Ilja A. Seržant*

External possession and constructions that may have it

Abstract: There seems to be no construction that would code specifically the possession relation of external possessors. Instead, various host constructions such as the free-affectee construction (a subtype of which is the free-dative construction), monotransitive or applicative construction can – to a different degree – accommodate participants that are bound by a possession relation. The binding procedure identifying the possessor operates at the pragmatic-semantic interface and takes into account the semantic roles of the event participants, their discourse saliency and lexical properties (such as animacy), world knowledge, properties of the possessum (such as the degree of (in)alienability), etc. The external-possession relation and the meaning of the hosting construction are orthogonal to each other, but there is a strong interplay between them. Positing a dedicated external-possessor construction faces the following problems: the same binding procedure is found in other constructions as well (such as the monotransitive or ditransitive constructions); at the same time, the very possession relation is only inconsistently found in constructions referred to as external-possessor constructions, and, what is more, the possession relation may sometimes be canceled (even if it is inalienable). To account for this terminologically, I introduce the term *non-thematic affectee construction*, a subtype of which is the *free (non-thematic) affectee construction* particularly spread in European languages. The latter is found with different types of coding (accusative, dative, different prepositional phrases) which have different diachronic sources.

Keywords: external possessors, external possessor constructions, free datives, free affectee, dative, dativus (in)commodi

1 Introduction

The paper is devoted to the phenomenon referred to as *external possessors* and, accordingly, to *constructions* that may accommodate external possessors. The discussion is partly terminological and partly substantial.

---

*Corresponding author: Ilja A. Seržant,** Johannes-Gutenberg-University of Mainz, TriMCo Project, FB 05, Institut für Slavistik, Saarstraße 21, 55099 Mainz, Germany, E-mail: ilja.serzants@uni-mainz.de.

With constructions I do not mean *idiomatic*, highly lexically restricted constructions as discussed, e. g., by Fillmore et al. (1988). I rather refer to the theory-neutral sense of this word, i. e. constructions with a high level of schematicity and compositionality as in Haspelmath (2015, 2.1) in terms of his *comparative concept*. Constructions are understood here as recurrent, complex grammatical units containing a number of open positions each of which is to be filled with a wide range of lexical input and endowed with predefined syntactic (and morphological) properties that convey an abstract grammatical meaning. The meaning of the construction, the meaning of the lexical input and, potentially, some pragmatic inferences yield the meaning of the utterance. In this paper, I tackle the question of the relationship between the meaning of so-called external-possessor constructions and the meaning of the utterances they are employed in; more specifically, I argue that the possession relation is something that – although frequently found in the meaning of the respective utterances – is not inherent to the meaning of the respective constructions.

I focus on the relationship between the phenomenon generally referred to as the *external possessor* and various constructions (*external-possessor constructions*) that have been claimed to code the external *possessor-possessum* relationship, for example, the Indo-European dative in its non-indirect-object use. I draw primarily on Shibatani (1994) who claims that the *external-possessor constructions* encode a relevance relation between the non-argumental participant and the coded event, where *the non-argumental participant* implies an NP that codes a participant which is not part of the argument structure of the verb in a theory-neutral sense. According to Shibatani (1994), the relevance may be instantiated in the non-argumental NP's referent being affected by the event and/or in its being in physical proximity to the event. In other words, either the event should lead to high affectedness or, alternatively, the extra-thematic referent must be in immediate physical proximity to the event in order to allow for the relevance relation (Shibatani 1994: 476). Therefore, as Shibatani (1994: 464) argues, the possessive relation is not something inherent to the meaning of the relevant constructions but rather something that is motivated by this meaning. I take an even stronger stand and claim that many so-called external-possessor constructions do not code possession, and, hence, the use of the term *external-possessor construction* as such is often misleading and ill-advised. Different constructions that have been referred to as external-possessor constructions code various meanings, which themselves are not semantically related to possession, whereas the possession effect is an inference drawn from world knowledge, event organization, discourse model and lexical properties of the core arguments. That is to say, the meaning of the (external) possession relation found in the utterances emerges at the lexical and pragmatic level and is not an integral part of the abstract grammatical meaning of the respective construction. Different lexical items serving

as input for a particular construction may have various relations among their referents in the world (cf. Lehmann et al. 2000). These relations may have influence on some coding properties of the host construction, but, crucially, they are not the result of the meaning of the hosting construction. To give an example, the binding relation between an antecedent and its co-referential reflexive pronoun is a semantic-pragmatic relation coded by the lexical meaning of the reflexive pronoun and not by the host construction the antecedent NP and the reflexive NP occur in. In most languages, the procedures underlying the identification of the reference of the reflexive pronoun are independent of whether, say, the reflexive pronoun is a direct object, indirect object or adjunct, and there is no dedicated *reflexive construction*.

In turn, the grammatical meaning of the constructions at hand is typically the meaning of some kind of indirect affectedness ("relevance to the event" in Shibatani 1994), as has been often suggested in the literature.

I proceed as follows: First, I introduce briefly the notion of *external possessor* and related constructions (Section 2). I subsequently (Section 3) describe the free-dative construction – a category that largely overlaps with the external-possessor construction of the European type. Here, I argue that the possession relation is not part of the coded meaning. Section 4 provides argumentation for a more coherent term, namely, the *free-affectee construction* and offers an over-view over its different subtypes. Section 5 is devoted to other constructions with an external possessor some of which figure prominently as external-possessor constructions in the literature; its aim is to argue that the possession relation is pragmatically induced as with the free-affectee construction above. Section 6 summarizes the conclusions.

2 External possessors

All available definitions of *external possessor* necessarily have two components as in (1): a semantic one (1a) and a syntactic one (1b):

(1)   There is an integral semantic property, namely, (1a) the external possessor must refer to a participant that can be construed as a possessor of some other participant of the event (the *possessum*).[1] In turn, *external* refers to the syntactic condition (1b) of both the *possessor* and the *possessum* being

---

1 There is a great cross-linguistic variation as to what may count as *possessor* and *possessum*. Generally (e. g. in Payne and Barshi 1999) and in this paper, the *possessive* relation is not taken to mean just the literal possession such as ownership, but also includes such relations as part-whole, kinship relation, etc.

expressed by two different constituents and neither is a syntactic dependent of the other (Haspelmath 1999: 108).

While the criteria (1a) and (1b) are obligatory ones, additional criteria have been invoked by different authors depending on a particular construction (cf. König 2001: 971–972 with an overview):

(1c) the *possessum* is typically demoted syntactically (incorporation, chômeur) but not necessarily morphologically (Payne and Barshi 1999: 10), which is not found with the European type discussed at length in, *inter alia*, Haspelmath (1999);

(1d) raising of the *possessor* argument into a core-argument position (advocated, *inter alia*, by Payne and Barshi 1999: 3), which is not found with the European dative type or the Scandinavian type discussed at length in, *inter alia*, Lødrup (2009);

(1e) non-omissibility of the *possessum* is a property typically found, e. g., in the dative European type. In particular contexts and languages, exceptions to this are found, cf. exs. (22) from German and (23) from Latvian below; furthermore, this property is also missing in the cases of *possessor splitting* discussed by Podlesskaya and Rakhilina (1999).

Moreover, the definition (1a) + (1b) might implicationally be related to the following semantic properties:

(1f) the strong tendency of the possessor NPs to animate referents, since only animates are natural possessors,

(1g) the indirect affectedness of the possessor referent (*inter alia*, Havers 1911): the external possessors experience some effect from the action, either supported by the lexical meaning of the verb or as an additional implication from the event construal (Payne and Barshi 1999: 13).

Both (1f) and (1g) can have an alternative explanation to be discussed in more detail below. For the time being, notice that, regarding (1f), the semantic role of beneficiary/maleficiary equally favors animates so there is no need to assume some possessor meaning to motivate this bias. With regard to (1g), assuming the beneficiary/maleficiary to be the primary meaning explains the effect of possession, because the situation in which a participant is (dis)advantaged by something that happened to another participant requires some link between these two. This link is very often a possession relation.

To be more precise, the notion of indirect affectedness has been suggested as a cover term encompassing such roles as beneficiary/maleficiary. The exact nature of the indirect affectedness is differently defined in the literature (cf.

Velázquez-Castillo 1999's "the speaker's empathy" with the possessor).[2] There is a consensus that the external possessor is indirectly and sometimes even adversely affected by the event experienced by the directly affected referent (cf., *inter alia*, Havers 1911; Croft 1985; Wierzbicka 1986; Gianollo 2014: 103; differently Niclot 2014). Moreover, indirect affectedness has been claimed to be the semantic invariant of the so-called external possessor constructions. Thus, Haspelmath (1999: 112), following previous research (*inter alia*, Havers 1911; Bally 1926; König and Haspelmath 1997), argues that the "affectedness condition" is an integral part of the meaning of the European dative-external-possessor constructions. He furthermore points out that the external possessor is not or not only affected physically (in contrast to internal possessors), but also, and crucially, may be affected mentally by the event (Haspelmath 1999: 111). To put it differently, the dative referent is "interested in the event" by gaining from it or losing by it (Delbecque and Lamiroy 1996: 88); the event is construed as being of immediate relevance for the participant coded by the dative argument (Shibatani 1994). This is illustrated by way of examples in (2) from Roldán (1972: 27) and Haspelmath (1999: 112):

(2) a. Spanish   [Roldán 1972: 27]
     Sus   ojos se   llenaron de lágrimas.
     3SG.POSS.ADJ eyes REFL filled   of tears
   b. *Los ojos se   **le**   llenaron de lágrimas.*
      the eyes REFL 3SG.DAT filled   of tears
      'His eyes filled with tears.'

Although both the internal (2a) and the external (2b) possessors are physically affected by the event, the difference among them is that only the dative participant in (2b) is represented as mentally affected and pragmatically unmarked while (2a) "requires a special context (e. g. eye surgery during which the patient is anesthetized)" as Haspelmath (1999: 112) puts it.

    The datival external possessors are areally biased. They are mainly restricted to European languages, and Modern but not Biblical Hebrew (Berman 1982; König and Haspelmath 1997; Haspelmath 1999); they do not grammatically delineate between alienable and inalienable possession, which is a feature of the European languages in general (Haspelmath 2001), despite some tendencies (cf. 3.2 below). The datival external possessors adhere to the broad definition in (1a + 1b) but fail with regard to (1d) by not or just incipiently acquiring some core-argument properties (cf., *inter alia*, Roldán 1972; Berman

---

2 The term *empathy* has been introduced by Kuno and Kaburaki (1977), cf. also Lehmann et al. (2000, 2004) who draw on this term albeit with a somewhat different interpretation.

1982: 50; Vergnaud and Zubizarreta 1992; König and Haspelmath 1997; Baldi and Nuti 2010; Nikolaeva 2001; Stolz et al. 2008: 39). Thus, the European external possessors may develop some argumenthood in specific contexts, but these changes are marginal and, in any event, they do not involve a reassignment of syntactic roles in contrast to many languages outside Europe (cf. Payne and Barshi 1999). Payne and Barshi (1999), in their definition, require the possessor to be expressed as a core argument of, and syntactically (but not semantically) governed by, the verb, cf. exs. (4)–(6). This narrow definition excludes the European type of external possessors that are coded by a dative adjunct as in (2).

In contrast to European languages, which may – if at all – only show restricted indications for some syntactic promotion of the possessor NP into a core argument and no demotion of the possessum argument, many languages outside of Europe employ various rearrangement strategies to code the possessor NP as an object (and the possessum NP as an adjunct or an oblique, cf. Payne and Barshi 1999; Haspelmath 1999) – a phenomenon traditionally referred to as *possessor raising*, (with somewhat different implications) *possessor stranding* or *control* in the generative grammar (*inter alia*, Payne and Barshi 1999; Lee-Schoenfeld 2006; Deal 2013; Lee-Schoenfeld and Diewald 2014) or *possessor ascension* in the relational grammar (Blake 1984) and in typology (Croft 1985). There are three main construction types here (Haspelmath 1999: 119):

(3)   External possessor constructions outside Europe   [Haspelmath 1999: 119]
     – Possessor object with possessum oblique, cf. (4),
     – Possessor object with possessum incorporation, cf. (5),
     – Possessor object with applicative marking on the verb, (6)

(4)   Yoruba   [Rowlands 1969: 22; Haspelmath 1999: 119]
     *ó   jí   **mi**   l'   ówó   gbé.*
     he steal me in money take
     'He stole my money.' (lit. 'He stole me in money.')

(5)   Chukchi   [Nedjalkov 1976: 199; Haspelmath 1999: 120]
     *ətləg-e   **ekək**   qaa-nm-ənen.*
     father-ᴇʀɢ son.ᴀʙs reindeer-slaughter-3sɢ.ᴘsᴛ
     'The father slaughtered a reindeer for the son.'

(6)   Kalkatungu   [Australian; Blake 1984: 439]
     *Kalpin-tu lha-nytyama-mi-kin **nyini** thuku?*
     man-ᴇʀɢ hit-ᴀᴘᴘʟ-ꜰᴜᴛ-2sɢ 2sɢ.ᴀʙs dog.ᴀʙs
     'Will the man hit your dog?'

Typical for all three construction types is the demoted syntactic status of the possessum NP (1c). Thus, Blake notes that – although both the possessor and the possessum are unmarked – it is only the external-possessor NP that has properties of a direct object in Kalkatungu: in (6), for example, it is only the possessor NP that is cross-referenced on the verb by the object series and not the possessum (Blake 1984: 439).

Note that instances of the "promotional" external-possessor constructions are also marginally found in European languages, cf. the following examples from Russian and their English translations:

(7) Russian   [Arutjunova 1976: 156ff.]
   a. *Ego   povedenie menja udivilo.*
      3SG.GEN behavior   1SG.ACC surprise.PST.SG.N
      'His behavior surprised me.'
   b. *On   udivil   menja svoim   povedeniem.*
      3SG.NOM surprise.PST.SG.M 1SG.ACC REFL.POSS.INS.SG behavior.INS.SG
      'He surprised me with his behavior.'

(8) Russian   [Arutjunova 1976: 156ff.]
   a. *Veličie   gor   poražaet.*
      mightiness.NOM.SG mountain.GEN.PL surprise.PRS.3SG
      'The mightiness of the mountains is surprising.'
   b. *Gory   poražajut   svoim   veličiem.*
      mountain.NOM.PL surprise.PRS.3PL REFL.POSS.INS.SG mightiness.INS.SG
      'The mountains surprise with their mightiness.'

Already at this point, one might be surprised to discover that the same function of coding the possessor and the possessum by means of two different constituents is realized by such morphosyntactically different means across and within languages: free datives, applicatives, verbal lability (here: not marking the difference between the "applicative" and basic transitive uses), incorporation, etc., that is, constructions that are elsewhere used for purposes not immediately related to one another.

In what follows, my argumentation runs as follows. I take the notion of *external-possessor construction* literally: in order for a construction to qualify as an *external-possessor construction* it must minimally satisfy the conditions in (9):

(9) A "true" *external-possessor construction* (EPC):
   a. should always code precisely the possession relation as its invariant meaning,

   b. regardless and independent of whether or not the possessor is affected,
   c. semantically independent of the lexical input, and
   d. it should be clearly distinct from other constructions primarily by virtue of its morphosyntactic properties.

Then, I argue that the (external) possession relation is a purely pragmatic effect, an "inference" (cf. Lee-Schoenfeld and Diewald 2013: 37) that is not a part of the coded meaning of many alleged external-possessor constructions which therefore do not satisfy the minimal requirements in (9). This inference results from a pragmatic procedure like (10) that is largely the same across different "external-possessor constructions" and may often be canceled (e. g. by the following discourse):

(10)   *The default procedure for identifying the possessor*
   a. for some nouns in the S/P role,[3] there is an open possessor-valence that needs to be filled in; the possessor will be identified according to (c) and (d);
   b. in turn, with referents in the S/P role that lexically do not have a possessor valence, the missing link for why there is a non-coreferential affectee – which is not a core participant of the event – may be a possession relation between the two; if this link is a possession relation, the possessor will be identified according to (c) and (d);
   c. there is a representation of the discursively most accessible referents, among which the possessor will be selected;
   d. these referents are ranked according to their plausibility of being the possessor, taking into account world knowledge about the type of the situation, animacy of the referents, additional affinities, e. g.: frequency-based expectations, an affectee of the happening to the S/P participant is very much likely to be also its possessor, etc.

Below, I examine different constructions and argue that (i) the possession relation is mostly a cancelable inference and is not an integral part of the meaning of the respective constructions (Section 3) and, vice versa, that (ii), given the right lexical input, the external possession effect is found far beyond the alleged external-possessor constructions (Section 5). From this I will conclude that the possession relation is a semantic-pragmatic effect orthogonal to the meanings of the hosting constructions.

---

3   The semantic-syntactic macroroles are used here according to Comrie (1989).

3 Free datives and external possession

Free-dative refers to any dative-marked NP that is not directly licensed by the verb but whose referent stands in a semantic relation to it (cf., *inter alia*, Delbecque and Lamiroy 1996: 89; König 2001: 970). To my knowledge, the term *free dative* stems from the German grammatical tradition (*der freie Dativ*) which, in turn, follows the classical grammatical descriptions such as *dativus (in)commodi, dativus ethicus*, etc. Other terms are the *non-actantial dative* in the Romance tradition (cf. García 1975) or *datif étendu* (Leclère 1976), and *the loose dative* in Indo-European Historical-Comparative Linguistics (*Der loserer Dativ* in Brugmann 1911: 555ff.; Vondrák 1928: 261ff.). Free datives may be exposed to various semantic constraints and may also be extremely productive and relatively unrestricted (as e. g. in Latvian or Czech, cf. Fried 1999a, 1999b, 2011).

Free datives appear in a number of different guises such as *external-possessor dative* (*Pertinenzdativ* in the German tradition), *dativus sympatheticus, dativus (in)commodi, dativus ethicus* and others (Abraham 1973; Baldi and Nuti 2010: 354; Havers 1911; Helbig 1981; Isačenko 1965; Paul 1987; Wierzbicka 1986). Unfortunately, there is a lot of terminological confusion here and different linguists use these terms somewhat differently (cf. Helbig 1981: 189). Thus, Havers (1911: 1) originally defined the term *dativus sympatheticus* as a dative which can be replaced by the genitive but which expresses some additional, intimate relationship of the participant to the event (hence, *sympathetic*). He thus links it directly to the notion of *external possessor*, which, however, did not exist as a term at his time.

At the same time, external possessors are defined more broadly than *free datives*: the former is defined independently of some particular form of coding while the latter is restricted to instances that exhibit a dative case or a dative-like pre/postposition. While most authors select just one of these two categories to describe their data, especially in European languages, these two notions intersect considerably. While external possessors all express some intimate relationship to the event, the reverse is not always true: not all free-dative NPs that equally express an intimate relationship to the event are, at the same time, logical possessors of some other participant of the event. In the latter case, strictly speaking, the terms *external possessor* and *dativus sympatheticus* no longer fit. Here, the term *dativus (in)commodi* has been used. Already at this point, it becomes obvious that once the condition of the presence of a possession relation is relaxed, the terms *sympatheticus, (in)commodi* and *free-dative* may be merged into one.

As to the precise syntactic status of the dative NP, there is some controversy in the literature, which has to do with the fact that free datives may exhibit certain degrees of syntactic integration both on the higher level of construction

and on the lower level of particular verbs. The latter sometimes integrate the dative into their case frames (cf. Seržant 2013: 324, 327ff. for an overview; examples in Seržant and Bjarnadóttir 2014 from Baltic and Old Russian). Thus, while the term *free dative* generally entails that the dative NP is non-argumental, the latter may nevertheless exhibit some properties of genuine indirect objects, for example, in German. This development may be motivated by the fact that the dative case is associated with indirect objects in the language elsewhere. Indeed, tests such as the promotion into subject with the *get*-passive group together the unequivocal indirect objects (e. g. of transfer verbs) and the datives in German (cf. Wegener 1990: 80–81; König and Haspelmath 1997: 527–528; Eisenberg 2006: 298 with a list of other, however, less reliable diagnostics). Nevertheless and crucially, these datives do not fill some open semantic valence of the verb (König 2001: 970; Fried 1999a: 473), and despite certain tendencies towards argumenthood, they remain distinct from the "true" indirect objects to different degrees in different languages. For example, free-datives in monotransitive constructions never code a participant that is indispensable to the same extent as the indirect-object datives of ditransitive constructions, although both constructions superficially may share a number of properties.

Furthermore, languages may impose different restrictions regarding the input for the dative NP (e. g. adhering to the animacy scale), verb input (e. g. no stative verbs, Latvian being a rare exception here, cf. Holvoet 2011), different types of the indirect affectedness (e. g., only adversative meaning with intransitive verbs in German, cf. Hens 1997: 202–204), as well as restrictions on the other argument(s) in the construction. Some researchers take the fact that languages generally restrict the group of verbs which may occur with external possessor datives or *dativus (in)commodi* as evidence for positing an additional valence slot in the argument structure of the respective verbs. This might be one way (out of many others) of giving a coherent description of which verbs allow these datives and which do not. However, as has been mentioned, at the descriptive level, such a valence is substantially different from the "regular" valences in that it does not code a participant that is always present in the event structure coded by the verb. To provide an example, the verb *waschen* 'to wash' in German always refers to an event in which at least two participants must be present (even if they are not expressed overtly as in (22)): the washer and the thing washed. In turn, the presence of a possessor/beneficiary/maleficiary etc. is optional, and it is not true that each and every event of washing necessarily implies a possessor and/ or beneficiary/maleficiary. Having said that, there might indeed be some gradience with respect to the relation between the verb and free datives.

While many authors consider *dativus (in)commodi, dativus ethicus, dativus sympatheticus*, etc. to be different categories both semantically and even

syntactically, there have been quite a number of attempts to define the semantic invariant of free datives, viewing them rather as a set of related sub-categories both synchronically and diachronically. Most authors agree that free datives generally express an indirectly affected participant, cf. *Betroffener* 'the affected one' (*inter alia*, Berman 1982; Wegener 1985; cf. Kučanda 1996: 329); more specifically, *indirectly mentally affected participant* (Haspelmath 1999 on external possessors), *personal relevance* of the event for the dative referent (*personne intéressée* in Bally 1926), *topic relation* between the event and the dative referent (Aissen 1999), or just relative *discourse saliency* (Holvoet 2011: 104). I subsume these terms under Shibatani's (1994) *relevance relation* of the event for the non-argumental (i. e. dative) participant as the invariant meaning where *(in)commodi, iudicantis*, etc. instantiate different subtypes thereof. In what follows, I briefly illustrate various meaning facets of free datives.

3.1 Different subtypes of free datives

First, there is the *dativus (in)commodi* or the *dative of affect* (Hens 1997). The dative marking codes the experiencer or maleficiary who is affected (often to her/his disadvantage) in a particular way by the event, having no choice but to experience it (the adversative component). The relevance of the event for the dative referent is hence crucial:

(11)   German   [Hens 1997: 206]
    Ihm   ist die Suppe übergekocht.
    3SG.DAT is the soup boiled_over
    'The soup boiled over on him.'

Hens (1997: 206) argues that the dative participant is not just adversely experiencing the resultative situation in the German construction like (11) but rather "is responsible for a resultative event with negative impact because of a failure to prevent the change from occurring." He assumes this to be the primary meaning of (11). While responsibility effects are not deniable with many verbs, the following example does stretch the notion of responsibility despite additional explanations given in Hens (1997: 209):

(12)   German   [Hens 1997: 209]
    Die Luft erzitterte ihm   oft   unter fernem Donner.
    the air   trembled 3SG.DAT often under remote thunder
    'He often felt the air tremble from thunder in the distance.' (T. Bernhard, "Frost")

It is often assumed that the external-possessor-dative (*dativus sympatheti-cus*) differs in meaning and syntax from other types of free datives like *the ethical dative, dativus (in)commodi*, etc. (*inter alia*, König 2001: 971). While there might indeed be different subtypes of the free-dative construction, this variation is rather restricted and does not suffice to assume genuinely unrelated categories. Rather, it is often motivated by different input NPs (e. g. the relational nouns which always require their possessor to be retrievable from the discourse in one way or another), different verbs (for example, those encoding positive ('to build') vs. negative effects ('to break')) or some pragmatic effects (Shibatani 1994). In what follows, I discuss some of these differences.

In German, the external-possessor dative NPs, in contrast to, e. g. ethical datives, (i) "manifest all the properties of genuine clause-level constituents, such as occurrence in the forefield" and (ii) do "not combine with noun phrases containing adnominal possessors, unless they are co-referent with the dative phrase" (König 2001: 971). However, as to (i), it is only the dativus ethicus that indeed cannot be moved freely (assumedly due its somewhat clitic-like realization). Other free-datives such as *dativus iudicandi* or *dativus (in)commodi* below are equally allowed in the forefield.

(13) German   [Hens 1997: 207]
      Ihm   ist mein Photoapparat ins   Wasser gefallen.
      3SG.DAT is my   camera   in-the water fallen
      'He dropped my camera in the water.'

Note also that adjuncts may also occur in the forefield in German. This means that the distinction is not to be drawn between syntactically free datives and the argument-like external-possessor datives but rather between ethical datives, on the one hand, and other free datives and adjuncts in general, on the other.

In turn, (ii) seems to be rather circular: if the possession relation is defined as an integral part of the meaning, then instances with some other possessor coded within the possessum's constituent, such as (13), will be sorted out by this definition, and, at the same time, this definition will strongly favor relational nouns as the input. Moreover, following this line of argumentation, one would have to analyze (13) as an instance of free dative because there is a non-coreferential adnominal possessor *mein* 'my', while (14) can be analyzed as an instance of the external-possessor (and, hence, not of a free dative) construction, although, intuitively, both examples represent two slightly different variants of one and the same construction:

(14) German   [personal knowledge]
       Ihm   ist der Fotoapparat ins   Wasser gefallen.
       3SG.DAT is the camera   in-the water   fallen
       'He dropped his camera in the water.'

Similarly, the following examples from Russian illustrate that the possession relation is not something inherent to the construction but is obtained pragmatically. Thus, (15) is inherently ambiguous regarding the reference of the possessor of the phone: the missing information on the possessor is "guessed" on the basis of the pragmatic procedure in (10):

(15) Russian   [personal knowledge]
       Na rabote mne   slomali   telefon.
       at   work   1SG.DAT break.PST.PL phone.ACC.SG
       'Someone at work broke the phone (and I am affected by this).'

There are no syntactic constraints that would preclude modifying the subject NP by an adnominal possessor as in (16), although this would naturally cancel the default possession relation between the dative argument and the affected NP:

(16) *Na rabote mne   slomali   telefon   ženy.*
       at   work   1SG.DAT break.PST.PL phone.ACC.SG wife.GEN.SG
        (i) 'Someone at work broke my wife's phone [and I am affected by this].'
        (ii) *'Someone at work broke my phone of my wife [and I am affected by this].'

The same recurs in the alleged external-possessor constructions of other languages: while (17) should count as an instance of external-possessor construction with an inalienable object NP, the possession relation is canceled by some additional context in (18) which makes the claim of there being a dedicated external-possessor-construction in Modern Hebrew unjustified:

(17) Modern Hebrew   [Berman 1982: 47]
       Ani exboš   lexa   et ha yad.
       I'll bandage DAT.2SG ACC DEF hand
       'I'll bandage your hand.'

(18) Modern Hebrew   [Berman 1982: 47]
       Ani exboš   lexa   et ha yad   šel ha pacúa.
       I'll bandage DAT.2SG ACC DEF hand GEN DEF wounded
       'I'll bandage the injured man's hand for you.'

The finding that the possession relation is cancelable in (14), cf. (13) or in (15), cf. (16), suggests that the possession meaning in these examples is not coded. Moreover, the fact that (16) and (18) are less frequent (and, therefore, less natural) than (15) and (17), respectively (cf. Berman 1982: 47 fn. 9), has nothing to do with the meaning of the construction involved but rather with the fact that real situations in which the beneficiary/maleficiary is not at the same time the possessor of the theme affected are not particularly frequent. It has been noted in the literature that the possession relation effect is secondary: the participant affected by a new change-of-state of a non-coreferential participant is just likely to be in some possession relation with it in terms of a pragmatic effect (Shibatani 1994; Hens 1997: 210; Seržant 2013: 327) or "inference" in Lee-Schoenfeld and Diewald (2013: 37).

In turn, the encoding of the possessor as in (13) or (16) is necessary in the case of focal contrast (13) or of canceling the results of the default procedure in (10) identifying the possessor. Alternatively, one would be forced to claim that (15) covertly represents two distinct constructions depending on who is the owner of the phone – a solution that is not plausible.

Other properties of the dative external possessor have been mentioned. For example, König (2001: 971) mentions the non-omissibility of the possessum NP in German (cf. also Kerevičienė 2004: 6 on Lithuanian):

(19) German   [personal knowledge]
　　　*Maria wusch　　ihr-em　Sohn *(die　　Füße).*
　　　Maria wash.PST.3SG her-M.DAT son feet(.ACC) the(.ACC)
　　　'Maria washed her son's feet.'

Indeed, the omission of the accusative argument would render this particular sentence ungrammatical. However, the reason for this is not some genuine property of an external-possessor construction but rather the general conditions on the object drop in this language. This restriction is not only confined to the free datives that are possessors but also to any other free dative such as *dativus commodi*, contrast (20) with (21):

(20) German   [Hens 1997: 202]
　　　Anna hat uns　　das Zimmer mit　hellgrünem　Teppich ausgelegt.
　　　Anna has 1PL.DAT the room　with bright_green carpet covered
　　　'Anna laid bright green carpet for us in our room.'

(21) German
　　　*Anna hat uns　　(mit　hellgrünem　Teppich) ausgelegt.
　　　Anna has 1PL.DAT (with bright_green carpet) covered

While under conditions such as those above (there is no space here to describe them in detail), the object drop in German is not possible, there are other conditions that do allow an object drop in the so-called external-possessor construction:

(22) German
      [http://www.parents.at/forum/showthread.php?t=439104&page=13]
      Er hat umsonst in der Wohnung gewohnt,
      'He was living in the apartment without charge,'
      sie   hat   ihm   gewaschen, gebügelt, gekocht,
      3SG.NOM AUX.PRS.3SG 3SG.DAT wash.PPP   iron.PPP   cook.PPP
      eingekauft etc...
      do_shopping.PPP
      'she did the washing, ironing, cooking, etc., for him.'

Furthermore, other languages which have weaker constraints on the ellipsis of discourse-known referents also allow the omission of the possessum object, even in non-generic clauses referring to a particular event. Consider the following example from a blog about how dogs behave with veterinarians:

(23) Latvian   [http://sobaka.lv/forum/viewtopic.php?f=52&p=49039]
      Vakar ar Rufusu biju pie dakteres, jo viņam bija dikti sarkana actiņa.
      Tad kad viņa   viņam   mazgāja
      then when 3SG.F.NOM   3SG.M.DAT   wash.PST.3
      Ø$_i$ viņš   neko   ne-teica.
      pro.ACC.PL 3SG.M.NOM   nothing.ACC NEG-say.PST3
      'Yesterday I was with Rufus at the veterinarian, because his eye$_i$ became quite red. When she [scil. the veterinarian] was washing his$_{DAT}$ [eye], he [scil. the dog] didn't utter a peep.'

Thus, whether the possessum NP may be dropped or not is not dependent on whether or not there is an external possessor but rather is constrained by the general rules and restrictions of the language on argument drop.

Another alleged property of the external-possessor construction is the obligatory singular of the inalienable possessum under the distributive meaning. While with the internal possessor both singular and plural are possible (25), the external-possessor construction admits only singular in French (24) as has been claimed in Vergnaud and Zubizarreta (1992) following Kayne (1975: 164–169):

(24) French   [Vergnaud and Zubizarreta 1992: 597]
    Le médecin leur   a   radiographié l' estomac.
    the doctor   3PL.DAT AUX.3SG X-rayed   the stomach.**SG**
    'The doctor X-rayed their stomachs.'

(25) French   [Vergnaud and Zubizarreta 1992: 602]
    Le médecin a   radiographié leur   stomac/
    the doctor   AUX.3SG X-rayed   3PL.POSS.**SG** stomach.**SG**/
    leurs   estomacs.
    3PL.POSS.**PL** stomach.**PL**
    'The doctor X-rayed their stomachs.'

However, this restriction in (24) seems to only hold true for some languages such as French. As a matter of fact, even in French, this restriction is subject to variation and many speakers do not adhere to it. Both the singular and plural are equally felicitous, for example, in Russian:

(26) Russian   [personal knowledge]
    Roditeli   pomyli   detjam   golovy/golovu
    parent.NOM.PL wash.PST.PL child.DAT.PL head.ACC.**PL**/ACC.**SG**
    novym   šampunem.
    new.INS.SG   shampoo.INS.SG
    'Parents washed kids' heads with a new shampoo.'

Finally, another alleged feature of specifically external-possessor constructions is that they do not induce the meaning of responsibility and failure to prevent the situation – the adversative meaning as per Shibatani (1994: 463) – in contrast to the *dativus (in)commodi*. Thus, examples such as (27) and (28) are different from the one in (11) (Hens 1997: 210):

(27) Croatian   [Kučanda 1996: 323]
    Krvari   mu   nos.
    bleed.PRS.3 3SG.DAT nose.NOM.SG
    'His nose is bleeding.'

(28) German   [Hens 1997: 210]
    Dem   Kind jucken   die   Haare.
    the.DAT child itch.PRS.3PL the.NOM hair
    'The child's hair itches.'

In my view, this is rather a pragmatic effect of the fact that certain situations are more likely to have a person responsible for them than others. Thus, (12) is unlikely to have a person responsible for it, exactly as in (28). Moreover, as has been pointed out by Shibatani (1994: 463), this difference is also motivated by different degrees of (physical) proximity of the dative referent to the event and the transitivity degree of the verb. Shibatani argues that the adversative reading appears if the verb is less transitive (hence, the affectedness of the dative referent is less straightforward) and if the dative referent is less proximal to the event (for example, if no body parts of the dative referent are involved).

There is, thus, no evidence to support the assumption that the external-possessor dative is a genuinely different construction from other types of free datives such as the *dativus (in)commodi*: all three subtypes have the same invariant meaning of encoding a participant who is (i) not an obligatory participant of the event and (ii) for whom the event is relevant in some way. In turn, whether this participant is the possessor of some other participant or not depends on the interrelations between the participants and is not directly dependent on the meaning of the construction. However, it has been frequently noted that the free-dative construction (external-possessor construction) often occurs with a specific class of nouns in European languages. In the following subsection, I focus on these nouns and argue that there is no empirical evidence to assume that this input produces a genuinely distinct construction.

3.2 Free datives and inalienable possession

There is a class of nouns that, due to extra-linguistic factors, are not autonomously interpretable. They imply the existence of some other, autonomous participant that referentially binds these nouns by virtue of the (inalienable) possession relation and, thereby, allows their coherent interpretation in the discourse. These are primarily body parts, names of kinsmen, parts of clothes, relational nouns such as *side*, etc. (cf. the list in Heine 1997: 10; Stolz et al. 2008). These nouns are infelicitous on their own and always entail the existence of a possessor (Fillmore 1968: 89ff.). The fact of inalienability is, *per se*, an extra-linguistic fact of the world, but it imposes some specific constraints on how these referents are coded. A property that is part of the inherent design of the world, so to say, naturally does not need to be coded – it is understood by default as world knowledge. For example, a discourse about a leg cannot be coherently interpreted if the reference of the inalienable possessor – *the anchor*

in Dahl and Koptjevskaja-Tamm (2001) – of the leg is not retrievable from that discourse; this is different with other nouns such as *a dog* which may be part of a coherent discourse with no reference to the possessor. Yet, while the reference of the anchor must be somehow retrievable from the discourse, introducing the anchor as the possessor via a dedicated possession construction can be perceived as marked or even odd, because the explicit coding of the possession relation naturally produces the cancelable inference that this possession relation was not assumed in the presupposition as a default relation (cf. *I have a hand*). This is the reason why many languages employ a different coding strategy for anchors vs. "situational" possessors. Thus, in the following example, two interpretations are pragmatically equally likely (but, of course, not equally frequent):

(29) Russian   [personal knowledge]
   Ona   myla   volosy   syna.
   3SG.F.NOM   wash.PST.SG.F   hair.ACC.PL   son.GEN.SG
   'She was washing her son's hair.'
   (i) Inalienable: 'she was washing her son.'
   (ii) Alienable: 'After she had cut off some of her son's
        hair, she was washing them to preserve them as a memory.'

The utterance in (29) is not the default way of expressing (i), exactly because the expression of this type of possession is simply redundant, requiring additional pragmatic stimulation, and may be used, for example, to discursively de-focus the possessor. Similarly, (30) may suggest that the burnt hair was actually cut off beforehand (i. e. made alienable) and only then burnt, whereas (31) does not have this effect (König 2001: 972):

(30) German   [König 2001: 972]
   Ich   habe   meine   Haare   verbrannt.
   1SG.NOM   AUX.1SG   1SG.POSS.ADJ.(ACC).PL   hair.(ACC).PL   burned
   'I (have) burnt my hair.'

(31) German   [König 2001: 972]
   Ich   habe   mir   die   Haare   verbrannt.
   1SG.NOM   AUX.1SG   1SG.DAT   DET.(ACC).PL   hair.(ACC).PL   burned
   'I (have) burnt/singed my hair.'

In my view, this difference stems exactly from the fact that (30) codes the possession relation – a strategy that welcomes the alienability in the

presupposition to be interpreted coherently – whereas the construction in (31) simply does not code possession at all. This does not mean that the dative referent cannot be interpreted as the possessor of the accusative referent, this just means that this possession relation is not coded but emerges at the pragmatic level of the interpretation of the utterance according to the procedure in (10). Thus, the possession relation is not obligatory even with inalienables, cf.:

(32)   Czech   [Fried 1999a: 477]
    Do   polívky   mu   spadl   něčí
    into soup.GEN.SG 3SG.M.DAT fall.PP.SG.M someone.POSS.NOM.SG
    vlas.
    hair.NOM.SG.M
    'Someone's hair fell into his soup.'

There are instances where the reference of the possessor must be coded (i. e. internally), cf. Kučanda (1996: 326), Lee-Schoenfeld and Diewald (2013, 2014). I claim that this is either when the possessor licensed by the object NP may be guessed incorrectly by the default pragmatic procedure in (10), as would have been the case without the pronoun *něčí* in (32), or in order to provide some contrast effect as in (33):

(33)   German   [Lee-Schoenfeld and Diewald 2014: 291]
    Ich   wasche   mir   meine   Hände.
    1SG.NOM wash.PRS.1SG 1SG.DAT 1SG.POSS.ADJ.ACC.PL hand.ACC.PL
    'I wash my hands.'

The co-ocurrence of *mir* '1SG.DAT' and *meine* 'my' only makes sense if one accepts that these two items express different meanings, because a simple reiteration of the same meaning such as *'I wash my hands of mine' would not be felicitous.

The very existence of the possession relation is entailed by the lexical properties of the inalienable noun (e. g. *Hände* in (33)) which carries an unfilled possessor valence lexically, fully regardless of the construction it occurs in. However, according to the procedure in (10), additional pragmatic procedures are needed in order an argument to this empty valence. The dative NP expresses the indirectly affected participant of the event and is, therefore, the best candidate among the accessible discourse referents to fill this valence.

The possessor of inalienables is highly predictable (Dahl and Koptjevskaja-Tamm 2001: 209) and, hence, too costly to be coded as a possessor, which is why inalienable possessors are only mentioned in order to establish their

semantic relation to the event (cf. Lehmann et al. 2000: 73–75). Thus, if the inalienable possessor is the agent, it appears in the respective A slot, cf. (34), whereas if it is only an indirectly affected participant, it will be integrated as an adjunct, cf. the free-dative construction in (35):

(34) Lithuanian   [Baltic; personal knowledge]
   Aš   *plaukiu*   *rankas.*
   I.NOM.SG wash.PRS.1SG hand.ACC.PL
   'I am washing (my) hands.'

König and Haspelmath (1997) refer to constellations such as (34) as *implicit-possessor constructions*. However, it seems to me that there is no principal difference in how the possessor is identified in (34) and, for example, in (35) below. Moreover, in all these constructions the possessor referent is expressed in a constituent not immediately dependent on the possessum NP, i. e. external constituent:

(35) Lithuanian   [Baltic; personal knowledge]
   Aš   *plaukiu*   *rankas*   *vaikui.*
   I.NOM.SG wash.PRS.1SG hand.ACC.PL child.DAT.SG
   'I am washing (my) child's hands.'

Similarly, Vergnaud and Zubizarreta (1992: 597) consider the structure in (36) as just another kind of external-possessor construction:

(36) French   [Vergnaud and Zubizarreta 1992: 596]
   Les   *enfants*   *ont*   *levé*   *la*   *main.*
   DET.NOM.PL child.NOM.PL AUX.3PL raise.PP DET hand
   'Each of the children raised his/her hand.'

I conclude, even for inalienable possession, it is misleading to call the constructions of the type exemplified in (34) or (35) external-possessor constructions for the following reasons: (i) the encoding of the very possession relation is pragmatically redundant, and, therefore, an analysis according to which encoding the possession relation has been purposely avoided in both (34) and (35) is preferable; (ii) the nominative marking of the possessor referent in (34) and the dative marking in (35) shows that the case-marking is solely motivated by the semantic role of the referent in the event and not by its possessor role (else, one would expect the same case); (iii) the very possession relation is cancelable with the right context, cf. (35) which is syntactically in no way different from (34)

except for the dative adjunct *vaikui* 'for/to the child'. Furthermore, the meanings of the constructions involved are quite different: while the monotransitive construction illustrated in (34) is highly grammaticalized and provides a very general, bleached meaning that can be defined, e. g., as force transmission from A to P referent (as per Talmy 1988; Croft 2015), the free-dative construction as, e. g., in (35) allows for the expression of a non-argumental participant that has an indirect relation to the event in terms of relevance.

Thus, the non-subcategorized dative NP hosting logical possessors of inalienable NPs in various European languages is not just another way to express possession relation with inalienables as opposed to the internal-possessor strategies for alienables. The lack of a grammatical distinction between alienable and inalienable possessors/possession is one of the distinctive features of European languages in broader areal perspective (Nichols 1992: 123, Haspelmath 2001). Consequently, numerous attempts to draw a rigid line between possessor free-datives and non-possessor free datives are, in my view, unjustified also regarding the inalienable input.

Taking the external-possessor free-datives as a genuinely distinct construction is probably rooted in the idea spread particularly in various formal approaches that the meaning of the dative referent has to be computed differently on its possessor reading as opposed to other readings such, e. g., *dativus ethicus*: while the former meaning is syntactically derived from the corresponding construction with the possession coded internally in terms of the raising of the possessor NP higher up along the tree out of its "original" host, the other free-dative readings are derived from various constructs to assign the extra-thematic affectee role to the dative NP (e. g. by the covert applicative in Pylkkänen 2008). As I have argued (along with many others), this major derivational split is not empirically justified.

Finally, there is no diachronic evidence to assume that a split between external-possessor datives and other free datives was ever present before e. g., in Indo-European (pace Paykin & Peteghem 2002). It seems rather that the reverse is true: datives develop the function of marking the (internal) possessor in some languages of Europe as, for example, in Old Russian, Hungarian or some German dialects, cf. (37):

(37) Hungarian   [Nikolaeva 2001]
      Péter-nek a   kalap-ja
      Peter-DAT DEF hat-3SG
      Peter's hat'

Paykin and Peteghem (2002) follow Levine (1986) in assuming that the free dative only codes possessors in Russian. Moreover, they assume that the

dative originally coded inalienable possessors in Russian and was then extended to alienable possession relations by virtue of semantic extension. This claim cannot be upheld given the evidence of Old Russian/Old Church Slavonic and other ancient Indo-European languages such as Latin or Ancient Greek (Brugmann 1911: 555ff.; Borkovskij and Kuznecov 1963 [2003]: 433; Vondrák 1928: 261ff.) which attest various non-possessive uses of the free dative:

(38) Old Church Slavonic   [Slavic; Vondrák 1928: 262]
Smotrite   že   mi   zъlodĕistvo   ichъ.
see.IMPV.2PL PRT 1SG.DAT evil.NOM/ACC.SG 3PL.GEN
'As to me, look at their evil deeds.' (Supr. 443, 7)

(39) Old Russian   [Pravdin 1956: 21]
azъ   bo ljaxom   mnogo zla   tvorix.
1SG.NOM PRT Pole.DAT.PL much   evil.GEN.SG make.AOR.1SG
'I did a lot of bad deeds to Poles.' (Cod.Laur. 89v)

(40) Latin   [Romance; Van Hoecke: 1998: 8]
Sol   omnibus lucet.
sun.NOM all.DAT.PL shine.PRS.3SG
'The sun shines for everybody.' (Petronius, *Satyricon*, 100)

(41) Latin   [Romance; Van Hoecke: 1998: 16]
Quintia   formosa   est   multis.
Quintia.NOM beautiful.NOM.SG.F be.PRS.3SG many.DAT.PL
'Quintia is beautiful in the eyes of many.' (Catullus, 86,1)

An original possessor meaning of the Indo-European dative can also safely be ruled out on typological grounds because the Proto-Indo-European dative stems from an allative-like expression with a well-defined locational meaning of *to*-landmark. This meaning is well-attested in Latin or Old Russian. A development similar to the Romance allative-dative preposition *a* is, therefore, much more likely. The tendency to occur prevailingly in the context of inalienable possession – found only in some European languages but not in all – must, therefore, be regarded historically as secondary. Indeed, Paykin and Peteghem (2002: 336) do acknowledge that the meanings of the experiencer or animate goal (indirect affectedness/relevance of the event to the referent, in our terms) are associated with this syntactic position as well. I suggest that this is historically the primary and only meaning of the free-dative construction.

4 The free-affectee construction

I have argued above that, first, different facets of the free-dative construction can be regarded as just subtypes of one and the same category with an invariant meaning and invariant morphosyntactic properties and, secondly, that there is no external-possessor dative construction because, thirdly, the possessor role is not coded but identified by means of a pragmatic procedure like the one in (10) which is in no way construction-specific. Consequently, I suggest a new label for the construction at issue (to replace the European subtype of the external-possessor construction), namely, the *free-affectee construction*.[4]

Haspelmath (1999) argues that the dative-marked external possessor is a construction typical of European languages and is only sporadically attested outside Europe. While the evidence for the areal bias of this type of dative is indeed pervasive, I add that the phenomenon should not be described by the notion of *external-possessor construction:* while the word "external" is fully correct, there is no obligatory possession relation between the dative referent and one of the core-argument referents of the verb.

The dative external-possessor construction should rather be identified as the *dative free-affectee construction*, which is a subtype of a more general cross-linguistic category, namely, the *free-affectee construction*.

(42) Definition of the Free-Affectee Construction
      A construction that enables the encoding of an extra-thematic participant
      which is (a) in some way affected by the event (relevance relation) but (b)
      does not considerably alter the assignment of syntactic roles of the core
      arguments of the predicate and does not become a full-fledged core argu-
      ment itself.

The notion *free datives* has been designed for conservative Indo-European languages, and it is not cross-linguistically applicable since many languages lack a dedicated dative case, and/or the functions of the free dative are fulfilled by some other marking. Thus, in Russian, in addition to the old dative, the function of a free dative may also be coded by the prepositional phrase based on the *at*-landmark concept (cf. Garde 1985 who refers to this PP as to *sympatheti-cus*), namely, *u* 'at' governing the genitive. There are some slight meaning

---

4 The term *affectee* has been used, *inter alia*, by Berman (1982) for the general semantic role of the free dative.

differences (cf. Paykin and Peteghem 2002), but these differences are not relevant here:

(43) Russian   [Kazakov, Izbrannye Rasskazy]
      Golos   **_u neë_** *nemnogo drožit.*
      voice.NOM.SG **at her** slightly   tremble.PRS.3SG
      '**Her** voice is slightly trembling.'

Furthermore, Old Russian and Old Church Slavonic sometimes employ the *accusative* free-affectee (alongside the dative one) to code the indirectly affected participant, the *accusativus (in)commodi* (cf., *inter alia*, Popov 1881; Danylenko 2003: 105–106, 2006; Krys'ko 2006: 118–119; Seržant and Bjarnadóttir 2014: 232–234):[5]

(44) Old Russian   [12c., adopted from Krys'ko 2006: 118]
      Straxъ   *mja*   *eda*   *vъdadjatъ*   *ny ognevi.*
      fear.NOM   1SG.ACC   whether   expose.PRS.3PL   us   fire.DAT
      'I am afraid they might expose us to the fire.'

(45) Old Russian   [14c., adopted from Krys'ko 2006: 118]
      ...da   *mja*   *tuža*   *ne budetъ.*
      ...that   1SG.ACC   trouble.NOM.SG   NEG   be.FUT.3.SG
      'so that I would not come into troubles.'

The accusative affectee *mja* (in both examples) is adjoined to the existential construction based on the verb *byti* 'to be' (dropped in the present tense in (44)) and a noun in the predicative function, *strax* 'fear' in (44), and *tuža* 'trouble' in (45).

     In turn, Modern Hebrew employs the preposition/prefix *le* which, based on its locational use, is rather inessive, i. e. *in*-landmark:

(46) Modern Hebrew   [Berman 1982: 47]
      ima   *raxaca*   *le*   *Dan et*   *ha panim.*
      Mom   washed   DAT   Dan   ACC   DEF   face
      'Mom washed Dan's face.'

---

5 Note that the accusative here is historically an old accusative, and Old Russian morphologically and functionally clearly distinguishes between accusative and dative elsewhere.

Moreover, Finnic languages simply lack a dedicated dative case altogether (except for the extinct Livonian) and employ the adessive case for the same purposes, which is used as *at*-landmark and *on*-landmark on its locational meaning:

(47) Finnish   [König and Haspelmath 1997: 560]
      Minu-lla lähtee   kohta juna.
      1SG-ADES depart.PRS.3SG soon train
      'My train departs soon.'

(48) Estonian   [König and Haspelmath 1997: 561]
      Ta-l   jookseb   nina-st   ver-d.
      3SG-ADES run.PRS.3SG nose-EL.SG blood-PART.SG
      'His nose is bleeding.'

Romance languages employ the preposition *a/à* with the locational meaning *to*-landmark ("allative strategy"), cf. French:

(49) French   [Lamiroy 2003]
      Max a   tordu le bras à Luc.
      Max has twisted the arm to Luc
      'Max has twisted Luc's arm.'

Modern Greek employs the old genitive to code the free affectee. Similarly, Tocharian employs the genitive but often additionally adds a verbal clitic resumptive pronoun (*-ne* in the example below):

(50) Tocharian   [TB 3 a4–5 Š, from Sieg and Siegling 1949: 5–6]
      Te keklyauṣormeṃ brāhmaṇi   śaulne-skwaññe
      this hear.PST.CNVB **brahman.GEN.SG** life-delight.NOM.SG
      wikā-ne.
      disappear.PST.3SG-3SG.OBL
      'Having heard this, the Brahman has lost the joy of life. [lit. the joy of life disappeared on him].'

I summarize the different case-marking strategies to code the free affectee exemplified above in the following table (Table 1). Note that Russian, Modern Hebrew, French, Finnish or Estonian still retain the primary, locational meaning, thereby being distinct from the European dative case; moreover, the basic locational meaning is different in these languages:

Table 1: Overview of different strategies to code the free affectee.

	Free-Affectee coding strategy	Example
German, Latin, French (pronouns), Spanish, Latvian, Lithuanian, Russian & Old Russian, etc.	dative case	passim
Koine Greek, Modern Greek, Tocharian, etc.	genitive case (with dative-like functions)	(50)
Old Russian (restrictedly)	accusative case (with no dative-like functions)	(44), (45)
Russian	prepositional phrase (*at*-landmark location & dative-like functions)	(43)
Finnish, Estonian, etc.	adessive case (*at*-landmark location & dative-like functions)	(47), (48)
Modern Hebrew	prepositional phrase (*in*-landmark location & dative-like functions)	(46)
French (nouns)	prepositional phrase (*to*-landmark location & dative-like functions)	(49)

There are, of course, different ways for the manner in which various free-affectee constructions emerge, whereby different developmental paths constrain the relationship between the meaning of the particular free-affectee construction and the possession in synchronic terms. Thus – albeit rarely – a free-affectee adjunct sometimes develops from a purely internal-possessor marking such as genitive case by gradual syntactic emancipation from its original host constituent (cf. Seržant 2013: 324, 328–329).

Such a development is often motivated by information-structure purposes, e.g. by the need to topicalize the possessor (Nikolaeva 2001). It is, furthermore, natural for those internal possessor marking strategies that underwent considerable semantic bleaching from encoding possession only to encoding any kind of relation between the head and dependent NPs. Thus, in Postclassical Greek, one finds same-constituent genitives that may also code beneficiary roles with no possession (ii) alongside the old possession meaning (i):

(51) Koine Greek   [Christians, to appear]
      askētôn   hōraiótēs
      ascetic.GEN.PL adornment.NOM.SG
       (i) 'adornment of the ascetics'
       (ii) 'adornment for the ascetics'

In this case, the possessor meaning is the original meaning which then gradually bleaches, subsequently yielding a true free affectee not restricted to possessors (cf. Merlier 1931). This is the case in languages such as Postclassical and Modern Greek or Tocharian where the etymological genitive case may be independent syntactically from its possessum and has a meaning other than just the one of the possessor, e. g. the meaning of an affectee, cf. Gianollo (2014):

(52) New Testament/Koine Greek   [Gianollo 2014: 101]
      *Kaì epéchrisen   **autoû** tòn   pēlòn   epì*
      and anoint.AOR.3SG 3SG.GEN DET.ACC.SG mud.ACC.SG on
      toùs   ophthalmoùs
      DET.ACC.PL eye.ACC.PL
      'then he anointed the man's eyes with the mud' (Ioh. 9.6)

The construction in (52) renders the free-dative constructions exactly as discussed above, the only difference being the case marking: while it is the dative case in the free-dative construction, it is the genitive case in Koine and later Greek. Similar developments of an originally internal-possessor marking developing into an independent constituent coding affectees are attested in Cheremis (Nikolaeva 2001 based on the data from Kaangasmaa-Minn 1966–1969) and Erzya Mordvin (Nikolaeva 2001).

Conversely, free datives may develop from markers of "true" datives coding recipients or addressees and often stemming from purely locational, e. g. *at*-landmark or *to*-landmark expressions (cf. Heine 1997). The latter are not biased towards a possession relation to begin with but are readily compatible with the possessive interpretation. Compare the following example with the originally purely locational expression *at*-landmark (preposition *u* 'at' governing the genitive) having both meanings: the old, locational one in (i) and the secondary, possessive one in (ii):

(53) Russian   [personal knowledge]
      Nožka u   stula.
      leg   at chair
       (i) 'The leg (is lying) at the chair.'
       (ii) 'The chair leg'

In contrast, as is well-known, in some languages, the dative has acquired the function of encoding the possessor, even the internal possessor. The gradual change into an internal-possessor marker is attested, for example, in the dative case of Hungarian (cf. Nikolaeva 2001) or Old Russian; a gradual change from an

external possessor only into both external and internal ones is discussed in Lødrup (2009: 241f.) with respect to the Norwegian/Scandinavian preposition *på* and Icelandic *á*.

Depending on the source of the free-affectee coding, it can be more strongly/ weakly biased towards possession; and, vice versa, depending on the source of the internal-possessor coding, there may be stronger/weaker biases towards relevance/indirect affectedness:

Table 2: The diachronic developments of *affectees* and *internal-possessor* expressions.

	Affectee (dative)	Internal possessor (genitive)
	Indirectly/mentally-affected participant: experiencer, addressee, recipient, beneficiary	Possessor sensu lato
Old Russian,Hungarian, some German dialects	——————————————————————————————→	
Tocharian, Modern Greek, Cheremis, Erzya Mordvin	←——————————————————————————————	

Table 2 implies that the existence of a true external-possessor construction as defined in (9) is potentially possible if, for example, a strategy used to code internal possessors (e. g. the genitive) would emancipate itself syntactically, but not semantically, from its original host constituent without losing its original possessor semantics. Indeed, the possessor-genitive scrambling in Finnish (Huumo and Leino 2012) or the ablative-marked possessor scrambling in Komi (Nikolaeva 2001) may be a case in point, fulfilling the minimal conditions for an EPC in (9). This scenario is especially likely if the language already has a free-affectee construction as found in Finnish. I emphasize that these constructions represent a special case while the majority of constructions referred to as external-possessor constructions in the literature do not satisfy (9).

5 Other constructions

I have argued that the European, dative external-possessor construction is, in fact, a subtype of the *free-affectee construction* which primarily codes the indirect affectedness of an extra participant while the possession relation is due to the (cancelable) effect of a procedure as the one in (10). In this section, I briefly

examine other constructions that could be and have been analyzed as EPCs and argue that the possession relation found here is equally pragmatic in nature and triggered by a procedure like (10).

Different heterogeneous and structurally unrelated constructions each with quite different functions and meanings have been referred to as EPCs in the literature. They have been brought into one group just because of one common property, namely, due to the fact that they can accommodate participants that are independently bound by a possession relation. However, with many of such participants (inalienables), the possession relation comes as an integral part of the lexical meaning and is grounded in the design of the world. The choice of constructions that accept these lexical items as their input might be so versatile in a particular language that speaking about them as EPCs seems to be rather ill-advised (e. g. the transitive construction, ditransitive construction, the free-affectee construction, possessor-PP construction, applicative construction, double topic/subject construction (in Japanese or Indonesian), etc.).

By way of example, consider the EPC formed by applicative in (6) repeated here as (54) for convenience:

(54) Kalkatungu   [Australian; Blake 1984: 439]
      Kalpin-tu lha-nytyama-mi-kin nyini   thuku?
      man-ERG   hit-APPL-FUT-2SG   2SG.ABS dog.ABS
      'Will the man hit your dog?'

It is a received wisdom that applicatives primarily have beneficiaries, sometimes also locations or instruments in the object position (Polinsky 2013; Peterson 2007). Some applicatives may also – similar to free-affectee constructions – accommodate NPs whose referents are in a possession relation as in (54). However, this is not the primary function of applicatives. For example, the applicative marker *-nytyama-* in Kalkatungu may also have benefactive meaning, cf. the following example where this marker loses its initial nasal by a phonetic dissimilation rule (Blake 1984: 439):

(55) Kalkatungu   [Australian; adopted from Blake 1984: 439]
      *nga-thu inytyi-**tyama**-mi kalpin   utyan.*
      1SG-ERG chop-APPL-FUT   man.ABS wood.ABS
      'I will chop the man some wood.'

Differently from (54), there is no possession relation in (55) whatsoever. Nevertheless, the construction in (54) is in no way different from (55) and, consequently, the function of this construction is not to code a possessive

relation, the latter being just a pragmatic effect in (54) triggered by the proce-dure in (10).

In the same way, Shibatani (1994: 464–465) argues that the topic construc-tion of the type illustrated immediately below may also accommodate possessor and possessum NPs, but its function is clearly not related to possession but rather to topichood:

(56) Japanese   [Shibatani 1994: 464]
      Zoo-wa   hana-ga   nagai.
      elephant-TOP nose-NOM long
      'As for the elephant, its nose(= trunk) is long.'

(57) Indonesian   [Shibatani 1994: 465]
      Ali   kepala-nya besar.
      Ali   head-3P   big
      'As for Ali, his head is big.'

Moreover, as Shibatani (1994: 465) argues, this construction equally readily accommodates NPs that are not bound by a possessive relation as its input:

(58) Japanese   [Shibatani 1994: 465]
      Hana-wa   sakura-ga   itiban ii.
      flower-TOP cherry-NOM first   good
      'As for flowers, cherry blossoms are the best.'

Furthermore, external possessors may be found in a number of other construc-tions that generally are not considered to instantiate an EPC. For example, nouns entailing a possession relation may be accommodated by the ditransitive construction (as defined in, *inter alia*, Malchukov et al. 2010) as shown by Baldi and Nuti (2010: 354) for Latin by means of the following example:

(59) Latin   [Baldi and Nuti 2010: 354]
      *(epistulas) e   manibus   dedit   **mi**   ipse*
      letter.ACC.PL from hand.ABL.PL give.PST.3SG 1SG.DAT REFL
      in   manus
      in   hand.ACC.PL
      'those letters from (his) hands he gave **to me** into (my) hands' (Plaut. Trin. 902)

Here, the dative recipient *mi* is semantically also the external possessor of the noun in the adjunct PP according to the definition in (1). Obviously, there is

nothing in the meaning of the ditransitive construction with an adjunct that would require this possession relation. Furthermore, many communication verbs require the addressee to be marked by dative in Latvian as in the example below.

(60) Latvian   [Personal knowledge]
    Aplaupītāj-i   piepras-īj-a   saimniek-am naud-u.
    robber-NOM.SG demand-PST-3 owner-DAT.SG money-ACC
    'The robbers demanded the owner (to give them) money.'

The dative *saimniekam* 'to the owner' and the accusative *naudu* 'money' are in a possession relation, but, crucially, this ditransitive construction is licensed by the verb and is typical of an entire semantic verb class in this language. Its meaning is to express the theme of communication (in the accusative), the addressee (in the dative) and the speaker (in the nominative).

    Other constructions are also suitable to host referents related by possession such as locational adverbs which provide the reference of the exact location:

(61) Russian   [Podlesskaya and Rakhilina 1999: 508]
    Griša   poceloval Mašu   v   guby.
    Griša.M.NOM kiss.PST.M Maša.ACC in lip.ACC.PL
    'Griša kissed Maša on the lips.'

(62) Norwegian   [Lødrup 2009: 221]
    De   barberte hodet   på ham.
    they shaved   head.DEF on him
    'They shaved his head.'

In (61), the locational adjunct serves to specify the exact location on the person referred to by the direct object NP. In (62), in turn, the locational adjunct *på ham* 'on him' refers to the person affected. There are various constraints and restrictions as to how exactly these locational adjuncts can be used if they are occupied by nouns/pronouns involved in the inalienable possession relation which are not subject of this paper. While the situation in Norwegian is somewhat complicated (cf., *inter alia*, Lødrup 2009), one may better assume that there is no difference between (61) and (63) in terms of two separate grammatical units distinct as to their properties other than those immediately resulting from the lexical meaning of their inputs:

(63) Russian   [personal knowledge]
 Griša   postavil mašinu v garaž.
 Griša.M.NOM put.PST.M car.ACC.SG in garage.ACC.SG
 'Griša parked his car into the garage.'

The choice of the construction in (61) as opposed to expressing the possessor internally is semantically motivated (Podlesskaya and Rakhilina 1999). This way of expressing the situation is available precisely because the implied possessor is semantically and discursively salient and the inalienability of the possessee entails a possessor; the latter is identified by a procedure like (10).

6 Conclusions

To recap, the assumption that there is a dedicated *external-possessor construction* has led researchers to identify syntactically and semantically different constructions as EPCs, sometimes within one and the same language. Of course, it is not impossible that there might be different units of grammar with the same function. It seems, however, that it is more plausible to assume that the very possession meaning in various constructions (applicative, incorporation, free-dative/affectee construction, etc.) is an effect that is not triggered by the particular construction but rather by the nature of the respective events and the participants involved as well as by frequency-based expectations, world-knowledge and discourse, cf. (10). As has been shown, the effect of possession relation is often cancelable which projects it into the realm of pragmatics because coded semantic content cannot easily be contradicted. From this, it follows that (i) these constructions do not encode possession and, hence, should not be referred to as EPCs and (ii) the procedure establishing the possession relation is not construction-specific.

  This claim is terminological to some extent and does not substantially alter our understanding of the constructions presented above. For example, the claim made by Haspelmath (1999) that the dative external-possessor construction is areally biased to mainly non-northern European languages can be simply reformulated by stating that there is a special European subtype of the free-affectee construction that is typical of these languages. Consequently, there is no alleged basic construction (the one with the internal possessor) from which another construction (the alleged EPC) is derived by means of some transformation or movement (cf. Tuggy 1980 for Spanish; Langacker 1993 for French; Shibatani 1994; Haspelmath 1999 and many others). These are just two semantically and

syntactically unrelated constructions: in the former, the possession relation is coded, in the second type, the possession relation may be present as a cancelable semantic-pragmatic effect at the level of utterance interpretation.

NPs with different inherent and non-inherent properties may have some preferences for particular constructions or for particular slots in these constructions. To give an example, transitive subjects are much more frequently definite than some intransitive subjects. This, however, does not mean that the transitive construction expresses or co-expresses definiteness of the subject argument. The definiteness effect is just a consequence of, or epiphenomenal to, the semantics of the construction. Analogically, NPs that are bound by a possessive relation may occupy slots according to their semantic properties: the possessum NP, by having mostly inanimate referents, is more likely to occur in the S/P position or even as an adjunct PP (Haspelmath 1999: 113; Dahl and Koptjevskaja-Tamm 2001: 209), whereas the possessor NP is more prone to animates and, hence, more likely to occur in the A position; if the possessor and the agent are not co-referential then the possessor NP seeks to occur second-prominent to A. Furthermore, as regards, for example, the free-affectee construction, it is simply more likely to be used with body-part objects than with other object referents, because body parts are the most natural to trigger effect on a participant (the affectee) not co-referential with the A and P. Thus, Kučanda (1996: 330) puts forward the following hierarchy that implicationally organizes different semantic noun classes regarding their likelihood or easiness to affect a human participant in general and the free-dative coded participant in particular (cf. Fried 1999a, 1999b: 477 and many others):

(64) Empathy Hierarchy   [Kučanda 1996: 330]
       body parts > kinship terms > other relations among humans > parts of clothes > things that a person is interested in > etc.

If the affectee is not co-referential with either A or P, additional means must be used to code it and its semantic role. There are basically two major strategies for this: (i) the introduction of the non-argumental affectee does not trigger a major rearrangement of syntactic roles of the core arguments (the *free-affectee construction*); and, conversely, (ii) the introduction of the affectee triggers a rearrangement of syntactic roles of the core arguments (e. g. *the applicative construction, the incorporation construction*). Only the first strategy, but not the second, is typical for Standard Average European languages; English and Scandinavian, in turn, show reluctance to non-argumental affectees (Haspelmath 1999). The low syntactic integration of the affectee is typical of the European and, in fact, Indo-European dative free-affectee construction. Table 3 summarizes the new construction labels replacing the EPC label:

Table 3: Labels replacing the external-possessor construction.

Non-thematic affectee cxn	
Argumental (non-thematic) affectee cxn – applicative construction, – incorporating construction, etc.	Free (non-thematic) affectee cxn – free-dative construction, – free-genitive construction (Modern Greek), – free *at*-landmark PP construction (Russian), etc.

Finally, I have argued that both the internal and the external possessors are sometimes related diachronically: internal possessors may emancipate themselves from their original host constituent and develop into true external possessors while, in turn, free affectees may generalize the frequent coreferentiality with possessors and acquire the function of denoting (internal) possessors.

Abbreviations

ABL	ablative
ABS	absolutive
ACC	accusative
ADES	adessive
ADJ	adjective
AOR	aorist
APPL	applicative
AUX	auxiliary
CNVB	converb
DAT	dative
DEF	definite article
DET	determiner
EL	elative
EPC	external-possessor construction
ERG	ergative
F	feminine
FUT	future
GEN	genitive
IE	Indo-European
IMPV	imperative
INS	instrumental
M	masculine
N	neuter
NEG	negation
NOM	nominative
NP	nominal phrase

OBL	oblique
P	person
PART	partitive
PL	plural
POSS	possessive
PP	prepositional phrase
PP	past (active) participle
PPP	past passive participle
PRT	particle
PRS	present
PST	past
REFL	reflexive
SG	singular
TOP	topic

References

Abraham, Werner. 1973. The ethic dative in German. In Ferenc Kiefer & Nicolas Ruwet (eds.), *Generative grammar in Europe*, 1–19. Dordrecht: D. Reidel.

Aissen, Judith. 1999. External possessor and logical subject in Tz'utujil. In Doris L. Payne & Immauel Barshi (eds.), *External possession*. (Typological Studies in Language, 39), 451–485. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.,

Arutjunova, N.D. 1976. *Predloženie i ego smysl*. Moscow: Nauka.

Baldi, Philip & Andrea Nuti. 2010. Possession. In Philip Baldi & Pierluigi Cuzzolin (eds.), *New perspectives on historical Latin syntax*, vol. 3, 239–387. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Bally, Charles. 1926. L'expression des idées de sphère personnelle et de solidarité dans les langues Indo-européennes. In Franz Fankhauser & Jakob Jud (eds.), *Festschrift Louis Gauchat*, 68–78. Aarau: Sauerländer.

Berman, Ruth. 1982. Dative marking and of the affectee role: Data from Modern Hebrew. *Hebrew Annual Review* 6. 35–59.

Blake, Barry J. 1984. Problems for possessor ascension: Some Australian examples. *Linguistics* 22. 437–453.

Borkovskij, V. I. & P. S. Kuznecov 1963 [2003]. Istoričeskaja grammatika russkogo jazyka. Moscow: Izd. Nauka.

Brugmann, Karl. 1911. *Vergleichende Laut-, Stammbildungs- und Flexionslehre nebst Lehre vom Gebrauch der Wortformen der Indogermanischen Sprachen*. Zweite Bearbeitung. Zweiter Band: Lehre von den Wortformen und ihrem Gebrauch. Strassburg: Karl J. Trübner.

Christians, Dagmar. to appear. Zur adjektivischen Wiedergabe griechischer adnominaler Genitive bei der slavischen Übersetzung liturgischer Hymnen.

Comrie, Bernard. 1989. *Language universals and linguistic typology*, (2nd edition). Oxford: Blackwell.

Croft, William. 1985. Indirect object "lowering". *Proceedings of the Eleventh Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, 39–51.

Croft, William. 2015. Force dynamics and directional change in event lexicalization and argument realization. In Roberto G. de Almeida & Christina Manouilidou (eds.), *Cognitive science perspectives on verb representation and processing*, 103–129. New York: Springer.

Dahl, Östen & Maria Koptjevskaja-Tamm. 2001. Kinship in grammar. In Irène Baron, Michael Herslund & Finn Sørensen (eds.), *Dimensions of possession*, 201–225. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Danylenko, Andriy I. 2003. *Predikaty, vidminky I diatezy v ukraïns'kij movi: istoryčnyj I typologičnyj aspekty*. Xarkiv: Oko.

Danylenko, Andriy. 2006. The Greek accusative vs. new Slavic accusative in the impersonal environment. In Andriy Danylenko (ed.), *Slavica et Islamica*, 243–265. Munich: Otto Sagner.

Deal, Amy Rose. 2013. Possessor raising. *Linguistic Inquiry* 44(3). 391–432.

Delbecque, Nicole & Béatrice Lamiroy. 1996. Towards a typology of the Spanish dative. In William Van Belle & Willy Van Langendonck (eds.), *The dative*. Vol. 1: *Descriptive studies*, 73–118. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Eisenberg, Peter. 2006. *Grundriss der deutschen Grammatik. Der Satz*. Band 2. 3. durchgesehene Auflage. Stuttgart: Metzler.

Fillmore, Charles J. 1968. The case for case. In Emmon Bach & Robert T. Harms (eds.), *Universals in linguistic theory*, 1–88. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Fillmore, Charles J., Paul Kay & Mary Kay O'Connor. 1988. Regularity and idiomaticity in grammatical constructions: The case of *let alone. Language* 64. 501–538.

Fried, Mirjam. 1999a. From interest to ownership: A constructional view of external possessors. In Doris L. Payne & Immauel Barshi (eds.), *External possession*, 473–504. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Fried, Mirjam 1999b. The "free" datives in Czech as a linking problem. In Katarzyna Dziwirek, Herbert Coats, & Cynthia M. Vakareliyska (eds.), *Annual workshop on formal approaches to Slavic linguistics* 7, 145–166. Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publications.

Fried, Mirjam. 2011. The notion of affectedness in expressing interpersonal functions. In Marcin Grygiel & Laura A. Janda (eds.), *Slavic linguistics in a cognitive framework*, 121–143. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

García, Erica. 1975. *The role of the theory in linguistic analysis: The Spanish pronoun system*. Amsterdam: North-Holland.

Garde, Paul. 1985. O tak nazyvaemyx "simpatičeskix" padežax v sovremennom russkom jazyke. *Russian Linguistics* 9(2/3). 181–196.

Gianollo, Chiara. 2014. Competing constructions for inalienable possession in the Vulgate Gospels: Translator's choices and grammatical constraints. *Journal of Latin Linguistics* 13(1). 93–114.

Haspelmath, Martin. 1999. External possession in a European areal perspective. In Doris L. Payne & Immanuel Barshi (eds.), *External possession*. (Typological Studies in Language, 39.), 109–135. Amsterdam/Philadelpha: Benjamins.

Haspelmath, Martin. 2001. The European linguistic area: Standard Average Euopean. In Martin Haspelmath, Ekkehard König, Wulf Oesterreicher & Wolfgang Raible (eds.), *Language typology and language universals/Sprachtypologie und sprachliche Universalien/La typologie des langues et les universaux linguistiques*. vol. 2, 1492–1510. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Haspelmath, Martin. 2015. The serial verb construction: Comparative concept and cross-linguistic generalizations. A paper.

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

Heine, Bernd. 1997. *Possession: Cognitive sources, forces, and grammaticalization*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Helbig, Gerhard. 1981. Die freien Dative im Deutschen. *Deutsch als Fremdsprache* 18. 321–332.

Hens, Gregor. 1997. Constructional semantics in German: The dative of inaction. *American Journal of Germanic Linguistics & Literatures* 9(2). 191–219.

Holvoet, Axel. 2011. Beyond external possession: Genitive and dative with locational nouns in Latvian. *Baltic Linguistics* 2. 79–107.

Huumo, Tuomas & Jaakko Leino. 2012. Discontinuous constituents or independent constructions? The case of the Finnish "split genitive". *Constructions and Frames* 4(1). 56–75.

Isačenko, Alexander V. 1965. Das syntaktische Verhältnis der Beziehungen von Körperteilen im Deutschen. *Studia Grammatica* 5. 7–27.

Kangasmaa-Minn, Eeva. 1966–1969. *The syntactical distribution of the Cheremis genitive*. (Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 146). Vols.1, 2. Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.

Kayne, Richard. 1975. *French syntax*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.

Kerevičienė, Jurgita. 2004. External possession in Lithuanian. *Acta Linguistica Lithuanica* 50. 1–9.

König, Ekkehard. 2001. Internal and external possessors. In Martin Haspelmath, Ekkehard König, Wulf Oesterreicher & Wolfgang Reible (eds.), *Language typology and language universals*, Vol. 2, 970–978. Berlin: de Gruyter.

König, Ekkehard & Martin Haspelmath. 1997. Les constructions à possesseur externe dans les langues de l'Europe. In Jack Feuillet (ed.), *Actance et Valence dans les langues de l'Europe*, 525–606. Berlin: Mouton.

Krys'ko, Vadim B. 2006. *Istoričeskij sintaksis russkogo jazyka. Objekt i perexodnost'*. 2-e izdanie, ispravlennoe i dopolnennoe. Moskva:Azbukovnik. [Historical syntax of Russian. Object and transitivity].

Kučanda, Dubravko. 1996. What is the dative of possession? *Suvremena lingvistika* (41–42) 22(1–2). 319–332.

Kuno, Susumu & Etsuko Kaburaki. 1977. Empathy and syntax. *Linguistic Inquiry* 8. 627–672.

Lamiroy, Béatrice. 2003. Grammaticalization and external possessor structures in Romance and Germanic languages. In Martine Coene & Yves d'Hulst (eds.), *From NP to DP. 2: The expression of possession in noun phrases*, 257–280. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Langacker, Ronald. 1993. Reference-point constructions. *Cognitive Linguistics* 4. 1–38.

Leclère, Christian. 1976. Datifs syntaxiques et datif éthique. In Jean-Claude Chevalier & Maurice Gross (eds.), *Méthodes en Grammaire Française*. Paris: Klincksieck.

Lee-Schoenfeld, Vera 2006. German possessor datives: Raised *and* affected. *Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 9. 101–142.

Lee-Schoenfeld, Vera & Gabriele Diewald 2013. Explaining case variation in German inalienable possession constructions. *Tampa Papers in Linguistics* IV. 31–43.

Lee-Schoenfeld, Vera & Gabriele Diewald. 2014. The pragmatics and syntax of German inalienable possession constructions. *Proceedings of the Fortieth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society* (BLS 40). 289–313.

Levine, J. 1986. Remarks on the pragmatics of the "inalienable Dative" in Russian. *Russian Language Journal* 40(135). 11–24.

Lehmann, Christian, Yong-Min Shin & Elisabeth Verhoeven. 2000. Unfolding of situation perspectives as a typological characteristic of languages. *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* (STUF) 53(1). 71–79.

Lehmann, Christian, Yong-Min Shin & Elisabeth Verhoeven. 2004. *Direkte und indirekte Partizipation. Zur Typologie der sprachlichen Repräsentation konzeptueller Relationen*. 2nd edition. (Arbeitspapiere des Seminars für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Erfurt 13). Erfurt: Universität Erfurt. Downloadable at http://www.christianlehmann.eu/publ/ASSidUE13.pdf.

Lødrup, Helge. 2009. External and internal possessors with body part nouns: The case of Norwegian. *SKY Journal of Linguistics* 22. 221–250.

Malchukov, Andrej, Martin Haspelmath & Bernard Comrie. 2010. *Studies in ditransitive constructions. A comparative handbook*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

Merlier, Octave. 1931. Le remplacement du datif par le génitif en grec moderne. *Bulletin de correspondance héllenique* 55. 207–228.

Nedjalkov, Vladimir P. 1976. Diathesen und Satzstruktur im Tschuktschischen. In Ronald Lötzsch (ed.), *Satzstruktur und Genus verbi*, 181–211. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.

Nichols, Johanna. 1992. *Linguistic diversity in space and time*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Niclot, Domenico. 2014. From semantic roles to evaluative markers: The dative and affected possessors. In Silvia Luraghi & Heiko Narrog (eds.), *Perspectives on semantic roles*. 271–325. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Nikolaeva, Irina. 2001. The Hungarian external possessor in a European perspective. In Cornelius Hasselblatt & Rogier Blokland (eds.), *Finno-Ugrians and Indo-Europeans: Linguistic and literary contacts. Proceedings of the Symposium at the University of Groningen, November 22–24, 2001*. (Studia Fenno-Ugrica Groningana 2), 272–285. Maastricht: Shaker.

Paul, Peter. 1987. Dependent or not? Drawing a line in verb valency. *Australian Journal of Linguistics* 7. 321–332.

Paykin, Katia & Marleen Van Peteghem. 2002. External vs. internal possessor structures and inalienability in Russian. *Russian Linguistics* 27. 329–348.

Payne, Doris L. & Immanuel Barshi. 1999. *External possession. What, where, how and why*. In Doris L. Payne & Immanuel Barshi (eds.), *External possession*. (Typological Studies in Language, 39), 3–29. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Peterson, David A. 2007. *Applicative constructions*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Podlesskaya, Vera I. & Ekaterina V. Rakhilina. 1999. External possession, reflexivization and body parts in Russian. In Doris L. Payne & Immanuel Barshi (eds.), *External possession*. (Typological Studies in Language, 39), 505–522. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Polinsky, Maria. 2013. Applicative constructions. In Matthew S. Dryer & Martin Haspelmath (eds.), *The World Atlas of Language Structures Online*. Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. (Available online at http://wals.info/chapter/109, Accessed on 2015-03-11.)

Popov, Alexander V. 1881. *Sintaksičeskie issledovanija*. Voronezh: Syntactic Investigations.

Pravdin, A. B. 1956. Datel'nyj priglagol'nyj v staroslavjanskom i drevnerusskom jazykax, *Učenye zapiski instituta slavjanovedenija* XIII, 3–120.

Pylkkänen, Liina. 2008. *Introducing arguments*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Roldán, Mercedes. 1972. Concerning Spanish datives and possessives. *Language Sciences* 21. 27–32.

Rowlands, Evan Colyn. 1969. *Yoruba*. Sevenoaks, Kent: Hodder & Stoughton.

Seržant, Ilja A. 2013. The diachronic typology of non-canonical subjects. In Ilja A. Seržant & L. Kulikov (eds.), *The diachrony of non-canonical subjects*. SLCS 140, 313–360. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Seržant, Ilja A. & Valgerður Bjarnadóttir. 2014. Verbalization and non-canonical case marking of some irregular verbs in *-ē- in Baltic and Russian. In Artūras Judžentis, Tatyana Civjan & Maria Zavyalova (eds.), *Balai ir slavai: dvasinių kultūrų sankritos*. Vilnius: Versmės. [Proceedings of the international conference, dedicated to the academian Vladimir Toporov, The Balts and Slavs: Intersections of Spiritual Cultures.], 218–242. Vilnius: Versmės.

Shibatani, Masayoshi. 1994. An integrational approach to possessor raising, ethical datives and adversative passives. *Berkeley Linguistic Society* 20. 461–486.

Sieg, Emil & Wilhelm Siegling. 1949. *Tocharische Sprachreste. Sprache B*, Heft 1: *Die Udānālaṅkāra-Fragmente*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Stolz, Thomas, Sonja Kettler, Cornelia Stroh & Aina Urdze. 2008. *Split possession*. (Studies in Language Companion Series 101). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Talmy, Leonard. 1988. Force dynamics in language and cognition. *Cognitive Science* 12. 49–100.

Tuggy, David. 1980. Ethical dative and possessor omission si, possessor ascension no! *Working Papers of the Summer Institute of Linguistics* 24. 97–141.

Van Hoecke, Willy 1998: The Latin dative. In William van Belle & Willy van Langendonck (eds.), *The dative*. Vol. 1. 3–38. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Vergnaud, Jean-Roger & Maria-Louise Zubizarreta. 1992. The definit determiner and the inalienable constructions in French and English. *Linguistic Inquiry* 23. 595–652.

Vondrák, Wenzel. 1928. *Vergleichende Slavische Grammatik*. II. Band. Formenlehre und Syntax. Zweite Aufl. Neubearbeitet von Dr. O. Grünenthal. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Wegener, Heide. 1985. *Der Dativ im heutigen Deutschen*. Tübingen: Narr.

Wegener, Heide. 1990. Der Dativ – ein struktureller Kasus? In Gisbert Fanselow & Sascha W. Felix (eds.), *Strukturen und Merkmale syntaktischer Kategorien*. (Studien zur deutschen Grammatik, 39), 70–103. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.

Wierzbicka, Anna. 1986. The meaning of a case: A study of the Polish dative. In Richard D. Brecht & James S. Levine (eds.), *Case in Slavic*, 386–426. Columbus/OH: Slavica.