position within the sentence. Such enclitics can also appear within the possessed phrase, though this is old-fashioned. Pozovi Marka i [sestru mu]. (now usually: i njegovu sestru). 'Invite Marko and his sister'.*[13]

Another work, mentioned above as bearing importance for the discussion of the APD is Kučanda (1996). Like Gallis, Kučanda cited a number of examples from German, but he instead works from a synchronic perspective. Kučanda is particularly interested in cases when the clitic APD is included or omitted from possessive phrases, i.e., the focus here is on the optionality of the APD. Agreeing with Gallis, Kučanda holds the opinion that possessive pronouns and the APD are not synonymous in the pragmatic-syntactic sense. Furthermore, he considers the APD from a new perspective, incorporating the animacy hierarchy model, which has its roots in the works of de la Grasserie (1886–7: 234–7), Forchheimer (1953: 12–13), and then later fleshed out in Smith-Stark (1974), before finally being convincingly instated by Comrie (1989: 185–200). The animacy hierarchy is a model of the communicational interface of the feature [biological life] and grammatical person.[14] Moreover, most relevant for the APD, this model intrinsically incorporates the relationship of a speaker and an interlocutor in a discourse. Below is the traditional cline of the animacy hierarchy (à la Comrie 1989): speaker > interlocutor > 3rd person (human > animate > inanimate)[15] (1st person) (2nd person)

However, the opposition of singular ~ plural is missing from Comrie's model. Therefore, I present Givón's (1984: 739) more developed model below: a) degree of referentiality – pronoun > definite noun > indefinite noun; b) degree of individuation – singular > plural; c) degree of egocentricity – 1st person > 2 nd person > 3rd person.

---

[13] Browne and Alt (2004: 87).

[14] It is important to note that while the general cline of [+human] > [-human] and 1st person > 3rd person might be considered a linguistic "universal," languages vary in how [+human] is defined. For example, in Old Russian, the words for 'slave' *rab* and child *'dete'* were specified as non-virile, and therefore when appearing as direct objects of verbs, they would take the inanimate accusative form, instead of the genitive.

[15] The parentheses here signify that the elements contained within represent an internal hierarchy of the 3rd person.

Taking Givón's cline into account, Kučanda views the APD as a phenomenon which occurs most frequently with singular pronouns of the 1st person, and most rarely with indefinite plural nouns of the 3rd person.

A corresponding hierarchical view of types of APD objects is offered by Larisa Šarić (2002). Šarić concludes that the object of the APD is most often a body part, or a kinship term. Particularly frequent are *otac* 'father' and *majka* 'mother'. Šarić supplements Kučanda's model nicely by supplying the actual words that occur along the hypothetical animacy cline; except we can consider 'animacy' here to be 'inalienability', i.e., one's head is as inalienable as one's father.

The above works summarize the major contributions the discussion of APDs in Slavic in recent years; however, these works focus strictly on the semantic-pragmatic perspective. Moving away from the various semantic categories that have been proposed, this work focuses on the APD in relation to the syntax-pragmatic interface (Marten 2002). Specifically, having noticed the obviation strategies of native speakers (cf. § 1.2) in their choice of grammatical case for an APD object (i.e., *bratu mi se sviđa fudbal*), I approached this problem by utilizing a sociolinguistic questionnaire, which I distributed in Belgrade, Sarajevo, and Zagreb. In the next section I discuss the structure of this questionnaire.

3 An Investigation of Grammatical Case and the Objects of BCS APDs: Questionnaire

Given that this topic has not been discussed in the literature to date, most importantly from the empirical perspective, this questionnaire was designed to reveal patterns of usage among native speakers of the BCS dialects. Below I present the criteria used in selecting the sentences for the questionnaire.

3.1 The Structure of the Questionnaire

The specific contexts which I included in the questionnaire are: i) Nominative + APD: *Ime mi je Josh* 'My name is Josh' (and one example in which the APD is split from its object: *Razboleo mi se učitelj* 'My teacher got sick'). ii) Genitive + APD: *Ideja vam se plašim* 'I am afraid of your ideas (and *Plašim vam se oca* 'I am afraid of your father'). iii) Dative + APD: *Sestri mi se sviđa Egipat* 'My sister likes Egypt' (and *London mi se sviđa ocu* 'My father likes London', and one more context: *Dali su im bratu nova kola* 'They gave their brother a new car', where *bratu* serves as the indirect object of *dati*). iv) Locative + APD: *Razgovaramo ti o psima* 'We are talking about your dogs' (and *O predsedniku ti razgovaramo* 'We are talking about your president'). v) Instrumental + APD: *Sa sestrom ti idu* 'I am going with your sister' (and *Idu ti s roditeljima* 'They are going with your parents').

From these five categories, we[16] constructed 20 sentences, which are numbered from 1–20.[17] The respondents were asked to choose ''Yes', 'No', or 'Maybe' in response to whether they viewed each respective sentence as acceptable, unacceptable, or questionable in their dialect. If the respondent responded 'Maybe', then (s)he was asked to comment on his/her choice. Sentences 5, 7, 14–18 contain possessive adjectives, and, therefore are acceptable for all speakers. They serve as distracters in this questionnaire to misdirect respondents from the central issue of APD usage. I gathered 23 respondents from Belgrade, 26 from Sarajevo, and 30 from Zagreb. 41 men and 38 women participated, for a total of 79 native speakers. The youngest respondent was 18 years old; the oldest 66. No respondents were sought who were below the age of 18.

4 The Results of the Questionnaire (see Appendix 1 for data)

i) Nominative + APD #2: *Ime mi je Josh*, #11: *Razboleo mi se učitelj*, #20: *Brat mi se razbolio*. From the choices of respondents of all dialects, it is clear that there exists a general tendency for objects of the APD to be acceptable for native speakers of BCS when it occurs in a nominative case context. It is also apparent that speakers preferred the clitic APD to either remain or move to Wackernagel's (2nd) Position, but the object (noun) can occur either immediately preceding the APD or after the entire clitic cluster. This demonstrates that the APD should be considered fully incorporated into the laws of clitic ordering, inasmuch as it obeys the same principles of movement (to 2nd Position) by which non-APD clitics are governed. Therefore, we should rule out any suggestion that the APD is somehow formed independent of the phrase structure (i.e., it is not "adverbial," or "added" to the phrase secondarily as a separate clause, as some have suggested, and which will be discussed in more detail below).[18]

ii) Genitive + APD #13: *Ideja vam se plašim*, #18: *Plašim vam se oca*. #13 was rejected by most speakers of BCS. It is interesting however, that #18 was

---

[16] I would like to thank Prof. Bojan Belić for his help in constructing sentences that to him, as a native speaker, sounded strange but not ungrammatical. This approach was pivotal in my research, as most speakers responded without worrying so much about the prescriptive norm for their dialect as about whether they could feasibly say or hear a particular example in their dialect, as shown by the huge variation in choice, inter- and intra-dialectally in my results.

[17] See the full questionnaire with tabulated results in Appendix 1.

[18] Here, it is worth noting recalling the hierarchical models presented above and the role of person in the results of my respondents. All nominative + APD sentences use a 1st person APD *mi*, which alone could have affected the acceptability level of these sentences. However, the combination of 1st person + nominative case has important implications which will be discussed below.

accepted a few times by speakers. It is safe to say that the genitive case is not compatible with the APD for the vast majority of speakers, likely because there are so few verbs that take genitive objects, giving the genitive a much lower chance of even occurring in APD contexts.

iii) Dative + APD #1: *Sestri mi se sviđa Egipat*, #6: *London mi se sviđa ocu*, #12: *Dali su im bratu nova kola*, #19: *Disk su im prijatelju dali*. This is the most interesting category in the questionnaire, based on the unexpected nature of the results from all dialect groups. Whereas genitive + APD sentences are rejected almost categorically by native speakers, here sentence #1 is considered to be grammatically acceptable by the majority of my respondents from Bosnian, and Croatian, but only slightly acceptable in Serbian. #6 is considered acceptable by my Bosnian respondents (but less acceptable for women), questionable for my Croats, and unacceptable by my Serbs. It is possible that the position of the object, preceding or following the clitic cluster, could be a heuristic for the variation in acceptability #1 and #6. #12 and #13 are categorically denied, and it appears that the object of the APD cannot serve as an indirect object of a verb. On the whole, however, one might view all the above examples as exhibiting a sort of "dative stacking" or "dative nesting" constraint, which disfavors the "piling" up of the same grammatical category due to a possible increase in comprehension difficulties; and taken into account, this view makes the acceptability of #1 much more puzzling when compared to #6. Moreover, the data perhaps suggest that native speakers are troubled by *mi* in #6, where it follows a noun, but in #1 it follows a verb. We will return to this topic a bit later.

iv) Locative + APD #3: *Razgovaramo ti o psima*, #8: *O predsedniku ti razgovaramo*. These sentences were almost categorically rejected. Perhaps due to DL syncretism in BCS, speakers avoid increasing sentential ambiguity[19] by "opting" out for a transparent possessive adjectival construction. It is interesting though that both sentences contain the locative preposition *o* 'about'. However, in #3, this apparently does not help speakers with ambiguity issues, given that the APD is split from its object by the preposition, and it appears that speakers cannot process the APD as connected semantically to the prepositional phrase (i.e., the APD forms a semantic unit with its object, which appears not to be able to split across constituents).

v) Instrumental + APD #4: *Idu ti s roditeljima*, #9: *Sa sestrom ti idu*. While the majority of Croatian and Serbian respondents reject these examples, the Bosnian respondents were more evenly split in their assessments.

---

[19] This follows the idea that the occurrence of the same grammatical case (as in the DL examples above) for multiple arguments may obscure their semantic roles.

5 Explanation and Conclusions

As expected, the majority of respondents accepted nominative + APD, given that these can be considered to be much less contextually loaded sentences. Moreover, examples like *Razboleo mi se učitelj* 'My teacher got sick' show that the APD can split from its object, demonstrating that the APD is not exempt from the rules of clitic clustering.[20] This perhaps is not as interesting judging by the nominative + APD examples, which allow the splitting to occur un-problematically. However, examples like *Sestri mi se sviđa Egipat* 'My sister likes Egypt' and *London mi se sviđa ocu* 'My father likes London' show that in a non-nominative context, the place of the object in relation to its APD is critical. As can be seen in Appendix 1, *Sestri mi se sviđa Egipat* is accepted by the majority of all speakers (save only the variation in the Serbian results), but *London mi se sviđa ocu* is acceptable at a high level only by Bosnian speakers. This seems to demonstrate the splitting of the APD from its object is a dialect variable of BCS, acceptable in all dialects in the nominative, but only in Bosnian for the dative.

Now, let us return to Kučanda (1996) and his hypothesis that the APD in BCS is optional only when a speaker desires the sympathy of an interlocutor. If an APD is used, then a biased judgment (eliciting sympathy) of the object of the APD is transferred from a speaker to an interlocutor. Also important to note: according to the animacy hierarchy, *mi* occupies the highest position in the hierarchy. I repeat the hierarchy for the reader below: speaker > interlocutor > 3rd person (human > animate > inanimate) – (1st person) (2nd person).

This hierarchy then appears to explain why examples like the genitive + APD *Ideja vam se plašim* 'I fear your ideas' and *Plašim vam se oca* 'I am afraid of your father' are not accepted by the majority of my respondents, other than simply being an uncommon case for verbs. It appears that it is much less common for the APD to be projected onto an interlocutor (outside the 1st sg.). One might expect the APD to be just as possible in the 2nd person, given that supplication or desired sympathy is something a speaker elicits from an interlocutor,[21] but this is not the case.

Adding further to prior research on the APD, I now turn to the issue of grammatical case and the APD. It is a generally held principle that there is also a cline of the frequency of grammatical case in language. The minimal elements needed to form a sentence are an actor (subject) and an action (verb). Moreover, to carry on a minimal conversation, speakers can put together strings of these minimal sentences. Of course, narratives are much more informative

---

[20] Clitic clustering represents the migration of all unstressed elements (clitics) to the 2nd accentual (unstressed) position in a phrase, defined as either following the first accented word (more or less Serbian) or the first syntactic constituent (more or less Croatian) in a phrase.

[21] From this perspective, it would appear then that there could be some politeness strategies involved with APD usage, although this is outside the scope of this discussion.

when things like direct and indirect objects are included; but these elements are not necessities to minimal sentential structure. I believe this minimal sentential structure and the frequency of grammatical case exist on a similar cline to that of the referentiality, animacy, and the plurality hierarchies discussed above. These elements can be incorporated into a new APD hierarchy, in which referentiality, animacy, plurality, and case are all interrelated elements. Below is my formulation of this new model:

A) PERSON: speaker > interlocutor > 3rd p. > gender > human > animate > inan. – (1st p.) (2nd p.) $\equiv$ [22]

B) NUMBER: singular > plural $\equiv$

C) CASE (SEMANTIC ROLE) of the APD object: Actor (nom.) > Patient (acc.) > Experiencer (dat.) > Beneficiary (dat.) ~ (gen.) ~ (loc.) ~ (instr.)

D) USE A POSSESSIVE ADJECTIVAL CONSTRUCTION $\sim$ [23]

The acceptability of the sentence *Sestri mi se sviđa Egipat* 'My sister likes Egypt' demonstrates that dative experiencers have precedence over dative objects and the remaining cases. The dative, when occurring as a logical subject, can then incorporate the 1st person perspective, and thus secure the sympathy of an interlocutor for a speaker. The sentences *Dali su im bratu nova kola* 'They gave their brother a new car' and *Disk su im prijatelju dali* 'They gave their friend a new CD' are ill-formed because of the combination of 3rd person, plural, and the function of the dative here as an indirect object, or beneficiary, and not a logical subject.

Furthermore, there still remains the question about the so-called "optionality" of the APD with the pragmatic function of the *dativus sympatheticus*. In sentences such as *Ideja vam se plašim* 'I fear your ideas', the use of the APD with a genitive object is rejected by the majority of respondents, despite being a morphologically sound construction. As some of my respondents commented on their questionnaires, they prefer to use possessive constructions in these cases, and instead of using the APD they wrote: *Plašim se vaših ideja* and *Vašeg oca se plašim* for *Plašim vam se oca*. Therefore, the so-called "optionality" of the APD can be rephrased as "speaker preference for adjectival possessive constructions when moving farther to the right along the APD hierarchy".

Finally, a few general questions remain regarding the processing of more contextually loaded APDs (e.g., the ones that are not optimal selections and activate possessive constructions). Lutz Marten (2002: 22) presents a simple model, much in the hierarchical fashion of this paper, of communication between a speaker and an interlocutor from the perspective of the complete transfer of information beginning with sound and ending with interpretation:

---

[22] These symbols indicate that A, B and C are mutually interrelated.

[23] This symbol indicates that when the choices on the clines of A, B, and C fall to the right, and thus the optimal conditions are not met, D is then activated.

The interpretation of an utterance – sound → phonology → lexicon → {syntax, pragmatics} → {interpretation, semantics}

Without the syntactic (the proper location of grammatical elements in a phrase) and the pragmatic (the intention placed behind the utterance), we cannot proceed to the semantic level (the final interpretation of the utterance by an interlocutor), of course. According to this model then, my respondents did not accept the majority of non-actor objects for APDs for the following reason: the pragmatic function of the *dativus sympatheticus* blocks any possible interpretation of APDs as other than an actor who is either 1st person or is related to the 1st person APD and functions as its logical subject.

Marten (2002: 18) then presents his criteria for the semantic relevancy of an utterance, which explains the importance of his singling out of the syntax-pragmatics interface in the interpretation of an utterance: Relevancy – Condition 1: A supposition is relevant when its contextual effects, in a given context, are high. Condition 2: A supposition is relevant insofar as the load necessary for its processing, in a given context, is low.

Following from this model and the new hierarchy for the APD presented above, it can be stated that the optimal choice for an APD requires high contextual effects and a low processing load. The further left on the APD hierarchy we get, the higher the contextual effects are and the lower the processing load is. Moreover, the processing load appears to become much greater for my respondents when they see sentences with case "stacking" or "nesting." Marten's relevancy model may seem basic, but it appears to explain how most semantic hierarchies work.

In conclusion, the results of this preliminary study of the APD benefit from and add to the abovementioned hierarchical models of Comrie (1989), Kučanda (1996), and Givón (1984) by updating them first through sociolinguistic fieldwork, and then through subsequent analysis on the semantic-pragmatic level. Coupled with Marten's insights into the syntax-pragmatic interface, this study offers enlightenment on an often overlooked, but highly relevant grammatical phenomenon of BCS from the sociolinguistic and also general linguistic perspective. Finally, studies like the present are cautionary in a way, given that it is becoming increasingly difficult for linguists to trust prescriptive grammars. Therefore, taking them to task by going out into the field and collecting real tokens of speech will continue to help build more rigorously objective (and insightful) views of language.

REFERENCES

Eugenija BARIĆ et al., 2005: *Hrvatski jezik. Gramatika*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.

– –, 1979. *Priručna gramatika hrvatskoga književnog jezika*. Zagreb: Školska knjiga.

Wayles BROWNE & Theresa ALT, 2004: *A Handbook of Bosnian, Serbian, and Croatian.* SEELRC. Available on-line: http://www.seelrc.org:8080/grammar/mainframe. jsp?nLanguageID=1.

Wayles BROWNE, 2006: Serbo-Croat. *The Slavonic Languages.* Eds. Bernard Comrie and Greville G. Corbett. London & New York: Routledge. 306–387.

Bernard COMRIE & Greville G. CORBETT, 2006: *The Slavonic Languages.* London & New York: Routledge.

Bernard COMRIE, 1989: *Language universals and linguistic typology: syntax and morphology.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Arne GALLIS, 1974: Da li je srpskohrvatski adnominalni dativ pripadnosti (posesivni dativ) – Balkanizm? *Zbornik za filologiju i lingvistiku*, XVII/1, 51–61.

Talmy GIVÓN, 1984: *Syntax: A functional-typological introduction.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Raoul de la GRASSERIE, 1886 [1887]: Études de grammaire comparée: de la categorie du nombre. Paris. *Revue de la linguistique et philologie comparée* 19, 234–237.

Marc L. GREENBERG, 2006: *A Short Reference Grammar of Standard Slovene.* SEELRC Grammars. Available on-line: http://hdl.handle.net/1808/5469. Also published as Marc L. GREENBERG, *A Short Reference Grammar of Slovene* (= *LINCOM Studies in Slavic Linguistics 30*). Munich: Lincom.

Wilhelm HAVERS, 1911: *Untersuchungen zur Kasussyntax der indogermanischen Sprachen.* Strassburg: Verlag von Karl J. Trübner.

David HUNTLEY, 2006: *Old Church Slavonic. The Slavonic Languages.* Eds. Bernard Comrie and Greville G. Corbett. London & New York: Routledge. 125–187.

Dubravko KUČANDA, 1996: What is the Dative of Possession? *Suvremena Lingvistika* 22, 41.

Lutz MARTEN, 2002: *At the Syntax-pragmatics interface: verbal underspecification and concept.* Oxford University Press.

Peter MAYO, 2006: Belorussian. *The Slavonic Languages.* Eds. Bernard Comrie and Greville G. Corbett. London & New York: Routledge. 887–946.

Irina NIKOLAEVA & Maria TOLSKAYA, 2001: *A grammar of Udihe.* Berlin – New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Dragutin RAGUŽ, 2010: *Gramatika hrvatskoga jezika.* Zagreb: Vlastita naklada.

Robert A. ROTHSTEIN, 2006: Polish. *The Slavonic Languages.* Eds. Bernard Comrie and Greville G. Corbett. London & New York: Routledge. 686–758.

Ljiljana ŠARIĆ, 2002: *On the semantics of the "dative of possession" in the Slavic languages: An analysis on the basis of Russian, Polish, Croatian/Serbian and Slovenian examples.* Glosos 3.

Karl SANDFELD, 1930: *La linguistique balkanique.* Paris.

Ernest SCATTON. 2006: Bulgarian. *The Slavonic Languages.* Eds. Bernard Comrie and Greville G. Corbett. London & New York: Routledge. 188–248.

Natalie SCHILLING-ESTES, 2002: *Investigating Stylistic Variation. The Handbook of Language Variation and Change.* Eds. J. K. Chambers, Peter Trudgill, and Natalie Schilling-Estes. Oxford, UK: Blackwell. 375–401.

David SHORT, 2006: Czech. *The Slavonic Languages.* Eds. Bernard Comrie and Greville G. Corbett. London & New York: Routledge. 455–532.

–, 2006. Slovak. *The Slavonic Languages.* Eds. Bernard Comrie and Greville G. Corbett. London & New York: Routledge. 533–92.

T. Cedric SMITH-STARK, 1974: The plurality split. *Chicago Linguistic Society* 10, 657–671.

Gerald STONE, 2006: *Cassubian. The Slavonic Languages.* Eds. Bernard Comrie and Greville G. Corbett. London & New York: Routledge. 759–794.

APPENDIX 1

My commentary in bold; all other English, translations.

1. Sestri mi se sviđa Egipat. D + APD 'My sister likes Egypt.'	DA NE MOŽDA
Bosanski: Da – 19 Ne – 6 Možda – 1 (M: 8, 2, 1), (Ž: 11, 4, 0) Srpski: Da – 7 Ne – 11 Možda – 5 (M: 6, 4, 3), (Ž: 1, 7, 2) Hrvatski: Da – 16 Ne – 11 Možda – 3 (M: 7, 6, 2), (Ž: 9, 5, 1) Ukupno: Da – 42 Ne – 28 Možda – 9 (M: 21, 12, 5), (Ž: 21, 16, 3) Ako možda, zašto? Bosanski: Sviđa se mojoj sestri… **(possessive adjective used here instead)** Hrvatski: čuje se često … (it's heard [this way] frequently) Srpski: Veoma retko u upotrebi/staromodno/koriste manje obrazovani ljudi/starija populacija (Very rarely used/old-fashioned/used by less-educated people/the older generation)	
2. Ime mi je Josh. N + APD 'My name is Josh.'	DA NE MOŽDA
Bosanski: Da – 21 Ne – 4 Možda – 1 (M: 11, 0, 0), (Ž: 10, 4, 1) Srpski: Da – 17 Ne – 4 Možda – 2 (M: 12, 1, 0), (Ž: 5, 3, 2) Hrvatski: Da – 16 Ne – 11 Možda – 3 (M: 9, 5, 1), (Ž: 11, 2, 2) Ukupno: Da – 54 Ne – 19 Možda – 6 (M: 32, 6, 1), (Ž: 26, 9, 5) Ako možda, zašto? Hrvatski: bolje "ja sam Josh". (It's better to say 'I am Josh')	
3. Razgovaramo ti o psima. D + APD 'We are talking about your dogs.'	DA NE MOŽDA

Bosanski: Da – 5 Ne – 18 Možda – 3 (M: 2, 8, 1), (Ž: 3, 10, 2) Hrvatski: Da – 3 Ne – 23 Možda – 4 (M: 2, 11, 2), (Ž: 1, 12, 2) Srpski: Da – 3 Ne – 19 Možda – 1 (M: 3, 10, 0), (Ž: 0, 9, 1) Ukupno: Da – 11 Ne – 60 Možda – 8 (M: 7, 12, 3), (Ž: 4, 31, 5) Ako možda, zašto?	
4. Idu ti s roditeljima. I + APD 'They are going with your parents.'	DA NE MOŽDA
Bosanski: Da – 8 Ne – 14 Možda – 4 (M: 4, 7, 0), (Ž: 4, 7, 4) Srpski: Da – 3 Ne – 18 Možda – 2 (M: 2, 11, 0), (Ž: 1, 7, 2) Hrvatski: Da – 5 Ne – 22 Možda – 3 (M: 2, 11, 2), (Ž: 3, 11, 1) Ukupno: Da – 16 Ne – 54 Možda – 9 (M: 8, 29, 2), (Ž: 8, 17, 7) Ako možda, zašto? Bosanski: Hrvatski: Srpski: u južnoj Srbiji/totalno neispravno/čula sam i to (in Southern Serbia/totally incorrect/I heard this before)	
5. Moj pas se razbolio. 'My dog has become ill.'	DA NE MOŽDA
Ako možda, zašto?	
6. London mi se sviđa ocu. D + APD 'My father likes London.'	DA NE MOŽDA
Bosanski: Da – 15 Ne – 9 Možda – 2 (M: 8, 3, 0), (Ž: 7, 6, 2) Srpski: Da – 5 Ne – 17 Možda – 1 (M: 4, 9, 0), (Ž: 1, 8, 1) Hrvatski: Da – 7 Ne – 20 Možda – 3 (M: 3, 11, 1), (Ž: 4, 9, 2) Ukupno: Da – 27 Ne – 46 Možda – 6 (M: 15, 23, 1), (Ž: 12, 23, 5) Ako možda, zašto? Bosanski: Hrvatski: Srpski: mom ocu … **(possessive adjective used here)**	
7. Plašim se vaše kazne. 'I fear your punishment.'	DA NE MOŽDA
Ako možda, zašto?	
8. O predsedniku ti razgovaramo. L + APD 'We are discussing your president.'	DA NE MOŽDA

Bosanski: Da – 4 Ne – 20 Možda – 2 (M: 2, 9, 0), (Ž: 2, 11, 2)
Srpski: Da – 3 Ne – 18 Možda – 2 (M: 2, 11, 0), (Ž: 1, 7, 2)
Hrvatski: Da – 2 Ne – 25 Možda – 3 (M: 2, 11, 2), (Ž: 0, 14, 1)
Ukupno: Da – 9 Ne – 63 Možda – 7 (M: 6, 31, 2), (Ž: 3, 32, 5)

Ako možda, zašto?
Bosanski:
Hrvatski:
Srpski: ne treba ovaj "ti" / južna Srbija
(This "you" is unecessary/Southern Serbia)

9.	Sa sestrom ti idu. I + APD 'They are going with your sister.'	DA NE MOŽDA

Bosanski: Da – 10 Ne – 14 Možda – 2 (M: 7, 5, 1), (Ž: 3, 9, 1)
Srpski: Da – 2 Ne – 19 Možda – 2 (M: 1, 12, 0), (Ž: 1, 7, 2)
Hrvatski: Da – 6 Ne – 20 Možda – 4 (M: 3, 10, 2), (Ž: 3, 10, 2)
Ukupno: Da – 18 Ne – 53 Možda – 8 (M: 11, 27, 3), (Ž: 7, 26, 5)

Ako možda, zašto?
Bosanski:
Hrvatski:
Srpski: ne – idu ti sa sestrom/možda ti… **(this speaker prefers the verb to precede the APD)**

10.	Knjige su im dali učiteljicama. D + APD 'They gave their books to the teachers.'	DA NE MOŽDA

Bosanski: Da – 2 Ne – 21 Možda – 3 (M: 1, 9, 1), (Ž: 1, 12, 2)
Srpski: Da – 1 Ne – 21 Možda – 1 (M: 0, 13, 0), (Ž: 1, 8, 1)
Hrvatski: Da – 2 Ne – 26 Možda – 2 (M: 1, 13, 1), (Ž: 1, 13, 1)
Ukupno: Da – 5 Ne – 68 Možda – 6 (M: 11, 27, 3), (Ž: 7, 26, 5)

Ako možda, zašto?

11.	Razbolio mi se učitelj. N + APD My teacher has become ill.'	DA NE MOŽDA

Bosanski: Da – 20 Ne – 4 Možda – 2 (M: 10, 1, 0), (Ž: 10, 2, 2)
Srpski: Da – 19 Ne – 2 Možda – 2 (M: 11, 1, 1), (Ž: 8, 1, 1)
Hrvatski: Da – 24 Ne – 4 Možda – 2 (M: 11, 3, 1), (Ž: 13, 1, 1)

Ukupno: Da – 62 Ne – 10 Možda – 6 (M: 11, 27, 3), (Ž: 7, 26, 5)
Ako možda, zašto?
Bosanski:
Hrvatski:
Srpski: možda: "mi" je suvišno, jer odnos sa profesorom pretpostavlja distancu
(perhaps "me/my" is superfluous, because the relationship with a professor
presupposes distance)

12.	Dali su im bratu nova kola. D + APD 'They gave their brother a new car.'	DA NE MOŽDA

Bosanski: Da – 3 Ne – 23 Možda – 1 (M: 2, 9, 0), (Ž: 1, 14, 1) Srpski: Da – 1 Ne – 21 Možda – 1 (M: 0, 13, 0), (Ž: 1, 8, 1) Hrvatski: Da – 1 Ne – 27 Možda – 2 (M: 1, 13, 1), (Ž: 0, 14, 1) Ukupno: Da – 5 Ne – 71 Možda – 4 (M: 3, 35, 1), (Ž: 2, 36, 2) Ako možda, zašto?		
13. Ideja vam se plašim. G + APD 'I am afriad of your ideas.'	DA NE MOŽDA	
Bosanski: Da – 2 Ne – 23 Možda – 1 (M: 2, 8, 1), (Ž: 0, 15, 0) Srpski: Da – 1 Ne – 22 Možda – 0 (M: 1, 12, 0), (Ž: 0, 10, 0) Hrvatski: Da – 1 Ne – 27 Možda – 2 (M: 1, 13, 1), (Ž: 0, 14, 1) Ukupno: Da – 4 Ne – 72 Možda – 3 (M: 4, 33, 2), (Ž: 0, 39, 1) Ako možda, zašto?		
14. Idu s tvojim poznanicima. 'They are going with your acquaintances.'	DA NE MOŽDA	
Ako možda, zašto?		
15. Mojoj majci se sviđa Italija. 'My mother likes Italy.'	DA NE MOŽDA	
Ako možda, zašto?		
16. Dali su njihovoj unuci lutku. 'They gave their niece a doll.'	DA NE MOŽDA	
Ako možda, zašto?		
17. Razgovaramo o tvojim mačkama. 'We are talking about your cats.'	DA NE MOŽDA	
Ako možda, zašto?		
18. Plašim vam se oca. G + APD 'I am afraid of your father.'	DA NE MOŽDA	
Bosanski: Da – 5 Ne – 16 Možda – 5 (M: 2, 6, 3), (Ž: 3, 10, 2) Srpski: Da – 7 Ne – 15 Možda – 2 (M: 5, 8, 0), (Ž: 2, 7, 2) Hrvatski: Da – 7 Ne – 18 Možda – 5 (M: 5, 8, 2), (Ž: 2, 10, 3) Ukupno: Da – 19 Ne – 49 Možda – 12 (M: 12, 20, 5), (Ž: 7, 27, 7) Ako možda, zašto? Bosanski: vašeg oca (×4) (use of possessive adjective) Hrvatski: možda: koristim "vi" s poštovanjem/ vašeg oca/možda: jer ga nisam upoznao. (I use "you" [formal] with respect/**use of possessive**/maybe: because I don't know him). Srpski: … vašeg oca …/ oca se vašeg (**use of possessive in both cases**)		
19. Disk su im prijatelju dali. D + APD 'They gave their CD to a friend.'	DA NE MOŽDA	

Bosanski: Da – 4 Ne – 17 Možda – 4 (M: 1, 7, 3), (Ž: 3, 10, 1)
Srpski: Da – 3 Ne – 18 Možda – 2 (M: 2, 11, 0), (Ž: 1, 7, 2)
Hrvatski: Da – 2 Ne – 27 Možda – 1 (M: 1, 13, 0), (Ž: 1, 14, 1)
Ukupno: Da – 9 Ne – 62 Možda – 7 (M: 4, 31, 3), (Ž: 5, 31, 4)

Ako možda, zašto?
Bosanski:
Hrvatski: neki sportski prihvaća života
(some sporty take on life)
Srpski:

20. Brat mi se razbolio. N + APD 'My brother has become ill.'	DA NE MOŽDA

Bosanski: Da – 15 Ne – 9 Možda – 1 (M: 8, 2, 1), (Ž: 7, 7, 0)
Srpski: Da – 21 Ne – 2 Možda – 0 (M: 11, 2, 0), (Ž: 10, 0, 0)
Hrvatski: Da – 25 Ne – 2 Možda – 3 (M: 12, 2, 1), (Ž: 13, 0, 2)
Ukupno: Da – 61 Ne – 13 Možda – 4 (M: 4, 33, 2), (Ž: 0, 39, 1)

Ako možda, zašto?

BOSANSKO-HRVAŠKO-SRBSKI ZAIMENSKI SVOJILNI DAJALNIK V SKLADENJSKO-PRAGMATIČNEM VMESNIKU

Članek predstavlja zaključke, ki izhajajo iz sociolingvističnega terenskega raziskovanja svojilnih zvez v bosanskem, hrvaškem in srbskem jeziku (BHS), in sicer gre za: (1) geografsko razširjenost zaimenskega svojilnega dajalnika (ASD), npr.: *Brat mi ima psa* 'Brat mi ima psa' in (2) stopnjo njegove sprejemljivosti v različnih jezikovnih položajih v primerjavi s predpisano imenovalniško svojilno pridevniško zvezo, npr.: *Moj brat ima psa* 'Moj brat ima psa'. Poleti 2010 sem v Beogradu, Sarajevu in Zagrebu razdelil vprašalnike, ki so vsebovali številne različne rabe svojilnih zvez. Glede sprejemljivosti ASD v posameznih stavkih so ankentiranci izbirali med odgovori 'Da', 'Ne', ali 'Morda'. Če so izbrali 'Morda', so morali svojo negotovost tudi pojasniti. Ponudili so zanimive rešitve glede na različno družbeno opredeljene percepcije ASD-rabe, hkrati pa so zagovarjali zelo podobne vzorce v vseh BHS-narečjih; to pomeni, da obstajajo določene omejitve ASD-rabe, ki so skupne v vseh treh narečjih. Upoštevajoč pragmatične in skladenjske zakonitosti sem prilagodil hierarhične modele živosti in referenčnosti ter tako pokazal, da je ASD-raba najbolj odvisna od pomenske vloge. Na koncu razprave povzemam zamisel o skladenjsko-pragmatičnem vmesniku (à la Marten 2002), ki upošteva pojmovanja sobesedilnih učinkov ter obdelavo podatkov kot spremenljivk, za katere se zdi, da potrjujejo teze o omejitvah ASD-rabe v določenem okolju.