Observations on the ordering of modifiers in nominal expressions in some Old Bulgarian texts with reference to Greek[*]

Mila Dimitrova-Vulchanova & Valentin Vulchanov, The Norwegian University of Science & Technology, Trondheim - Norway
mila.vulchanova@hf.ntnu.no/valentin.vulchanov@hf.ntnu.no

0. Introduction.

The aim of this paper is twofold. A primary goal is to map down regularities in modification patterns in the Old Bulgarian (OB) nominal phrase as they occur in a preliminary selection of early texts. Our subsidiary goal is to try and detect potential NT (New Testament) Greek[1] influences in the ordering patterns. In section **1.** we discuss the basic generalizations with respect to designated positions for different modifier types (cf. Sproat & Shih 1991, Cinque 1994, Dimitrova-Vulchanova & Giusti 1998, 1999, among others). In section **2.** we discuss the regularities that may be stated for the pre-nominal and post-nominal position and how they are employed in different types of phrases, e.g., definite vs. indefinite phrases. In section **3.** we provide evidence for the status of the definite article based on our text-sample. In section **4.** we discuss instances of Greek influence and to what extent the sample evidences original Old Bulgarian (OB) developments and patterns. In section **5.** we present some problematic data with permutations in the ordering of modifiers which challenge accepted accounts in the syntax of nominal expressions (e.g. the N-movement account proposed originally in Cinque 1994 and Greenberg's Universal 20). Finally, we offer some preliminary conclusions. The texts on which this study is based are The Enin Apostle (EA), Symeon Miscellany (SM), Dobromir Evangelium, Mark (DE, Mk), and Psalterium Sinaiticum (PS) and the New Testament in the original Greek version (Scrivener 1902).

1. The data: basic generalizations with respect to modifier type.

We first look at a category we here define as P(ossessive)A(djective)s in line with the tradition of e.g., Trubetzkoy (1937), and more recently Corbett (1987). These are modifiers derived from a pronominal base which agree with the head noun in features (gender, number and case). In the sample this category appears overwhelmingly in the post-nominal position (N > PA), as witnessed in (1) below.

(1)   a.   въ   оученнн   свонмь   (DE, 12a, 9-10)
                in   teaching,LOC PA-anaphoric, LOC
         b.   въ   оуню   нашею   (DE, 9b, 6-7)
                in   eyes,DUAL, LOC our,DUAL, LOC

However, this category may occasionally occupy the pre-nominal position as well, as shown in (2).

(2)   въ   твоемъ   разоумѣ   (EA, 3b, 6)

---

[1] NT Greek is a specific variety of Post Classical Greek as discussed in Manolessou (2000), Horrocks (1997) and Blass & Debrunner (1961) among others.

in   your, LOC   reason, LOC

A variation in position of the type instantiated above can be attributed for instance to a distinction between weak vs. strong position along the lines of Cardinaletti (1998).

   Possessive adjectives occupy the position immediately following the head noun also when the nominal expression contains other modifiers, such as e.g. quality adjectives, as вєликомоу (*great*) or other types of adjectives, such as н͞єсьнын (*heavenly*) in (3a-b) below. Thus the linear ordering pattern is N > PA > AP.

(3) a.   имєнї   твоємоу   вєликомоу   (EA, 32b, 1-2)
          name, DAT   your, DAT   great, DAT
     b.   о͞ць   вашь   н͞єсьнын   (DE, 8a, 5-6)
          father, N   your, N   heavenly, N

   With regard to demonstratives and their position relative to the nominal head an important consideration is whether one is dealing with an instance of the demonstrative, that is the strong form, or an instance of the evolving article, that is the weak form. The reason for this state of affairs is simply that both items coincide in morphological form, while apparently differing in syntactic position and tonic properties (e.g., stressed vs. unstressed). We discuss this issue in **3.** below arguing that the most reliable (and soundest) criterion for article status is syntactic position inside the nominal phrase, leaving potential semantic considerations aside. For the time being we observe that the demonstrative occurs both post-nominally, as shown in the examples in (4), and pre-nominally, as in (5).

(4) a.   вь врѣмѧ   сє   (DE, 5a, 6)
          in time, ACC   this, ACC
     b.   єваньгєлнє   сє   (DE, 16b, 16)
          evangelium, N   this, N
     c.   о   дьнн   томь   (DE, 15b, 11)
          about day, LOC   that, LOC
(5) a.   вь   тыѧ   днн   (DE, 14b, 8)
          in   those, ACC   days, ACC
     b.   вь   ть   у�— кͣсь   (DE, 14a, 5-6)
          in   that, ACC   hour, ACC

When the demonstrative co-occurs with other modifiers the latter usually follow it creating the pattern N > Dem. > AP, as in (6) below.

(6) ц͞рквь   снѧ   рѫкотворєнѫѭ   (DE, 20b, 11-12)
     church, ACC   this, ACC   man-made, ACC

   An interesting category among the modifiers of the OB head noun are the type usually labeled D(enominal)A(djective)s (cf. Corbett 1987, and Stavrou, forthcoming on DA/GA properties in general and for an analysis). The percentage of DAs among modifiers is very high, most likely because DAs realize a variety of theta-roles, as demonstrated in the examples in (7) below, as well as being an inherently Common Slavic category based on a productive pattern, a pattern similar to non-defective grammatical paradigms (cf. Trubetzkoy 1937). This property of DAs may explain their high frequency and unproblematic use. DAs are overwhelmingly post-N in the sample, as indicated by the examples in (7).

(7) a.   домы   вьдовнѧ   (GA, social group)(DE, 12a, 17)
               house, PL, ACC widow, DA, PL, ACC

	b.	въ	цѓрьство	бѓжнє (possesor)	(DE, 2a, 20-2b, 1)
		in	kingdom, ACC	God, DA, ACC	
	c.	въ	кннгахъ	монснннахъ (Agent)	(DE, 10b, 19-20)
		in	books, LOC	Moses, DA, LOC	
	d.	отъ	плода	лозьнааго (Source)	(DE, 18a, 10-11)
		from	fruit, GEN	vine, DA, GEN	

There also occur nominal expressions with DAs co-occurring with genitival/dative phrases, as demonstrated in the example in (8a), as well as expressions with two genitives, such as келестнна and папы рнмьскааго in (8b). The patterns that emerge are N > DA > Gen/D NP and N > GenNP > GenNP.

(8)	a.	намѣстьιє	дамасово	папы	рьмьскааго	(SM, 23c, 27-29)
		seat, ACC	Damascus, DA, ACC	Pope, GEN	Rome, DA, GEN	
	b.	намѣстнιє	келестнна	папы	рнмьскааго	(SM, 23d, 28-24a, 1)
		seat, ACC	Callysty, GEN	Pope, GEN	Rome, DA, GEN	

2. Generalizations with respect to type of expression and linear position of the modifier.

In the text-sample there is a distinct tendency for the post-nominal position to be employed in definite nominal expressions for phrasal modifiers, such as adnominal genitival/dative NPs[2], complex adjective phrases, and expanded forms of adjectives. Consider the data in (9)-(11). (9) provides evidence for adnominal genitival/dative noun phrases in post-N position, respectively снмона прокаженааго in (9a), гробоу in (9b) and молнтвѣ in (9c) .

(9)	a.	въ	домоу	снмона	прокаженааго	(DE, 16a, 14-15)
		in	house, LOC	Simon, GEN	leprous, GEN	
	b.	на	дврн	гробоу		(DE, 25a, 15)
		on	door, PL, ACC	grave, SG, DAT		
	c.		храмь	молнтвѣ		(DE, 7a, 18)
			temple, N	prayer, DAT		

The expanded forms of adjectives[3] also tend to occur primarily in post-nominal position, as witnessed in (10).

(10)	въ вѣкъ	грѣдѫщен	н	жнвотъ	вѣуьныі	(DE, 5a, 8-9)
	in time, ACC	coming, ACC	and	life, ACC	eternal, ACC	

A similar tendency obtains for complex Adjective Phrases (AP), such as phrases in which the head adjective takes a complement. This is the case with възлюбенааго ємоу in (11) where ємоу (*him*) is the complement of възлюбенааго (*beloved*).

(11)	нмѣаше	єднного	сѓна	възлюбенааго ємоу	(DE, 9a, 9)
	had, 3SG	one, ACC	son, ACC	beloved, ACC him, DAT	

The pre-nominal position is primarily employed for modifiers in indefinite expressions, such as зълѣхытрѫ (*evil*) in (12a) and завнстьныιа (*jealous*) in (12b) below.

(12)	a.	въ	зълѣхытрѫ	дшѓоу	(SM, 4c, 15-16)
		in	evil, ACC	soul, ACC	

---

[2] In the text-sample adnominal datives are very frequent supporting the observations made in Kodov & Mirčev (1965: 217).

[3] In the OB tradition these forms are often referred to as complex forms. For a discussion of the origin and function of these forms see Duridanov et al. (1993: 206).

b.　　зⰰвнстьныⰹ　　　　помыслы　　　　　　　　(SM, 5a, 26-27)
　　　jealous PL, N　　　　thought PL, N

3. The article evolving.

Unambiguous instances are hard to find due to the exact morphological overlap between the demonstrative and the evolving article. An additional difficulty arises because there appears to be a partial overlap in discourse function as well. Thus, both the demonstrative and the article can have an anaphoric function referring to an entity mentioned earlier in the discourse, as evidenced for the demonstrative in the examples in (4)-(5) above. This function is well-attested for Greek also from a diachronic perspective (cf. Manolessou 2000). Also both the article and the demonstrative occur only in definite expressions, due to their referential properties (cf. Longobardi 1994 who defines the article as a kind of referential index). In regard of discourse/referential function the article and the demonstrative only diverge in the deictic proper function, which is apparently missing in the case of the article (cf. Renzi 1997: 1-11 and Giusti 2001: 158)[4]. The partial overlap in discourse function and referential features thus undermines discussions of alleged occurrences of the article based exclusively on these features (cf. Ivanova-Mirčeva & Haralampiev 1999: 125-129). The latter can, at best, be taken as additional/subsidiary, but not as crucial evidence for article uses of the form at hand.

Consider the following examples.

(13)　a.　　ѥднна　вьдовнца　　оуⰱога　(first mention)　(DE, 12b, 6-7)
　　　　one, N　widow, N　　　poor, N

　　a'.　　вьдовнца　　сн　　оуⰱогаѣ　(2nd mention)　(DE, 12b, 11-12)
　　　　widow, N　　the, N　poor,exp., N

　　b.　　...н каково　　здⰰнне　　　(first mention)　(DE, 13a, 3-4)
　　　　and what, N　building, N

　　b'.　　велнкаѣ　　сн　　　зьдⰰннѣ　(2nd mention)　(DE, 13a, 6)
　　　　big PL, ACC　the PL, ACC building PL, ACC

　　b''.　　ταυ❖ταζ　　　　τα▱ζ μεγα❖λαζ　οιⲉⲣκοδομα❖ζ
　　　　(NT, Mk, XIII, 2)
　　　　this PL　　　the　　big PL　　　building PL

　　c.　　погыⰱѣль　　сн　　помазаннѣ　　ⰱыстⰱ　(DE, 16b, 2-3)
　　　　waste, N　　the, N　oil, GEN　　　was

In (13a') an occurrence of the article corresponds to the second mention of a referent, ѥднна вьдовнца (*a poor widow*) ((13a)), the two expressions occurring only a couple of lines across. Likewise, the examples in (13b-b') attest an anaphoric function of the pronoun **сн**, again with the two expressions occurring minimally close to each other. This is the case of the example in (13c), too, the only difference being that the expression is anaphoric within the discourse context (e.g., without explicit first mention of the referent). What all three examples suggest is that the pronoun at hand can occur immediately following nouns, as in (13a'), adjectives, as in (13b'), and nominalizations, as in (13c). This is a clear indication that the form under discussion is a structural marker of the phrase as a whole, rather than e.g. only the head or any

---

[4] Renzi (1997: 1-11) analyzes the categories DEMONSTRATIVE, PRONOUN, and ARTICLE as a bundle of syntactic and semantic features and Giusti (2001: 158) critically discusses Renzi's proposal arguing that the article is underspecified for the features *definite* and *anaphoric*, while missing the feature *deictic*.

other constituent for that matter. Thus, what we consider as more or less unambiguous instances of the article are cases when the pronoun occurs in a specific position inside the nominal expression immediately following the phrase initial constituent, irrespectively of whether it is an adjective or a noun.

In the typological tradition low selection for the host of cliticization/attachment is usually interpreted as a sign of grammaticization, and this is what we are actually after in this specific case. Our analysis is very much in line with the analysis offered in Gălăbov (1950), whereby the evolvement of the article both accompanies and also, quite likely, brings about a radical re-organization of the architecture of the nominal expression. We also agree with Giusti (2001) that, while the article is underspecified for semantic features, it is exclusively defined in terms of its structural/syntactic function inside the nominal expression.[5] Occurrences only in the context of a noun are ambiguous as such uses can be instances of the demonstrative in post-nominal position, as shown in (4) above, a position well-attested for demonstratives in their deictic function.

In terms of linear order the position occupied by the article is a classical instance of the Wackernagel/2nd position. There is further evidence supporting the evolvement of such a site specifically designated for clitics occurring inside the nominal expression. Consider the examples in (14) below.

(14) a. **Вьсѣ**   **ми**   лѣтъ   (EA, 2a, 15)
          all, PL, N   my,cl   year, PL, GEN

       b. не   дѣло   **ли**   мое   вы   есте   (EA, 3b, 16-17)
           not   work, NQcl.   my   you   are

       c. не   ӣс ха̅ **ли**   г̅ъ   нашего   вид‘ѣхъ   (EA, 3b, 15-16)
           not   Jesus Christ, GEN   Qcl.   God, GEN   our, GEN   saw, 1 SG

The phrase in (14a) is about the only instance in our sample of a Dative clitic, **ми** used in a possessive function, while (14b-c) witness the possibility of the question clitic, **ли**, occurring in the noun phrase as well. This is in contrast to the options for **ли** attachment available in Modern Bulgarian, whereby **ли** can only occur outside the border of a phrase, a noun phrase or a verb phrase, but not inside.[6]

4. NT Greek and its influence.
We now consider instances that can be attributed to NT Greek influence (cf. Blass & Debrunner 1961, Horrocks 1998 and Manolessou 2000 for features of NT (PC) Greek noun phrase syntax, and Assenova 1989 on the features of the Balkan Sprachbund and possible influences in general). One such case is the post-nominal position of APs in indefinites.

(15) a. камень   жрьновьныи   (DE, 1b, 20- 2a, 1)
          stone,   mill, DA,exp.

---

[5] Within a generative framework Guisti (2001: 159) analyzes the diachronic evolution of the article from a/the demonstrative as a reanalysis in terms of structural position inside the nominal expression of the type SpecDP > D°.

[6] This fact is taken as evidence that the site of **ли**-attachment is constant across all instances, the difference being what maximal projection has moved to the Specifier of the projection headed by **ли**. This analysis can be assumed for the examples in (14b-c) as well, a minimal difference with Modern Bulgarian being the possibility of moving fragments of a phrase to the specifier of **ли** rather than full phrases.

| | a'. | λι❖☐ος | μυλικο═ς | | (NT, | Mk, |
| IX, 42) |

		stone, N	mill, DA, N
	b.	кънигы	ρасποустьныıА		(DE, 3a, 1-2)
		certificate PL, ACC discharging PL, ACC
	b'.	βιβλι❖ον	αℯ𝒯ποστασι❖ου		(NT,	Mk,
X, 4)

book, SG, ACC   discharging, GEN

As already mentioned in **2.** above, the most typical position for modifiers in indefinite expressions in the current text-sample is the pre-nominal one. In contrast, the examples in (15a-b) above witness post-nominal occurrences of APs. A comparison with the potential NT Greek source text shows that this is the same position in which the modifiers occur in the Greek original ((15a'-b')). Moreover, the post-N position is defined in Blass & Debrunner (1961) as the most common in indefinite expressions in NT Greek.

Furthermore, the data discussed in **1.** above indicate that the most common position for denominal adjectives (DA) in the sample considered here is the post-nominal one. This observation is very much in line with the general post-nominal pattern for modifiers which agree in features with the head noun in definite expressions. Our sample contains occasional pre-nominal DAs, as in (16a-b), which can be attributed to NT Greek influence again.

(16)	a.	краниево	м︮ѣсто		(DE, 23b, 3)
		skull, DA, N	place, N
	a'.	κρανι❖ον	το❖πος		(NT,	Mk,
XV, 22)

skull, GEN   place, N

DAs offer an interesting case of comparison with NT Greek, since they represent instances of parallel linear ordering, however, with a contrast in morphology and overt syntactic realization. Thus, there is a clear tendency for denominal adjectives to replace a genitival noun phrase in the Greek original. Consider the examples in (17) below.

(17)	a.	въ ц︮рьство	б︮жнє		(DE, 2a, 20-b,1)
		in kingdom, ACC	God DA, ACC
	a'.	ειℯ𝒯ς τη═ν	βασιλει❖αν	του⚬	Θεου⚬		(NT,
Mk,IX, 47)

into the, ACC kingdom, ACC the, GEN God, GEN

	b.	отъ	плода	лозьнааго		(DE, 18a, 10-11)
		from	fruit, GEN	vine, DA, GEN			❖
	b'.	εℯ𝒯κ του⚬	γεννη❖ματος	τη⚬ς	αℯ𝒯μπε❖λου		(NT,Mk,
XIV, 25)

from the fruit, GEN   the, GEN vine, GEN

In (17a) б︮жнє (*God*, adj.) corresponds to the phrase του⚬ Θεου⚬ (*of-the God*) in the Greek source example in (17a'). Likewise, in (17b) лозьнааго (*vine, adj.*) corresponds to τη⚬ς αℯ𝒯μπε❖λου (*of-the vine*) in (17b') in Greek. We consider denominal adjectives (DA) occurring both in pre-nominal and post-nominal position as a specific OB strategy for rendering adnominal genitives from the Greek original. This tendency clearly counterevidences claims that the use of adnominal genitives in OB texts was enhanced by their frequent occurrence in the Greek originals (cf. e.g. Duridanov et al.

1993:428), further supporting the view that translators of the period overwhelmingly resorted to native OB patterns in rendering specific Greek constructions.

This tendency is further supported by the data discussed in **3.** above concerning the evolution of the article. More often than not, the OB phrase containing the article corresponds to a specific Greek construction, often labeled in the literature the DS (determiner-spread) construction. In such cases, the Greek phrase contains a head noun preceded by the article and followed by a modifier with a resumed instance of the article. There is no doubt that the respective OB phrase, such as the one in (18a) and the Greek one in (18b) are based on two different and, in each case, language-specific patterns. Likewise, the occurrence of the article in the example in (13b') corresponds to a phrase with a phrase-initial demonstrative followed by an article and a modifier in phrase-internal position in the respective Greek phrase in (13b'') (cf. Manolessou 2000 for an outline of the NT Greek modification patterns). Clearly, no NT Greek influence can be attested in these cases either.

(18)   a.   вьдовнца   сн   оуъогатѣ   (2nd mention)   (DE, 12b, 11-12)
             widow, N   the, N   poor,exp., N

       b.   η☺ χη❖ρα αυ☺❖τη   η☺ πτωχη▭   (NT,   Mk,
XII, 43)
             the widow, N   this, N   the poor, N

Further instances of deviation from the Greek text are found in (19) below, whereby the position of the modifier in the OB text differs from the one in the NT Greek original, even though the respective Greek position is a viable choice for OB as well.

(19)   a.   въ   дьнн   тъіѫ   по   скрьбн   тоі   (DE, 15a, 7)
             in   days   those after sorrow   that

       a'. εℯτν εℯτκι❖ναις ται◦ς η☺με❖ραις, μετα▭   τη▭ν θλι❖ψιν
             εℯτκει❖νην (NT, Mk, XIII,24)
             in those   the days,   after the sorrow that

       b.   скозѣ   нглннѣ   оушн   (DE, 4b, 9-10)
             through needle, DA, PL, ACC   ear, PL, ACC

       b'. δια▭   τρυμαλια◦ς   ρ☺αφι❖δος   (NT, Mk, X,
25)
             through hole, GEN   needle, GEN

5. Permutations. Complex ordering cases.

In the current text-sample there are data which contradict some standard typological assumptions, such as e.g. Greenberg's (1966: 87) Universal 20 as well as popular current accounts, like e.g. the partial N-movement account (cf. Cinque 1994).

Usually the linear pattern is N > PA > AP, as in (20a) below, and N > AP > Gen/D NP, as in (20b) below. We may then further stipulate that an extended version would be N > PA > AP > Gen/D NP, even though such phrases do not actually occur in the text sample.

(20)   a.   нмені   твоемоу   веднкомоу   (EA, 32b, 1-2)
             name,DAT   your, DAT   great, DAT

       b.   жрътвѫ   хвадѣ   въінѫ бѣн   (EA, 34a, 15)
             offering, ACC   praise,D   always God, D
             "Offering to the eternal praise of God"

However, one also finds mirror orderings when the modifiers occur in the pre-nominal position (e.g. AP > PA > N), as in the example in (21a) below, as well as

permutations in the ordering in the post-nominal position, as witnessed by the data in (21b-b') below.

(21) a. мьр̑тваꙗ   ваша   тѣлеса   (SM, 7d, 19-20)
          dead, PL, ACC   your, PL, ACC   body, PL, ACC

      b. въ   горѣ   с͞тѣи   его   (EA, 32b, 9-10)
          in   mountain, LOC   holy, LOC   he, GEN

      b' отъ   горы   с͞тыꙗ   своеꙗ   (PS, 2v, 4)
          from   mountain, GEN   holy, GEN   anaphor PA, GEN

      c. г͞ви   пѣс…   новꙗ   (EA, 33b, 6)
          God, D song, ACC   new, ACC
          "God's new song"

      d. съказание   с͞новнꙗ   естьства   (SM, 6c, 25-26)
          account, ACC   son, DA, GEN   nature, GEN
          "account of the nature of the son"

One also finds instances whereby the adnominal possessor phrase, a dative or a genitive NP, precedes the head noun, as demonstrated in (21c-d) above by г͞ви (*God's*) and с͞новнꙗ (*son's*), respectively. All of these data are inconsistent with a partial N-movement account on which the ordering of modifiers is not expected to be affected by the movement of the head noun across them.

A similar pattern seems to obtain with the universal quantifier вьсь (all), which usually occurs pre-nominally, as in (22a) below (e.g. universal Q(uantifier) > N > PA/AP).

(22) a. вьсе   житие   свое   (DE, 12b, 18)
          all, ACC fortune, ACC   anaphoric PA, ACC

However, phrases in which the universal quantifier is phrase-final, thus following all modifiers of the head, as in (22b-c), are also common.

      b. многоуьстьныихъ   бж͞ствьныихъ   кънигъ всѣхъ (SM, 2v, 18-20)
          all-honoured PL ,GEN   God DA, PL ,GEN   book PL GEN   all PL ,GEN

      c. страстьное   зазорьство   все   (SM, 5c, 7-8)
          passionate, N   accusation, N   all, N

A partial N-movement account cannot explain these data either.[7]

Greenberg's (1966: 87) Universal 20 states that "When any or all of the items (demonstrative, numeral and descriptive adjective) precede the noun, they are always found in that order. If they follow, the order is either the same or its exact opposite." Thus, the options expected cross-linguistically are permutations in the post-nominal order of modifiers, but not in the pre-nominal position. The OB sample data clearly contradict this generalization. Consider the examples in (23)-(24) below.

(23) a. с͞тыꙗ   и   мирьскыꙗ   шесть събор̑ъ   (SM, 23a, 14-15)
          holy, ACC and   world, DA, ACC   six, ACC council, PL, GEN

      b. с͞тыихъ   три   сътъ   и   осмии   на   десꙗте   о͞ць (SM,23a,16-18)
          holy, PL, GEN three, GEN hundred, PL, GEN and eight, GEN on ten, LOC father,
                                                                              PL, GEN

      c. с͞тыихъ   въ   кѡнстантинни градѣ съта и шести десꙗтъ и пꙗти о͞ць

---

[7] Note, however, that this is consistent with the analysis in Giusti & Dimitrova-Vulchanova 1996 with DP raising to SpecQP. The glitch is that at this stage it is not clear whether QP is a functional projection yet.

(SM, 23a, 26-29)

holy PL, GEN in Constantin, LOC city, LOC hundred, GEN and sixty, GEN five, GEN father, PL, GEN

The data in (23) above evidence a pattern of the type AP > (PP)> Num > N. (23c) is particularly striking, since it attests the possibility of a heavy prepositional phrase modifier to occur in phrase internal position. In contrast, in (24) below the exact reverse order is attested, i.e. Num > AP >N.

(24)   a.   ШЕСТН СЪТЪ   Н ТРН ДЕСѦТЪ С͞ТЫНХЪ О͞ЦЬ   (SM, 23a, 25-26)

six, GEN hundred, PL, GEN and thirty, GEN holy, PL,GEN father, PL, GEN

The OB sample data are not only problematic in regard of the "illicit" pre-nominal permutations of the type demonstrated in (23)-(24) above. A striking fact is that a language should allow for both "regular" (e.g., following the default hierarchy of modifiers proposed in Sproat & Shih 1991) and mirror orderings in both the pre-nominal and post-nominal position, that is all four logically possible options. One potential solution is to attribute the permutations at hand to Greek influence. However, the discussion and the data in **4.** above strongly undermine this hypothesis. Other potential solutions are Cinque's (2000) multiple XP roll-up account on which fragments of the noun phrase together with its modifiers are assumed to successively raise to the specifiers of functional projections, thus reversing the default post-nominal order. Alternatively one may adopt the radical merge analysis originally proposed in Bouchard (1998) and implemented and further developed for modification patterns in the modern Balkan languages in Dimitrova-Vulchanova (2002). On the latter approach the unification of the head noun with modifiers is driven by selectional properties/ factors and the setting of a linearization parameter which is language-specific.[8] These issues await further research.

6.Conclusions.

In this paper we have reported preliminary data concerning the ordering of modifiers inside the nominal phrase in a selection of OB texts. Our observations so far indicate robust native tendencies, such as e.g. the use of denominal adjectives in place of adnominal genitives in the Greek original, the evolvement of a definite article, quite different in nature and function (e.g., obligatoriness), and syntactic position, from its Greek counterpart. The reported data also present quite a challenge to popular recent syntactic accounts of the cross-linguistic ordering options in terms of the permutations allowed. To the extent that the OB noun phrase, as indicated by the sample data, has a hierarchical structure, such permutations, to our mind, cannot be attributed to NT Greek influence or to a "free/flexible word order", an assumption to be proven by future research.

References:

Assenova, P. 1989. *Balkansko ezikoznanie. Osnovni problemi na Balkanskija ezikov sujuz*. Sofia: Nauka i izkustvo.

Blass, F. & A. Debrunner 1961. *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature*. Cambridge: CUP/Chicago, Illinois: The University of Chicago Press.

Bouchard, D. 1998. The Distribution and interpretation of Adjectives in French. *Probus*, 10, 139-183.

---

[8] This approach is supported by recent work by Stavrou (1995) where interpretational differences between pre-N and post-N modifiers in Greek are argued for, based on a difference in syntactic structure.

Cardinaletti, A. 1998. On the deficient/strong opposition in possessive systems. In: Alexiadou, A. & C. Wilder (eds.). *Possessors, Predicates and Movement in the DP.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins: 17-53.

Cinque, G. 1994. On the Evidence for partial N-movement in the Romance DP. In: Cinque, G. et al. (eds.) *Paths Towards Universal Grammar. Essays in Honour of Richard Kayne*: 85-110. Washignton: Georgetown UP.

Cinque, G. 2000. On Greenberg's Universal 20 and the Semitic DP. *University of Venice WP in linguistics*, vol. 10, 2

Corbett, G. 1987. The Morphology/Syntax Interface: evidence from possessive adjectives in Slavonic. *Language* 63, 2, 299-345.

Dimitrova-Vulchanova, M. 2002. Modification in the Balkan Nominal Expression: an account of the (A)NA : AN(*A) order contrast. In: Coene, M., Tasmowksi, L. & H. d'Hulst (eds.). *From NP to DP.* Amsterdam:John Benjamins.

Dimitrova-Vulchanova, M. & G. Giusti 1998. Fragments of Balkan Nominal Structure. In: Alexiadou, A. & C. Wilder (eds.). *Possessors, Predicates and Movement in the DP.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 333-360.

Dimitrova-Vulchanova, M. & G. Giusti 1999. Possessors in the Bulgarian DP. In: Dimitrova-Vulchanova, M. & L. Hellan (eds.) *Topics in South Slavic Syntax and Semantics*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 163-192.

Duridanov, I. et al. (eds.) 1993. Gramatika na starobulgarskija ezik. Fonetika, morfologija, syntaksis. Sofia: BAN.

Gălăbov, Iv. 1950. Za člena v starobulgarskija ezik. In: *Izvestija na narodnija muzej v Burgas*, *nr.1*. (re-printed in Gălăbov, Iv. 1986. *Izbrani trudove po ezikoznanie*. Sofia: Nauka i izkustvo)

Giusti, G. 2001. The birth of a functional category: from Latin ***ille*** to the Romance article and personal pronoun. In: Cinque, G. & G. P. Salvi (eds.) *Essays in Honour of Lorenzo Renzi*, North Holland Publishers.

Giusti, G. & M. Dimitrova-Vulchanova 1996. Quantified Noun Phrase Structure in Bulgarian. In: Toman, J. (ed.) Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics. Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publications.

Greenberg, J. 1966. Some universals of grammar with particular reference to the order of meaningful elements. In: Greenberg, J. (ed.) Universals of language (2nd ed.). Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 73-113.

Horrocks, G. 1997. *Greek: A History of the Language and its Speakers*. London: Longman.

Ivanova-Mirčeva, D. & Iv. Haralampiev. 1999. Istorija na bulgarskija ezik. Veliko Turnovo: Faber.

Kodov, Chr. & K. Mirčev 1965. *Eninski apostol. Starobulgarski pametnik ot 11 vek*. Sofia.

Manolessou, I. 2000. *Greek Noun Phrase Structure: a study in syntactic evolution*. PhD thesis, University of Cambridge.

Renzi, L. 1997. Fissione di lat. ILLE nelle lingue romanze. In: Holtus, G. Et al. (eds.) *Italica et Romanica. Festschrift für Max Pfister zum 65 Geburtstag*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Scrivener, F. H. A. (ed.) 1902. The New Testament in the original Greek. Cambridge: at the University Press.

Sproat, R. & Ch. Shih 1991. The Cross-linguistic distribution of adjective ordering restrictions. In: Georgopoulos, C. & R. Ishihara (eds.) *Interdisciplinary Approaches to Language. Essays in honor of S.-Y. Kuroda.* Dodrecht: Kluwer, 565-593.

Stavrou, M. 1996. Adjectives in Modern Greek: and instance of predication, or an old issue revisited. *JL*, 32.1: 79-112

Stavrou, M., forthcoming. Pseudo-adjectives: adjectives or nouns. An account of the morphology-syntax interaction.

Symeon Miscellany. In: *The Trondheim-Sofia Corpus of Early Slavic* at http://www.hf.ntnu.no/SofiaTrondheimCorpus/

Trubetzkoy, N. 1937. O pritjažatel'nyx prilagatl'nyx (possessiva) starocerkovno-slavjansogo jazyka. *Zbornik lingvistiĉkih i filoloških rasprava A. Beliĉu o 40-godišnjici njegova nauĉnog rada posveĉuju njegovi prijateli i uĉenici*: 15-20. Belgrade: Mlada Srbija.

Velčeva, B. 1975. *Dobromirovo evangelie. Bulgarski pametnik ot 12 vek*. Sofia.