PROJECT MUSE®

Formal Consequences of Dative Clitic Doubling in Bulgarian Ditransitives: An Applicative Analysis

Nikolay Slavkov

Journal of Slavic Linguistics, Volume 16, Number 1, Winter - Spring 2008, pp. 139-166 (Article)

Published by Slavica Publishers

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1353/jsl.0.0012>

➔ *For additional information about this article*

<https://muse.jhu.edu/article/257807>

Formal Consequences of Dative Clitic Doubling in Bulgarian Ditransitives: An Applicative Analysis*

Nikolay Slavkov

Abstract. This paper demonstrates that the Double Object Construction exists in Bulgarian, a fact that has so far escaped notice due to the disguise in which the construction appears. Bulgarian is a language that allows an indirect object to be optionally doubled by a dative clitic. I claim, however, that this optionality has formal consequences: ditransitives with dative clitic doubling are equivalent to Double Object Constructions (DOC), where the DP Goal is projected higher than the DP Theme. Variants without dative clitic doubling, on the other hand, are Prepositional Ditransitive Constructions (PDC), where the DP Theme is projected higher than the PP Goal. Although not evident from the surface word order and morphology in Bulgarian, the availability of these two distinct structures is confirmed through classic diagnostics such as binding, weak crossover, and scope. After attesting the DOC in Bulgarian, I offer an analysis in which the dative clitic is the morphological realization of an applicative head. I also draw parallels with Romance, suggesting that UG may be implicated in this type of doubling.

1. Introduction

In this paper I focus on Bulgarian ditransitive sentences and explore the idea of a correlation between dative clitic doubling and the Double Object Construction. Bulgarian, like Romanian and Spanish (among other languages), allows an indirect object to be doubled by a dative

* I am extremely grateful to María Luisa Rivero for guiding me to and through this topic and to Galina Dukova-Zheleva, Nina Kazanina, and Juana Liceras for reading earlier drafts. Many thanks to Martina Gračanin-Yuksek and Keren Tonciulescu for their useful comments and support and to the FDSL-6 and NLS 2005 audiences. I am also grateful to two anonymous reviewers and to Catherine Rudin for their comments and suggestions. Rok Žaucer, Olga Arnaudova, and Anousha Sedighi have also contributed ideas in earlier stages of this work. All errors are my own. This work was partially supported by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (Standard Research Grant 410-2003-0167 to María Luisa Rivero).

clitic in ditransitive contexts.¹ Although this type of doubling is typically considered optional and without formal consequences, I question this assumption. It is, of course, desirable within a generative framework to account for optionality in a systematic way and to take it as indicating different properties at some level. With this idea in mind, I observe that clitic-doubled ditransitives in Bulgarian behave in a fundamentally different way from their non-doubled counterparts. In particular, I propose that sentences like (1) have the properties of the Double Object Construction (DOC) and are thus the formal equivalent of English *John gave Mary the book*. On the other hand, sentences like (2), in which no clitic doubling applies, have the properties of the Prepositional Ditransitive Construction (PDC) and are equivalent to English *John gave the book to Mary*.

¹ While the primary focus of this paper is dative clitic doubling in ditransitives, it should be noted that clitic doubling in Bulgarian extends to a variety of other dative contexts. Some of these include psychological predicates (i), reflexive or *se* unaccusatives (ii), two-argument unergatives (iii), benefactive datives with transitive predicates (iv), and so on. (see Cuervo 2003a for equivalent examples in Spanish).

- (i) Na Marija í xaresvat bonbonite.
to Maria CL_{DAT} like_{3PL} the chocolates
'Maria likes the chocolates.'
- (ii) Na knigata í se otkâsnaxa koricate.
to the book CL_{DAT} REFL tore_{3PL} the covers
'The book's covers came off.'
- (iii) Andrej mu izvika na Živko.
Andrej CL_{DAT} shouted_{3SG} to Živko
'Andrei shouted at Zhivko.'
- (iv) Neli im napravi kâšta na nejnite roditeli.
Neli CL_{DAT} made_{3SG} house to her parents
'Neli built a house for her parents.'

Furthermore, clitic doubling occurs not only with dative objects but also with accusatives. As an anonymous reviewer points out, doubling is in fact more common with accusatives because of its case disambiguating function in such contexts.

An applicative analysis may or may not apply to the dative or accusative doubling constructions mentioned above. Cuervo (2003b), for example, analyses Spanish sentences equivalent to (i) through (iv) as applicatives. A discussion of these matters extends beyond the scope of this paper and is left open to future research (however, see also Dukova-Zheleva 2006 for an applicative analysis of (ii) and of certain other kinds of Bulgarian accusative and dative clitic constructions).

- (1) Ivan í izprati pismo na Marija.
 Ivan CL_{DAT} sent letter to Maria
 'Ivan sent Maria a letter.'
- (2) Ivan izprati pismo na Marija.
 Ivan sent letter to Maria
 'Ivan sent a letter to Maria.'

This correlation between dative clitic doubling in ditransitive sentences and the DOC on the one hand and non-doubled ditransitives and the PDC on the other has already been established in Spanish (Demonte 1995, Cuervo 2003a, b) and Romanian (Diaconescu 2004, Diaconescu and Rivero 2007). Thus, one of the main goals of this paper is to add Slavic to this literature. In doing so, I also integrate into my proposal a Bulgarian phenomenon known as *na*-drop (Vakareliyska 1994, 2002), which interacts with the DOC in an interesting way.

The second goal of this paper is to offer an applicative analysis of the Bulgarian DOC. Typically, in applicative constructions the verb has special morphology which allows the syntactic and semantic licensing of an additional argument; such an argument is often labelled non-core or applied, as it is not assigned by the argument structure of the verb (for discussion and examples see Alsina and Mchombo 1993, Anagnostopoulou 2003, Baker 1988, Baker 1996, Bresnan and Moshi 1990, and Hale and Keyser 1993, among others). Following Marantz (1993), a number of typologically distinct languages which may not necessarily exhibit traditional applicative verbal morphology have nonetheless been found to have double object constructions with applicative characteristics (see Pytkänen 2002 for English, Finnish, and Japanese; McGinnis 2001 for Albanian, Icelandic, and Italian; Cuervo 2003a, b for Spanish; Diaconescu 2004, Diaconescu and Rivero 2007 for Romanian). I propose that Bulgarian, which lacks applicative morphology in the traditional sense, should also be added to the inventory of languages which have a double object construction with applicative properties. It will be argued throughout this paper that the dative clitic in ditransitive sentences is the systematic indicator of the DOC in Bulgarian and that it is the morphological realization of an applicative head. The latter claim is consistent with several recent proposals in the

literature (McGinnis 2001 for Italian; Cuervo 2003a, b for Spanish; Diaconescu 2004, Diaconescu and Rivero 2007, for Romanian).

In proposing that the Bulgarian DOC is an applicative construction, I also show that it fits well within Pylkkänen's (2002) universal typology distinguishing between high and low applicatives. The high applicative (which I do not discuss further in this paper) denotes a semantic relation between an individual and an event, and its head is situated roughly above VP. The low applicative, on the other hand, denotes (transfer of) possession between the direct and the indirect (applied) object and is located within VP.² According to this classification, the Bulgarian double object construction is a low applicative. My analysis is consistent with a constructionist approach in which DOC properties are derived from applicative functional heads and not from theta roles lexically encoded in phrasal categories.

This paper is organized as follows. In the section 2 I elaborate on the main hypotheses regarding the Bulgarian double object construction and offer some cross-linguistic observations consistent with my proposal. In section 3 I show data from Bulgarian which are interpreted as preliminary evidence for the idea that clitic-doubled ditransitives have a different structure from their non-doubled counterparts. In section 4 I focus on structural asymmetries illustrated through binding, weak crossover, and scope. The results of these tests constitute the main evidence in favor of my proposal that the double object construction is available in Bulgarian. In section 5 I lay out the details

² A third type of applicative, called *affected*, is introduced to the typology by Cuervo (2003b). While this applicative is also outside of the focus of this paper, note that Dukova-Zheleva (2006) analyses what she calls reflexive (i) and non-reflexive (ii) anticausatives with dative participants in Bulgarian as *affected* or *middle* applicatives; furthermore, Dukova-Zheleva analyses non-reflexive anticausatives with accusative participants (iii) as *low* applicatives.

- (i) Izgubixa mi se očilata.
lost_{3PL} CL_{DAT} REFL the glasses
'My glasses got lost.'
- (ii) Teži mi čantata.
weigh_{3SG} CL_{DAT} the bag
'My bag is too heavy for me.'
- (iii) Sârbi me râkata.
itch_{3SG} CL_{ACC} the hand
'My hand is itchy.'

of an applicative analysis of the Bulgarian DOC and also provide a structure illustrating the PDC. In section 6 I discuss some general implications of this work and offer concluding remarks.

2. Main Hypotheses and Some Cross-Linguistic Data

Many languages exhibit two alternative ways of expressing a relationship between a Theme and a Goal. As illustrated by English, a DP Theme can precede and c-command a PP Goal, as in (3). Alternatively, a DP Goal can appear before and structurally dominate a DP Theme, as in (4). Greek is another language in which both a prepositional ditransitive construction and a double object construction are available, as shown in (5) and (6), respectively.

(3) I sent the book to John. → English PDC

(4) I sent John the book. → English DOC

(5) O Gianis estile to gramma stin Maria.
 the Gianis_{NOM} sent_{3SG} the letter_{ACC} to-the Maria_{ACC}
 'John sent the letter to Mary.' → Greek PDC

(6) O Gianis estile tis Marias to gramma.
 the Gianis_{NOM} sent_{3SG} the Maria_{GEN} the letter_{ACC}
 'John sent Mary the letter.'³ → Greek DOC
 (Anagnostopoulou 2003)

In contrast to the English and Greek examples above, no such alternation seems to be available in Bulgarian, at least not at first sight. Bulgarian has flexible word order whereby the Theme can precede the Goal and vice versa, shown in (7a) and (7b), respectively, without any apparent structural consequences or visible morphological differences.

³ Note that the indirect object in Greek is marked with Genitive case (i.e., not Dative) due to the loss of the Genitive/Dative distinction in Greek morphology. The loss of this distinction is typical of the Balkan Sprachbund, with some languages retaining Dative and others Genitive marking.

As shown in (8a) and (8b), the Theme and the Goal can be reversed in dative clitic-doubled ditransitives as well.

- (7) a. Ivan izprati pismo na Marija. → Bulgarian PDC
 Ivan sent letter to Maria
 'Ivan sent a letter to Maria.'
- b. Ivan izprati na Marija pismo. → Bulgarian PDC
 Ivan sent to Maria letter
 'Ivan sent a letter to Maria.'
- (8) a. Ivan í izprati pismo na Marija. → Bulgarian DOC
 Ivan CL_{DAT} sent letter to Maria
 'Ivan sent Maria a letter.'
- b. Ivan í izprati na Marija pismo. → Bulgarian DOC
 Ivan CL_{DAT} sent to Maria letter
 'Ivan sent Maria a letter.'

In this paper I argue that the crucial factor in determining PDC versus DOC status in Bulgarian is not the word order but the absence or presence of a dative clitic doubling the indirect object.⁴ Thus my main hypothesis I postulate is that the dative clitic accounts for an alternation between two distinct structures. To recapitulate, when the clitic is absent, as in (7), the structure of the sentence is that of the PDC, in which the direct object is expressed as a DP and c-commands the indirect object expressed as a PP. On the other hand, when the clitic is present, as in (8), the structure is that of the DOC, in which the indirect object is projected higher and therefore c-commands the direct object.

It is important to observe that in the DOC in English in (4) and Greek in (6) both arguments are expressed as DPs. This leads to my second hypothesis, closely related to the first, predicting that the morpheme *na* in Bulgarian alternates between a true directional preposition in (7) and a dative case reflex in (8). By this token, the phrasal constituent *na Maria* can be analyzed as a PP in the variants without a

⁴ I abstract from the question of what constitutes the basic word order in Bulgarian and from a discussion of topic and focus. While such issues are undeniably important, they remain beyond the scope of this paper, since I concentrate on purely structural asymmetries indicated by the phenomenon of dative clitic doubling.

dative clitic in (7) and as a DP in the clitic-doubled ones in (8). While such a dual role for the Bulgarian *na*-phrase has already been assumed in the literature (see, for example, Schick 2000, Vakareliyska 1994, 2002), I introduce a novel aspect to this account by correlating the preposition with the PDC and the case marker with the DOC.

Evidence for the hypotheses presented here will be given in sections 3 and 4. At this point, however, it is worth making some cross-linguistic observations consistent with my proposal. As already pointed out, Greek is among the languages that participate in an alternation between the PDC shown in (5) and the DOC shown in (6). Greek is also a language that allows dative clitic doubling in ditransitive contexts. As demonstrated in (9) and (10), dative clitic doubling is ungrammatical in the PDC, but grammatical in the DOC.

- (9) *Tu edhosa to vivlio ston Gianni. → Greek PDC
 CL_{GEN} gave the book_{ACC} to-the John
 'I gave the book to John.'

- (10) Tu edhosa tu Giani to vivlio. → Greek DOC
 CL_{GEN} gave the John_{GEN} the book_{ACC}
 'I gave John the book.' (Anagnostopoulou 2003)

While dative clitic doubling in Greek does not by itself account for the double object construction, the fact that the clitic is grammatical only in the DOC is highly suggestive. In other words, there seems to be a strong link between dative clitic doubling and the double object construction. Overall, the data in (9) and (10) show that the clitic systematically correlates with different structures and properties, and therefore provide evidence against the view of dative clitic doubling in ditransitives as an optional phenomenon (for details see Anagnostopoulou 2003). Further support for this general line of reasoning has been drawn from Romance:

- (11) a. Pablo mandó una carta a María. → Spanish PDC
 Pablo sent a letter_{ACC} to María_{DAT}
 'Pablo sent a letter to Maria.'

- (11) b. Pablo le mandó una carta a María. → Spanish
 Pablo CL_{DAT} sent a letter_{ACC} to María_{DAT} DOC
 'Pablo sent Maria a letter.' (Cuervo 2003a, b)
- (12) a. Mihaela trimite o scrisoare la Maria. → Romanian PDC
 Mihaela sends a letter to Maria
 'Mihaela sends a letter to Maria.'
- b. Mihaela îi trimite o scrisoare la Maria. → Romanian
 Mihaela CL_{DAT} sends a letter to Maria DOC
 'Mihaela sends Maria a letter.' (Diaconescu 2004)

As the data from Spanish in (11) and Romanian in (12) indicate, clitic doubling in these languages applies similarly as in Bulgarian.⁵ It has been proposed by Demonte (1995) and Cuervo (2003a, b) for Spanish and by Diaconescu (2004) and Diaconescu and Rivero (2007) for Romanian that this clitic-doubling alternation is equivalent to the alternation between the PDC and the DOC. In other words, in both Spanish and Romanian as in Bulgarian, it is not the linear word order but rather the presence of the dative clitic that indicates the availability of the DOC. Furthermore, just like the Bulgarian *na*-phrase, *a* 'to' in Spanish and *la* 'to' in Romanian have been described by the cited authors as alternating between a directional preposition and an empty case marker. By this token, the Spanish *a Maria* is a PP in the non-doubled PDC (11a) and a DP in the clitic-doubled DOC (11b). In a similar fashion, *la Maria* in Romanian is a PP in (12a) and a DP in (12b). Interestingly, the alternation between a case marker and a real preposition in ditransitives has also been observed for Japanese *ni* (Miyagawa 1997).

Overall, there is enough cross-linguistic evidence to warrant the hypotheses for Bulgarian which I outline above. In the next section I present more Bulgarian data that lend preliminary support to this line of reasoning.

⁵ One interesting difference is that Spanish does not allow constructions in which both the direct and the indirect object are clitic-doubled, while Romanian and Bulgarian do. The analysis of such constructions remains beyond the scope of this paper (but see also footnote 15).

3. The DOC in Bulgarian: Locatives, Prepositions, and *na*-Drop

Three sets of facts lend initial support to the proposed correlation between dative clitic doubling and the double object construction. One well-known property of the DOC is that it is ungrammatical with true locative Goals, as illustrated in English (13). Bulgarian clitic-doubled ditransitives do not allow locative Goals either, as in (15). Conversely, the English prepositional ditransitive construction is fully compatible with locatives, as in (14), and so is the Bulgarian variant without a dative clitic in (16). By this token it seems plausible that (13) and (15), on the one hand, and (14) and (16), on the other, are equivalent constructions.

(13)	John sent Steven / *Berlin a letter.	→	DOC
(14)	John sent a letter to Steven / to Berlin.	→	PDC
(15)	Ivan mu izprati pismo na Stojan/ *na Berlin.
Ivan CL _{DAT} sent letter to Stojan to Berlin
'Ivan sent Stojan/*Berlin a letter.'	→	DOC
(16)	Ivan izprati pismo na Stojan/ na Berlin.
Ivan sent letter to Stojan to Berlin
'Ivan sent a letter to Stojan/Berlin.'	→	PDC

A second interesting observation is that prepositional Goals are ungrammatical in Bulgarian dative clitic-doubled ditransitives, as demonstrated in (17), (19), and (21). The Goals in these variants can only appear with the case marker *na*. On the other hand, in the absence of dative clitic doubling, PP Goals are perfectly licit, as shown in (18), (20), and (22). When *na* appears in a variant without a dative clitic doubling the indirect object, it is a true directional preposition, as shown in (22).⁶

⁶ Note that the role of *na* in Bulgarian is extremely complex. It can function as a locative preposition, a directional preposition, a dative marker, or a possessive (dative) marker.

- (17) Majka μ_i slaga zaxar na/ *v čaja $_i$. *preposition,
 mother CL_{DAT} put_{3SG} sugar to in the tea *na*=case marker
 Lit: 'Mother puts the tea sugar.' → DOC
- (18) Majka slaga zaxar v čaja. preposition OK
 mother put_{3SG} sugar in the tea → PDC
 'Mother puts sugar in the tea.'
- (19) Emilija im $_i$ zgotvi edna supa na/ *za decata $_i$.
 Emilia CL_{DAT} cooked a soup to *for the children
 *preposition, *na*=case marker
 'Emilia made the children soup.' → DOC
- (20) Emilija zgotvi edna supa za decata. preposition OK
 Emilia cooked a soup for the children
 'Emilia made a soup for the children.' → PDC
- (21) Ivan μ_i prašta pismo na/ *do ministerstvoto $_i$.
 Ivan CL_{DAT} sends letter to to the ministry
 *preposition, *na*=case marker
 'Ivan sends the ministry a letter.' → DOC
- (22) Ivan prašta pismo na/ do ministerstvoto. preposition OK
 Ivan sends letter to to the ministry → PDC
 'Ivan sends a letter to the ministry.'

If we analyze the clitic-doubled variants in the above examples as DOCs, where both the direct and the indirect objects must be expressed as DPs, then the fact that such clitic-doubled sentences are ungrammatical with a PP Goal receives an explanation. On the other hand, the fact that ditransitives without a dative clitic are compatible with, and in fact require, a preposition follows from the proposal that they are PDCs.

A third phenomenon that fits well within the general proposal of this paper is *na*-drop. As Vakareliyska (1994, 2002) observes, *na* 'to' can be dropped in colloquial Bulgarian when the indirect object is doubled

by a clitic, as in (23). Crucially, *na*-drop is ungrammatical in the absence of dative clitic doubling, as shown in (24).

- (23) (Na) nego/ Ivan mu dadox knigite. *na*-drop OK
 to him/ Ivan CL_{DAT} gave_{1SG} the books → DOC
 ‘I gave him/Ivan the books.’

- (24) *(Na) nego/ Ivan dadox knigite. **na*-drop
 to him/ Ivan gave_{1SG} the books → PDC
 ‘I gave him/Ivan the books.’

Vakareliyska (1994) discusses the role of *na* as a meaningful (locative and/or directional) preposition as opposed to a dative case marker. I integrate this into my proposal and claim that *na*-drop is grammatical in the double object construction and ungrammatical in the prepositional ditransitive construction. In other words, in the non-doubled PDC where the Goal must be expressed as a PP, *na* is obligatory, as it carries a directional meaning; on the other hand, in the clitic-doubled DOC where the Goal must be a DP, *na* can be omitted, as it is a redundant case marker.⁷

Overall, while the facts presented so far do not constitute direct evidence for a structural asymmetry between dative clitic-doubled and non-doubled ditransitives in Bulgarian, they are consistent with correlating the former with the DOC and the latter with the PDC.

4. Structural Asymmetries

In this section I provide the main evidence for the existence of a structural asymmetry between dative clitic-doubled sentences and their counterparts without doubling. I use three classic DOC diagnostics: binding, weak crossover, and scope.

⁷ Note that *na*-drop is primarily a sentence-initial phenomenon. Vakareliyska observes that it is marginal in sentence-medial and ungrammatical in sentence-final position. She proposes an account of these facts in terms of stronger sentence stress in sentence-final position and weaker stress sentence-initially and relates that to issues such as topic and focus, which are not discussed here. For the purposes of my analysis, the key fact is that *na*-drop *can* be grammatical in the clitic-doubled variants (i.e., DOCs) while it is *always* ungrammatical in the non-doubled variants (i.e., PDCs).

4.1. Binding of Possessives

Recall that the essential property of the double object construction is that the DP Goal c-commands the DP Theme. On the other hand, in the prepositional ditransitive construction, the DP Theme c-commands the PP Goal. A simplified representation of this is given below:

(25) a. DOC: DP > DP

b. PDC: DP > PP

This c-command asymmetry can be illustrated in English with the binding of possessives (see Barss and Lasnik 1986, Larson 1988, and Pesetsky 1995 for further discussion of binding). When a possessive is embedded in the Goal, the prepositional ditransitive construction is grammatical; that is, the higher Theme can bind the possessive in the lower Goal as in (26). However, in the double object construction, where the Goal is projected in a higher position, the sentence is ungrammatical; that is, the lower Theme cannot bind the possessive in the higher Goal as in (27). The main hypothesis outlined in the previous section predicts that the same asymmetry should be reflected in Bulgarian in the presence versus absence of dative clitic doubling. As (28) indicates, the variant without a dative clitic, the Bulgarian PDC, behaves exactly like its English counterpart in (26). On the other hand, the clitic-doubled variant in (29), which I propose is the Bulgarian DOC, is equivalent to the English in (27). Thus, the hypothesis that the double object construction is available in Bulgarian and that a dative clitic is its indicator is confirmed.

(26) I gave every paycheck_i to its_i owner. → PDC

(27) *I gave its_i owner every paycheck_i. → DOC

- (28) Vârnaxme rečnika_i na negovija_i sobstvenik.⁸ → PDC
 returned_{2PL} the dictionary to its owner
 'We returned the dictionary to its owner.'
- (29) *Vârnaxme mu_i rečnika_i na negovija_i sobstvenik. → DOC
 returned_{2PL} CL_{DAT} dictionary to its owner
 Lit: 'We returned its owner the dictionary.'

The reverse pattern is obtained in English when the possessive is embedded in the Theme. In the PDC the lower Goal cannot bind the possessive in the higher Theme, as in (30); however, in the DOC the higher Goal is able to bind the lower Theme, as in (31). By hypothesis, the same should apply to Bulgarian: the non-doubled variant with a possessive in the Theme should be ungrammatical while the variant with a dative clitic doubling the indirect object should be grammatical. As (32) and (33) indicate, these predictions are borne out.

- (30) ??/*I gave his_i paycheck to every worker_i. → PDC
- (31) I gave every worker_i his_i paycheck. → DOC
- (32) *Otkazaxme negovija_i ček na rabotnika_i. → PDC
 denied_{1PL} his check to the worker
 'Lit: We denied his check to the worker.'
- (33) Otkazaxme mu_i negovija_i ček na rabotnika_i. → DOC
 denied_{1PL} CL_{DAT} his check to the worker
 'We denied the worker his check.'

⁸ Note that Bulgarian has short and long form possessives. As an anonymous reviewer points out, short form possessives are typically more conversational and are the default unmarked form. The long forms, on the other hand, are marked and sometimes described as emphatic or contrastive. In this paper, I mostly use the long form possessives (e.g., *negovija* for 3rd person singular) because the short form (e.g., *mu* for 3rd person singular) is homophonous with the dative clitic and may introduce unnecessary complexity for readers unfamiliar with Bulgarian. However, in the section on weak crossover, I use the short form possessive *mu* to make these particular examples sound more natural.

To sum up, even though in all Bulgarian examples in this section the Theme linearly precedes the Goal, the clitic-doubled variants behave like the English DOC and the non-doubled variants like the English PDC. This constitutes strong evidence that in the variants without a dative clitic, the Theme is projected higher than the Goal, and in the variants where clitic doubling applies the Goal is projected higher than the Theme.

4.2 Weak Crossover

Additional evidence supporting the proposed correlation between dative clitic doubling and the double object construction comes from Weak Crossover (WCO), as shown schematically in (34).

(34) $*[wh_i \dots [possessive_i \dots] \dots t_i \dots]$

The conditions for weak crossover effects to apply are as follows: a lower *wh*-argument is co-indexed with a possessive pronoun embedded in a higher argument; if the *wh*-argument raises above the possessive, the sentence becomes ungrammatical.

In English (35) and (36) a possessive is embedded in the Goal argument. In the DOC (35) the lower *wh*- Theme raises across the possessive in the higher Goal and makes the sentence ungrammatical. In (36), however, there is no effect on grammaticality because in the PDC the *wh*- Theme is projected higher and does not cross over the possessive in the lower Goal. The same facts can be attested in Bulgarian. Since clitic doubling applies in (37), the prediction is that the Theme is the lower argument; when it raises, it crosses over the possessive in the higher Goal and WCO obtains. In (38), on the other hand, the prediction is that the Goal is projected in a lower position because of the lack of clitic doubling; as expected, this sentence is grammatical because when the higher *wh*- Theme raises, it does not cross over the possessive in the lower Goal.

- (35) *What_i did Mary give its_i owner *t_i*?⁹ → DOC
- (36) What_i did Mary give *t_i* to its_i owner? → PDC
(Cuervo 2003b)
- (37) */[?]Kakvo_i mu dade Ivan na sobstvenika mu_i *t_i*? → DOC
what CL_{DAT} gave Ivan to the owner its
'What_i did Ivan give its_i owner *t_i*?'
- (38) Kakvo_i dade Ivan *t_i* na sobstvenika mu_i? → PDC
what gave Ivan to the owner its
'What_i did Ivan give *t_i* to its_i owner?'

In the above examples the possessive is embedded in the Goal argument. This makes the DOC ungrammatical and the PDC grammatical. The reverse pattern is predicted and observed when the possessive is in the Theme, as illustrated below. The English DOC in (39) is grammatical and the PDC in (40) ungrammatical. Similarly, the Bulgarian clitic-doubled variant in (41) is grammatical and the non-doubled one in (42) is ungrammatical.

- (39) Who_i did Mary give *t_i* his_i check?¹⁰ → DOC
- (40) *Who_i did Mary give his_i check to *t_i*? → PDC
(Cuervo 2003b)
- (41) Na kogo_i mu vârna *t_i* testa mu Ivan? → DOC
to whom CL_{DAT} returned_{3SG} the test his Ivan
'Who_i did Ivan return *t_i* his_i test?'
- (42) *Na kogo_i vârna testa mu *t_i* Ivan? → PDC
to whom returned the test his Ivan
'Who did Ivan return his test to?'

⁹ For additional examples and discussion of weak crossover see Barss and Lasnik 1986 and Larson 1988, among others.

¹⁰ Certain speakers do not accept (39) as fully grammatical, but they still find it more acceptable than the completely ungrammatical (40).

In sum, weak crossover effects in Bulgarian clitic-doubled variants obtain exactly as in the English DOC; conversely, in non-doubled variants in Bulgarian WCO applies exactly as in the English PDC. Thus, the hypothesis that the presence versus absence of dative clitic doubling accounts for the existence of two different structures in Bulgarian is confirmed.

4.3 Frozen Scope

The third piece of evidence for my proposal comes from a scopal asymmetry. Aoun and Li (1989) and Bruening (2001) observe that in the English PDC scope is always free between the Theme and the Goal (43–44). In the DOC, however, scope is frozen. That is, the Goal can scope over the Theme (45) but the Theme cannot take scope over the Goal (46):

PDC free (Goal > Theme; Theme > Goal):

(43) The teacher gave *a* (different) candy to *each* child.

(44) The teacher gave *each* candy to *a* (different) child.

DOC frozen (Goal > Theme; *Theme > Goal):

(45) The teacher gave *each* child *a* (different) candy.

(46) The teacher gave *a* (*different) child *each* candy.

If we compare the English data with Bulgarian, the correlation between clitic doubling and the double object construction is confirmed once again:

PDC free (Goal > Theme; Theme > Goal):

(47) Učiteljat dade *edno* (različno) bonbonče na *vsjako* dete.
 the teacher gave_{3SG} one different candy to each child
 'The teacher gave a (different) candy to each child.'

- (48) Učiteljat dade *vsjako* bonbonče na *edno* (različno) dete.
 the teacher gave_{3SG} each candy to one different child
 'The teacher gave each candy to a (different) child.'

DOC frozen (Goal > Theme; *Theme > Goal):

- (49) Učiteljat mu dade *edno* (različno) bonbončena *vsjako* dete.
 the teacher CL_{DAT} gave_{3SG} a different candy to each child
 'The teacher gave each child a (different) candy.'
- (50) Učiteljat mu dade *vsjako* bonbonče na *edno* (*različno)
 the teacher CL_{DAT} gave_{3SG} each candy to a different
 dete.
 child
 'The teacher gave a (*different) child each candy.'

As in the English PDC, scope in the non-doubled Bulgarian variants in (47–48) is free between the Theme and the Goal. In the clitic-doubled variants, in parallel with the English DOC, when *vsjako* 'each' is in the higher Goal it takes scope over *edno* 'one' in the lower Theme as in (49); however, when *vsjako* is in the lower Theme, it cannot take scope over *edno* in the Goal as in (50).

Cuervo (2003b) presents Spanish data equivalent to (47–50) and relates them to Bruening's (2001) explanation of scope freezing in the double object construction in English. The idea is that frozen scope in the DOC is not caused by the Theme DP being frozen in place. Bruening proposes that both the Goal and the Theme can move for scope, but quantifier raising (QR) obeys superiority. Thus, the relative hierarchical position that the Theme and the Goal have in some local domain cannot be altered by quantifier raising. This approach can also be adopted for the Bulgarian scope facts if we assume that the Goal has a higher hierarchical position than the Theme (see the structure proposed for the DOC below). As for the Theme > Goal word order (which is also possible, as mentioned earlier), it can be assumed that the accusative DP has to move across the higher dative. Even if the accusative lands in a position where it can be interpreted for scope, when the dative DP undergoes QR, it would move to a position above the accusative, obeying superiority. Thus, the structure for the DOC

provided in the following section captures the scope facts better than a structure where the Theme is projected higher than the Goal (i.e., the PDC).

To summarize, the results from tests with binding, weak crossover, and scope point to a structural asymmetry between Bulgarian clitic-doubled ditransitive sentences and their non-doubled counterparts. When clitic doubling applies, regardless of the linear word order (which may be Theme > Goal or Goal > Theme), the indirect object is projected in a higher position than the direct object. In this configuration the *na*-phrase is not a PP but a DP, and the morpheme *na* is not a preposition but a dative case reflex.

These facts lead to the conclusion that dative clitic doubling in ditransitives is not optional as sometimes claimed but obligatory in syntactic terms: the presence of a dative clitic signals the double object construction. As mentioned earlier, Bulgarian is not the only language where the double object construction is to be linked to the phenomenon of dative clitic doubling. Strong support for my proposal comes from Spanish (Demonte 1995, Cuervo 2003a, b) and Romanian (Diaconescu 2004, Diaconescu and Rivero 2007). Thus, there are reasons to implicate Universal Grammar in this type of clitic doubling and seek a unified cross-linguistic analysis for it.

5. Applicative Analysis of the Bulgarian Double Object Construction

The double object construction cross-linguistically has received a significant amount of attention in the literature, and a number of different analyses have been advanced (see, for example, Diaconescu 2004 for a recent overview). In this paper, I assume no derivational relatedness between the DOC and the PDC and pursue an applicative analysis in the general spirit of Marantz (1993).

Recall that a number of languages around the world have constructions with special applicative verbal morphology. Such morphology can have a variety of functions, one of which is to relate an indirect and a direct object. This is illustrated in Chichewa (from Baker 1988), where the applicative morpheme in (51) accounts for a DOC type structure. In (52), on the other hand, there is no applicative morphology but a preposition relating the indirect and the direct objects (i.e., PDC).

- (51) Mbidzi zi-na-perek-**er**-a nkhandwe msampha.
 zebras subj.prefix-past-hand-**appl**-asp fox trap
 'The zebras handed the fox the trap.' Chichewa
- (52) Mbidzi zi-na-perek-a msampha **kwa** nkhandwe.
 zebras subj.prefix-past-hand-asp trap **to** fox
 'The zebras handed the trap to the fox.' Chichewa

Bulgarian readily lends itself to an applicative analysis because the dative clitic, which is the single indicator of the DOC in this language, can be treated as the morphological spell out of an applicative head. Thus, broadly speaking, Bulgarian clitic-doubled ditransitives correspond to (51) and their non-doubled counterparts to (52). Cuervo (2003a, b) proposes an analysis along these lines for the Spanish ditransitive clitic-doubled (i.e., double object) construction. She claims that the Spanish DOC is a low applicative under Pylkkänen's (2002) classification. As mentioned earlier, low applicatives express (transfer of) possession between the direct object and the non-core argument (indirect object) and sit roughly within VP.

In this paper I adopt Cuervo's analysis for Bulgarian. As the structure in (53) indicates, the applicative phrase is embedded under little *v* and the higher Goal is projected in the specifier of ApplP; the applicative head, spelled out as a dative clitic (see also McGinnis 2001), takes the lower Theme as its complement. The clitic assigns inherent dative case to the applied object, and *na* in (53) below is a dative case marker, not a preposition. Thus, the higher Goal is expressed as a DP, which is an essential characteristic of the DOC. In the derivational process the verb raises to Voice and the dative clitic climbs out of the Applicative Phrase (Diaconescu and Rivero 2007). This can be done by a syntactic or morphological process which applies to both the clitic and the verb, which I do not discuss here.¹¹

¹¹ For further details on movements that apply to derive the linear word order, for passive clitic-doubled constructions, for details on the semantic relations, and for additional discussion and justification of the structure, see Cuervo 2003b; see also Marantz 1993.

(53) The structure of the Bulgarian DOC

Ivan *ì* prati knigata na Marija.

Ivan CL_{DAT} sent_{3SG} the book to Marija

'Ivan sent Maria the book.'

(adapted from Cuervo 2003a)

The structure of ditransitives without dative clitic doubling, i.e., the Bulgarian PDC, is given in (54) below. In this structure, the higher Theme c-commands the lower Goal, which is expressed by a directional prepositional phrase.

(54) The structure of the Bulgarian PDC¹²

Ivan prati knjigata na Marija.
 Ivan sent_{3SG} the book to Marija
 'Ivan sent the book to Maria.'

(adapted from Cuervo 2003a)

The structures in (53) and (54) account straightforwardly for the asymmetries observed in the previous section. The fact that dative clitic-doubled ditransitives in Bulgarian parallel the English DOC with regard to binding, weak crossover, and scope is explained by the hierarchical position of the Goal and the Theme in (53). On the other hand, the parallel between the English PDC and the Bulgarian non-doubled variants is predicted by the structure in (54), where the higher Theme c-commands the lower Goal. Note that such hierarchical relations between the Theme and the Goal can be reflected in different analyses of the DOC. For example, Marantz (1993) and Anagnostopoulou (2003) assume the same Goal > Theme projection but propose different struc-

¹² See previous footnote.

tures for the DOC. Broadly speaking, in the analyses proposed by these authors the dative sits above the verb and thus has a direct semantic relation with the event, which is a sign of a high applicative, but no direct relation with the theme object, a sign of a low applicative. The analysis proposed here is better able to capture the correct semantic relations between the two objects and the verb (for discussion see Diaconescu and Rivero 2007). Another analysis, specifically proposed for a clitic-doubled DOC, is offered by Demonte (1995). She claims that a possessor DP originating in the specifier of the Theme object moves to a position above the verb, namely, the specifier of a Clitic Phrase. Cuervo (2003a, b) objects to this analysis, claiming that the postulation of a clitic phrase lacks independent motivation and the phrase itself has unclear properties.

While it is beyond the scope of this paper to discuss in detail the various analyses of the DOC cross-linguistically, I think adopting the structures in (53) and (54) offers some advantages over previous proposals (see Diaconescu and Rivero (2007) for discussion; however, see Gračanin-Yuksek (2006) for a proposal based on Croatian data that runs counter to an applicative analysis of the double object construction). One particular advantage of an applicative analysis is its ability to account for the different types of double object predicates cross-linguistically. As Pylkkänen (2002) points out, in English, only *give* type verbs participate in the DOC, as indicated by (55) versus (56).

(55) I gave Mary the book.

(56) *I took away Mary the book.

Pylkkänen argues that low applicatives in English have only a *recipient* head denoting a *transfer of possession* relationship in which the direct object is *to* the possession of the indirect object. However, she also proposes a second low applicative with a *source* head, whose semantics assert a relationship in which the direct object is *from* the possession of indirect object. This low applicative head is unavailable in English, as (56) indicates, but available in other languages such as Korean, Japanese, Hebrew, Finnish, and others. As illustrated below, the Bulgarian double object construction is grammatical with both *give* and *take* verbs. This indicates that the dative clitic can function as either a low *recipient* or a low *source* applicative head.

- (57) Az mu dadox knigata na Ivan.
 I CL_{DAT} gave the book to Ivan
 'I gave Ivan the book.'

- (58) Az mu vzex knigata na Ivan.
 I CL_{DAT} took the book to Ivan
 Lit: 'I took away Ivan the book.'

- (59) Az mu vzex knigata na Ivan, zaštoto ne e negova.
 I CL_{DAT} took the book to Ivan because NEG is his
 Lit: 'I took away Ivan the book because it doesn't belong to him.'

Note that (58) can have two different interpretations: (i) the book that was taken belongs to Ivan and (ii) the book was in Ivan's possession but does not belong to him. The availability of this second interpretation is confirmed by (59). Similar constructions have been called possessive datives in many languages and have been claimed to differ from the double object construction (see Landau 1999). However, Pylkkänen proposes an account of possessive datives in which they are just like double object constructions, the only difference being that the directionality of the applicative head is not *to* but *from*. Thus (58) is an example of a low applicative with *from* directionality.¹³

To recapitulate, the applicative analysis proposed for the Bulgarian double object construction offers an explanation of the facts discussed in the earlier sections of this paper. The hierarchical relations between the Theme and the Goal are properly expressed, and the structures proposed allow adding Bulgarian to a universal inventory of double object low applicative constructions. At the same time, the proposed analysis allows for some cross-linguistic variation in the applicative heads participating in the double object construction. The picture that emerges is compatible with constructionist views where possible meanings for dative arguments are derived from properties of the

¹³ For equivalent examples and treatment of a dative clitic as a low *source* applicative head in Romanian and Spanish, see Diaconescu 2004 and Cuervo 2003b, respectively. Also note that these authors propose a third low applicative head denoting *static* possession. This may be available in Bulgarian as well, but I do not discuss it here.

syntactic configuration, such as the applicative head that licenses the dative DP, Voice, and little *v*.

6. Conclusion

This paper has pursued two major goals. The first one was to identify a structure that has so far escaped notice in the literature on Bulgarian: the double object construction. The availability of the DOC in Bulgarian was suggested by observations about locatives, prepositions, and *na*-drop and confirmed by facts from binding, weak crossover, and scope. My proposal supports earlier analyses of the complex role of the Bulgarian *na*-phrase and extends them to the correlation between *na* as a dative case marker and the DOC on the one hand and *na* as a meaningful preposition and the PDC on the other. The second major goal was to offer an applicative analysis of the Bulgarian DOC. I argued that since the dative clitic is the systematic marker of the double object construction, it can be analyzed as the overt morphological realization of a low applicative head. The two distinct structures proposed for the Bulgarian DOC and PDC offer a straightforward explanation of the binding, weak crossover, and scope facts discussed earlier, and allow for a unified cross-linguistic account of the relevant phenomena.

A major consequence of my proposal is that it provides evidence against the assumption in the literature that dative clitic doubling in ditransitive sentences is optional. As illustrated in this paper, sentences with clitic doubling can be reliably correlated with the DOC, and their counterparts without dative clitics can be correlated with the PDC. Thus the presence of a dative clitic doubling the indirect object is syntactically obligatory in the double object configuration, and the absence of this clitic is syntactically obligatory in the alternative, prepositional configuration. Under my proposal Slavic, represented by Bulgarian, joins Romance, represented by Romanian and Spanish, in a group of typologically distinct languages which have a dative alternation disguised as a seemingly optional clitic-doubling alternation. It is important to note that this paper does not argue against analyses in which dative clitic doubling is linked to discourse-level factors. In es-

sence, my proposal amounts to adding a new, structural dimension to the complex role that clitics play in Bulgarian.^{14, 15}

Finally, while the properties of double object constructions in the languages of the world may vary along several different dimensions (see Anagnostopoulou 2003 for an overview), the picture that emerges from this paper is one in which two new classes can be identified: one where the DOC is easily detectable as it is visible in the linear word order (e.g., English); and one where the DOC structure is less obvious or disguised, yet systematically signalled by a clitic with applicative properties.¹⁶ This second type of double object construction seems to be fairly productive across languages, which suggests that dative clitic doubling is governed by the principles of Universal Grammar. It also raises the question of whether dative clitic doubling in ditransitives can potentially be a diagnostic for the double object construction in other typologically distinct languages.

¹⁴ As an anonymous reviewer points out, many authors consider clitic doubling constructions to differ from their non-doubled counterparts with regards to information structure but not with regards to syntactic structure (e.g., Avgustinova 1997, Dimitrova-Vulchanova 1995, Dimitrova-Vulchanova and Hellen 1998, Schick 2000, Vakareliyska 1993, 2002, Werkmann 2003, among others). In particular, it is generally accepted that clitic-doubled constructions exhibit a specificity effect. While my proposal does not discuss this issue in detail, note that a specificity effect is not necessarily in contradiction with an applicative analysis. On the basis of Marantz 1993, Nakanishi (2001) proposes an applicative analysis of Japanese ditransitives in which an overt morphological head is responsible for a specificity effect in the double object construction.

¹⁵ The same anonymous reviewer also raises the question of constructions with clitic doubling of both the accusative and the dative arguments which, as already mentioned, exist in Bulgarian but are not accounted for in this paper. To my knowledge, this issue has not yet been addressed in detail in the literature on applicatives so I leave it open to future research. However, Diaconescu and Rivero (2007) suggest informally that in similar constructions in Romanian both the dative and the accusative clitics may be part of a low applicative phrase.

¹⁶ I argue throughout this paper that linear word order in Bulgarian is uninformative with regard to the alternation between the DOC and the PDC. Note, however, that the DOC may be reflected in clitic orders: in investigating South Slavic clitic templates, Rivero (2005) suggests that the obligatory Dat > Acc order can be considered a reflex of the double object construction. Such a proposal is consistent with the view that dative clitics in ditransitives are the source of the DOC, which lies at the core of my argument. Note, however, that the Slavic clitic order has also been explained in terms of the topicality hierarchy (e.g., by Givón 1979, among others).

References

- Alsina, Alex and Sam A. Mchombo. (1993) "Object asymmetries and the Chichewa applicative construction". Sam A. Mchombo, ed. *Theoretical aspects of Bantu grammar*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications, 17–45. [CSLI Lecture Notes, 38.]
- Anagnostopoulou, Elena. (2003) *The syntax of ditransitives: Evidence from clitics*. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Aoun, Joseph and Audrey Yen-Hui Li. (1989) "Scope and constituency". *Linguistic inquiry* 20: 141–72.
- Avgustinova, Tania. (1997) *Word order and clitics in Bulgarian*. Saarbrücken: German Research Center for Artificial Intelligence. [Dissertations in Computational Linguistics and Language Technology, 5.]
- Baker, Mark. (1988) "Theta theory and the syntax of applicatives in Chichewa". *Natural language and linguistic theory* 6: 353–89.
- . (1996) "On the structural position of Themes and Goals". Johan Rooryck and Laurie Zaring, eds. *Phrase structure and the lexicon*. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 7–34.
- Barss, Andrew and Howard Lasnik. (1986) "A note on anaphora and double objects". *Linguistic inquiry* 17: 347–54.
- Bresnan, Joan and Lioba Moshi. (1990) "Object asymmetries in comparative Bantu syntax". *Linguistic inquiry* 21: 147–85.
- Bruening, Benjamin. (2001) "QR obeys superiority: Frozen scope and ACD". *Linguistic inquiry* 17: 233–73.
- Cuervo, María Cristina. (2003a) "Structural asymmetries but same word order". Anne Marie DiSciullo, ed. *Asymmetry in grammar*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 117–44.
- . (2003b) *Datives at large*. Ph.D. dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Demonte, Violeta. (1995) "Dative alternation in Spanish". *Probus* 7: 5–30.
- Diaconescu, Constanța Rodica. (2004) *Romanian applicative constructions*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Ottawa.
- Diaconescu, Constanța Rodica and María Luisa Rivero. (2007) "An applicative analysis of double object constructions in Romanian". *Probus* 19(2), 209–33.
- Dimitrova-Vulchanova, Mila. (1995) "Clitics in Slavic". *Studia linguistica* 49: 54–92.

- Dimitrova-Vulchanova, Mila and Lars Hellan. (1998) "Introduction". Mila Dimitrova-Vulchanova and Lars Hellan, eds. *Topics in south Slavic syntax and semantics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, ix–xxvii.
- Dukova-Zheleva, Galina. (2006) "Quirky subjects in Bulgarian: Three different types of constructions containing accusative and/or dative arguments". Ms., University of Ottawa.
- Givón, Talmy (1979). *On understanding grammar*. New York: Academic Press.
- Gračanin-Yukse, Martina. (2006) "Double object construction in Croatian: Arguments against Appl". Richard Compton, Magdalena Goledzinowska, and Ulyana Savchenko, eds. *Formal approaches to Slavic linguistics: The Toronto meeting*. Ann Arbor, MI: Michigan Slavic Publications, 94–112
- Hale, Ken and Samuel J. Keyser. (1993) "On argument structure and the lexical expression of syntactic relations". Ken Hale and Samuel J. Keyser, eds. *The view from building 20*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 51–109.
- Larson, Richard. (1988) "On the double object construction". *Linguistic inquiry* 19: 335–92.
- Landau, Idan. (1999) "Possessor raising and the structure of VP". *Lingua* 107: 1–37.
- Marantz, Alec. (1993) "Implications of asymmetries in double object constructions". Sam Mchombo, ed. *Theoretical aspects of Bantu grammar*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications, 113–50.
- McGinnis, Martha J. (2001) "Variation in the phase structure of applicatives". Johan Rooryck and Pierre Pica, eds. *Linguistic variations yearbook 1*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 101–42.
- Miyagawa, Shigeru. (1997) "Against optional scrambling". *Linguistic inquiry* 28: 1–26.
- Nakanishi, Kimiko. (2001) "Frozen scope and weak crossover in ditransitives". *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 41: 109–26.
- Pesetsky, David. (1995) *Zero Syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Pylkkänen, Liina. (2002) *Introducing arguments*. Ph.D. dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Rivero, María Luisa. (2005) "Topics in Bulgarian morphology and syntax: A minimalist perspective". *Lingua* 115(8): 1083–1128.
- Schick, Ivanka P. (2000) "Clitic doubling constructions in Balkan Slavic languages". Frits Beukema and Marcel den Dikken, eds. *Clitic phenomena in European languages*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 259–92.

- Vakareliyska, Cynthia. (1994) "Na-drop in Bulgarian". *Journal of Slavic linguistics* 2: 121–50.
- . (2002) "Na-drop revisited: Omission of the dative marker in Bulgarian double dative object constructions". Laura Janda, Steven Franks, and Ronald Feldstein, eds. *Where one's tongue rules well: Festschrift for Charles E. Townsend*. Bloomington, IN: Slavica, 165–92.
- Werkmann, Valja. (2003) *Objektklitika im Bulgarischen*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.

University of Ottawa
PO Box 500 – Addis
Stn. A, Ottawa, ON
K1N8T7
Canada
nslav061@uottawa.ca

Received: June 2006
Revised: May 2007