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Abstract

This dissertation is a study of the syntactic and semantic properties of arguments marked with a dative clitic in Bulgarian. Contemporary Bulgarian has been claimed to have lost its Case system compared to its previous historical stages. Yet, as the current study demonstrates, the language has systematically utilized a morphological marker in the form of a dative clitic to identify a particular set of arguments across a wide variety of structural environments - the dative arguments. The major proposal advanced here is that dative arguments are treated uniformly by the grammar of the language because they uniformly represent peripheral arguments introduced in the specifier of a functional head that assigns to them morphological dative Case. Despite the fact that these arguments might assume a wide variety of thematic interpretations (recipients, goals, possessors, sources, beneficiaries, malefactives, etc.), I demonstrate that their meaning is derived structurally from the position in which they are licensed. Crucially, only one dative occurs within a structural domain. The intra-linguistic comparison of a variety of constructions further leads to the conclusion that in each context datives are prominent arguments introduced at the periphery of a structural domain. This proposal explains the ability of datives to bind nominative subjects, to serve as structural subjects in impersonal predicative constructions, and to interact with nominative subjects in bi-clausal environments. To capture their uniform structural distribution and simultaneously to account for the wide range of thematic meanings, I propose that the argument introducer is a semantically underspecified functional head of the High APPL(licative) type as defined in Pylkkänen (2002/2008). The current study contributes to the ongoing theoretical debate of argument structure and argument interpretation and introduces Bulgarian as a relevant language when it comes to the study of datives in double object constructions, 'quirky' dative subjects, and dative possessors.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 Theories to Argument Structure

The main goal of this dissertation is to provide a theory of the syntax of dative arguments in Modern Bulgarian and in particular to provide a theory of how dative arguments combine into the syntax and obtain interpretation.

Providing explicit answers to the question of how arguments combine to produce meaning defines a basic undertaking in formal linguistics. Providing answers for why a change of state verb such as break must take an object argument, whereas a manner verb such as sweep does is not trivial undertaking:

(1)  a. *John broke.
    b. John slept.

What accounts also for the fact that a verb like 'open' can alternate between having one argument or two arguments, and what ensures that the first argument is interpreted as an 'agent' of the opening event, whereas the second argument is interpreted as a 'patients'?:

(2)  a. The door opens.
    b. Mary opens the door.
Or are the two alternating ways of expressing almost identical ditransitive meaning derived from each other, or represent two distinct frames?:

(3)  
   a. Mary gave the book to John.
   b. Mary gave John the book.

According to *Lexicalist approaches* to argument structure, as developed in Levin and Rappaport 1995, Levin 1999, Reinhart 2000, Horvath and Siloni 2008 a.o., it is the lexical meaning of the verb that affects the configurations in which it may appear. Under this approach to argument structure, the syntactic component is viewed as operating with fully-fledged lexical elements that include not only the information about argument structure but also the information regarding the interpretation of the arguments. Alternative syntactic constructions with similar meaning, such as the so called 'dative shift', and the flexibility of verbs to appear within various subcategorization frames, are viewed as resulting from elements that are defective, modified, or augmented (i.e. valency-enhanced) already in the lexicon.

According to *approaches to 'thematic roles'* to argument structure, such as Fillmore 1968 / 1970, argument structure is understood to be regulated via *thematic roles* as grammatical primitives. On this view, the distribution of structural arguments is controlled by a small set of hierarchically ordered role labels (e.g. agent > instrument > patient) that exists independently of the meaning of the verb. Each verb belongs to a class and each class is then associated with a particular set of thematic role labels. For example, a verb from the break-class ('bend', 'fold', 'shatter', etc.) is transitive and can take an 'agent' or an 'instrument' subject argument and a 'patient' object argument:

(4) John / the stick broke the window.

The realization of the thematic roles is realized via a set of so called *Linking rules* that map the highest role to the 'subject' argument (see Fillmore’s (1968) Sub-
ject Selection Rule). Baker’s (1988:46) Uniformity of Theta Assignment Hypothesis (UTAH) represents an example of the efforts towards aligning thematic roles directly with structural positions, rather then assuming that primitive thematic roles hierarchies control the realization of structure:

(5) **UTAH:** Identical thematic relationships between items are represented by identical structural relationships between those items at the level of D-structure.

According to a strict interpretation of UTAH, thematic roles are mapped/linked into particular structural positions and any surface variation of a phenomenon (i.e. English double objects or external possessive constructions) is to be taken at face value for syntactic transformation. The basic function of UTAH, as originally defined by Baker 1988, is to regulate where the various arguments of a predicate are realized. Derivational/transformational theories of grammar have heavily employed UTAH, even going so far as treating thematic roles as formal features that get ”checked” in a similar manner as Case or agreement phi-features (see Hornstein 1999). 'Thematic roles' under Baker’s (1988) original UTAH, however, are not to be understood as features or as independently existing labels that control argument realization; it is also not to be confused as a formalized principle that can be taken as a structure controlling device as it is the case in alternative approaches to meaning such as Lexical Functional Grammar or Role and Reference Grammar. Rather, by saying that structural position maps onto particular theta roles, UTAH basically captures general observation and cross-linguistic tendencies regarding argument prominence (see Baker 1996):

(6) **Tendencies in thematic mapping (Baker 1996)**

   a. an agent/causer is projected in the highest [SpecVP]
   b. a Theme/patient is projected in the lower [SpecVP]
   c. a goal/path/location is projected in the complement of V

Ultimately, whether UTAH is a formal condition of grammar that regulates the ar-
arguments of a predicate in a non-trivial way, or whether UTAH is to be reduced to a descriptive and conventional device depend on the approach one takes regarding syntactic structure. If one assumes that a verb has more than one argument, one needs a principle and a mechanism to control how each argument is to be realized and interpreted. If, on the other hand, one assumes that each verb decomposes into predicates that each takes one local single argument, "a syntactic principle such as UTAH as a regulator of argument realization and interpretation becomes trivial" (Baker 1997:42).

According to the syntactic approach to argument structure, and specifically the theoretical strand as developed in Marantz 1984, 1997, 2001, Hale and Keyser 1993, 1997, Harley 2003, Borer 2005, Ramchand 2008, thematic roles are subsumed under the notion of 'event structures', which deconstruct the meaning of the verb into clausal or temporal sub-events. Different than the lexicalist approach to event structure that relies on linking rules to preserve argument prominence, the regularities of argument structure under the syntactic approach are controlled directly by the syntactic event structure and the functional heads involved in the event structure. Syntactic structure itself is assumed to be controlled by a limited (universal) set of structural relations an a (sparse) fundamental set of functional heads (Hale and Keyser 1993) attaches to the lexical root and determines its category 1:

(7) Fundamental relations of Argument structure (Hale & Keyser 1993, 1998):
   a. **Head-Complement**: If X is a complement X of a head H, then X is the unique sister of H and X.
   b. **Specifier-Head**: If X is the specifier of a head H, and if P the first projection of H, then X is the unique sister of P

---

1 Note that there is no explicit answer as to why languages have only these four categories. Hale and Keyser assume that it might has to do with the fact how certain basic 'notional' categories are expressed in linguistic terms: events (V), instance of an entity (N), state (A), relation (R) (Hale and Keyser 1993:149)
Restricted inventory of categorical heads (Hale & Keyser 1993):
V – verbs
N – nouns
A – adjectives
P – prepositions

Depending on the lexical inventory of a language, categorical heads could be overt morphemes or zero morphemes. Crucially, categorical heads operate in the syntax to type the head of the phrase and serve semantically to introduce an eventuality (v), an entity (n), a state (a), or a relation (p). According to the syntactic approach to event structure, a speaker learns the semantic meaning of a lexical item through his experience with a language and is then able to choose between several universally available structural options of building the argument structure of this lexical item. The options are limited by the two fundamental relations - an argument is either directly selected by a functional/categorical head or it is introduced in the specifier of a functional head. Both configurations bring with them certain semantic implications. For example, if a nominal expression (NE) is directly selected as a complement of a categorical head X, the canonical semantic interpretation is change the state of NE. This captures the intuition that when a verb such as 'open' combines with a noun phrase such as 'door', the interpretation is that the event of 'opening' is changing the state of the 'door':

\[
\text{[XP]} \\
\begin{array}{c}
X \quad \text{NE}
\end{array}
\]

When, on the other hand, a nominal expression (NE) is introduced to an event, state, or entity via a functional head, the canonical interpretation of the structure is \( NE \text{ related to event/state/entity} \):
1.2 Theories of Argument Introducing Heads

That arguments of events can be introduced into the syntax via functional heads is an idea rooted in Marantz (1984), who points to an asymmetry observed between the thematic roles that are possible for the subject argument of transitive events and the ones possible for the internal object argument. Arguments serving as the subject of transitive events can assume a very limited set of thematic roles (agents, causers, experiencers, possessors), whereas arguments serving as the direct object of transitive verbs can assume a variety of interpretation and sometimes even cannot be readily assigned thematic roles (see also Levin 1999).

This asymmetry as to the availability of semantic theta roles led to the proposal that object arguments are selected and licensed within the lexical domain of the VP, whereas subject arguments are licensed external to that domain. This proposal was further developed by Kratzer (1996) and into what is now standardly known as the Theory of Voice. Voice, as proposed by Kratzer, is the functional head responsible for the structural and semantic integration of the external arguments of transitive verbs. The semantic role of Voice, according to Kratzer, is to relate an argument to the event described by the verbal phrase via the compositional rule of Event Identification.2 Voice of a transitive event relates the agent argument, whereas Voice of a stative event relates the experiencer or possessor:

\[ \text{[XP]} \]
\[ \text{\_\_\_\_} \]
\[ \text{NE \hspace{1em} X'} \]
\[ \text{\_\_\_\_} \]
\[ \text{X \hspace{1em} (YP)} \]

2Note that Event Identification is a compositional rule that is rather different than Predicate Modification and Functional Application, as it does not modify the predicate, but merely checks and asserts that an entity is the agent to an event
(9)  \([\text{Voice}]\): \(\lambda x.\lambda e.\text{Agent} (x)(e)\)

(10)  \text{Event Identification}:

a.  'John feeds the dog'

b.  \(\langle e,\langle s,t\rangle\rangle \rightarrow \langle e,\langle s,t\rangle\rangle\)

c.  \(\lambda x\lambda e.\text{Agent} (x)(e)\lambda e.\text{feed} (\text{the dog})(e) \rightarrow \lambda x.\lambda e.\text{Agent} (x)(e)\&\lambda e.\text{feed} (\text{the dog})(e)\)

As Voice has a fixed structural position - i.e. it is said to select for a vP complement (in English) - the meaning of the external arguments in English transitive events is structurally derived. For example, if the vP event in the complement of Voice denotes an activity, the external argument is interpreted as the agent. If the events denotes a state, the argument is interpreted as the experiencer. If the event denotes a causality, the arguments is interpreted as the causer. There is no need for a linking rule to explain the prominence of the external arguments, because the argument is introduced as the highest argument in the event structure.

In addition to object arguments of categorial heads and subject arguments introduces by Voice, work on alternating syntactic constructions has let to proposals of additional argument introducing heads of the so called \textit{Applicative} category (Marantz 1997, Pylkkänen 2002/2008, and Cuervo 2003). In most European languages, it is observed that a third kind of event argument is systematically identified by a special oblique case marking - \textbf{the dative arguments}. Under the applicative approach to dative arguments it is assumed that the uniform morphological realization of these arguments defines a distinct structural and semantic class. To some extent the structural distribution of these dative arguments is reminiscent of the distribution of external arguments - the dative argument is shown to be structurally more prominent than vP-internal arguments. Yet, the semantic interpretation of dative arguments is not as restricted as that of transitive subjects. Cross-linguistic studies have shown that a dative argument might be interpreted as a \textit{goal, possessor, location, source, experiencer, benefactor, malefactor, affectee, or ethical dative}. Adding to the challenge
of capturing the structural properties of dative arguments is also the fact that their distribution is shown to vary greatly across languages.

Hebrew, for example, has been shown to allow for dative arguments of event predicates that are understood as source/possessor of the direct object (Landau 1999) parallel to constructions, in which an argument that is understood as possessor is local to the direct object:

(11) Ha-yalda kilkela le-Dan et ha-radio
        the-girl spoiled to.DAT-Dan ACC-the-radio
    'The girl broke Dan’s radio’ / ‘The girl broke the radio (on) Dan’

(12) Ha-yalda kilkela ha-radio šel Dan
        the girl spoiled ACC-the-radio of Dana
    'The girl broke Dan’s radio'

Crucially, subsequent work on Hebrew under the applicative approach to datives has shown that the two possessive constructions are not transformationally related (Pylkkänen (2002/2008, Bar-Asher Siegal and Boneh 2015). In spite of producing a possessive-like interpretation, it has been demonstrated that the dative argument merges into a higher structural positions than the structural position of DP-internal possessor arguments.

English, similar to Hebrew, has been shown to allow higher merged arguments to produce a possessive-like reading. Yet, different than Hebrew, English does not mark these arguments dative and restricts these constructions to events, in which the argument is interpreted either as a recipient or beneficiary, but crucially not as a source:

(13) English Double Object
    a. *I broke him a vase.
    b. *I melted him the ice.
    c. I gave him a book.
d. I sent **him** a letter.

e. I baked **him** a cake.

f. I bought **him** a new VCR.

Pylkkänen (2002/2008) accounts for this cross-linguistic variation in the availability of non-agentive third arguments by proposing that an arguments can be introduced by a functional head that varies in its lexical specification. Concretely for transitive constructions that imply 'coming into possession' or 'loosing possession', Pylkkänen (2002/2008) proposes a special *possessive* type of *Low applicative heads*, which relate an argument to the direct object argument and encode the specific relationship that is to hold between the two internal arguments of the transitive event. The applicative nature of Pylkkänen's functional heads captures the theoretical idea that these arguments are added/merged later into the syntax than other arguments, whereas the lexical specification allows Pylkkänen to capture cross-linguistic variations.

As shown in the denotations below, Pylkkänen's (2002/2008) APPLFROM-head is defined to select an entity and to combine it with another entity that is then understood as the *source/possessor*, whereas the APPLTO-head is defined to select an entity and to combine with another entity that is then understood as the *recipient*:

(14) APPLFROM: $\lambda x.\lambda y.\lambda f(e(s.t)).\lambda e F(e,x) \& \text{theme } (e,x) \& \text{from-the-possession } (x,y)$

(15) APPLTO: $\lambda x.\lambda y.\lambda f(e(s.t)).\lambda e F(e,x) \& \text{theme } (e,x) \& \text{to-the-possession } (x,y)$

As already mentioned, the (lexical) specification of the functional applicative introducers is important for Pylkkänen's analysis as it captures the fact that English arguments of ditransitive double object constructions and Hebrew dative arguments of ditransitive constructions share a structural prominence in regard to a direct object argument, but don't share the same semantics. English indirect objects are interpreted as 'receivers', whereas Hebrew dative objects are interpreted as 'sources':
Hebrew dative possessors:

\[ TP \text{ The girl.NOM} \ [VP \text{ broke} \ [ApplP \text{ Dan.DAT} \ [APPL' \text{ APPLfrom} \ [DP \text{ radio}])))] \]

English indirect objects in DOCs:

\[ TP \text{ I.NOM} \ [VP \text{ send} \ [ApplP \text{ him} \ [APPL' \text{ APPLto} \ [DP \text{ a book}]))] \]

Adding to the empirical pool of structurally prominent dative arguments, Cuervo (2003) demonstrates with data from Spanish, that dative arguments can be understood as the source/possessor of the direct object argument not just with verbs that denote active events, but also with verbs that denote stative eventualities, such as admire, have, see, envy, etc. (Cuervo 2003:73):

\[ \text{Pablo } \text{ le } \text{ admira } \text{ la patiencia a-Valeria} \]

\[ \text{Pablo.NOM} \text{ she.DAT} \text{ admires} \text{ the patience.ACC Valeria.DAT} \]

'Pablo admires Valeria's patience' / (Lit. 'Pablo admires Valeria the patience')

In order to capture the fact that dative source arguments are accepted with verbs denoting 'static' eventuality, but are not accepted with static verbs in languages such as Hebrew, German or Finish, and English DOCs (*John sees Mary the book), Cuervo (2003) proposes a new lexical type of the applicative head to be added to the inventory:

\[ \text{APPLAT: } \lambda x.\lambda y.\lambda f(e(s,t)).\lambda e F(e,x) \& \text{ theme} (e,x) \& \text{ at-the-possession} (x,y) \]

Again, Cuervo's (2003) additional argument introducer serves to capture the cross-linguistic variation between languages with restrictive applicative frame (English), languages with less-restrictive applicative frame (i.e. restricted to active events as in Hebrew, German, Finnish), and languages with non-restrictive applicative frame (as in Spanish).
Empirical studies under the applicative approach of argument introducing heads, have further shown that there are also languages, such as Chaga, Luganda, Venda, and Albanian, in which applicativization applies productively beyond transitive event structures. These languages have been shown to applicativize not just transitive events with predicates that denote ‘losing possession’, ‘coming into possession’, or ‘static possession’, but also unergative events. Note that as unergative events lack a direct object argument altogether, the applicative argument receive a 'beneficiary' reading (data are from Pylkkänen 2002:25):

(20) Mukasa ya-tambu-le-dde Katonga. [Luganda]
Mukasa PAST-walk-APPL-PAST Katonga.
'Mukasa walked for Katonga.'

(21) I vrapova. [Albanian]
he.DAT ran.1SG.
'I ran for him.'

In order to capture languages with such productive applicativization, Pylkkänen (2002/2008) proposes that in addition to the low 'possessive' applicative heads, the inventory should also include argument introducers of the type High Applicatives. Different than the low applicative type, the semantic denotation of these heads is such that it allows them to select a vP as it's complement rather than a DP.

The denotation of Pylkkänen's (2002/2008) high applicative is basically a general argument introducer modeled on Kratzer's Voice head. The functional head selects its complement and relates this complement to an argument introduced in its specifier:

(22) High APPLben: \( \lambda x.\lambda e.APL(x)(e) \)

The compositional rule of Event Identification, combines the semantics of the new argument to the semantics of the complement and asserts that this new argument is part of the event.

Note that whereas Pylkkänen's (2002/2008) low applicative heads are specified for meaning, the meaning of the high applicative head is said to be 'collapsible' depending
on the language (see Pylkkänen's 2002:21). This implies that if a language allows high applicativization of unergatives only with *beneficiary* meaning, then the high APPL head will be the following:

(23) pseudo English:

   a. 'I run (for the benefit of) John'
   b. \( \langle e, \langle s, t \rangle \rangle \rightarrow \langle e, \langle s, t \rangle \rangle \)
   c. \( \lambda x. \lambda e \ \text{APPLBEN}(x)(e) \ \lambda e. \ \text{I run}(e) \rightarrow \lambda x. \lambda e. \ \text{APPLBEN}(x)(e) \ & \lambda e. \ \text{I run}(e) \)

To sum up, the fundamental assumption behind the applicative approach is that the arguments added via applicativization are high prominent arguments. The cross-linguistic variation as to the productivity of the process, however, has forced proponents of the applicative approach to introduce (i) applicative heads with different semantic import and (ii) applicative heads with different selectional properties. This itself creates a theoretical paradox. On the one hand, the syntactic (constructionist) approach to meaning, strives to capture thematic interpretation in terms of structure and the applicative strand of this approach strives to capture the syntax of high prominent arguments that are not transformationally derived from a lower position. On the other hand, scholars working under the applicative account propose distinct functional heads and distinct structural positions, thus giving the impression that the process of applicativization is not uniform and is controlled by an inventory of stipulated distinct functional heads. Under such an approach to applicativization, however, accounting for cross-linguistic variation reduces to a descriptive analysis of the facts.

If we, however, assume one uniform APPL head as a general argument introducer and leave the semantic interpretation of the applicative argument underspecified, we could explain cross-linguistic variation as to the productivity of the applicativization process as a factor of intra-linguistic morpho-syntactic properties. Such an approach to applicativization calls for the following assumptions:
a. Structure building precedes in chunks and Spell-out domains;
b. Thematic interpretation is derived from the relations of the arguments within a Spell-out domain;
c. Arguments are either selected by a lexical head, or introduced by a functional head;
d. The Applicative head is a general argument introducer with an underspecified semantic content;

In this dissertation, I provide an extensive study of dative arguments in Bulgarian and I argue that these arguments are all prominent arguments introduced via an underspecified applicative head at the periphery of a Spell-Out domain. As such, these arguments represent a natural morphosyntactic class and as a result of this they are uniformly spelled out with dative morphology.

1.3 The Dative arguments in Bulgarian

The central claim in this dissertation is that dative clitic marked arguments in Bulgarian represent one uniform class of arguments, which are assigned morphological dative Case by a uniform functional argument introducer of the applicative type. Since I claim that these arguments are not licensed by the meaning of the verb, I will demonstrate that their thematic interpretation correlates closely with a particular structural configuration as well as with the particular meaning of the lexical roots involved in each configuration. My analysis is consistent with a syntactic approach that assumes that event structure decomposes into separate predicative relations. It is also consistent with the assumption that verbs can occur with particular structural frames depending on whether their lexical meaning is compatible with a given frame (Marantz 2013).

Modern Bulgarian has many constructions that involve dative clitic-marked arguments. I therefore propose that the language has one general Applicative head modeled according Pylkkänen’s (2002/2008) High Applicative head. I further pro-
pose that the overt dative clitic is a major clue that signals the presence of APPL and as such allows for unambiguous and productive use of the construction despite the language’s free word order.

The following data provide a cursory overview of the distribution and possible interpretations of dative arguments. Note that the dative clitic is obligatory in each of these constructions, whereas the doubled argument itself can be dropped as indicated by the brackets. Each set of data is the subject of study throughout the dissertation.

The first set of data represents transitive construction with activity verbs of the type of ‘give’/’send’/’create’ in which the dative is interpreted as the ‘recipient’ ’beneficiary’ or ‘possessor’ of the direct object argument:

(25) Az mu izprati-x pisma-ta vednaga (na
I.NOM he.DAT send-Past.1SG letter-the.PL.ACC immediately to
momče-to)
boy-the
‘I have immediately sent the boy the letters.’ / ‘I have sent the boy’s letters immediately.’ / ‘I have sent immediately the letters (for the benefit of) the boy.’

(26) Az mu napravi-x sandvič (na momče-to)
I.NOM he.DAT make-Past.1SG sandwich to boy-the
‘I have made the boy a sandwich.’

The second set of data represent transitive constructions with activity and stative verbs of the type ‘take’, ‘break’, ‘loose’ etc. in which the dative is interpreted as the ‘source’, ‘possessor’, or ‘malefactive’ argument. Note that as these constructions do not exists in English, I translate them here with the closest paraphrases:

(27) Az mu vze-x kolelo-to včera (na momče-to)
I.NOM he.DAT take-Past.1SG bicycle-the yesterday on boy-the
‘I took the boy’s bicycle yesterday.’ / ‘I took the bicycle from the boy yesterday.’

(28) Az mu sčupi-x radio-to včera (na momče-to)
I.NOM he.DAT brake-Past.1SG radio-the yesterday on boy-the
‘I broke the boy’s radio yesterday’ / ‘I broke the the radio to the boy yester-
I.NOM he.DAT saw-Past.1SG new-the bicycle yesterday on boy-the
'I saw the boy’s new bicycle yesterday' / 'I saw the new bicycle at the boy
yesterday')

The third set of data represent unergative constructions with activity and stative
verbs, in which the indirect object is interpreted as the 'malefactive' or 'beneficiary'
argument:

(30) Az mu vika-x (na momče-to)
I.NOM he.DAT yelled-Past.1SG on boy-the
'I yelled at the boy.'

(31) Az mu jadox-x (na momče-to)
I.NOM he.DAT eat-Past.1SG on boy-the
'I ate for the boy.'

The third set of data involves unaccusative and impersonal SE-marked predicates
with which the dative argument is interpreted either as 'experiencer', as 'possessor',
a 'beneficiary' or a 'malefactive':

(32) (Na momče-to) mu se otvarjat vrat-i.
on boy-the he.DAT refl. open-Pres.PL door-PL.ACC
'The boy feels like opening doors.' / 'Doors are opened for the boy.' / 'The
boy's doors are opening.'

(33) (Na momčeta-ta) im se spi-i.
on boys-the.PL they.DAT refl. sleep-Pres.3SG
'The boys feel like sleeping.'

The fourth set of data involves adjectival predicates, in which the dative argument is
interpreted again as the 'experiencer':

(34) (Na deca-ta) im e studen-o.
on children-the.PL they.DAT be-Pres.3SG cold.3SG
'The children feel cold.'
The fifth set of data involves modal and modal-like bi-clausal constructions, in which the dative is interpreted again as the 'experiencer':

(35) \((\text{Na deca-ta}) \ \text{im} \ \text{trjabva da spat.}\) 
    on \ children-the.PL they.DAT must to sleep.PL 
    'The children need to sleep.'

(36) \((\text{Na deca-ta}) \ \text{im} \ \text{se iska da spat}\) 
    on \ children-the.PL they.DAT SE want.3SG to sleep.PL 
    'The children wish to sleep.'

The final set of data involves DP-internal dative arguments interpreted as whatever the relevant argument of the head noun is - 'possessor', 'writer', 'whole', 'kinship' etc.

(37) \(\text{Tova sa [DP pisma-ta mu (na momče-to)]}\) 
    This be-Pres.PL [DP letter-the.PL he.DAT of boy-the] 
    'These are the boy's letters. (Could be author, theme, possessor)'

(38) \(\text{Tova e [DP sestra im (na momčeta-ta)]}\) 
    This be-Pres.3SG [DP sister.SG they.DAT of boys-the.PL] 
    'These is the sister of the boys.'

1.4 Outline of the dissertation

Each of the above structures is the focus of a chapter in this dissertation. In each of the chapters, I study the syntax of the particular structure and I compare each structure to alternative ways of expressing similar meaning. I also probe to prove uniform structural configurations that would substantiate the proposal of a uniform Applicative head that selects for a particular structural complement. In each of the chapters I attempt to provide answer to the two questions:

a. How are Dative arguments integrated into each configuration?

b. How are Dative arguments interpreted in each configuration?
Chapter 2 introduces some relevant aspects of the Bulgarian clausal syntax with particular focus of the way word orders are conditioned by information structure. This section focuses mainly on the structural position of nominative subjects of transitive and intransitive eventive frames. With the help of adverbial modifiers, scope and binding, I establishes Bulgarian as a low VSO language, in which the non-topicalized ([−specific]) subject argument can remain vP internally while the verb moves to T. The results of this chapter serve as a structural orientation when discussing the relative position of the dative arguments in the subsequent chapters.

Chapter 3 turns to first set of dative arguments and analyzes the Bulgarian (di)-transitive constructions. Here I contrast clitic versus clitic-less structures and I demonstrate that similar to English, Bulgarian distinguishes between two alternative ditransitive frames. Classic diagnostics such as binding, quantifier scope, idiomatic expressions, and specific nominalization patterns confirm that despite its free surface word order, the language distinguishes an applicative frame. Crucially, I demonstrate that the dative argument is merged at the periphery of the vP domain and is higher than the vP-internal nominative subject in Bulgarian ditransitives. In addition, in this chapter I investigate also the morpho-syntactic nature of the preposition na, which obligatory marks dative arguments and I demonstrate that na is a not a preposition in the applicative frame.

Chapter 4 studies three different structural frames that obligatorily take dative subjects - monoclusal impersonal predicates, bi-clausal subjunctive constructions, and adjectival predicative construction. With this set of data I offer a direct comparison to alternative constructions that take nominative subjects and I demonstrate the structural and interpretational distinctions. This section establishes the dative introducing functional head as a peripheral argument introducer and confirms the subjecthood properties of the dative applicatives.

Chapter 5 Returns to the datives of (di)-transitive event constructions and explores the origin of the 'possessors' interpretation. Here I demonstrate that although a salient thematic meaning of dative arguments might be 'possessor' of the direct object, the datives do not derive (raise) from within the nominal domain. The novel
evidence presented in this section challenges both *possessor raising* analyses of clausal dative possessors. This section also offers novel insight as to the structure of dative arguments within the nominal domain and draws a parallel to the peripheral datives of the verbal domain. Although Bulgarian DP-internal relational morphology is highly homophonous when it comes to marking structural arguments of a nominal, I demonstrate that similar to the clausal domain datives are high applicative arguments merged at the periphery and related as arguments of the nominal.

With this the intra-linguistic investigation of Bulgarian Dative arguments concludes. By varying the structural environment and the lexical roots involved into each structural frame, I am able to identify the morpho-syntactic properties of the dative arguments and to demonstrate that the thematic interpretation of these arguments depends on the structural context to which they are related.

Although I do not offer an explicit analysis of the dative clitic, throughout the dissertation I assume that the clitic is a spell-out of morphological agreement between the applicative argument and the APPL-head. I derive this assumption from studies of the clitic doubling pattern across Balkan languages (Kallulli 1995, 2008, 2016 for Albanian, Anagnostopulou 2003 for Greek, Diaconsecu 2004 for Romanian, Franks and King 2000 for Slavic, and Rudin 1996 and Legendre 2003 for Bulgarian) as well as from studies of the clitic doubling pattern across varieties of Spanish (Sportiche 1996, Suñer 1988, Cuervo 2003). Crucially, I do not assume that the clitic is a Spell-out of the applicative head. Rather, as the constructions with datives consistently fail to nominalize, I assume that this is because these constructions are derived via a zero head that prevents further derivation (Pesetsky 1995, Miyagawa 2012b).
Chapter 2

Aspects of Bulgarian syntax

2.1 Morphological Case, Agreement, Word Order and Information Structure

One of the most striking properties that distinguishes Contemporary Bulgarian (and Macedonian) from the rest of the Slavic and South Slavic Languages and from previous diachronic stages - i.e. the period of the so-called Old Church Slavonic period - is the fact that it lacks Case morphology on nouns, adjectives, and numerals. Case distinction is only retained in the morphological paradigm of the full personal (referential) pronominals, the agreement morphology of the verb, and in the form of pronominal clitics. In traditional grammars one reads often that the pronominal clitics are short forms of the pronominal forms in Bulgarian. However, one of the central claim in this dissertation is that pronominal clitics are grammaticalized morphological markers which systematically distinguish a structural frame in which arguments are licensed in structurally high positions. More concretely, I argue that the dative

\footnotetext[1]{Genealogically, the language belongs to the South branch of the Slavic language family and shares typological properties with its neighboring non-Slavic languages such as Romanian, Albanian, Greek, Turkish and various Balkan Romani languages). In this relation, one often reads that Modern Bulgarian 'is considered an exotic among the modern Slavic languages' (see Alexieva 2004:241). Cross-linguistic analyses of Bulgarian grammar, thus compare the language not just to Slavic languages, but also to the non-Slavic areal languages known as the Balkan Sprachbund.}

\footnotetext[2]{Old Church Slavonic (OCS) refers to the first Slavic literary language that emerged during the 9th century in the area of current South-East Europe.}
clitics in Bulgarian are utilized to distinguish prepositionally-licensed argument from arguments licensed via a high peripheral Applicative head in Bulgarian. The proposal that Applicative heads assign morphological dative/genitive case has been independently made for languages such as Albanian (McGinnis 1998), Icelandic (Collins and Thráinsson 1996), Spanish (Demonte 1995), and Greek (Anagnostopoulou 1999) among others.

In what follows, I demonstrate the pronominal and the verbal agreement paradigm and the word orders associated with declarative neutral reading. This exposition of Bulgarian syntax should serve for a better understanding of the morpho-syntactic properties of the language and allow for a better structural orientation when we move to the study of the structural position of arguments in the dative clitic marked frames. Note that in addition to dative clitics, Bulgarian utilizes also accusative clitics. The constructions that involve accusative clitics have been ignored in the current study and has been left for future investigation. So far, the literature on the distribution of accusative clitics in Bulgarian has been pointing to a close correlation between accusative clitics and word orders that are related to topicality and specificity (Rudin (1997), Leafgren (1997), Jaeger and Gerassimova (2002), Krapova and Cinque (2008), as well as Harizanov (2014)). I will therefore assume for the time being that the language utilizes accusative clitics parallel to Romance-style Clitic Left Dislocation (CLLD), whereas dative clitics are not dislocational markers, as these occur obligatory independent of topicality, specificity and focus.

2.2 Morphological paradigms of pronominals and verbal agreement

As shown in the paradigms below, only personal (referential) pronominals distinguish between case, person, number, and gender. Interrogative, indefinite, and negative
pronouns, on the other hand, distinguish only between Case and number.

Table 2.1: Paradigm of the personal referential pronominals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1SG</th>
<th>2SG</th>
<th>3SGm</th>
<th>3SGf</th>
<th>3SGn</th>
<th>1PL</th>
<th>2PL</th>
<th>3PL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominative</td>
<td>az</td>
<td>ti</td>
<td>toj</td>
<td>tja</td>
<td>to</td>
<td>nie</td>
<td>vie</td>
<td>te</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>men</td>
<td>teb</td>
<td>nego</td>
<td>neja</td>
<td>nego</td>
<td>nas</td>
<td>vas</td>
<td>tjax</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.2: Paradigm of personal non-referential pronominals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Interrogative</th>
<th>indefinite</th>
<th>negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominative</td>
<td>koj</td>
<td>njakoj</td>
<td>nikoj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>kogo</td>
<td>njakoj</td>
<td>nikoj</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most naturally, when referring to a non-arbitrary definite entity of an event, native speakers usually use a zero pronominal in subject position (Rudin 1986, Peneev 1998) as the language is a pro-drop language exhibiting all the characteristics of such language type (Rizzi 1982):

(1) Piš-a knigi.
write-Pres.1SG book.PL
'I write books'

(2) Piš-em kniga.
write-Pres.1PL book.SG
'We write a book'

(3) Piš-exa kniga.
write-Past.Imperf.3PL book.SG
'They wrote a book'

Although the pronominal is dropped, the verb carries full agreement morphology with the null subject. The agreement itself occurs as a morpheme that attaches as a suffix.

3 Note that when an interrogative, indefinite or negative is D-linked and co-occurs with a full nominal expression, the pronominal will show gender agreement:

(i) njakoj-a žena dojde.
some-3SGf woman come-Past.3SG
'Some woman came.'

(ii) ko-e momče dojde?
what-3SGn boy come-Past.3SG
'What boy came?'
on the verb (or on the auxiliary in the case of the analytical tenses) and realizes
the intersection of the phi-features of the subject argument and the tense features of
the event. Crucially, even when the subject argument is dropped, the morphological
realization of the verb still signals that a Past/ Present Tense event is predicated of a
nominative argument. The postverbal direct object argument of the transitive frame,
on the other hand, is not marked by case or agreement. The following table presents
the paradigm of the Present Tense of one of the three verbal conjugation classes.
Abstracting from the idiosyncratic overt realization of the individual morphemes, the
same paradigm applies to the three non-analytic tenses of Bulgarian - the Present
Tense, the Past Imperfect, and the Past Aorist:

Table 2.3: Paradigm of the Present Tense verbal inflection (3rd conjugation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1SG</th>
<th>2SG</th>
<th>3SGm</th>
<th>3SGf</th>
<th>3SGn</th>
<th>1PL</th>
<th>2PL</th>
<th>3PL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominative</td>
<td>-m</td>
<td>-s</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-me</td>
<td>-te</td>
<td>-t</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In intransitive constructions, on the other hand, the verb agrees with the only
available argument sharing the same morphological paradigm as the agreement of
the transitive subjects. The major difference being that in unaccusatives, the verb is
obligatorily marked with an overt (reflexive-like) invariant SE morpheme.

(4) Cvetja-ta SE razlisti-xa.
FlowerPL-the.PL SE bloom-Past.PL
'The flower bloomed'

(5) Deca-ta SE radva-xa.
childrenPL-the.PL SE rejoice-Past.PL
'The children rejoiced'

In unergative or agentive intransitives, the invariant SE morpheme is obligatorily
absent:

(6) Deca-ta skača-xa.
childrenPL-the.PL jump-Past.PL
'The children were jumping'
Genitive, locative and instrumental arguments, on the other hand, are expressed with prepositional phrases:

(9) Az izprašt-am vinagi knigite na Mary na Ivan
I.NOM send-Pres.1SG always books-the of Mary to Ivan
'I always send some Mary's books to Ivan'

(10) Az sâm udivlen vinagi ot Ivan.
I.NOM AUX-Pres.1SG marvelled.3SGm always from Ivan
'I am always impressed by Ivan'

Compare the same Bulgarian examples with the neighbouring South Slavic Serbo-Croatian, which has retained its Case system on nominal expressions:

(11) Ja pošaljem Mari-na knjig-e Ivan-u.
I.NOM send-Pres.1SG Mary-GEN books-ACC Ivan-DAT
'I send books of Mary's to Ivan'

(12) Ja sam oduševlen Ivan-om.
I.NOM AUX-Pres.1SG impressed.3SGm Ivan-INST
'I am impressed by Ivan'

2.3 The SE-marked active predicates

Unaccusative/middle event predicates in Bulgarian as well as impersonal event predicates are obligatory marked with the invariable reflexive morpheme SE in Bulgarian.4

4Certain unaccusative verbs, especially such with the meaning of 'arrive' are not marked with SE, but are obligatorily marked with an aspectional/locative preposition pri-stigam 'arrive', do-litam 'arrive by flying', iz-čezvam 'disappear', u-miram 'die', etc. This means that these are all morphologically complex unaccusative verbs in Bulgarian that differ from SE-marked simple unaccusative verbs. In any case, I assume that whether the morpheme is SE or some other derivational morpheme, the argument is always directly selected in the complement position of V.
The following is a sample list of predicates that obligatory occur with SE. This section is in so far relevant as dative ‘quirky’ subjects, which are the topic of chapter 4, occur obligatory with a SE-marked predicate.

(13) The SE marker in **Bulgarian constructions:**

   a. **non-animate unaccusative** predicates of the type *otvarja* se 'to open', *razlisti* se 'to bloom', *ščupi* se 'to break, *skása* se 'to rip up', etc.;
   b. **animate unaccusative** predicates of the type *straxuvam* se 'to fear', *otvrastavam* se 'to get disgusted', *sramuvam* se 'to get ashamed', *radvam* se 'to rejoice', *usmixvam* se 'to smile', *vlija* se 'to get influenced' etc.;
   c. **impersonal active events**

Depending on the lexical meaning of an unaccusative SE-predicate, the construction can produce a variety of meanings, including middles and reflexive-like interpretations. Yet, the sole argument of an unaccusative predicate cannot co-occur with an additional reflexive anaphor *sebe si*, nor can it co-occur with an additional agentive by-phrase:

(14) Vrati-te *(SE) otvarja-t.
doors-the SE open
'The doors open'

(15) *vrati-(te) SE otvarja-t sebe si
doorPL.NOM-(the.PL) SE open-Pres.PL self-refl
Intended: 'The doors open by themselves'

someone SE rejoice-Pres.3SG
'Someone rejoices'

(17) *radva-a SE njakoj sebe si
rejoice-Pres.3SG SE someone (*self-si)
Intended: 'Someone is rejoicing himself'

(18) *Njakoj SE radv-a ot Ivan.
someone SE rejoice-Pres.3SG (by Ivan)
Intended: 'Someone has been rejoiced by Ivan'
I take this to mean that the reflexive interpretation of the unaccusative active construction is a by-product of the overt reflexive morpheme, but crucially there is no additional reflexive argument introduced. The argument frame of SE-marked unaccusative predicates includes only one argument and the verb obligatorily agrees with this argument.

Uniformly, SE is not compatible with active transitive and unergative construction:

(19) Njakoj student (*SE) otvarja vrati 
some student (*SE) open-Pres.3SG doors  
'Some student opens doors'

(20) Njakoj student (*SE) kixa 
some student (*SE) sneeze-Pres.3SG  
'Some student sneezes'

Active unergative and transitive event predicates never occur with SE when they are predicated by an argument and the verb always agrees with this argument. However, unergative and transitive event predicates can also occur in an impersonal frame, i.e. not predicated over a particular argument. Crucially, in the absent of an external argument, the SE morpheme becomes obligatory and the verb will occur with a default agreement, which coincides with the 3rd person singular:

(21) Deca-ta kixa-xa. 
children-the.PL sneeze-Past.3PL 
'The children were sneezing.'

(22) Dete-to kixa-še. 
child-the.3SGn sneeze-Past.3SG  
'The child was sneezing'

(23) Kixa-še *(SE). 
sneeze-Past.3SG SE  
'It has been sneezed' / 'Sneezing was happening'

If the agentive event is transitive, the impersonal version of it will obligatory occur with SE and the verb will carry agreement with the internal argument:
As a result of this, we obtain an idiosyncratic overt syntax between an active impersonal transitive event and an active unaccusative event in Bulgarian. In both, the unaccusative and the impersonal active frame, SE is obligatory and the verb displays morphological agreement with the available internal argument.\(^5\) Regarding the morpho-syntactic nature of the SE marker, traditional grammars of Modern Bulgarian describe it as a morpheme that signals one common structural property, namely the absence of an external argument of active event constructions (see Nicolova 2017 and Penčev 1996). I assume therefore that the SE morpheme itself is not instantiating some specific meaning or function, i.e. it does not introduce reflexivity or passive meaning. Rather it serves to mark a structural frame, in which the verb has not been introduced with an external argument.

\(^5\)In spite of the similar realization of the structure, the interpretation of unaccusative and impersonal event predicates is different. Unaccusative active SE-events are not compatible with an agentive implication, whereas impersonal active SE-events are compatible with an agentive implication and allow for an optional by-phrase:

(i) Četa-t *(SE) knigi (ot dete-to). read-Pres.PL SE book.PL (by child-the.3SGn) 'Books are read by the child'.

(ii) Razlisti-xa *(SE) cvetja-ta (*ot dete-to). bloom-Past.PL SE flowers-the.PL (*by child-the) 'The flowers bloomed (*by the child).'.

\(^42\)
To capture the properties and the vacuous function of SE in Bulgarian, I therefore propose that SE is the morphological realization of active Voice in the absence of an external argument. In the case of agentive transitive and unergative event constructions where an argument is introduced in the specifier of little v, active Voice is available but it is not overtly realized:

(26)  **Bulgarian transitive/unergative event structure:**

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{[VoiceP]} \\
\text{DP[+ANIMATE]} \quad \text{Voice'} \\
\text{Voice} \quad [vP] \\
\text{t} \quad v' \\
\text{v} \quad \text{VP} \\
\text{V (DP[+/-ANIMATE])}
\end{array}
\]

On the other hand, when an unergative, transitive or unaccusative event lacks an external argument, i.e. the event has not been predicated over an individual or is not semantically compatible with an external argument, then active Voice in Bulgarian is obligatorily realized as SE:
Bulgarian impersonal transitive/unergative and unaccusative events:

\[
\text{[VoiceP]}
\]
\[
\text{\hspace{1cm} Voice'}
\]
\[
\text{SE-Voice \ [vP]}
\]
\[
\text{\hspace{1cm} v \ VP}
\]
\[
\text{\hspace{1cm} V \ (DP[+/-ANIMATE])}
\]

So we hold that the structure that I am assuming for Bulgarian is such that the external argument of transitive and unergative events is introduced in the syntax by little v \(^6\), whereas the argument of an unaccusative event is directly selected as a complement of the verb (V).

The SE morpheme under my analyzes is a morphological Spell-out of an active Voice head in the absence of an external argument. For the current study of the dative applicative arguments, we will see that the realization of the SE morpheme is relevant when datives assume the role of 'logical' subjects of event predicates, which are the topic of chapter 4.

Before we move to study of the dative arguments, however, I provide several arguments in favor of the hypothesis that in Bulgarian the common SVO word order is a derived word order, manipulated by information structure. In what follows, I demonstrate that pre-verbal subjects are topicalized subjects, correlating with specificity, whereas post-verbal subjects are arguments that remain in their base vP internal

\(^6\)Note that in Kratzer (1996, 2003) the head that is responsible for the introduction of the external argument is called Voice whereas in Marantz 1997 this head is called little v. However, Marantz (2013), calls for a distinction between little v and Voice, proposing that little v is merely a verbalizer, whereas Voice is an argument introducer.
position.

On the bases of my evidence, I conclude that the Bulgarian should be analyzed as a low VSO language, in which arguments are licensed by morphological case and can remain in-situ in their base position, whereas the verb moves and incorporates to higher functional heads, such as Voice, Aspect and Tense.

2.4 The Pre-verbal Nominative Arguments

In this section I establish that Bulgarian has two declarative word orders - VS(O) and SV(O). Although both word orders are neutral (i.e. non-focalized), I bring evidence from scope interactions that support my claim that the neutral SV(O) order involves topicalized subjects with a [+specificity/referentiality] interpretation, whereas the neutral VS(O) order is derived via verb movement to T with the subject remaining within the vP domain.

2.4.1 Pre-verbal subjects are Topics

Although SVO is considered to be stylistically the most neutral word order with a frequency of 80.5 per cent of all sentences according to a corpus study by Leafgren (2002), the VSO word order is also accepted as an answer to the broad question, 'What happened?'. In fact, in an out-of-the-blue context, where one only presupposes that an event happened and the entire content of the event is asserted as new information, an indefinite pronominal subject in Bulgarian must remain in a post-verbal position below an adverbial modifier in both matrix and subordinate clauses in Bulgarian:

(28) Q: 'What happened?'
    A: 'Someone often dances tango'

(29) tancuva često njakoj tango.
    dance-3SG often someone tango
    'Someone often dance tango'
(30) Kazax, če tancuva često njakoj tango.
said.1SG that dance-3SG often someone tango
'I said that, someone often dances tango'

Answering the broad question "What happened?", with a pre-verbal indefinite subject, on the other hand, produces unambiguously a strong specific interpretation of 'someone' being 'a certain (specific) person':

(31) Njakoj tancuva često tango.
Someone dance-Pres.3SG often tango
'Someone (specific) often dance tango'

(32) Kazax, če njakoj tancuva često tango.
said.1SG that someone dance-Pres.3SG often tango
'I said that, someone (specific) often dance tango'

If the behaviour of the indefinite subjects in terms of specificity is indeed an indicator that the pre-verbal position in Bulgarian is associated with specificity, then it is no surprise that pre-verbal subjects in declarative clauses in Bulgarian are either marked by a definite marker or belong to the group of referential nominal expressions, such as proper names, referential pronominals, or indefinites with specific interpretation (as found by Leafgren 2002):

(33) Te/mladeži-*(te) tancuvat često tango.
They/young-people-the dance-PL often tango
'They/the young people often dance tango.'

(34) Kazax, če te/Ivan/mladeži-*(te) tancuva često tango.
said.1SG that they/young-people-the dance-3SG often tango
'I said that, they/young-people-the often dance tango'

A neutral word order with a definite/referential post-verbal subject that remains below the adverbial is highly dispreferred:

(35) *Tancuva-t često mladeži-te tango.
dance-PL often young-people-the.PLNOM tango
Intended: 'The young people often dance tango'
Declarative word orders with inverted post-verbal referential subjects that occur immediately after the verb but crucially above an adverbial are discussed as highly marked * stylistic inversions* (Georgieva 1974 and Dyer 1992):

(36) *Tancuva-t često te tango.*

dance-Pres.PL often they.PLNOM tango

Intended: 'They often dance tango'

(37) *Tancuva često Maria tango.*

dance.Pres.3SG often Maria tango

Intended: 'Maria often dances tango'

(38) Tancuva-xa te često tango.

dance-Past.PL they.PLNOM often tango

'Dancing often the tango they did'

(39) Praznuva-xa svatbarite ludo do ranni zori.

celebrate-Past.PL wedding-attendants crazy until early dawn

'Celebrating crazy until the early dawn the wedding attendants did'

Assuming that low adverbial modifiers (such as manner adverbs) mark the edge of the vP phrase (Alexiadou 1997), we observe that in the declarative VSO word order the subject with indefinite/weak interpretation remains below the adverb, whereas the verb moves to the left of the adverbial. On the other hand, in the SVO word order the subject with specific/definite interpretation is above the adverbial modifier directly followed by the verb. To account for both word orders of Bulgarian declaratives, I adopt the vP internal hypothesis according to which subject arguments of transitive events are generated vP internally within the thematic domain (Kitagawa 1986, Koopman and Sportiche 1991) and I propose that [+specific] subjects in Bulgarian must evacuate their base-generated position to a position outside the vP domain. I assume further that in both the VSO and SVO order, the verb raises to a higher functional head (e.g. Voice, Aspect and Tense), since in both word orders the inflected verb is above the low adverbial. Since VSO is a well accepted declarative word order, the move of an argument to the Specifier of TP must not be an obligatory operation in Bulgarian. On the other hand, as SVO is the only acceptable word order with
specific/referential subjects, I propose that movement to a left-edge specifier position is triggered by the subject’s own specificity and its inability to remain in-situ within the vP domain:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{[TopicP]} \\
\text{DP}_1[+\text{SPECIFIC}] \quad \text{Topic'} \\
\text{Topic} \quad ...
\end{array}
\]

This proposal implies that pre- and post-verbal nominal subject arguments in Bulgarian declarative clauses are distinguished based on the referential properties of the subject argument itself. Pre-verbal subject arguments are always interpreted as specific/referential subjects, whereas post-verbal subject are interpreted as non-referential (weak/non-specific) subjects.

The Bulgarian declarative VS(O) word order is reminiscent of the Greek VS(O) (Alexiadou and Anagnostopolou 2001), with the only difference that Greek allows proper names and definite subject arguments to remain post-verbally, whereas Bulgarian strongly prefers proper names to occupy the pre-verbal position but allows indefinite nominal expressions to remain in-situ:
The Bulgarian VS(O) order is also very much reminiscent of English existential constructions with the 'there' expletive, in which indefinite subjects are allowed to remain low (i.e. post-verbally) and are unambiguously interpreted as non-specific arguments (Jackendoff 1977). The major difference between English and Bulgarian being that Bulgarian does not need to satisfy left-edge requirements by an expletive, whereas English must employ an expletive pronomininal. As a result, English weak existential constructions obligatory occur with 'There', whereas Bulgarian weak existential constructions are verb-initial:

(43) English weak indefinites:
   a. There are some (*specific) books on the table.
   b. There is a (*specific) book on the table.
   c. *There is he/John/his book in the room.

In addition to the interpretational effects, pre- and post-verbal subject of transitive configurations differ in terms of quantifier scope and contextual presupposition.

2.4.2 Evidence from Quantifier Scope

In addition to their overt position relative to the verb and the correlation with specificity, pre-verbal and post-verbal nominative subjects in Bulgarian display systematic asymmetries in terms of quantifier scope. Observe first that in English, the following sentence is ambiguous between a specific and weak interpretation of the indefinite
nominative subject ‘some student’:

(44) Some (different) student often reads every e-mail. (some > every; every > some)

One can utter the structure to mean that every e-mail has been read by a different student, or that one specific student is reading all e-mails.

Similar ambiguity obtains Bulgarian, but only with post-verbal indefinite subjects. In the following example, which represents the answer to an out-of-the-blue broad question ‘What happens?’, the indefinite subject is in a post-verbal position below the adverbial. The word order produces either a reading in which every e-mail is read by a different student, or that a student is reading all e-mails:

(45) čete tajno njakoj (različen) student vseki e-mail.
read-Pres.PL secretly some (different) student every e-mail.
'Some student secretly reads every e-mail.' (some > every; every > some)

If however, we answer the broad question with an SVO word order, we unambiguously produces a specific reading only. The scope between the two quantified nominal expressions is suddenly frozen. By uttering the SVO order, a speaker unambiguously conveys that the indefinite is to be interpreted as a specific participant of the event. The contrast between the two readings can be exemplified by the fact, that the SVO word order becomes odd with the adjective različen ’different’:

(46) njakoj *(različen) student čete tajno vseki e-mail.
some (*different) student AUX.3SG read-Pres.3SG secretly every e-mail.
'Some student secretly reads every e-mail.' (some > every; *every > some)

I assume that Quantifier Raising (QR) is a feature driven operation constrained by locality (Bruening 2001) in conjunction with the proposal that quantifiers are of the type ⟨⟨e, t), t⟩, I explain the above asymmetries in structural terms (Heim and Kratzer 1998). When both arguments of a transitive construction are quantifiers, the
first available site of the type \( (t) \) where the quantifier phrase can be interpreted is the vP node. In order to get interpreted, both quantified phrases must obligatorily move (covertly) and merge to the note of the type \( (t) \) (Heim and Kratzer 1998).

The distinct scopal interpretation of the two minimal pairs of Bulgarian, however, suggest that the pre-verbal and the post-verbal subjects do not share the same featural specification.

In the case of the VSO word order, where the scope relation between the subject and the direct object is symmetric, the theory of QR captures and predicts the scope ambiguity. The universally quantified direct object is allowed to either outscope the indefinite subject to produce a weak existential reading or to reconstruct in its base position below the subject to produce a specific reading:

(47) Symmetric Quantifier Scope

a. \([\text{vP } \text{Every}_1 \text{ Some } v_q [\text{vP } V t_1]] \) (every > some)
b. \([\text{vP } \text{Some } v_q [\text{vP } V \text{ Every}]] \) (some > every)

In fact, native speakers prefer to express the inverse scope with an overt displacement of the direct object above the indefinite subject but just below the adverbial, thus providing overt evidence for the otherwise assumed quantifier movement:

(48) čete tajno [vseki e-mail]_1 njakoj (različen) student t_1.
read-Pres.PL secretly every-e-mail some (different) student t
'Some (non-specific) student often reads every-e-mail.'

In the case of the pre-verbal indefinite subjects, on the other hand, the frozen scope between the pre-verbal subject and the post-verbal direct object might lead to the conclusion that these pre-verbal indefinite subjects are high-generated topic subject that asymmetrically c-command the direct object argument from outside of the vP domain, thus always outscoping the direct object:

(49) \([\text{TP } \text{Some}(+\text{spec}) T \ldots[\text{vP [VP } \text{Every}]]] \) (some > every; *every > some)

(50) \([\text{TP } \text{Some}(+\text{spec}) T \ldots[\text{vP } \text{Every}_1 [\text{VP } t_1]]] \) (some > every; *every > some)
An argument against high-generated topicalized subjects in Bulgarian, however, is supported by the fact that universally quantified pre-verbal subject arguments still allow for inverse scope with an existentially quantified direct object argument. As the example below demonstrates, a universally quantified subject is pronounced pre-verbally allowing the interpretation that for 'every student' there is a variable e-mail. At the same time, the same structure allows the existentially quantified direct object to obtain also specific reading:

(51) Vseki student čete tajno t njakakév (različen) e-mail po vreme na lekcija.  
"Every student secretly reads some e-mail during lecture."(some > every; every > some)

Based on this, I interpret the frozen scope of pre-verbal indefinite subject as a case of [+specificity] which affects the interpretation of indefinite nominal expressions in ways that are independent of the syntactic position of the nominal at LF (i.e. at the time of semantic interpretation). So, we hold that [+specific] pre-verbal indefinite subject arguments might give the illusion of quantifier interaction, but it actually seems to be a case of a referential nominal expression that overrides the scope of the universally quantified direct object:

(52) [TP Some(+spec)1 T ...[vP t1 Every1 [VP t1]]] (some > every; *every > some)

This property of the Bulgarian pre-verbal indefinite subjects will again become relevant in chapter 3, when I discuss the position of the dative arguments.

Turning to the position of pre-verbal and post-verbal indefinite arguments of SE-marked unaccusative predicates, we observe the already familiar pattern; an indefinite argument with weak existential interpretation remains below the adverbial and is
interpreted, whereas an indefinite argument with specific interpretation is pre-verbal:

(53) radva-a SE mnogo njakoj student.
    rejoice-Pres.3SG SE much some student
    'Some (non-specific) student rejoices a lot'

(54) njakoj student SE radv-a mnogo.
    some student SE rejoice-Pres.3SG much
    'Some (specific) student rejoices a lot'

Again, declaratives with post-verbal non-quantified definite/referential nominal expression is highly dispreferred and the verb carries agreement suffixation with the available argument in both word orders:

(55) *radva-a SE mnogo toj/Ivan/student-ta.
    rejoice-Pres.3SG SE much he/Ivan/student-the
    Intended: 'He/Ivan/The student rejoices a lot'

(56) toj/Ivan/student-ta SE radv-a mnogo.
    he/Ivan/student-the SE rejoice-Pres.3SG much
    'he/Ivan/The student rejoices a lot'

My final argument in support of my proposal that the VS(O) order is derived via an in-situ subject in Bulgarian comes from Hanging (discoursive) Topic constructions, which are only possible with definite and specific preverbal subject arguments in both transitive and SE-marked intransitive structures.

2.4.3 Evidence from Hanging (discoursive) Topics

In Bulgarian, Hanging Topics (HT) have been recorded as a stable phenomenon in the written and spoken colloquial register (Popov 1979, Pashov 1989, Guéntcheva 1994, Krapova and Cinque 2008 among others). These are constructions that are only sensible in contexts in which the referent of the HT has been either previously mentioned, is immediately present in the conversational context, or can be easily accommodated from the context.

As outlined in Krapova and Cinque (2008), HT in Bulgarian share the following
Properties of Hanging Topics (HT) in Bulgarian:

a. HT anchors left-edge arguments to the immediate conversational context;
b. HT are characterized with a specific prosodic break;
c. HT are by default nominative pronominals;
d. HT match the phi-features (person, number, gender) of the argument that serves as the grammatical subject in a construction;
e. HT double only a specific, definite, or pronominal subject;
f. HT are only possible in the matrix clause;

The following examples demonstrate the above properties of HT:

(58) Ti, ti kakvo nosiš pak? 
     you.NOM, you what carry.2SG again? 
     '(As of you), what are you carrying again?'

(59) Toj, student-* (āt) pristigna mnogo rano. 
     He.NOM, student-the arrived.3SG very early 
     '(As of him), the student arrived pretty early.'

(60) Tja, Maria otkaza srcštata. 
     She.NOM, Maria cancel-Past.3SG meeting-the 
     '(As of her), Maria cancelled the meeting.'

Occasionally, HT constructions are also called 'doubled subject constructions' as they double whatever counts as the grammatical subject (see Leafgren 2002:75f). Indeed, a HT is not reserved only for the subjects of transitive constructions. The specific pre-verbal arguments of the SE-unaccusatives can also be doubled by a HT:

(61) Toj, njakoj SE radva mnogo. 
     He.NOM, someone SE rejoice-Pres.3SG much 
     '(As of him), some (specific) student rejoices.'

The crucial pre-requisite is that the subject argument is the pre-verbal specific subject. A post-verbal non-referential subject, be it the subject of a transitive or of a SE-
marked intransitive, fails in the hanging topic construction:

(62) *Toj, pristigna mnogo rano njakoj student.
    He.NOM, arrive-Past.3SG very early some student-the
    Intended: '(As of him), some (non-specific) student arrived pretty early.'

(63) *Toj, SE radva mnogo njakoj.
    He.NOM, SE rejoice-Pres.3SG much someone
    Intended: '(As of him), someone (non-specific) rejoices.'

I take the ill-formedness of the HT constructions to follow from the fact that the indefinite subject is post-verbal and non-referential, thus it cannot be anchored to someone already mentioned in the immediate discourse context.

With this, I conclude the discussion of the structural positions relevant for the nominative subjects in Bulgarian. In this chapter I demonstrated that nominal expressions can remain in their post-verbal position both in transitive and in SE-marked intransitives to produce weak existential interpretation. Crucially, their post-verbal position is to the right of a modifying adverbial, whereas the verb itself is obligatorily to the left of the adverbial. Once again, the VS(O) word order is not a marked word order, but represents the most neutral way of answering an out-of-the-blue broad question 'What happened?'. In the SV(O) word order, on the other hand, the subject argument is definite and specific and is crucially above the adverbial modifier.

I proposed therefore that nominative arguments in Bulgarian are generated and derived within the vP domain, but move to the specifier of TP depending on their (inherent/lexical) referential/specific properties.

The following schema summarizes the clausal domains of Bulgarian that will be assumed in this study:

(64) [CP Left-Periphery...[TP Inflectional domain [vP Thematic Domain...]]]]

The vP domain is the extended domain of the categorical Verb Phrase. It is the Thematic domain where the argument structure of the eventive predicate is expressed.
For Bulgarian, this is also the domain where arguments are introduced and licensed morphological case. The TP domain is the domain associated with tense and aspect. The edge of this domain is associated with focus and topic movement. The *Left Periphery* domain in Bulgarian is the domain associated with clause-typing.

Following Alexiadou's (1997) proposed hierarchy of adverbial phrases, the distribution of the distinct types of **adverbials** further supports the assumed clausal domains of Bulgarian. The example of a matrix declarative below reveals that 'high' (non-focalized) modal adverbial modifiers such as *maj* 'perhaps' can occur in sentence initial position, whereas temporal, resultative and low manner adverbials such as *vse* 'always', *često* 'often', *nacjalo* 'completely', *vnimatelno* 'carefully', *lesno* 'easy', *bárzo* 'fast' occur between the inflected predicate and the direct object argument. The absolute final position in Bulgarian can only host adverbials that express definite time or location, such as *včera* 'yesterday':

(65)  
\[
\text{maj} \quad \text{[TP njakoj₁ e čupil₂ otnovo [vP t₁ t₂ časi]]}
\]
perhaps [TP someone Aux brake-Part.3SG again [vP t t cups]
\]
\[
\text{včera}
\]
yesterday.

'Perhaps, someone (specific) has been breaking cups yesterday.'

Having proposed a syntax for Bulgarian transitive and intransitive construction, I now move to examine the structural properties of the dative arguments in Bulgarian. In the next chapter, I compare the syntax of dative clitic marked ditransitives to cliticless ditransitive structures. Now that I have established the vP domain as the thematic domain that licences morphological case and have shown how information structure and context are relevant for the interpretation of pre-verbal and post-verbal arguments, I proceed to establish the distinction between dative and prepositionally licensed arguments in Bulgarian.
Chapter 3

The Double Object Constructions in Bulgarian

In this chapter I focus on Bulgarian ditransitive constructions and I bring arguments in support of two hypotheses. The first hypothesis is that Bulgarian ditransitive verbs allow two alternate ways of organizing the argument structure of the event, reminiscent of the English alternation between Double Object Ditransitive Constructions (DOC) and Prepositional Ditransitive Constructions (PDC) of the type 'Mary gave Sue the book' and 'Mary gave the book to Sue'. In this relation, I bring evidence that Bulgarian ditransitives with a dative clitic are comparable to English DOCs, whereas cliticless ditransitives are comparable to English PDCs. Classical diagnostics such as binding, scope, idioms, and nominalization are brought in support for this hypothesis. The second and main hypothesis that I will defend is that in Bulgarian datives are uniformly licensed by a Peripheral Applicative head that takes the vP as its complement. In this relation I will demonstrate that dative arguments in Bulgarian ditransitives are not only higher than the direct object argument, but also higher than the subject argument. In what follows, I will demonstrate that both object and subject arguments cannot bind into clitic doubled dative arguments, but clitic doubled datives can bind into subject and object arguments. On the other hand, both object and subject arguments can bind into prepositional arguments, but prepositional arguments cannot bind into subject and object arguments.
3.1 The relevant data

The most neutral word order of Bulgarian ditransitive constructions with verbs of type 'send' and 'give' is the one in which the indirect object (IO) is pronounced at the right edge following the direct object (DO). However, as shown in the minimal pair below, Bulgarian like Spanish and Romanian allows ditransitive constructions to alternate between a clitic doubled indirect objects and clitic-less indirect objects:

(1) Maria izprati vednaga pisma na momče-to.  
Maria send-Past.3SG immediately letter.PL-the.PL to boy-the  
'Mary sent immediately letters to the boy.'

(2) Maria mu izprati vednaga pisma na momče-to.  
Maria he.DAT send-Past.3SG immediately letter.PL-the.PL to boy-the  
'Mary sent immediately the boy letters.'

(3) Pablo mandó una carta a Gabi. (Spanish: Cuervo 2003)  
Pablo sent a letter to Gabi  
'Pablo sent a letter to Gabi.'

(4) Pablo le mandó una carta a Gabi.  
Pablo CL.DAT sent a letter to Gabi  
'Pablo sent Gabi a dictionary.'

(5) Mihaela trimite o scrisoare la Maria. (Romanian: Diaconescu 2004)  
Mihaela sends a letter to Maria  
'Michaela sends a letter to Maria.'

(6) Mihaela îi trimite o scrisoare la Maria.  
Mihaela CL.DAT sends a letter to Maria  
(Romanian: Diaconescu 2004)  
'Michaela sends Maria a letter.'

Descriptively, the ditransitives uniformly involve three arguments in these languages. A nominative 'agent' argument, with which the verb agrees in number and person, a DO argument and a prepositionally-marked IO argument. However, the two structures are not fully identical in their interpretation. In the clitic-less construction, the indirect object of the 'send' and 'give' verbs can be understood both as the location
of a spatial event or as the receiver, reminiscent of English prepositional ditransitives (PDC) of the type 'Mary sent/gave the book to John' and it is compatible with true locational arguments (see Rappaport-Hovav and Levin (2008) for English, Cuervo (2003) for Spanish, Diaconescu (2004) and (Diaconescu and Rivero 2007) for Romanian, and Slavkov (2008) for Bulgarian):

(7) Mary send [DO a letter] [IO to John/to the ministry].

(8) Maria izprati [DP pisma] [IO na Ivan/ministerstvo-to].
    Maria send-Past.3SG [DP letter.PL] [IO to Ivan/ministry-the]
    'Mary sent letters to Ivan/to the ministry.'

In the declarative clitic-marked frame, on the other hand, the doubled indirect object is understood as a 'recipient', possessor' or 'beneficiary', but crucially incompatible with a true locational goal, thus paralleling English double object ditransitives (DOC) (Oehrle 1976, Barss and Lasnik 1986, Larson 1988, Pesetsky 1995, Marantz 1996, Bruening 2010 among others):

(9) Mary send John/*the ministry a letter.

(10) Maria mu izprati pisma na
    Maria he.DAT send-Past.3SG letter.PL-the.PL to
    Ivan/*ministerstvo-to.
    Ivan/*ministry-the
    'Mary sent Ivan/*the ministry letters.'

This asymmetry between clitic doubled and non clitic doubled ditransitives has been partly analyzed for Bulgarian under the applicative approach (Slavkov 2008) and applicative analyses of clitic doubled ditransitives have been proposed also for Spanish (Demonte 1995, Cuervo 2003 among others) and Romanian (Diaconescu 2004, Diaconescu and Rivero 2007). In what follows, I re-evaluate the Bulgarian data that establish the correlation between the dative clitic and the availability of a DOC-like frame and I extend and test the distribution of dative arguments beyond spatial ditransitives of the send/give type. Based on the novel empirical evidence in conjunction with the evidence that nominative arguments are generated and licensed within
the vP domain, I argue that Bulgarian DOCs must be derived via a high applicative head that introduces an argument at the edge of the vP domain. The following two structural configuration represent the structure that I attribute to prepositional clitic-less ditransitives, and the structure that I propose for the dative clitic doubled ditransitives.

For the PDC frame, I follow Bruening (2001, 2010) and assume that both object arguments - the prepositional and the direct object - are arguments of the same structural head. As we shall see in the subsequent sections, scopal facts, movement possibilities and the availability of certain idiomatic expressions support the proposal of a symmetric relation between the two object arguments. The locative argument itself is selected and licensed by a lexical preposition forming a prepositional phrase in the complement of the verb. The direct object argument is introduced in the 'inner' specifier of the locative event predicate and is semantically understood as related to the 'location':

(11) The PDC frame

\[
\begin{array}{c}
  \text{[vP]} \\
  \quad \searrow \\
  \text{DP[AGENT]} & v' \\
  \quad \searrow \\
  v & [VP] \\
  \quad \searrow \\
  \text{DP[THEME]} & V' \\
  \quad \searrow \\
  V & PP \\
  \quad \searrow \\
  P & \text{DP[LOCATION]}
\end{array}
\]

The type of the 'relation' itself is lexicalized in the form of the preposition, i.e.
*ot* 'from' lexicalizes a source relation, *za* 'for' lexicalizes a beneficiary relationship, etc. The subject argument in the PDC frame is hierarchically the most prominent argument introduced and licensed in the specifier of the (transitive) little *v*. In the **clitic-doubled dative** structural frame the *goal* argument is also understood as being related to the *theme* argument. Crucially, the *goal* is related to the entire event through the applicative head. It is an argument introduced in the specifier of a functional head that licenses the argument by assigning morphological dative case. By proposing that the applicative head selects for a *vP* complement and relates the new argument to the semantics of the entire event, I crucially predict that the most prominent argument of the Bulgarian **DOC** frame is the dative argument, rather than the nominative subject argument. In the next section, I demonstrate that this is indeed the case. The dative argument not only c-commands and binds the direct object argument, but c-commands and binds also the nominative subject argument in Bulgarian ditransitives:

(12) **The Applicative Frame**

\[
\text{[APPLP]}
\]

\[
\text{DP[DATIVE]} \quad \text{APPL'}
\]

\[
\text{APPL} \quad [vP]
\]

\[
\text{DP[AGENT]} \quad v'
\]

\[
\text{v} \quad \text{VP}
\]

\[
\text{V} \quad \text{DP[THEME]}
\]
In what follows I defend the proposal that the position of the dative argument of the Bulgarian DOC frame is such that it asymmetrically c-commands every other argument of the ditransitive event.

The chapter is organized as follows. In the first part of this chapter, I focus on ditransitive constructions of events of active transfer with directional verbs of the type *give* and *send* and I re-evaluate the structural asymmetries exemplified through binding, quantifier scope, weak cross over effects, idiomatic expressions, and nominalisation patterns. In each of the sections, I demonstrate that the asymmetries hold not just between the two object arguments, but also between the dative and the base position of the subject argument. In the last part of this chapter, I turn to the morpho-syntactic nature of the obligatory *na* preposition. The argument advanced in this section is that nominal phrases introduced by the applicative head are licensed and assigned dative case by the APPL head rather than being licensed by a lexical preposition. Here I evaluate existing arguments for the dual role of the *na* preposition in Modern Bulgarian (Schick 2000, Vakareliyska 2002, Slavkov 2008), and I bring novel evidence from distributive meaning under coordination as modeled for French in Jaeggli (1986) and for Spanish in Curevo (2003). The results support the proposal that clitic doubled *na*-marked arguments are dative marked DPs, rather than prepositional phrases.

### 3.2 The structure of Bulgarian ditransitives

In addition to the observation that English DOC and PDC ditransitive constructions produce interpretational variation between pure locational and 'recipient' (i.e. involved) reading, structural asymmetries in terms of anaphor binding, binding of pronominal variables, weak crossover effects, and scope of polarity elements have been taken as evidence for two distinct structural frames. The importance of these diagnostics is that these are all processes shown to be sensitive to hierarchical c-command relations rather than linear word order.
3.2.1 Binding relations

To the extent that c-command indeed matters for pronominal binding, it has been observed that a pronominal or an anaphoric variable in the IO is bound by the DO argument in the English PDC frame, whereas it consistently fails to be bound by the DO argument in the DOC frame (Barss and Lasnik 1986, Larson 1988, and Pesetsky 1995).

As demonstrated with the data below, in English prepositional ditransitives, the DO can always be an antecedent for an anaphoric IO ("to herself") or to a possessive subpart of the IO ("to its owner"). On the other hand, they are consistently bad if the theme argument is an anaphor or a possessive pronominal:

(13) *English Prepositional Ditransitive Constructions (PDC: DO → IO)*

a. I showed Mary to herself (in the mirror).

b. *I showed herself to Mary (in the mirror).

c. I send every paycheck to its owner.

d. ??I send his paycheck to every owner.

Note that for some speakers a quantified IO, such as 'every owner' ameliorates the structure and allows a bound interpretation. Such an amelioration is predicted to be possible for speakers that allow (covert) scrambling of the quantified phrase to a position that is above the DO. As we will see in the subsequent sections, there is actually overt evidence for such quantifier scrambling of PP arguments in Bulgarian.

On the other hand, English DOCs unambiguously fail to produce sensible meaning if the 'recipient'/'goal' argument is an anaphoric element. Crucially, even a quantified DO such as 'every worker' does not improve the reading even for speakers, who accept the ameliorated PDC frame above. In other words, the DOC frame in English allows for a fixed reading in which the first argument must be an [+animate] R(eferential) argument and crucially it must c-command the lower object argument for purposes of anaphoric binding:
English Double Object Constructions (DOC: IO ≫ DO)

a. I showed Mary herself (in the mirror).
b. *I showed herself Mary (in the mirror).
c. I gave/send every worker its paycheck.
d. *I gave/send its paycheck every worker.

The following two overly simplified graphics exemplify the observations regarding English. In the PDC frame, the theme argument c-commands and thus can serve as a structural antecedent for an anaphoric goal. In the DOC frame, on the other hand, it is the goal that c-commands the theme:

[PDC]

[DOC]

Turning to Bulgarian, the data below demonstrate that similar asymmetric binding relationships between the object arguments of ditransitives are detectable in the language, as well. As it turns out, the distinction between the DOC and the PDC frame in Bulgarian is a factor of the dative clitic - a fact observed already for Spanish and Romanian.

In the absence of a dative clitic, the most neutral declarative structure is when
both the DO and the IO argument are below a modifying adverbial, whereas the
inflected verb and the referential nominative subject are above the adverbial\(^1\). As
demonstrated in the translation, this construction allows the DO argument to produce
a grammatical bound reading with an anaphoric or possessive IO argument:

\[\text{(15)} \quad \text{Az pokaza-x tajno [DO edno dete] [IO na nego-si] (v I.NOM showed-Past.1SG secretly [DO a child] [IO to it-own] (in ogledalo-to). mirror-the)} \]

'I secretly showed a child to itself (in the mirror)

\[\text{(16)} \quad \text{Az dado-x tajno [DO edna kniga] [IO na nejniha, citatel]. I.NOM give-Past.1SG secretly [DO a bookFEM] [IO to her reader] 'I secretly gave a book to its reader.'} \]

\[\text{(17)} \quad \text{Az predstavi-x [DO edin doctor] [IO na negovija, pacient] I.NOM introduced-Past.1SG [DO a doctorMAs] [IO to his patient] 'I introduced a doctor to his patient.'} \]

Conversely, once we switch and use an anaphoric direct object, the structural frame
fails to permit a bound meaning exactly as it fails to do so in English PDCs:

\[\text{(18)} * \text{Az pokazax tajno [DO nego-si] [IO na edno dete] (v I.NOM showed-Past.1SG secretly [DO it-own] [IO to a child (in ogledalo-to). mirror-the)} \]

*I secretly showed itself to a child (in the mirror)

\[\text{(19)} * \text{Az dad-ox tajno [DO negova-ta kniga] [IO na edin citatel]. I.NOM give-Past.1SG secretly [DO his-the book] [IO to a reader] *'I secretly gave his book to a reader.'} \]

\[\text{(20)} * \text{Az predstavi-x [DO negovi-ja doctor] [IO na edin I.NOM introduced-Past.1SG [DO his-the doctorMAs] [IO to a patient] *'I introduced his doctor to a patient.'} \]

\(^1\text{Since Bulgarian has a relatively free word order, I need to clarify that the word order below represents the neutral reading with broad nucleus scope that is typical for an answer to the question 'What happened?'} \]
Once a dative clitic is involved, the relation between the two internal arguments reverses in a way that parallels the behaviour of the English DOCs (hence the translation with a DOC frame). In spite of what looks like a clause-final linear position, the clitic doubled IO argument is now unambiguously understood as the antecedent of a pronominal DO:

(21) Az mu dad-ox tajno [DO negova-ta1 kniga] [IO na edin čitatel1] [IO on a reader] 'I gave secretly a reader1 its own1 book'

Reversely, a clitic doubled pronominal Goal cannot be understood as being bound by the DO argument:

(22) *Az mu dad-ox tajno [DO edna kniga] [IO na nejnija1 čitatel1] [IO to her reader] '*I handed secretly its own1 reader a book1'

Under the assumption that binding mirrors structural order, rather than linear order, then a plausible conclusion is that both languages - English and Bulgarian - have an alternate way of organizing the arguments of a ditransitive event. Following Pylkkänen’s (2002) applicative analysis of English ditransitives and Cuervo’s (2003) applicative theory of structurally sensitive datives (2003), Slavkov (2008) interprets the Bulgarian binding asymmetries as evidence for a low applicative head:

(23) Slavkov (2008):

\[ \text{...v [APPL DPGOAL APPL DPTHeme]} \]

According to this analysis, the applicative functional head combines with the DO and introduces the Goal argument in its specifier before being selected by the verb:
What Slavkov (2008) does not show is that the clitic doubled dative object in Bulgarian ditransitives c-command not only the direct object, but also the subject argument. Observe that in cliticless ditransitive constructions where the nominative subject is the most prominent argument, a pre- and post-verbal referential subject argument c-commands and binds the IO argument:

(24) njakoji, kupi tajno [DO kniga] [IO na sebe-si,].
'someone buy-Past.3SG secretly [DO book] [IO to self-refl]
'Someonei secretly bought a book for himself,'

(25) njakoji, dade tajno [DO kniga] [IO na negovotoi dete].
'someone give-Past.3SG secretly [DO book] [IO to his child]
'Someonei secretly gave a book to hisi/j child'

(26) dade tajno njakoji, [DO kniga] [IO na negovotoi dete].
give-Past.3SG secretly someone [DO book] [IO to his child]
'Someonei gave a book to hisi child'

Conversely, a possessive subject argument fails to be bound by a referential IO argument. Note that a pre-verbal definite possessive subject could only refer to someone else’s cousin, who is probably contextually relevant:

(27) negovi-ja,*j bratovcov dade tajno kniga [IO na edno detej].
his-the cousin give-Past.3SG secretly book to a child
'Hisi/*j cousin gave a book to a childj'
Crucially, when the recipient argument is clitic doubled and dative, it suddenly provides a structural antecedent for the nominative subject. Note that the closest translation of the Bulgarian applicative frame is the English paraphrase of the type "X is such that...”.

(28) negovotoi/j dete mu dade tajno kniga na njakoj.
'His child he.DAT give-Past.3SG secretly book to someone
'Someone's child gave him a book.'

On the other hand, a possessive dative fails to be bound by the local subject arguments. As demonstrated by the co-indexation, the possessive dative can only be understood as referring to the child of someone, who is probably contextually relevant, but crucially not the pre- or post-verbal subject argument. Note that the linear order is not important - the clitic doubled argument could be to the left or to the right edge, without influencing the binding:

(29) na negovoto/*j dete njakoj mu dade tajno kniga.
'to his child someone hedat give-Past.3SG secretly book
'His/* child is such, that someonej (specific) secretly give it a book'.

(30) na negovoto/*j dete mu dade tajno njakoj kniga.
'to his child he.textscdat give-Past.3SG secretly someone book
'His/*j child is such, that someonej (non-specific) secretly gave it a book.

To sum up, the clitic doubled dative argument binds not only the direct object, but also the subject arguments in Bulgarian ditransitives. At the same time, it cannot be bound by a local subject argument. Yet, if we provide a higher nominative subject, binding into the embedded clitic doubled dative becomes possible. This is line with the current proposal that the Bulgarian dative applicatives are structurally too high for a local subject to serve as an antecedent:

(31) Njakoj, misli [CP če az mu dadox kniga na
'Someone think-Pres.3SG [CP that I.NOM he.DAT give-Past.1SG book to
him]
'Someonei thinks that he is such that I gave him a book.’
In fact, in chapter 4 I will demonstrate that dative arguments can serve as structural subjects of various predicative relations, thus confirming that they are able to interact with nominal subjects in terms of binding and control across local domains.

Crucially in the absence of a clitic, an embedded prepositional argument cannot be interpreted as being bound by a matrix subject in Bulgarian. This structure is only sensible in a pragmatic context, in which the referent of *na nego* 'to him' has been mentioned before:

(32) Njakojj misli [CP če az dad-ox kniga na ]
Someone think-Pres.3SG that he.NOM give-Past.1SG book to him 

*nego/*j].

'Someone, thinks that I gave a book to him/*j.'

In the following I present further structural evidence that a clitic doubled dative is indeed a high argument in terms of quantifier scope, weak cross over, idiomatic expressions, and inability to nominalize.

### 3.2.2 Quantifier scope between direct and indirect object

Barss and Lasnik's (1986) observation regarding the binding asymmetries between English PDCs and DOCs have been taken as an evidence for two distinct structural relations between the object arguments. And at least three possible solutions have been offered under the assumption that there is no transformational link between DOCs and PDCs.

Harley (1997, 2002) proposes a *symmetric analysis* of the ditransitive alternation, which essentially posits the same structure for both alternatives, but with the position of the two objects reversed. According to Harley, both ditransitive frames in English involve small clauses in the complement position of the v-head:
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Harley (2002):

a. \( \ldots v[PP \text{DPRECIPIENT} \text{Phave} \text{DPtheme}] \) (DOC)

b. \( \ldots v[PP \text{DPtheme} \text{Ploc} \text{DPRECIPIENT}] \) (PDC)

It is then the head of the small clause that varies between an overt locative preposition of the type \text{PLOC} and a possessive zero preposition of the type \text{PHAVE}. The proposal that prepositional ditransitives involve small clauses in the complement of \text{v} originated with Kayne (1984), with the idea of capturing the 'possessive' interpretation that is often available in the English DOC frame. In this sense, both Harley (2002) and Pylkkänen (2002/2008) are similar in assuming that the DOC frame is distinct from the PDC as they both offer solutions that involve specific functional heads as introducers of a higher Goal argument. Yet, both Harley (2002) and Pylkkänen (2002/2008) treat the two object arguments of English as arguments of the same functional head. Yet, sharing the same structural domain brings certain predictions. For once, one would expect a quantified DO argument to be able to outscope indirect object in the DOC frame. This, however, is not the case neither for English or for Bulgarian.

As demonstrated by Aoun and Lee (1989), scope is ambiguous between the quantified object arguments of the English PDC frame, but it is frozen in the DOC frame. When an argument is introduced by a locative preposition, the frame allows two readings in each of the variants:

(34) English PDC: \( \forall \gg \exists / \exists \gg \forall \) (Aoun and Li 1989)

a. Mary gave some (different) book to everyone.

b. Mary gave every book to someone (different).

Bruening (2010) makes the same observations regarding relative scope between the quantifiers \( a \) and \( each \) in English PDCs. In either of the two variants, an existentially quantified argument can be interpreted either as being specific or variant:
In the a) examples above, the nominal expression 'some book'/ 'a doll' can be understood either as being specific or being different for every 'recipient'. In the b) examples, the 'recipients' expressions 'someone/a girl' can also be understood either as being specific or variant for 'every book/each doll'. As both object arguments in the PDC frame are quantifiers of type ((e,t),t), the ambiguity in their interpretation means that they can re-order relative to each other when combining with the first available (t), which is the v-head. Bruening (2001:264) proposes therefore that the two internal arguments of the verb are essentially unordered and thus equidistant for movement in the PDC frame. The two quantifiers move obligatory to v for interpretation, and the surface scope and the inverse scope between the two arguments is obtained via the possibility of the IO quantifier to be interpreted in its base position.

English DOCs, on the other hand, only allow for one particular reading that results in a frozen scopal relation. As shown below, an existentially quantified IO takes always a wide scope over a universally quantified DO, whereas an existentially quantified DO is always understood to vary with an universally quantified IO:

(36) English DOC: \( \exists \gg \forall / \forall \gg \exists \)

a. I gave someone (*different) every book.
b. I gave a (*different) girl each doll.

(37) English DOC: \( \forall \gg \exists / \exists \gg \forall \)

a. I gave everyone a *(different) book.
b. I gave each girl a *(different) doll.

Based on everything said so far for Bulgarian, we predict that prepositional IOs will
allow inverse scope in a clitic-less ditransitive construction, similar to English PDCs. In constructions with a clitic, on the other hand, the scope between the arguments is predicted to be frozen. The data below confirm that these predictions are indeed borne out.

In the cliticless ditransitives, the existentially quantified edno kuče 'a dog' can be understood as specific or as being variant for vseki kokal 'every bone':

Bulgarian PDC: $\forall \gg \exists \gg \exists \gg \forall$

(38) Az dadox [DO vseki kokal] [IO na edno (različno) kuče].
INOM give-Past.1SG [DO every] [IO to a (different) dog]
'I gave every bone to a (different) dog.'

On the other hand, the existentially quantified DO edin kokal 'a bone' is understood either as specific or as variant with the universally quantified IO vsjako kuče 'every dog':

(39) Az dadox [DO edin (različen) kokal] [IO na vsjako kuče]
INOM give-Past.1SG [DO every bone] [IO to a (different) dog]
'I gave a (different) bone to every dog.'

Native speakers often prefer to scramble overtly quantified phrases in order to get the distinct readings:

(40) Az dadox tajno [IO na vsjako kuče]$_1$ [DO edin (različen)
INOM give-Past.1SG secretly [IO to a (different) dog] [DO every
kokal]$_1$
bone]$_1$
'I gave secretly a (*different) bone to every dog.'

Crucially, the overt position of the scrambled prepositional phrase is below the low modificational adverbial which suggests that this is indeed a position for QR movement.

Crucially, once we introduce a clitic in Bulgarian, the relative scope of the two internal arguments freezes exactly as it does in the English DOC frame. A quantified
IO always scopes over a quantified DO argument producing frozen scope:

\[ \exists \gg \forall / *\forall \gg \exists \]

(41) Az mu dadox [DO vseki kokal] [IO na edno (*različno) kuće] [DO every bone] [IO on a (*different) dog]
'I gave every dog a (*different) bone.'

(42) Az mu dadox [DO edin *(različno) kokal] [IO na vsjako kuće] [DO a (different) bone] [IO on every dog]
'I gave every dog a *(different) bone.'

The lack of inverse scope in English DOCs is taken by Bruening 2010 as evidence for an asymmetric approach and proposes that the Goal and the Theme argument are not arguments of the same structural head. Instead the presence of frozen scope in the DOC frame is taken to mean that the Goal argument of the English DOC frame is generated in the specifier of a functional head that takes the VP as its complement and is thus hierarchically closer to \( v(t) \) than the Theme argument is:

(43) Bruening (2010):
\[ \ldots \text{APPLP DPGOAL APPL [VP DPTHHEME]} \]

The asymmetric scopal interaction is a theoretical motivation for assuming that English DOCs are created via a verbal applicativization, rather than a nominal applicativization. The Bulgarian ditransitive data also suggest that the clitic doubled datives are generated asymmetrically higher than the direct object argument.

Yet, the Bulgarian picture is not complete without testing the scopal interaction between the clitic doubled IO and the subject argument. Recall that I presented...
evidence in chapter 2 that subject arguments are generated and licensed within the vP in Bulgarian and that subjects - other than proper names and referential pronominals - can remain within the vP for weak existential reading. The binding facts introduced in this chapter further suggested that the clitic doubled IO is not only higher that the DO argument in Bulgarian, but it is higher than the subject argument.

In what follows I proceed to test and demonstrate that the clitic doubled IOs of Bulgarian interact also with the subject argument in terms scope and with this confirm that the first merge position of these arguments is higher than the position of the IO arguments of the English DOC frame.

3.2.3 Quantifier scope between subject and indirect object

By hypothesis, if the clitic doubled IO is indeed generated outside the vP in Bulgarian, then it is predicted to interact not only with the direct object, but also with the vP-internal subject argument in terms of quantifier scope and binding. In the following, I demonstrate that this is borne out. The Bulgarian dative clitic doubled IO are indeed introduced in an exceptionally high position that selects the vP as its complement.

Recall that in cliticless prepositional ditransitives the IO argument is c-commanded by the DO argument and their relative scope is not fixed. If a subject argument is introduced higher than the two internal arguments, then it should also c-command the two internal arguments. This is indeed the case.

When the IO argument is universally quantified a post-verbal subject allows for inverse scope:

\[\text{(i) dade tajno [IO na vsjako negovo,} \_j \text{ dete}, \_j \text{ ujako,} \_j \text{ kniga t}_1.}
\]
\[\text{give-Past.3SG secretly [IO to every his child] someone book.}
\]
\[\text{'Someone, (non-specific) secretly gave a book to every child of his,} \_j{'}}
\]

\[\text{74}\]
Bulgarian PDC with post-verbal existential subject: $\exists \gg \forall / \forall \gg \exists$

(44) dade tajno njakoj (različen) čovek\textsubscript{i} kniga [IO na vsjako
give-Past.3SG secretly some (different) person book [IO to every
negovoto\textsubscript{i}/\textsubscript{j} dete].
his child].
'Some (different) person\textsubscript{i} secretly gave a book to every child of his\textsubscript{i}/\textsubscript{j}.'

Similarly, a universally quantified pre-verbal subject also allows for inverse scope with
the locative PP either remaining in-situ, or scrambled to the left:

Bulgarian PDC with pre-verbal universally quantified subject: $\exists \gg \forall / \forall \gg \exists$

(45) vseki\textsubscript{i} dade tajno kniga [IO na edno negovoi/o\textsubscript{i}/\textsubscript{j} dete].
Everyone give-Past.3SG secretly book [IO to one his child].
'Everyone\textsubscript{i} secretly gave a book to some (different) child of his\textsubscript{i}/\textsubscript{j}.'

(46) ?[IO na edno negovoi/o\textsubscript{i}/\textsubscript{j} dete] vseki\textsubscript{i} dade tajno kniga t\textsubscript{l}
[IO to one his child] everyone gave secretly a book.
'Everyone\textsubscript{i} secretly gave a book to some child of his\textsubscript{i}/\textsubscript{j}.'

I take the availability of bound reading between the subject and a possessive clitic-less
IO as well as the ability of PP arguments to scope over quantified subject as evidence
that the PDC frame in Bulgarian is created within the vP domain. As the edge of $v$
is the first node available for quantifier interpretation it is expected that quantifiers
could re-order and allow for inverse scope:

(47) [TP ...[vP SOME $v$ [....PP EVERY]]

(48) [TP ...[vP PP EVERY\textsubscript{i} SOME $v$ [...t\textsubscript{l}]]

Once we have a clitic doubled dative, the situation changes radically. First,
recall that the two sentences below could never mean that someone is giving a book

(ii) [IO na vsjako negovoi/o\textsubscript{i}/\textsubscript{j} dete\textsubscript{l}]
dade tajno njakoj kniga t\textsubscript{l}.
[to every his child] give-Past.3SG secretly someone book.
'Someone\textsubscript{l} (non-specific) secretly gave a book to every child of his\textsubscript{i}/\textsubscript{j}.'
to its own child (or for the benefit of its own child). Instead the sentences below only mean that someone is giving a book to someone else's child:

(49) \( \text{dade } \text{mu } \text{tajno } \text{njakoi, kniga na negovoto}/*_i \text{ dete.} \)
    give-Past.3SG he.DAT secretly someone book to his child.
    'His child/*_i is such, that someonei (nonspecific) secretly gave it a book'

The linear position of the clitic double argument does not matter. The argument could be pronounced at the right edge as the example above, or at the left edge as the example below. The scope binding facts remain the same:

(50) \( \text{na negovoto}/*_i \text{ dete mu } \text{dade } \text{tajno } \text{njakoi, kniga.} \)
    to his child he.DAT give-Past.3SG secretly someone book.
    'His child/*_i is such, that someonei (nonspecific) secretly gave it a book.'

Second, scope between a quantified dative and a nominative subject is always frozen. More concretely, an existential post-verbal subject cannot outscope an universally quantified dative and a universally quantified subject cannot outscope an existential dative in spite of what looks like linear precedence:

Bulgarian DOC with post-verbal indefinite subject: \( \forall \gg \exists /*\exists \gg \forall \)

(51) \( \text{dade } \text{mu } \text{tajno } \text{njakoi } \text{kniga na vsjako dete.} \)
    give-Past.3SG he.DAT secretly someone book to every child.
    'Every child is such, that someone (nonspecific) secretly gave it a book.'

Bulgarian DOC with pre-verbal universal subject: \( \exists \gg \forall /*\forall \gg \exists \)

(52) \( \text{vseki } \text{mu } \text{dade } \text{tajno } \text{kniga na edno dete.} \)
    everyone he.DAT give-Past.3SG secretly book to a child.
    'A specific child is such, that every person secretly gave it a book.'

3Note that the clitic follows the inflected verb in the post-verbal VSO order. This is so because Bulgarian clitics obey the Tobler-Mussafia Law (TML), which in a nutshell states that clitic object pronouns cannot occupy the initial position in the clause, where the initial position is defined with respect to the minimal clause, without hanging topics or left dislocated elements. Thus, pronominal clitics have a strong tendency to occur in the second position of the clause. If the verb phrase occupies the first position, the pronominal clitic will be placed postverbally given the illusion of a second position (Wackernagel) clitic.
The fact that pre-verbal universally quantified subject cannot outscope the dative argument, means that pre-verbal quantified subject reconstruct and are interpreted in their base position.

A puzzle for QR, however, is presented by the following data in which pre-verbal indefinite subjects seems to be unable to reconstruct into their base position:

**Bulgarian DOC with pre-verbal existential subject:** \( \exists \gg \forall / *\forall \gg \exists \)

(53) \textit{njakoj mu dade tajno kniga na vsjako dete.}
\( \text{someone he.DAT give-Past.3SG secretly book to every child.} \)
\'A specific child is such that someone (specific) gave it a book.'

This data is reminiscent of the data discussed in chapter 2, were I demonstrated that pre-verbal indefinite subjects are interpreted as specific topics and as such they affect the interpretation of quantified nominal expressions independent of their syntactic position at LF. Both, the data in chapter 2 and the data above point to a general observation about indefinites cross-linguistically and I do not offer an insightful solution here. Crucially, despite the fact that indefinite subjects do not reconstruct bellow the high existential datives, they still do not alter the binding facts. That is, the pre-verbal nominative subject consistently fails to serve as a local antecedent for the dative applicative:

(54) \textit{njakoj mu dade tajno kniga na negovotoj/*i dete.}
\( \text{someone he.DAT give-Past.3SG secretly book to his child.} \)
\'His childj/*i is such, that someonei (specific) secretly gave it a book.'

To sum up, by testing the binding and scopal relationship between the subject and IO object we confirm several critical properties of the Bulgarian ditransitive structure. Prepositional (non clitic doubled) locative phrases are always bound by a subject and by a direct object argument no matter whether the subject is post- or pre-verbal. Whereas clitic doubled dative arguments are always disjoint from subject and direct object arguments. In the Bulgarian DOC frame, the dative argument is the most prominent argument thus outscoping and serving as an antecedent for
the subject argument. Even in the case of specific pre-verbal indefinite subjects, the dative argument cannot be bound, thus confirming that it is the highest argument in the construction.

### 3.2.4 Weak Cross Over effects

The inability of quantified subject and object arguments of Bulgarian ditransitives to bind or outscope a clitic doubled dative argument is reminiscent of Barss and Lasnik's (1986) observation that DOCs and PDCs display asymmetric Weak Cross (WCO) effect between the two object arguments in English.

In general, for a WCO to arise following structural conditions must be met:

\[(55)\] Weak Crossover Effect

a. a wh-/quantified argument must be structurally low and coindexed with a possessive pronominal;

b. the possessive pronominal must be embedded in a structurally higher argument;

c. when the wh-/quantified argument raises above the possessive, the sentence becomes ungrammatical;

d. \[^{[wh...[her...][ti...]}\]

In the English examples below, the DOC frame is only fine with a wh-IO and fails with a wh-DO:

\[(56)\] WCO in English DOC (Barss and Lasnik 1986, Larson 1988)

a. *What\(_i\) did Mary give its owner \(t_1\)?

b. Who\(_i\) did Mary give \(t_1\) his check?

On the other hand, the PDC frame is only fine with a wh-DO and fails with a wh-IO:

\[(57)\] WCO in English PDC (Barss and Lasnik 1986, Larson 1988)

a. What\(_i\) did Mary give \(t_1\) to its owner?
The proposal that the Bulgarian clitic-doubled ditransitive involves a high applicative head, while non-doubled ditransitve are prepositional phrases, predicts that WCO effects will reproduce as a factor of the clitic. This is borne out. In line with the quantifier facts from the previous two sections, a wh-question with a clitic doubled IO is good not only with a co-indexed possessive DO (as is the case of English DOCs) but also with a co-indexed possessive subjects:

(58) Na kogo, mu dado-xa negovija, ček?
    to who he.dat give-Past.3PL his check
    'Who, is such that did they give him his check?'

(59) Na kogo, mu dado-xa njakakvi negovija, šefove ček?
    to who he.dat give-Past.3PL some his bosses check
    'Who, is such, that some bosses of his give him a check?'

On the other hand, a wh-question with a co-indexed possessive dative obligatorily fails, as both a wh-object and a wh-subject would cross over a co-indexed possessive phrase:

(60) *[Kakvoj,] mu dado-xa t, na negovija, sobstvenik?
    what he.dat give-Past.3PL t to his owner
    Intended: *Its owner is such, that what did they give him?'

(61) *[Koj,] mu dade t, bonboni na negovoto, dete?
    who he.dat give-Past.3SG t candy to his child
    Intended: Its child is such, that who gave it candy?'

In clitic-less ditransitives, which I demonstrated behave like English PDCs, wh-questions are perfectly fine with a co-indexed possessive goal and fail, as predicted by the WCO effect, with a wh-goal:

(62) [Kakvoj,] dado-xa t, na negovija, sobstvenik?
    [what] give-Past.3PL t to his owner
    'What did they give to its owner?'
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With this, we have additional confirmation that clitic doubled and cliticless ditransitives represent two distinct structural frames in Bulgarian. The cliticless ditransitives behave like English prepositional ditransitives in terms of binding, scope and WCO effects. Clitic doubled ditransitives, on the other hand, resemble and mimic some of the effects of English DOCs. Crucially the argument that is co-indexed with the clitic in Bulgarian is at the periphery above the subject argument. The fact that the dative clitic co-occurs even with non-referential wh-indefinites, reveals in addition the functional status of the obligatory dative clitic and its correlation with the applicative frame.

### 3.3 Interim conclusion and the proposal of peripheral applicativization

The proposal that the APPL head is an argument introducing functional head that applies at the periphery of a structural domain in Bulgarian has certain implications and predictions. For one, it allows us to explain the fact that Bulgarian allows dative applicativization to constructions other than predicates of creation and receiving. As the data below demonstrate, applicativization is not restricted to the lexical meaning of certain predicates or to a certain structure of predicates.

So far, we compared merely locative ditransitive with the meaning of *sending* and *giving*. Yet, Bulgarian allows applicativization with locative ditransitives with
the meaning of *taking, denying, breaking*. Uniformly, these constructions can be paraphrased with a prepositional phrase as well. Crucially, the preposition in the paraphrases is different than the *na*-marked clitic doubled high applicative and it lexicalizes the relation to which the argument stands to the event. On the other hand, the clitic doubled frame does not lexicalize a particular relation, but merely relates a high argument to the event. This ambiguity as to the exact interpretation of the relation is demonstrated in the translation of each applicativized example:

(66) Az *mu* vze-x tajno kolelo-(to) na momče-to.
I.NOM he.DAT take-Past.1SG secretly bicycle-(the) on boy-the
'I secretly took a/the bicycle from a boy (that might or might not belong to him).’ But also: 'I secretly took a/the bicycle for a boy’

(67) Az vze-x tajno kolelo-(to) ot momče-to.
I.NOM take-Past.1SG secretly bicycle-(the) from boy-the
'I secretly took the/a bicycle from the boy.’

(68) Az vze-x tajno kolelo-(to) za momče-to.
I.NOM take-Past.1SG secretly bicycle-(the) for boy-the
'I secretly took the/a bicycle for the boy.’

(69) Az *mu* sčupi-x radio-(to) na momče-to.
I.NOM he.DAT brake-Past.1SG radio-(the) on boy-the
'I broke the/a radio to the boy (that might or might not belong to him). But also: I broke the/a radio to the boy to affect him (positively or negatively).

(70) Az sčupi-x radio-(to) na momče-to.
I.NOM he.DAT brake-Past.1SG radio-(the) at boy-the
'I broke the/a radio of the boy.’

(71) Az sčupi-x radio-(to) za momče-to.
I.NOM he.DAT brake-Past.1SG radio-(the) for boy-the
'I broke the/a radio for the boy.’

Pylkkänen’s (2002) diagnostics for justifying a theoretical distinction between *High* and *Low* applicative heads is the inability of low applicatives to occur with unergative and stative predicates:
a. **Diagnostics 1: Transitivity Restrictions** Only high applicative heads should be able to combine with unergatives. Since a low applicative head denotes a relation between the direct and the indirect object, it cannot appear in a structure that lacks a direct object.

b. **Diagnostics 2: Verb Semantics** Since low applicatives imply a transfer of possession, they make no sense with verbs that are completely static [...] High applicatives, on the other hand, should have no problem combining with verbs such as *hold*: it is perfectly plausible that somebody would benefit from a bag holding event.

This restriction derives from Pyllkänen's (2002) own theoretical proposal that low applicatives obligatorily denote possession and as such cannot occur in structures that lack a direct object. For applicativization in Bulgarian to apply, however, one doesn't need to have an internal argument. The following set of data represent unergative constructions with perfectly grammatical dative applicative arguments. In all of these data, the interpretation of the applicativized argument derives either from the meaning of the verb or from the context. This means that the added argument might stand either in a 'beneficiary' or in a 'malefactive' relation to the event depending on the overall meaning of the event. Crucially, the dative is part of the event:

(73)   
Az vik-ax.    
I.NOM yell-Past.1SG    
'I was yelling.'

(74)   
Az mu vik-ax na momče-to.    
I.NOM he.DAT yell-Past.1SG to boy-the    
'I was yelling at the boy.' (might be simply talking in high voice or being angry at the boy)

(75)   
Az jad-ox.    
I.NOM eat-Past.1SG    
'I was eating.'
Az mu jadox-x na momče-to.
I.NOM he.DAT eat-Past.1SG to boy-the
'I ate for the boy.' (might be because he didn’t want to upset his mother, and I helped him by eating his food)

Az kixn-ax.
I.NOM sneeze-Past.1SG
'I sneezed.'

Az mu kixna-x na momče-to
I.NOM he.DAT sneeze-Past.1SG to boy-the
'I sneezed at the boy,' (might be by accident, might be on purpose)

In addition to unergative events, applicativization in Bulgarian applies also to transitive events with static interpretation, such as events of holding or events that denote physical or psychological perception:

Az mu dårž-ax kolelo-(to) na momče-to
I.NOM he.DAT hold-Past.1SG bicycle-the to boy-the
'I held the/a bicycle to the boy.' (might be of his possession, or the holding event was to affect him (positively or negatively))

Az mu vidja-x novo-(to) kolelo na momče-to
I.NOM he.DAT see-Past.1SG new-(the) bicycle on boy-the
'I saw the/a new bicycle to the boy.' (might be of his possession, or the seeing event was to affect him (positively or negatively))

In other words, the alternation between clitic doubled and prepositional phrases in Bulgarian goes well beyond the DOC alternation in English. The high dative in Bulgarian is possible to apply to the eventive syntax and is able to add a participant without restriction to the lexical semantics of verb (statve vs. active) or to the predicative structure (unergative or transitive). This is in line with the proposal that applicativization in Bulgarian applies at the periphery. Throughout the empirical data, we see that the language utilizes the dative clitic in a very systematic way and reliably correlates the clitic to a structural frame that mimics the English DOC frame but is crucially applying higher.
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Two more arguments support the applicative proposal for Bulgarian clitic-doubled frames. The first arguments comes from *idiomatic expressions.* In English, both the DOC frame and the PDC frame support idiomatic expressions that are specific to each frame (Larson 1988 among others). If the Bulgarian clitic doubled structure does not derive from the cliticless structure, distinct idiomatic expressions should be available in the language. The second argument comes from the failure of *nominalization.* In English, the DOC frame fails to nominalize, whereas the PDC frame is acceptable in deverbal nominal structures (Kayne 1984, Pesetsky 1995). If the clitic doubled structure does not derive from the cliticless structure, we should be able to observe similar asymmetries between clitic and cliticless constructions in Bulgarian.

### 3.3.1 Availability of idiomatic expressions

In the literature on raising and control constructions, the availability and the lack of idiosyncratic idiomatic meaning has been used as a straightforward test for differentiating between distinct syntactic structures. The idea is that in constructions that create idiomatic reading, the elements that participate in the idiom must have started the syntactic derivation as a constituent. In Larson 1988, the formation of idiomatic expressions has been taken as indication of first phase formation. Bruening 2010, formalizes the process of idiom formation and proposes that idiomatic interpretation is regulated by the general principle of composition:

\[ (81) \quad \text{The Principle of Idiomatic Interpretation:} \]

\[ X \text{ and } Y \text{ may be interpreted idiomatically only if } X \text{ selects } Y. \]

This principle in conjunction with the theory that external arguments are introduced by a separate functional head (be it little v or Voice) predicts the observation that there is a large class of idioms that hold between a verb and the direct object (*kick the bucket, pull strings*). By contrast, there are no idioms that hold between the subject argument and the verb to the exclusion of the direct object (*The shit hit *(the fan))* (Postal 1974). The argument is that since the functional head of the
subject arguments selects a VP, all of the VP internal arguments must be part of the idiom. On the other hand, as the V-head does not select for the functional head of the subject, the subject argument is not predicted to be part of a V-DO idiom.

If selection indeed controls the formation of idiomatic expressions, then a number of lexical relations that produce idiomatic readings between the verb and one of its arguments in ditransitives can be taken in support of the applicative approach to DOCs. Larson (1988) observes that the English DOC frame supports idiomatic expressions that do not include the indirect object:

(82) DOC: [V-DO] idiomatic meaning:
   a. Felix gave John the boot.
   b. Max gave John the creeps.

On the other hand, the PDC frame supports idiomatic expressions that exclude the direct object:

(83) PDC: [V-PP] idiomatic meaning:
   a. Felix threw Oskar to the wolves.
   b. Max carries this to the extreme.
   c. Max sent him to the showers.

A set of idioms specific to the PDC frame hold between the verb and the theme argument (give rise to X, give birth to X, throw the book at X). According to Bruening (2010) this option is possible and predicted by the selection principle (see Bruening 2010:535 for details). Crucially, there are no idioms that hold between the verb and the IO argument in the DOC frame, i.e. there are no idioms of the type ‘Felix threw the wolves Oskar’. This gap suggests that the IO argument of the DOC frame is externally introduced to the VP, i.e. the V-head does not select for the head responsible for the introduction of the IO argument. In other words, the gap of IO-Verb idioms in DOC constructions parallels the gap of Subject-Verb idioms in transitive constructions.

Turning to Bulgarian, the language supports a set of idiomatic expressions that
are specific to the clitic-doubled frames. The following is a selection of several idiomatic expressions of the type "teach X a lesson". Note that the idiom arises with an activity verb (give) as well as with a static verb (see). Crucially, when the na-marked argument is clitic-doubled, the idiom holds between the verb and the direct object. The same phrase fails to produce idiomatic expression in the absence of the clitic:

(84) Ivan *(im) dade urok na kradi-te
    Ivan they.DAT give.3SG lesson to robbers-the
    'Ivan taught the robbers a lesson'

(85) Ivan *(im) razkaza igra-ta na kradi-te
    Ivan they.DAT told.3SG game-the to robbers-the
    'Ivan taught the robbers a lesson'

(86) Ivan *(im) vidja smetka-ta na kradi-te
    Ivan they.DAT saw.3SG final-bill-the to robbers-the
    'Ivan taught the robbers a lesson'

Note that the data above demonstrate just one of all possible surface orders. Scrambling and focus dislocations do not obscure the idiomatic meaning:

(87) Az IGRA-TA *(im) razkazax na kradi-te
    I.NOM game-the they.DAT told.1SG to robbers-the
    'I taught the robbers a LESSON'

(88) Az na KRADI-TE *(im) razakazax igra-ta
    I.NOM to robbers-the they.DAT told.1SG game-the
    'I taught THE ROBBERS a lesson'

In the absence of the clitic, on the other hand, the idiomatic reading teach X a lesson is lost. As exemplified below, the structure produces only a literal meaning:

(89) Az razkazax igra na kradcite
    I.NOM tell-Past.1SG game to robbers
    Lit. 'Ivan explained a game to the robbers' / 'Ivan taught the robbers a lesson'
The availability of clitic doubled idioms that hold between the verb and the direct object is in line with the proposal that the V-head selects the DO as its complement whereas the clitic doubled IO is introduced by a higher functional head. The idiomatic expression is created at the level of the VP as a result of lexical selection between the V-head and the DO. The clitic doubled argument is not part of the idiom since it is added later and is crucially not selected by the V-head.

Like English, Bulgarian also supports V-PP clausal idiomatic expressions that crucially occur without a clitic:

(91) Ivan xwårli ideja-ta na pseta-ta.
Ivan threw.3SG idea-the to hounds-the
'Ivan wasted the idea'

(92) Ivan prati Petår za zelen xajver.
Ivan.NOM sent.3SG Peter for green caviar
'Ivan sent Peter on a wild goose chase'

(93) vsičko otide na vjat-r-a.
everything go-Past.3SG to wind-the
'Everything is wasted'

Whereas clitic doubled idioms exist, here a clitic changes the idiom into to a literal meaning, which in this case fails to produce meaning due to pragmatics:

(94) *Ivan im xwårli ideja-ta na pseta-ta.
Ivan theyDAT threw.3SG idea-the to hounds-the
Intended: 'Ivan threw the dogs the idea' /*'Ivan wasted the idea'

(95) *vsičko mu otide na vjat-r-a.
everything go-Past.3SG to wind-the
Intended: 'Everything went to the wind' /*'Everything is wasted'

We hold that Bulgarian has (at least) two types of idioms in ditransitives. When a clitic is involved, a ditransitive produces V-DO idioms, whereas in the absence
of a dative clitic, we find idioms that hold between the verb and the prepositional IO. Assuming that the creation of idiomatic expressions is controlled by the general structure building rule of Select, the presence of clitic doubled idioms that fail in clitic-less constructions supports the proposal that clitic-doubled arguments are not prepositionally licensed arguments. Basically, the idiomatic expressions demonstrate that the bottom part of the two ditransitive frames look like the following:

\[
\text{[PDC idiom: } \text{otide na vjatāra } 'wasted'\text{]} \\
\begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{VP} \\
\end{array} \\
\begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{(DP) V'} \\
\end{array} \\
\begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{V PP} \\
\end{array} \\
\begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{P na DP vjatāra} \\
\end{array}
\end{array}
\end{array}
\end{array}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\text{[DOC idiom: } \text{razkazax im igrata } 'taught a lesson'\text{]} \\
\begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{(DP) v'} \\
\end{array} \\
\begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{v V'} \\
\end{array} \\
\begin{array}{c}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{V DP igrata} \\
\end{array}
\end{array}
\end{array}
\end{array}
\]

3.3.2 Failure to nominalize

My final argument in support of my proposal to treat clitic-doubled ditransitives as high Applicative head comes from nominalization. Based on a observation made originally by Kayne (1984) and extensively discussed in Pesetsky 1995, English double
object di-transitives fail to be nominalized, whereas PDC are able to nominalize.

As observed by Kayne (1984), a clausal DOC construction, as the one below, does not permit nominalization. More concretely, the argument 'Mary' cannot be included under a derived nominal. The construction fails if we try to mark Mary with the relational preposition of. On the other hand, if we try to mark 'Mary' with the Saxon 's, then 'Mary' ends up with an 'agentive/possessive' interpretation, but crucially not a 'recipient' interpretation:

(96)  'Sue presented Mary a medal'.
  a. *[DP the presentation of Mary of a medal (by Sue)]
  b. *[DP Mary's presentation of a medal (by Sue)]

On the other hand, a prepositional ditransitives preserves the original interpretation of the PP argument under nominalization. The argument 'Mary' is understood as the 'recipient/goal' argument of the event and this meaning is preserved under a derived nominal:

(97)  'Sue presented a medal to Mary'.
  a. [DP the presentation of a medal to Mary (by Sue)]
  b. [DP A medal's presentation to Mary (by Sue)]

The same observation holds also for Bulgarian. Prepositional IO arguments (be it the na preposition or another) are included as full arguments in a derived nominal expression and their meaning is preserved:

(98)  Az dav-am knigi na deca-ta.
     I.NOM give-Pres.1SG books to children-the
     'I give books to the children'

(99)  [DP dava-ne-to na knigi na deca-ta (ot men)]
     [DP give-N-the of books to/za children-the (by me)]
     'The giving of books to the children (by me)'
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On the other hand, clausal constructions that involve the dative clitic systematically fail to nominalize under the same meaning:

(102) Az им dav-am knigi на деца-ta
     I.NOM they.DAT give-Pres.1SG books to children-the
     'I give the children books'

(103) *[DP dava-ne-to им на knigi на decata (ot men)]
     [DP give-N-the they.dat of books of children-the (by me)]
     '*The giving of the children of books (by me)'

Note that Bulgarian supports dative clitic doubled arguments with nominalizations (see chapter 5). Therefore, one cannot argue that dative clitics are independently impossible with nominalizations in the language. The failure of the above nominalization demonstrates that an applicativized ditransitive cannot nominalize. In other words, if one is applicativizing the event of 'giving' or the event of 'sneezing' and thus relating an argument directly to the event, one cannot nominalize the constructions.

As far as I know, there are two theoretical explanations as to why a deverbal nominalization fails with a DOC frame but is successful with a PDC frame. One account to the failure of nominalization is based on Selectional Incompatibility (Marantz 1997), the other account offers a morphological solution (Pesetsky 1996).
Marantz (1997) proposes that the inability of DOCs to nominalize is a result of a selectional incompatibility between the nominalizing head NOM and its complement. According to this account, in the PDC frame the N(inalizing) head select a VP and since the DO and the PP argument are direct argument of the V-head, the structural relation is inherited into the derived nominal and the meaning is preserved. In English, the verb moves to NOM and incorporates and the DO argument receives a Last Resort genitive of marker:

\[(106) \quad \text{Nominalization of Prepositional Ditransitive}\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
[\text{NP}] \\
\downarrow \\
\text{N} & [\text{VP}] \\
\downarrow \\
\text{DPtheme} & v' \\
\downarrow \\
\text{V} & \text{PP} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{P} & \text{DPgoal}
\end{array}
\]

In the DOC frame, on the other hand, the N-head would be selecting the ApplP as its complement (as this is the phrase in which the IO is introduced). A selectional incompatibility between N-head and APPLP is then proposed as the solution as to why DOCs fail to produce grammatical nominalzation:
A morphological treatment of the failure of deverbal nominalization is advanced in Pesetsky 1996, who follows Myers (1984), and proposes that affixation of a (functional) \textit{Zero morpheme}, which he calls G(oal) prevents any further derivation:

\begin{equation}
\text{Myer's Generalization: Zero-derived words do not permit affixation of further derivational morphemes.}
\end{equation}

According to Pesetsky (1996), the ill-formed nominals are a direct result of the availability of the zero G head that is responsible for the licensing of the Theme argument in Pesetsky’s (1996) analysis of DOCs. The proposal is that the G-head in the DOC frame undergoes incorporation into the verb, thus instantiating a zero-derived word and hence it cannot undergo further derivational processes such as nominalization. On the other hand, the PDC frame does not include a zero-morpheme, hence there is nothing to prevent its nominalization. On this account, there are two different verbs derived in syntax, one for the double object, the other for the dative construction:

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textit{give}$_1$ $[G[V]]$: double object construction
  \item \textit{give}$_2$ $[V]$: dative construction
\end{itemize}
Though somewhat different in structure, Pesetsky's approach to the two ditransitive constructions is comparable to the applicative head approach in one crucial fact: both approaches assume a phonologically null head in the DOC frame. Under the applicative account, the goal/benefactor is included into the structure, via a zero applicative head that is affixed to the verb. A secondary derivation such as nominalization is then predicted to fail:

\[
*[[[send books v] 0 John APPL] N n]
\]

On the other hand, as the PDC frame does not involve functional affixation, an additional nominal derivation is predicted to be possible:

\[
[[send books to John v] N n]
\]

Miyagawa (2012b) proposes an analysis of Japanese nominalizations, by similarly combing the applicative account of DOCs with the hypothesis of zero head derivation. The failure of *kata nominalizations is, according to Miyagawa, a direct evidence for the presence of APPL in DOCs, whereas the successful *kata nominalizations is
evidence for the absence of APPL. Observe that in the successful -kata nominalizations, the argument 'John' is marked by a prepositional phrase -e 'to', whereas in the unsuccessful nominalization, a prepositional phrase is absent:

(14) *Hanako-no John-no MIT-no susume-kata.
    Hanako-GEN John-GEN MIT-GEN recommend-way
    Intended: 'Hanako’s way of recommending MIT to John’:

(15) Hanako-no John-e-no MIT-no susume-kata.
    Hanako-GEN John-to-GEN MIT-GEN recommend-way
    'Hanako’s way of recommending MIT to John’

Both Pesetsky’s morphological account as well as Marantz’ and Miyagawa’s structural account capture the asymmetry between DOC and PDC nominalizations. Furthermore, both proposals assume that the failure to nominalize is the presence of an additional functional morpheme/head. A more fundamental explanation as to why the functional head prevents further derivation is still open and depends more or less on the approach one takes. For the current purpose of relating the Bulgarian clitic doubled ditransitive frame to the English DOC frame, however, it suffices to confirm that clitic doubled ditransitives in Bulgarian results in structural asymmetries that cannot be reduced to an analysis that assumes a derivational link between a clitic doubled and a cliticless construction.

Arguments form binding, scope, idiom formation, and nominalization all support the current proposal that clitic doubled structures do not derive from cliticless prepositional phrases in Bulgarian.

In the next chapter I turn to study the syntax of predicative constructions that obligatorily take dative subjects and I demonstrate that these are the exact same peripheral applicative arguments. The fact that Bulgarian has an applicative head that attaches at the periphery of a domain allows the language to use this process as a productive tool of adding/introducing arguments to a predicative construction.

However, before I move to the syntax of 'quirky' (dative) subjects, I want to turn to the morpho-syntactic nature of the na preposition. One major cross-linguistic distinction between English DOCs and Bulgarian applicatives is the way the two
languages mark the object arguments in their applicative frames. In English, the two object arguments of are morphologically realized as two DPs, whereas in Bulgarian the applicative argument is always marked with the dative clitic and the preposition *na*, which resembles the *na* preposition of locative constructions. Since, however, I am claiming that clitic doubled *na*-phrases do not derive from prepositional ditransitives, I turn in the next section to the morpho-syntactic status of the *na* preposition and I demonstrate that the Bulgarian *na* preposition has a double life. Crucially, it is not an instance of a lexical preposition when co-occurring with a dative clitic, but the realization of morphological dative Case.

3.4 On the status of the *na*-preposition

3.4.1 Clitic-marked *na* is not preposition

An observation made in Slavkov (2008) is that prepositional ditransitives are only licit in the absence of the dative clitic. In other words, true prepositional Goal argument are ungrammatical in the clitic-doubled (DOC) ditransitives:

    send-Past.3PL he.DAT letter to minister-the  
    'They sent a letter to the minister'

(117) Dado-xa (*mu) kniga za dete-to.  
    give-Past.3PL he.DAT book for child-the  
    'They gave a book for the child'

(118) Složi-xa (*mu) zaxar v čaja.  
    put-Past.3PL he.DAT sugar in tea-the.  
    'They put sugar in the tea.'

On the other hand, in the presence of the dative clitic the Goal argument must be marked with the what looks like a locative preposition *na* 'at':

(119) Te mu izprati-xa pismo *(na) ministâr-a*  
    TheyNOM send-Past.3PL letter to minister-the  
    'They sent the minister a letter.'
Crucially, when *na* appears in a variant without a dative clitic, it behaves as a true directional preposition as it can express true locative goals:

(120) Te (*mu) izprati-xa pismo *(na) ministerstvo-to
TheyNOM he.DAT send-Past.3PL letter to ministry-the
'They sent a letter to the ministry.'

(121) Te (*mu) složi-xa kniga *(na) škavče-to
TheyNOM it.DAT put-Past.3PL book on drawer-the
'They put a book on the drawer.'

Similar observations have been made for Spanish, as well. The Goal argument of dative clitic marked ditransitives must be marked with the preposition a, whereas true prepositional phrases cannot co-occur with a dative clitic (Cuervo 2003:38):

(122) El policía le asutaba *(a) ella.
the police.NOM CL.nom frightened her.DAT
'The police was frightening to her'

(123) Nada (*le) funciona sin ella.
nothing CL.DAT works without her.DAT
'Nothing works without her'

Crucially, the *a* marker can also serve as a true locational preposition and when it does so, a clitic is not possible:

(124) Hugo (*le) devolvió los libros a la biblioteca.
Hugo CL.DAT returned the books to the library
'Hugo returned the books to the library.'

Such requirement of an argument marker is also observed in Japanese ditransitives, where the postposition -ni obligatory co-occurs with the goal argument independent of whether the ditransitive construction is a double object or a locative prepositional ditransitive (Miyagawa and Tsujioka 1997):

(125) Sansei-ga gakusei-ni tegami-o okutta.
teacher-NOM students-NI letter-ACC sent
'The teacher sent two students a letter.'
Daitooryoo-ga kokkyoo-ni heitai-o okutta.
'President sent two soldiers to the border'

In fact, Miyagawa and Tsujioka (1997) argue that the -ni-marked phrase is in fact a Case-marked NP rather than a PP in the double object frame. Their argument is supported with evidence from classifier extraction that is possible out of bare nominal expressions and out of -ni marked double objects, but is otherwise blocked with (locational) prepositional phrases:

Sansei-ga gakusei-ni futa-ri tegami-o okutta.
'The teacher sent two students a letter'

Daitooryoo-ga kokkyoo-ni (*futa-tu) heitai-o okutta.
'The president sent two soldiers to the border'

Such numeral or quantifier extraction is not reproducible in Bulgarian, but I present two pieces of evidence that suggest that the Bulgarian na-marker has a double life in the grammar of Modern Bulgarian. Evidence from lack of distributive meaning under coordination and possibility of na-drop under adjacency suggest that na serves as a morphological Case realization in the clitic doubled DOC frame. On the other hand, na serves also as a true lexical preposition in clitic-less locative constructions.

3.4.2 Lack of distributive meaning under coordination

Jaeggli (1982) argues that à-marked indirect object arguments in French are NPs rather than PPs, because different than lexical prepositions which can take coordinated bare NPs as a complement, à cannot be omitted under coordination in French:

Ils ont parlé [à Marie et *(à) Paul].
'They have talked to Mary and to Paul.'
Cuervo (2003), demonstrates that Spanish a behaves like French à, but only in combination with the dative clitic. In the absence of a dative clitic, Spanish a behaves like a lexical preposition in terms of distributive meaning:

(131) Pablo les compró un regalo [á-Valeria y *(á)-la hija].
    Pablo.NOM they.dat bought.3SG a present Valeria.DAT and the.DAT daughter
    'Pablo bought Valeria and her daughter a present.'

(132) Pablo compró un regalo [á-Valeria y la hija].
    Pablo.NOM bought.3SG a present Valeria.DAT and the daughter
    'Pablo bought a present to Valeria and her daughter.'

Turning to Bulgarian, we have evidence that the French and especially the clitic doubled Spanish pattern is reproducible with clitic doubled frame. Observe first, that when we quantify an indefinite argument over two coordinated prepositional phrases, we obtain a distributive interpretation in Bulgarian:

(133) Toj vze edno pismo [ot direktora i ot men]
    He.NOM take-Past.3SG one letter from director-the and from me
    'He took a letter from the director and from me' (i.e. two separate letters has been taken)

Under coordination, one of the lexical prepositions can also be omitted. The reading we obtain, however, is a non-distributive interpretation:

(134) Toj vze edno pismo [ot [direktora i men]
    He.NOM took.3SG one letter from director-the and me
    'He took a letter from the director and me' (i.e. one letters has been taken)

Similar contrast in the distributive reading holds also for coordination of two cliticless na-marked phrases:
Surely, if the pragmatics is such that one cannot obtain a plausible distributive meaning (for example planting a kiss on two different people), we observe a contrast in the acceptability of the construction. Nevertheless, we can conclude that cliticless na behaves just like the lexical preposition in this case:

This establishes that na behaves like a lexical preposition with a locative meaning 'on'/at' in the absence of a clitic.
Compare the above non-distributive interpretation with the interpretation of a quantified subject over two coordinated direct objects:

(141) Endo dete vidja [director-a] i [men]
    one child saw director-the and me
    'One (specific) child saw the director and me'

The 'planting of one kiss on two people' example is pragmatically odd exactly as it is in the coordination data of prepositional phrases with one preposition:

(142) #Toj ni lepna edna celuvka [(na) direktora] i [(na) men]
    He.NOM us.DAT planted.3SG a kiss to director-the and to me
    # 'He planted a kiss on the director and me' (i.e. intended is the pragmatically odd reading of one kiss planted on two different people)

Note, that the only way a clitic-doubled coordinated phrase can obtain a distributive meaning in Bulgarian is by marking the quantified direct object with the overt (Slavic) distributive operator po 'each', which is an alternative syntactic mechanism for creating the distributive semantics and should not be considered as a relevant diagnostics:

(143) Toj ni izprati po edno pismo [na direktora] i [na men]
    He.NOM us.DAT sent.3SG each one letter to director-the and to me
    'He send the director and me each letter'

In the case of the coordinated datives, there is simply no distributive reading available as the expression 'one letter' could have never originated from within two prepositional
phrases.

In the absence of a clitic, we have seen that *na* behaves as a lexical preposition that can be dropped under coordination to produce two distinct interpretations. Under the clitic doubled frame *na* cannot be dropped and it does not allow for a distributive reading. There is, however, one particular environment in which the Case marker *na* can be dropped.

### 3.4.3 *na*-drop in colloquial registers

In Vakareliyska (1994, 2002) and discussed also in Slavkov (2008), colloquial registers of Bulgarian are shown to have a high tolerance for *na*-drop in combination with the dative clitic, but disallow *na*-drop in the absence of the clitic:

(144) \begin{align*}
(\text{Na}) & \quad \text{Ivan} & \text{mu} & \text{dado-x} & \text{knigi.} \\
\text{(to)} & \quad \text{Ivan} & \text{heDAT} & \text{give-Past.1SG books} \\
\end{align*}
'I gave Ivan books'

(145) \begin{align*}
*(\text{na}) & \quad \text{Ivan} & \text{dado-x} & \text{knigi.} \\
\text{to} & \quad \text{Ivan} & \text{give-Past.1SG books} \\
\end{align*}
'I gave the books to Ivan'

(146) \begin{align*}
(\text{Na}) & \quad \text{men} & \text{mi} & \text{kaza-xa, } & \text{če...} \\
\text{(to)} & \quad \text{me} & \text{IDAT} & \text{said-Past.3PL, that...} \\
\end{align*}
'They told me that...'

(147) \begin{align*}
*(\text{na}) & \quad \text{men} & \text{kaza-xa, } & \text{če...} \\
\text{to} & \quad \text{me} & \text{be.PL} & \text{said.PL, that...} \\
\end{align*}
'They told to me that...'

Idiomatic reading is also preserved under a *na*-drop:

(148) \begin{align*}
(\text{Na}) & \quad \text{kradci-te} & *(\text{im}) & \text{razakazax} & \text{igra-ta} \\
\text{(to)} & \quad \text{robbers-the} & \text{they.DAT} & \text{told.1SG game-the} \\
\end{align*}
'I taught the robbers a lesson'
Wh-phrases also allow *na-drop under adjacency:

\[(149) \quad (Na) \text{ koj } \text{ mu} \quad \text{ dado-x } \quad \text{ knigi?} \]
\[(to) \quad \text{ who} \quad \text{ heDAT} \quad \text{ give-Past.1SG} \quad \text{ books} \]

'Whom did I give books to?'

Crucially, *na-drop is only possible when the argument is directly adjacent to the clitic-marked verb as in the data above. If the argument is pronounced at right edge, or if there is an overt pre-verbal subject argument that splits the dative argument from the clitic-marked verb, the *na-marker becomes obligatory:

\[(150) \quad \text{ Izprati-xa } \quad \text{ mu } \quad \text{ vednaga } \quad \text{ pismo} \quad *(\text{na}) \quad \text{ ministār-a.} \]
\[\text{ sent-Past.3PL } \quad \text{ he.DAT} \quad \text{ immediately} \quad \text{ letter} \quad \text{ to minister-the} \]

'They have immediately send the minister a letter.'

\[(151) \quad *(\text{na}) \quad \text{ ministār-a } \quad \text{ te } \quad \text{ mu } \quad \text{ izprati-xa } \quad \text{ vednaga } \quad \text{ pismo.} \]
\[\text{ to minister-the they.NOM} \quad \text{ he.DAT} \quad \text{ sent-Past.3PL} \quad \text{ immediately} \quad \text{ letter} \]

'They have immediately send the minister a letter.'

To sum up the observations, *na-drop is possible only in the clitic-doubled construction and it is possible only under strict adjacency to the clitic-marked verb. Why adjacency is an obligatory pre-requisite for the phenomenon to occur is very intriguing and I do not attempt to offer a solution here. However, note that a similar "case drop" phenomenon has been recorded also for informal registers of Japanese (Miyagawa et al. 2018 and references), where speakers allow the drop of the morphological accusative case marker -o under strict adjacency to the verb:

\[(152) \quad \text{ Mariko-ga } \quad \text{nani(-o) } \quad \text{katta } \quad \text{ no?} \]
\[\text{ Mariko-NOM} \quad \text{ what(-ACC)} \quad \text{ bought} \quad \text{ Q} \]

'What did Mariko buy?'

\[(153) \quad \text{ Nani*(-o) } \quad \text{ Mariko-ga } \quad \text{katta } \quad \text{ no?} \]
\[\text{ what-ACC} \quad \text{ Mariko-NOM} \quad \text{ bought} \quad \text{ Q} \]

'What did Mariko buy?'

The research question, as to why adjacency is a factor that allows the drop of morphological Case is theoretically still unclear and an explanation remains open.
For our current purposes it suffices to demonstrate that na-drop correlates with the clitic-marked frame, for which I claim is an applicative frame. It also correlates with the fact that these na-marked arguments are DP rather than PPs.

3.4.4 Clitic-marked na as a post-syntactic repair

An alternative to treating na as realization of Case is to treat it as a post-syntactic morphological repair. In the clitic doubled frame, na seems optional under adjacency - an environment that allows easy syntactic coding as to the structural position and role of the applicative argument. Note that in English double object constructions, the Goal is not marked with Case or preposition and is obligatory adjacent to the verb:

(154) English DOC
     a. ?John gave Mary yesterday the book.
     b. *John gave yesterday Mary the book.

If we assume that na is actually absent in the DOC frame and is only realized when the argument is pronounced in non-local dislocated positions at the edges, we allow for a different viewpoint at the phenomenon.

It is not uncommon that prepositions are used as post-syntactic repairs across languages. Bruening (2010a) demonstrates that post-syntactic repairs with a preposition are possible even in English double object constructions. The argument for that comes from idiomatic expressions and constructions with heavy NPs. For example, idioms of the type give X the creeps are taken to invariably represent DOCs, as they fail to produce an idiomatic reading with the Prepositional frame *give the creeps to X.

(155) English idiomatic expressions
     a. Stories like this give [people] [the creeps] (DOC)
     b. *Stories like this give [the creeps] [to people] (PDC)
Yet, as reported in Bresnan et al. 2007, when the ‘recipient’ argument is too long and prosodically heavy, it gets pronounced to the left and is marked obligatorily with the to preposition.

(156) Stories like this must give [the creeps] [to people whose idea of heaven is a world without religion.]

Crucially, Bruening (2010a) demonstrates that in spite of the preposition, the structure patterns with DOCs in terms of scope and locative inversion:

(157) English idiomatic expressions

a. The bosses denied [some applicant] [every position] (DOC *every >> a)
b. The bosses denied [some position] [to every applicant] (PDC every >> a)
c. The boss denied [every position] [to some applicant or other from within the bureau] (DOC with heavy NP-shift *every >> a)

As a result, Bruening (2010a) proposes that in the case of heavy NP shift, the applicative argument moves to a rightward specifier. Following Bruening (2010) in conjunction with the na-drop data, one could then propose that na represents a form of syntactically inert repair that marks the dative argument. Crucially, na does not serve as a lexical preposition in the clitic doubled frame as it does not allow distributive meaning under coordination.

To sum up, this section demonstrated that the preposition na has a double life in the grammar of Modern Bulgarian. In the absence of a dative clitic, na-marked phrases are PPs, whereas in the presence of the dative clitic, na-marked phrases are DPs. The fact that the clitic can co-occur only with na and not with other prepositions was presented as the first clue that there is a close correlation between the two elements. Evidence from Spanish double object constructions, confirmed that such a correlation between a dative clitic and a prepositional-like element is not unique to Bulgarian. In addition, the Bulgarian coordination data further accredit
the hypothesis that under the clitic-marked frame the coordinated arguments are DPs rather than prepositional phrases.

The questions of whether the na-marker in Bulgarian applicative frame is the realization of morphological Case (Miyagawa et al 2018) or a form of post-syntactic repair (Bruening 2010a) has been left for future research.
Chapter 4

The Dative 'quirky' Subjects in Bulgarian

In this chapter I offer a description of the morphosyntax of several constructions which obligatorily take dative clitic doubled arguments as their logical subjects and I discuss their distribution and interpretation from the perspective of the applicative account of argument structure.

Cross-linguistically, constructions in which oblique arguments serve as subject-like arguments are not uncommon (e.g. Icelandic, Latin, German, Polish, Russian, Laz and some South Asian languages among others). In the literature, these oblique subject-like arguments are referred to as quasi-subjects, logical subjects, impersonal subjects, or quirky subjects. The research question that I am pursuing in this chapter is whether these quirky subjects constructions are reducible to the process of applicativization in Bulgarian and if yes, what in the grammar of Bulgarian allows is to employ the process of applicativization in such a productive way.

In what follows, I introduce three sets of structural environments in which Bulgarian employs dative clitic doubled subjects, and demonstrate that the dative arguments of all three environments share the morpho-syntactic properties of the applicative arguments in the DOC frame. Thus, at least for Bulgarian, we are able to reduce the distribution of the 'quirky' subjects to the process of peripheral applicativization.

In the previous chapters I argued for the availability of a DOC frame in Bulgarian,
in which dative clitic doubled arguments are introduced in the specifier of a functional head that selects for the vP complement. Here I will demonstrate that in all of the constructions in which the subject is obligatory dative in Bulgarian, the predicative structure is such that no (nominative) external argument can be introduced. The peripheral dative applicative serves as a structural subject with the consequence that it is also semantically understood as a 'logical' subject.

The major difference being that whereas in a (di)transitive the peripheral applicative is used as an alternative way of adding a high 'recipient/beneficiary' argument to the event, here the peripheral applicative is used as an alternative way of adding a subject argument to an otherwise impersonal event/state predicate. The twist is that nominal subject are directly predicated over by the event/state and thus understood as the direct participants, the dative subjects, on the other hand, are 'related' to the event/state via the high APPL head. Thus the semantics interprets these subjects as standing in 'some' plausible relation to the event/state.

Crucially these clitic doubled dative subjects share several fundamental properties with the clitic doubled datives of ditransitives - they scope over and bind any available argument and the construction fails to nominalize.

4.1 The dative subject constructions

In the following, I test the structural properties of dative arguments of three Bulgarian constructions.

I first begin with a very productive set of Bulgarian impersonal clausal constructions, in which the predicate is obligatorily marked with a SE-morpheme and the dative argument is understood as a 'feel like/experiencer' subject of the event. In the literature of Polish, these constructions are also called 'Involuntary State Constructions' (Rivero et al 2010):
Se-marked impersonal transitive event predicates:

1. (na Ivan) mu *(se) risuvat kartini.
   on Ivan he.DAT SE paint.PL painting.PL
   'Ivan feels like painting paintings'

2. (na Ivan) mu *(se) tancuvat narodni tanci.
   to Ivan he.DAT SE dance.PL folk.PL dance.PL
   'Ivan feels like dancing folk dances'

Se-marked impersonal intransitive event predicates:

3. (na studentite) im *(se) pusi.
   to student.PL they.DAT SE smoke.3SG
   'The students feel like smoking.'

4. (na studentite) im *(se) spi.
   to student.PL they.DAT SE sleep.3SG
   'The students feel like sleeping.'

The second construction is a construction with adjectival participial predicates, in which the dative subject is understood as the 'experiencer' of the state denoted by the adjectival predicate:

5. (na decata) im e toplo
   to children they.DAT Aux.3SG hot.3SG
   'The children feel hot.'

6. (na decata) im e tăţno.
   to children they.DAT Aux.3SG sad.3SG
   'The children feel sad.'

The third and final construction involves so called Circumstantial Modal Constructions (Demirok 2018), which in Bulgarian takes obligatory dative subjects. These are subjunctive da-constructions embedded under a modal such as trjabva 'must', in which the dative subject is understood as standing in some plausible relation to the eventuality. In the concrete example of 'must', the modal construction becomes interpreted rather as 'need', but it lacks crucially a root 'deontic' interpretation:
(7) (na decata) im trjabva da spat.
   to children theyDAT must.3SG to sleep.PL
'The children need to sleep.' / *'The child must sleep.'

I first demonstrate that in each of the above constructions, having a nominative subject has direct semantic implication of being directly predicated by the eventuality, whereas having a dative subject has direct semantic implications of being related to the eventuality. By doing this, I also demonstrate that the structural position of the dative subject coincides with that of the peripheral datives of the ditransitives.

In the second part of this chapter, I then move to test whether the dative subject has subject-like structural behavior. By subject-like behavior I understand the structural notion of a high externally merged argument. Finally, I demonstrate that all of the above constructions fail to nominalize exactly as the the applicativized transitive and unergative constructions fail to do so.

4.1.1 Dative subjects in SE-marked predicates

In chapter 2 I demonstrated that Bulgarian obligatorily marks active unaccusative/middle predicates events with the invariant morpheme SE. As it was also demonstrated, a crucial property of these constructions is that SE is in a complementary distribution with a nominative subject. Here are the relevant data again:

(8) vrati-te *(SE) otvarj-at.
    doors-the.PL SE open-Pers.3PL
'The doors are opening'.

(9) Az (*SE) otvarj-am vrati
    INOM (*SE) open-Pres.1SG doors
'I open doors'

The second significant property of Bulgarian is that transitive and unergative events can stand on their own and are interpreted as impersonal events, as long as they also occur with the SE morpheme. Note that these constructions can occur with an overt locative or with a non-definite temporal modifier, but they don't have to.
Since Bulgarian is a pro-drop language, there is no need for 'there'-insertion or 'it' expletive-insertion in the language:

(10)  (Tuk) *(se) spi
      (Here) SE sleep-Pres.3SG
      'Here sleeping is happening' / 'Here is for sleeping'

(11)  (Sledobed) ne *(se) spi
      (afternoon) NEG SE sleep-Pres.3SG
      'In afternoons sleeping is not happening' / 'The afternoons are not for sleeping'

(12)  (Tuk) ne *(se) tancuva-še
      Here NEG SE dance-Past.3SG
      'Here dancing never happened' / 'Here was never for dancing'

Crucially, in the absence of an internal argument, the SE-marked eventive predicate carries the default 3rd person singular agreement and inflects for tense, which shows that even though there is no expletive involved, the event is predicated over possible worlds, i.e. it is existentially closed.

In chapter 2, I took the complementary distribution between SE and the nominative argument of transitives to mean that SE is simply the morphological Spell-out of the active Voice in the absence of an external argument. Recall that I am assuming that the subject argument of transitive is the external argument directly introduced in the specifier of little v.

Let us turn now to the dative arguments in SE-marked eventive constructions. Observe that in all of the possible structures in which the dative argument is understood as a 'experiencer' subject, as shown above and repeated below, the overt SE-marker is obligatorily present. Yet, similar to active SE-marked unaccusatives, the event with the dative subject is not understood as a middle, reflexive, or passive event. That is, the direct object arguments 'paintings' and 'folk dances' in the two examples below are understood to be painted or danced by someone. As indicated in the translation, there are at least three potential readings. One is that the 'paintings' or the 'folk dances' are painted or danced for the benefit of the dative argument.
The second is that the dative argument is understood as the quasi agent, i.e. the experiencer, who would like to be the agent of the active event. The third is that the 'paintings' and the 'folk dances' stand in some 'possessive' relation to the dative 'Ivan':

(13) *(na Ivan) mu *(se) risuva-t kartini.
    to Ivan he.DAT SE paint-Pres.3PL painting.PL
    'Paintings are painted for the benefit of Ivan./'Ivan feels like painting paintings./' 'Ivan's paintings are painted.'

(14) *(na Ivan) mu *(se) tancuva-t narodni tanci.
    to Ivan he.DAT SE dance-Pres.3PL folk.PL dance.PL
    'Folk dances are danced for the benefit of Ivan./'Ivan feels like dancing folk dances./' 'Ivan's folk dances are danced.'

The question is whether these three readings 'experiencer', 'benefactive', and 'possessor' are derived from three distinct underlying syntactic structures, or whether they represent the semantic interpretation of the same structure that is the result of a semantically underspecified applicative head.

One major argument in favor of rejecting three different structures is that one cannot have more than one applicative argument in a construction. That is, despite the fact that it is plausible for a dative to be the 'benefactive' of a transitive event in which it is also the 'possessor', one cannot have two clausal datives:

(15) *(na Ivan) mu mu *(se) risuv-at kartini-te.
    to Ivan he.DAT he.DAT SE dance-Pres.3PL paintings-the
    Intended: 'Ivan's paintings are painted for the benefit of Ivan.'

The same is true for a plausible reading in which the dative is being an 'experiencer' of a transitive event in which it is also the 'possessor':

(16) *(na Ivan) mu mu *(se) risuv-at kartini-te.
    to Ivan he.DAT he.DAT SE dance-Pres.3PL paintings-the
    Intended: 'Ivan feels like painting his own paintings.'
Once again, in the presence of a nominative subject argument, the dative will be interpreted as being related to an agentive event and will receive the contextually plausible interpretation of a 'beneficiary' or 'possessor':

(17) Petar (*se) mu tancuva narodni tanci na Ivan
     Peter (*SE) he.DAT dance-Pres.3SG folk.PL dance.PL to Ivan
     'Peter dances folk dances for the benefit of Ivan'.

In the absence of a nominative subject argument, the dative might obtain in addition to plausible 'beneficiary' and 'possessor' reading, also the reading of an 'experiencer'. I take all this as evidence that the dative argument is added to an active event and that the SE morpheme is merely marking that the event was not predicated over an external agent, prior to the dative attaching to the event. The obligatory absence of SE with a nominative subject and conversely the obligatorily presence of SE with a dative 'experiencer' subject is an indicator of the structural position of the APPL head. Both, in agentive and in non-agentive/impersonal events, the peripheral APPL selects the vP and relates an argument that is then uniformly realized as a dative clitic doubled argument. Once Voice selects the applicativized vP, it gets spelled out either as SE in the case of impersonal events, or as zero in the case of agentive events:

\[
[\text{VoiceP}]
\]

\[
\text{SE-Voice} \quad [\text{APPLP}]
\]

\[
\text{DP[DATIVE]} \quad \text{APPL'}
\]

\[
\text{APPL} \quad [\text{vP}]
\]

\[
\text{v} \quad \text{VP}
\]

\[
\text{V} \quad (\text{DP})
\]
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Once again, the obligatory realization of SE in impersonal events in Bulgarian uniformly signals that an active event is realized and asserted. The dative argument is not predicated directly by the event, but is related to the impersonal event. SE is sensitive to the fact that the event is impersonal and is vacuously realized.

As we have seen, if the impersonal event has an internal argument, one might obtain possessive implication with the dative. If there is no internal argument, the dative will be interpreted either as an affected (beneficiary or malefactive) or as an experiencer argument. The exact interpretation of the dative depends on whether the lexical semantics of the verb has positive or negative connotation or whether we utter the sentence in a particular context:

(18) Puši im *(se) (na studentite).
    smoke.Pres.3SG they.DAT SE to student.PL
    'The students feel like smoking.' / 'Someone smokes at the students.'

(19) Spi im *(se) (na studentite).
    sleep.Pres.3SG they.DAT SE to student.PL
    'The students feel like sleeping.' / 'Someone sleeps for the benefit of the students.'

The dative argument has (i) the same morphological realization as the datives in the di-transitive DOC and (ii) the same structural distribution of a high applicative argument introduced by a functional head that selects for the vP. Both the SE marker and the clitic are obligatory in these impersonal eventive structures.

A SE-marked impersonal frame with a clitic-less na-marked argument is not possible in this construction, thus in line with my proposal that the arguments in the clitic-marked clausal frames are not prepositional phrases that are somehow inverted into a (high) left-edge position. As one can see, neither a post-verbal or a pre-verbal clitic-less argument is possible:

(20) *na Ivan SE spi.
    at Ivan SE sleep.Pres.3SG
    Intended: 'Ivan feels like sleeping.'
(21) *spi SE na Ivan.
sleep.Pres.3SG SE at Ivan
Intended: 'Ivan feels like sleeping.'

(22) *na Ivan SE tancuva-t narodn-i tanci.
at Ivan SE dance-Pres.PL folk-PL dance.PL
Intended: 'Ivan feels like dancing folk dances.'

(23) *tancuva-t SE narodn-i tanci na Ivan.
dance-Pres.PL SE folk-PL dance.PL at Ivan
Intended: 'Ivan feels like dancing folk dances.'

(24) The relevant generalizations of this section are:

a. when the specifier of v is filled with an external nominative argument,
   SE does not occur and APPL is interpreted as beneficiary/malefactive;

b. when the specifier of v is empty, SE occurs and APPL is interpreted also
   as experiencer;

c. when an internal argument is available, APPL is interpreted also as
   possessor;

I now turn to introduce another productive structure that obligatorily takes dative
subject arguments in Bulgarian - clausal adjectival predicates.

4.1.2 Dative subjects in Adjectival Predicates

In this subsection, I discuss clausal adjectival predicates in Bulgarian that take oblig-
atory dative subjects and are reminiscent of the pattern seen in the above impersonal
SE-marked clausal predicates.

The example below first demonstrates that adjectival predicates that denote a
state do not have to have an overt argument in Bulgarian. An expletive can optionally
be added for emphasis, but it is not required:

(25) (To) e stud-EN-o
(It) Be.Pres.3SG cold-ADJ-3SGn
'It is cold'
Even though an expletive is absent, both the adjective and the Copular BE carry the unmarked default agreement (which I am marking as 3SG throughout the dissertation). As Bulgarian does not have to fill in a structural specifier (i.e. EPP feature), such expletive is fully optional and is only used with emphatic reading.

A nominative subject in adjectival state predicates is possible and is interpreted as the carrier of the property denoted by the adjective. Crucially, both the adjective and the copular agree with the person, number and gender of the nominative argument:

(26) Te sa stud-en-i / tâž-(e)n-i.

They.NOM Be.Pres.PL cold-ADJ-PL / sad-ADJ-PL
'They are cold / sad'

When adjectival predicates take a dative argument, the dative is interpreted as being 'related to the state of being X' and roughly translates as 'DAT feels X' into English, which is very similar to the 'experiencer' interpretation of the dative subjects of impersonal SE-events. Descriptively, we observe below that, although the dative serves as a subject of the adjectival predicate, neither the Copular or the adjective agrees with the phi-features of the dative argument:

(27) (na) njakakvi deca im e stud-en-o /

to some children they.DAT Be-Pres.3SG cold-ADJ-3SGn /
tâž-(e)n-o.
sad-ADJ-3SGn
'Some children feel cold/sad.'

The morpho-syntactic pattern is familiar already; the dative subject occurs obligatorily with a clitic and it is in a complementary distribution with a nominative subject. The nominative subject controls the agreement within the predicate, whereas the dative subject occurs at the periphery and the predicate is realized with a default agreement. Once again, a clitic-less frame with a prepositionally marked argument is not possible, thus in line with my proposal that the arguments in the clitic-marked clausal frames are not prepositional phrases:
In addition, the datives allow for the familiar na-drop under adjacency exactly as it was shown to be the case in the DOC frame:

(30)  (na) nego mu e stud-en-o / tāž-(e)n-o
to him he.DAT Be.Pres.3SG cold-ADJ-3SGn / sad-ADJ-3SGn
'He feels cold/sad'

The following structural trees exemplify the distinct configurations between an adjectival state predicate with a nominative subject argument and an adjectival predicate with a peripheral dative applicative argument:

(31)  Maria e stud-EN-a.
      Maria BE.3SG cold-ADJ-3SGf.
      'Maria is cold.'
predicate (i.e. Gender/Number/Person) as well as the fact that the nominative argument is always definite in these copular constructions, I assume that the nominative argument is base generated in the specifier of the adjectival predicate in Bulgarian and subsequently moves to the specifier of the Copular v.

A dative argument, on the other hand, is introduced by the peripheral APPL that directly selects the Copular vP as its complement, thus obtaining 'experiencer' interpretation and sharing the morphosyntax of the applicatives in the active event predicates:

\[
\text{(32) (na) Maria} \text{ to Maria } \text{ she.DAT BE.3SG cold-ADJ-3SG. 'Maria feels cold.'}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{[APPLP]} \\
\text{DP[DATIVE] APPL'} \\
\text{APPL [vP]} \\
\text{v [AdjP]} \\
\text{-EN Root}
\end{array}
\]

4.1.3 Dative subjects in da-Subjunctives

The third and final structure are bi-clausal constructions with da-subjunctives\(^1\), in which the language productively utilizes the dative 'experiencer' subject again in a complementary distribution with nominative agentive subject.

\(^1\)The infinitival marker da serves as a subjunctive complementizer, similar to English to. Yet, different than English, the verb in Bulgarian subjunctives is not infinitival and it does not prevent nominative arguments from being licensed. This itself can be taken as an independent argument that nominative subjects are generated and licensed within the vP in Bulgarian.
One type of da-subjunctives occurs with modal adverbial, such as trjabva, where the alternation between a dative and a nominative subject disambiguates between matrix modal interpretation and circumstantial modal interpretation. As shown with the two minimal pairs below, the modal construction consists of a default-agreeing modal adverbial that embeds a da-subjunctive. In both structures, the subject argument occurs to the left of the modal and in both cases it controls the agreement morphology of the embedded predicate. Yet, as indicated in the translation, a nominative subject is interpreted under a matrix modal reading, whereas a dative subject is interpreted under some relevant relation to the modal:

(33) Az trjabva [da čet-a poveće knigi].
    INOM must-Pres.3SG to read-Pres.1SG more book.PL
    'I must read more books.'

(34) (na) men mi trjabva [da čet-a poveće knigi].
    to me I.DAT must-Pres.3SG to read-Pres.1SG more book.PL
    'I need to read more books.' / 'I was told to read.'

Another type of da-subjunctives occurs with regular adjectival predicates, where the alternation between a dative and a nominative subject is utilized to disambiguate between predicated subjects and 'experiencer' subjects:

(35) Az e xubavo [da čet-a poveće knigi].
    INOM BE-Pres.3SG well.3SG to read-Pres.1SG more book.PL
    'It is good for me to read more books.'

(36) (na) men mi e xubavo [da čet-a poveće
    to me I.DAT BE-Pres.3SG well.3SG to read-Pres.1SG more
    knigi].
    book.PL
    'I like to read more books.' / 'I like reading more books.'

In what follows, I argue that the subjunctive constructions with nominative subjects in Bulgarian correlate with English raising constructions, whereas the subjunctives with dative subjects correlate with English control constructions (Chomsky 1965, Chomsky 1981):
(37) Subject Raising
   a. John\textsubscript{1} seems to t\textsubscript{1} understand the problem.
   b. It seems John will understand the problem.

(38) Subject Control
   a. John tries PRO to understand the problem.
   b. *It is tried John will understand the problem.

The question is whether we have also testable structural diagnostics and evidence that would account for the divergent readings of the modal and adverbial interpretation of the Bulgarian constructions. Yes, the nominative subject, beside controlling the agreement of the lower predicate, can remain in its lower position without influencing the modal interpretation:

(39) Trjabva \[\text{da } \text{četa-t } \text{njakoi deca poveče knigi}.\]
    must.Pres.3SG to read-Pres.PL some children-the.PL more books
    'Some children must/*need read more books.'

(40) Njakoi deca-tai trjabva \[\text{da } \text{četa-t } t\textsubscript{1} poveče knigi}\]
    some children-the.PL.NOM must.Pres.3SG to read-Pres.PL t more books
    'Some children must/*need read more books.'

On the other hand, the position of the dative subject influences the overall interpretation. In the matrix position the dative argument is interpreted as the 'experiencer' subject, whereas in the subjunctive position the dative is interpreted as the 'benefactor' of an active event:

(41) (na) dete-to mu trjabva da čete poveče knigi.
    to the child it.DAT must.Pres.3SG to read-Pres.3SG more books
    'The child needs to read more books.'

(42) Trjbva \[\text{da } \text{mu } \text{četa-t } \text{poveče knigi na dete-to}\]
    must.Pres.3SG to it.DAT read-Pres.3SG more books to childr-the.PL
    'It is a must that the child is such that more books are read to it.'
In addition to the overt position and the distinct interpretation, we have additional evidence also from quantifier scope that the nominative subject is interpreted at the level of the embedded subjunctive clause, whereas the dative 'experiencer' subject is interpreted at the periphery of the matrix clause. As one can see from the data below, in subjunctives a matrix indefinite nominative subject allows for ambiguous scope with a universally quantified prepositional phrase:

Nominative subject: $\forall \gg \exists / \exists \gg \forall$

(43) edno (različno) dete trjabva [da čete vsjaka kniga].
    'One (different) child must.Read.3SG to read every book'

A dative 'feel like' subject, on the other hand, allows only for a specific existential reading and does not allow the universally quantified phrase to outscope and produce a weak existential reading. In other words, scope is unambiguously frozen with a peripheral dative applicative. Something I have also demonstrated in chapter 3, where I confirmed that dative applicatives in (di)transitive event constructions always produce frozen scope:

Dative subject: $\exists \gg \forall / *\forall \gg \exists$

(44) na edno dete mu trjbva [da čete vsjaka kniga].
    'One child needs to read every book.'

Dative subject: $\forall \gg \exists / *\exists \gg \forall$

(45) na vsjako dete mu trjbva [da čete edna kniga].
    'Every child needs to read a book.'

These results have two major implications. First, they demonstrate that quantifiers cannot raise out of the $da$-clause. Second, the fact that nominative subjects allow inverse scope in subjunctives, means that they are not topicalized and that they
reconstruct within the embedded vP. In other words, the availability of inverse scope over the matrix nominative argument means that its matrix position is not relevant for scope interpretation in subjunctives. The matrix dative experiencer, on the other hand, always outscopes other quantified arguments and cannot reconstruct to a lower position with the same interpretation.

For our purposes of demonstrating the distribution and productivity of dative subjects in Bulgarian, the above data suffice to demonstrate the systematic asymmetries between nominative and dative clausal subjects in subjunctive clauses. We have now evidence from three different sources that the dative subject is the peripheral subject that merges in the specifier of the peripheral applicative head:

(46) **Evidence for peripheral dative applicatives:**

- the inability of matrix dative 'experiencers' in modal adverbial constructions to obtain modal root interpretation;
- the inability of matrix dative 'experiencers' to occur in the lower subjunctive clause with the same thematic meaning;
- the inability of matrix dative subjects to produce inverse scope;

\[
\text{[APPLP]}
\]

\[
\text{DP[DATIVE] APPL'}
\]

\[
\text{APPL [ModalP]}
\]

\[
\text{Modal [TP]}
\]

\[
\text{da [vP]}
\]

Nominative matrix subjects, on the other hand, (i) allow only for modal root interpretation, (ii) they can occur within the subjunctive without changing their
thematic interpretation, (iii) and crucially, they allow inverse scope. Thus, I propose that modal bi-clausal constructions with Nominative subjects in Bulgarian are in fact raising constructions, with the nominative subject raising to the specifier of the modal, but crucially not to a topic position. That the matrix position is not a topic-left dislocation is important since pre-verbal indefinite subjects are otherwise interpreted as [+specific] (as shown in chapter 2 and in chapter 3):

![Diagram of ModalP structure]

In addition to the structural and semantic diagnostics, we observe the re-occurring morpho-syntactic pattern of the dative applicatives:

(47) Properties of the dative clitic frame:

a. the dative clitic is obligatory;
b. the na-marked argument can be dropped;
c. the na-marker, itself, can be dropped;

(48) ((Na) dete-to) mu trjgba da čete knigi.

'the child needs to read books.'
4.2 Failure to Nominalize

In chapter 3, I demonstrated that ditransitive event predicates of the dative clitic frame fail to nominalize, whereas clitic-less ditransitives nominalize and preserve the original meaning of the PP argument. I took this as evidence that applicativization involves a zero derivational morpheme that prevents further derivation. According to this, if a clause is applicativized, it cannot be nominalized anymore. On the other hand, if a clause is not applicativized, it can nominalize.

The following data confirm that the dative 'experiencer' subjects fail to nominalize, thus adding one more evidence in favor of the current proposal that these are the same peripheral applicative arguments:

(49) na Petar mu SE tancuvat narodni tanci.
    to Petar he.DAT SE dance-Pres.PL folk.PL dance.PL
    'Peter feels like dancing folk dances.'

(50) *[DP tancuva-NE-to mu na narodni tanci na Petar]
    [DP dance-N-the he.DAT of folk dances of Peter]
    Intended: 'The dancing of folk dances experienced by Peter'

On the other hand, a nominalization of the alternative structure with the nominal subject is perfectly fine:

(51) Petar tancuva narodni tanci.
    Petar dance-Pres.3SG folk.PL dance.PL
    'Peter dances folk dances.'

(52) [DP tancuva-NE-to na narodni tanci na Petar]
    [DP dance-N-the he.DAT of folk dances of Peter]
    'The dancing of folk dances by Peter' / 'Peter's dancing of folk dances.'

The same contrast obtains between nominalized dative 'experiencer' subjects of adjectival predicates and nominative subjects of adjectival predicates:

(53) na Petar mu e stud-en-o.
    to Peter they.DAT Be-Pres.3SG cold-ADJ-3SGn
    'Peter feels cold/sad.'
In the next section, I turn to test whether dative subjects share the structural distribution of external arguments, i.e. arguments introduced in the specifier of a functional head.

4.3 Confirming Dative Subjecthood

4.3.1 Datives as controllers of subjunctive agreement

In the previous section I introduced bi-clausal construction for which I claimed that the dative subject is an argument of the matrix clause. Such bi-clausal constructions with obligatory dative subjects are productive in Bulgarian beyond modal constructions. There is for example a variety of *da*-subjunctives embedded under SE-marked unaccusatives, in which the matrix dative argument is again interpreted as an 'experiencer' subject. Note that the 'experience the want' reading of the constructions below best translates as 'wish':

57) Na Ivan *(mu) *(se) iska da dojde.
to Ivan he.DAT SE want.3SG to come.3SG
Lit. 'Ivan feels like wanting to come.' / 'Ivan wishes to come.'

58) Na decata *(im) *(se) iska da dojd-at.
to children they.DAT SE want.3SG to come-Pres.PL
Lit. 'The children feel like wanting to come.' / 'The children wish to come.'

An impersonal SE-marked predicate such as 'happening' also licenses a *da*-subjunctive
that obligatory takes a matrix dative subjects. Note that due to the meaning of 'happening' which lexically asserts its complement, the most prominent interpretation of the structure is as if the dative is the actual 'agent' of whatever the embedded event denotes:

\[(59)\] Na decata *(im) *(se) slućva da letj-at prez Berlin.

'the children happen to fly through Berlin'

So far, I ignored the agreement morphology of the embedded predicate of *da*-subjective clauses, as I wanted to describe first the actual distribution and the thematic meaning of the dative subject arguments. If we reexamine the subjunctive examples of the previous section, we see that the obligatory dative subjects coincide with the agreement phi-features of the embedded transitive predicates.

I therefore propose that the dative applicative is the controller of PRO within the embedded clause. Thus, whereas the nominative subjects were shown to raise from within the embedded subjunctive clauses, the structures with the dative subjects are control constructions in Bulgarian:

- [APPLP]
  - \[DP[dative]\] APPL'
    - APPL [ModalP]
      - Modal [TP]
        - da [vP]
          - PRO \(v\)
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4.3.2 Datives as controllers of reflexives

Evidence from both embedded and matrix Reflexivization also confirm that peripheral dative 'experiencers' can serve as structural subjects that can control subject-oriented reflexive pronouns.

In bi-clausal constructions, we observe that datives by virtue of controlling PRO in the embedded subjunctive clause obligatorily control also subject-oriented reflexives (see also Sirgudsson 2002, and Zaenen/Maling/Thrainsson 1985:450 for the similar data with Icelandic dative subjects):

(60) na Ivan *(mu) trjabva da PRO čet-e [svoite knigi].
    to Ivan he.DAT need-Pres.3SG to PRO read-Pres.3SG self book.PL
    'Ivan needs to read his own books.'

(61) na decata *(im) *(se) iska da PRO čet-at [svojata
    to children they.DAT SE want.3SG to PRO read-Pres.PL self
    kniga].
    book.SG
    'The children wish to read their own book.'

(62) na men *(mi) *(se) slučva da PRO čet-a [svoite knigi].
    to me I.DAT SE happen.3SG to PRO read-Pres.1SG own book.PL
    'I happen to read my own books.'

With monoclausal examples, we also observe that dative experiencer subjects of SE-marked impersonal eventive predicates control reflexive pronouns:

(63) na Ivan *(mu) SE čet-at [svoite knigi].
    to Ivan he.DAT SE read-Pres.PL self book.PL
    'Ivan feels like reading his own books.'

(64) na men *(mi) SE raz-gležd-at [svoite knigi].
    to me I.DAT SE through-look-Pres.PL self book.PL
    'I feels like looking through my own books.'

The same obtains also for dative experiencers of adjectival state predicates:

(65) na Ivan *(mu) sa studeni [svoite deca].
    to Ivan he.DAT BE.Pres.PL cold.PL self children.PL
'Ivan feels his own children cold.'

This piece of evidence is significant as a subjecthood test, because reflexive pronouns of the type svoj 'own' in Bulgarian can otherwise be only bound by the nominative subject and never by an object argument in a transitive event construction:

(66) Az
_ čet-a [svoitei knigi].
I.NOM read-Pres.1SG own book.PL
'I read my own books.'

(67) Az pokazax na Ivan [svoite knigi].
I.NOM show-Past.1SG to Ivan own book.PL.
'I showed my/*his own books to Ivan.'

Note that a dative 'benefactive' in the DOC frame also fails to bind reflexives of the type svoj. This is expected since the DOC frame includes a nominative subject that intervenes between the peripheral dative and the object argument and is therefore the closest structural antecedent for the reflexive. Such intervening nominative subjects are absent in the impersonal SE-marked events:

(68) Az mu pokazax [svoite knigi] na Ivan.
I.NOM he.DAT show-Past.1SG own book.PL to Ivan
'Ivan is such, that I showed him my/*his own books.'

I take the data in which a dative experiencer subject controls reflexive pronouns in monoclausal and in bi-clausal constructions as strong support for the subjecthood of the dative arguments in all the constructions that take obligatory dative subjects.

Two additional tests for structural subjecthood from the literature on Icelandic 'quirky subjects' apply also to Bulgarian and confirm the structural subject-like properties of the Bulgarian dative subjects.

4.3.3 Conjunction reduction under a nominative subject

Similar to Icelandic, the Bulgarian dative subjects can also occur in Conjunction Reduction with nominative subjects (see also Sergudsson 2002:144 for similar
First observe that nominative subject reduction under conjunction is common and possible in Bulgarian:

\[(69)\]  
\[\text{njakolko studenta } \text{četo-xa } \text{mnogo i sega (njakolko studenta)} \]
\[\text{few student.PL read-Past.PL lot and now (njakolko studenta)} \]
\[\text{počiva-t.} \]
\[\text{rest-Past.PL} \]
\[\text{'Few students read a lot and now (few students) rest.'} \]

In the following examples, I conjoin a matrix transitive predicate with a nominative subject with one of the predicates that takes obligatory dative 'experiencer' subject (i.e. an impersonal SE- or adjectival predicate). This way the first member of the conjunction takes a nominative subject, whereas the second member takes a dative subject. Uniformly, we observe that in all three structures, the na-argument is reduced and the nominative subject controls the phi-features of the dative clitic. Note, that while the dative argument itself is reduced, the dative clitic cannot be reduced in Bulgarian and is obligatorily overt. This is in line with proposals, that clitics of these type are not the actual arguments but rather morphological agreement markers that obligatorily occurs with these applicative frames:

\[(70)\]  
\[\text{njakolko studenta } \text{četo-xa } \text{mnogo i (*na njakolko studenta)} \]
\[\text{few student.PL read-Past.PL lot and (*to some student.PL)} \]
\[\text{im se spi sega.} \]
\[\text{they.DAT SE sleep.Pres.3SG now} \]
\[\text{'Few students read a lot and now feel sleepy.'} \]

Crucially, despite the overt dative clitic, we obtain the very specific reading that while there may be lots of students who read a lot and lots of student who feel sleepy, there are very few students that are both. This is a classic diagnostic of showing that there is indeed argument reduction under coordination rather than a coordination of a pro-drop clause. As discussed in Partee (1979), such specific reading is hard to be captured with a structure like '[Few students read a lot] and [Few students feel sleepy]'. If we do not reduce the argument, then we obtain the conjoint reading:
Few students read a lot and few students feel sleepy now.’

The same results obtain for adjectival predicates and for subjunctive constructions. In the absence of the overt dative argument we obtain the reading, in which we are describing the set of entities that fulfill both properties expressed by the two conjoined predicates:

‘Few children played in the snow and now feel cold.’ / *Few children played in the snow and few children now feel cold.’

‘Few students must read and need to write.’ / *Few students must read and few students need to write.’

4.3.4 Evidence for nominative control

Whereas in the previous subsection the dative argument was reduced under conjunction with a nominative subject, in this section I embed the dative in a da-subjective and confirm that the nominative subjects force control of the dative argument also in this configuration:

‘I want to feel sleepy’
Again, in all of these structures, the overt na-argument is reduced and the Nominative 1st person matrix subject controls the phi-features of the dative clitic.

With this the chapter concludes and we add four more properties to the list of the datives arguments in Bulgarian that amounts to the conclusion that these arguments are introduced in the specifier of a functional head and therefore represent structural subjects:

(77) **Properties of Applicative frame in Bulgarian:**

- a. the na-marked argument is interpreted as standing in a relation to the predicate;
- b. the dative clitic is obligatry;
- c. the na-marked argument can be dropped;
- d. the na-marker, itself, can be dropped;
- e. the Dative argument outscopes every other argument;
- f. The Dative argument fails to nominalize;
- g. Dative subjects control nominative PRO;
- h. Dative subjects control reflexivization; Nominative subjects allow reduction of the dative arguments under Conjunctions; Nominative subjects control dative PRO;

In chapter 3, I demonstrated that the dative argument of the clitic-marked ditransitive constructions are always higher relative to the direct object argument in terms of binding and in terms of quantifier scope. In this chapter, I presented three additional types of productive structures that obligatorily take Dative subjects in Bulgarian - the impersonal SE-marked event predicates, adjectival predicates, and
bi-clausal subjunctive constructions. In all three structures, the dative arguments uniformly are understood as 'feel like/experiencer' subjects and are systematically opposed to constructions with nominative subjects as an alternative way of expressing meaning. Crucially, beside their thematic interpretation of 'logical' or 'quasi' subjects, we obtained structural evidence that the dative arguments share also the syntax of structural subjects. Similar to Icelandic 'quirky' subjects, the Bulgarian dative subjects bind reflexives, serve as controllers of PRO, and can be controlled by a nominative subjects. In addition the three Bulgarian structures that take obligatory dative subjects share the language-specific dative morphology - they obligatory co-occur with the dative clitic and the na-marker.

In the next chapter I turn to the nominal domain and demonstrate that peripheral applicativization can occur also within the nominal domain and I compare the distinct interaction between nominal and clausal dative arguments.
Chapter 5

The Dative 'possessors' in Bulgarian

5.1 The puzzle of external 'possession'

In the chapter on dative arguments in di-transitive constructions, I mentioned the availability of a possessive relation between the clitic doubled Goal argument and the direct object argument. The relevant data were the following:

(1) Az mu izprat-ix pisma-(ta) vednaga na
    I.NOM he.DAT send-Past.1SG letter-the.PL.ACC immediately to/*for
    momče-to
    boy-the
    'I have sent the boy the letters immediately' / 'I have sent the boy’s letters immediately'

This section is dedicated to the origin of the possessive interpretation available in transitive and unaccusative constructions and compares the currently proposed Applicative approach to the approach of Possessor Raising.

So far, I argued that dative arguments in the Bulgarian DOC frame are arguments introduced and licensed by a peripheral functional head of the APPL(icative) type that selects an asserted eventive proposition as its complement. As such the high
Dative argument is interpreted semantically as an argument standing in a relationship that is contextually plausible to the entire event.

That such constructions imply a possessive relationship between the applicative argument and an available direct object argument has been demonstrated for many languages. In the English DOCs, which are mainly accepted with events that denote 'receiving', 'informing', and 'creation', the 'coming into possession' meaning is always available as noted in Pylkkänen (2002/2008):

(2) Sue mailed Sue the sweater.

Crucially, negating the 'effective transfer of possession' of the DOC frame is claimed to be perfectly sensible as the 'possession' between the direct arguments is merely implicated and crucially not entailed (see discussion also in Harley and Miyagawa 2017):

(3) Mary mailed Sue the sweater, but she never received it.

(4) I wrote Sue a letter, but she never received it.

The deniability of the possessive relationship between the external dative 'possessor' and the 'possessee' under negation obtains in Bulgarian as well. Compare the contrast between negating a possessive interpretation between two discontinuous arguments and negating the possessive interpretation between two local arguments. Continuing a sentence by negating the discontinuous 'possessive' relation is perfectly sensible:

1Note, however, that successful transfer of possession can be encoded in the lexical meaning of the root (as shown in Levin Rappaport Hovav 2001). With verbs such as give, negating the coming-into-possession or being-into-possession meaning will sound always as a contradiction independent of the structure. Therefore, examples with predicates that lexically assert the meaning of 'transfer' should not be that the 'possessive' relationship is also structurally encoded:

(i) Mary gave Sue the sweater, but she never received it.

(ii) Mary gave the sweater to Sue, but she never received it.
On the other hand, continuing a sentence by negating a local 'possessive' relation changes the truth-conditions of the proposition. The sentence sounds as a contradiction and is only sensible as a correction:

(6) # sčupi-x [DP telefon-a na Maria], kojto vsaštност ne e broke-1SG [DP phone-the of Mary], which actually NEG BE.SG nejin. hers
# 'I broke Mary’s phone, which actually is not hers.'

Now, authors have pointed out to Bulgarian transitive constructions, in which the only sensible relation between a dative argument and the event is 'possession' (Stateva 2002, Krapova and Cinque 2013, Iovtcheva 2017) and have claimed that for this set of data the clausal dative cannot be interpreted as standing to the event in some affected/beneficiary role. These are constructions with predominantly transitive predicates that denote psychological and physical perception:

(7) Az mu xaresv-am šapka-ta na Ivan
I.NOM he.DAT like-Pres.1SG hat-the to Ivan
'I like Ivan’s hat' / ??? 'I like the hat for Ivan’s benefit'

(8) Az mu vižda-am šapka-ta na Ivan
I.NOM he.DAT see-Pres.1SG hat-the to Ivan
'I like Ivan’s hat' / ??? 'I see the hat for his benefit'

(9) Az mu raz-gležd-am šapka-ta na Ivan
I.NOM he.DAT observe-Pres.1SG hat-the to Ivan
'I observe Ivan’s hat' / ??? 'I observe the hat for Ivan’s benefit'

A Possessor Raising analysis for this set of data, according to these authors, seems tangible especially because of the independently existing DP-internal 'possessors', which share the same dative morphology:
The homophonous morphological realization of clausal and nominal dative arguments in Bulgarian as well as the availability of the 'possessive' interpretation in clitic-doubled ditransitivies has attracted interest from scholars advancing the theory of External Possessive Constructions (EPC) for Bulgarian (Stateva 2002, Krapova and Cinque 2013, Iovtcheva 2017). At the same time it has also received some non-derivational analyses under different theoretical approaches (see Pancheva (2004) for a distributive morphological account and Schüercks and Wunderlich (2003) for a lexicalist account).

In what follows, I will argue that there is no derivational link between the nominal and the clausal dative 'possessors'. Rather, I propose that the 'possessive' interpretation of the ditransitive DOC frame arises as an indirect consequence of the structural configuration that allows the high dative to be understood as 'related' to the event and any arguments included into this event.

In addition, I also demonstrate that the clitic marked frame within the nominal domain is created via a peripheral functional head that similarly to the datives within the clausal domain, relates a high argument to the nominal. Most importantly, however, I defend the hypothesis that the datives within the nominal domain create an opaque structural constituency and do not raise outside the DP-domain.

The major evidence in support of my undertaking comes from the following sources. Each of the individual points is developed in a separate subsection in the this chapter:
Evidence against Possessor Raising:

a. Co-occurrence of (independent) DP-external and DP-internal 'possessors';
b. Existence of structure-sensitive idiomatic expressions;
c. Binding of subject oriented reflexives;
d. Loss of possessive inference under negating;
e. Evidence for constituency;

In the following section, I first turn to the nominal domain and explore the structural and semantic properties of the DP-internal clitic-doubled dative. The focus in the exposition lies in demonstrating that (i) a clitic-doubled argument is distinct from adjectival and PP arguments and that (ii) a clitic-doubled argument forms a structural constituent with the nominal.

In section 2, I turn to demonstrate the interaction between clausal and nominal dative arguments and to the diagnostics that support a non-derivational link between the two 'possessive' structures, contrary to Possessor Raising accounts.

5.2 Argument realization within the nominal domain

Similar to the clausal domain, Bulgarian distinguishes between agreement- and prepositionally-licensed arguments within its nominal domain. Crucially, the Bulgarian nominal domain supports also dative clitic doubled arguments, which share the distributional properties that I have established for datives within the vP domain:

a. A dative clitic co-occurs with the na-marked argument;
b. The na-marked argument can be dropped, but the clitic is obligatory.

Descriptively, if we take the example of a simple non-relational nominal such as the object denoting noun kniğa 'book', the language has three ways of expressing an
argument of this noun: with a full relational pronominal, with a *na*-marked non-pronominal argument (commonly translated as 'of'), and with a dative clitic-marked argument (see Tasseva-Kurktchieva 2005 among others):

(13)  [DP negov-a-ta nov-a kniga]  
[DP his-SGf-the.SGf new-SGf book.SGf]  
'his new book'

(14)  [DP nov-a-ta kniga na edno dete]  
[DP new-SGf-the.SGf book.SGf of a child]  
'the new book of a child'

(15)  [DP nov-a-ta mu kniga (na edno dete)]  
[DP new-SGf-the.SGf he.DAT book.SGf (of a child)]  
'the new book of a child'

Although the data above are very close to paraphrases of each other and seemingly produce the meaning of 'possession', they do not represent the same underlying structure.

First, observe that full relational pronominals and PP-marked arguments are relatively free and can occur in various positions within the nominal domain, whereas arguments marked with the dative clitic are always fixed to the highest nominal element that takes the definite inflection:

(16)  [nP (negovi) tri (negovi) nov-i (negovi) knigi]  
[nP (his-PL) three his-PL new-PL (his-PL) book.PL]  
'three new books of his'

(17)  [nP (na Ivan) tri nov-i knigi (na Ivan)]  
[nP (of Ivan) three new-PL book.PL (of Ivan)]  
'three new books of Ivan'

(18)  [DP nov-i-(te) mu [nP tri knigi] (na Ivan)]  
[DP new-PL-the.PL he.DAT book.PL (of Ivan)]  
'Ivan’s three new books'

So we observe that nominal relational semantics, can be expressed in three ways
in Bulgarian. Furthermore, Bulgarian uses all three nominal structures in a highly homophonous way and does not distinguish between animacy or alineability. In addition to alienable possessive relations between an [+animate] possessor and an object-denoting [-animate] nominal expression, there are many more relations that exists between two nominal phrases that can be expressed with nominal relational morphology. Such is the case of kinship (family relations), social relations, body parts, part-whole, intrinsic aspects (color, shape, character etc.), and many more. The following examples are by no means exhaustive, but they provide a selection of different nominal categories and demonstrate that the argument of a nominal expression can be expressed with a relational pronominal, a clitic, or a PP in Bulgarian:

**Nominal Body-Part relations:**

(19)  
negov-(a) präst  
his-(the) finger  
'his finger / a finger of his'

(20)  
präst-*(a) mu na Ivan  
finger-the he.DAT of Ivan  
'Ivan’s finger’ / *a finger of Ivan’

(21)  
präst-(a) na Ivan  
finger-(the) he.DAT of Ivan  
'the finger of Ivan’ / a finger of Ivan’

**Property of a [-animate] relation:**

(22)  
negov-(ia) cvjat  
his-(the) color  
'his color / a color of his’

(23)  
cveta-*(a) mu na jaketo  
color-the he.DAT of jacket  
'The jacket’s color’ / *a color of the jacket’

(24)  
cveta-(a) na jaketo  
color-(the) of jacket  
'the color of the jacket’ / a color of the jacket’
The three ways of expressing an argument of a noun are equally possible. Observe the argument *jake* 'jacket' of a property denoting noun, such as *cvjat*, is [-animate] and can very well be expressed with a pronominal, a dative clitic, or a preposition. The same holds for the inalienable body part 'finger' that can take an argument realized either as a pronominal, clitic, or preposition.

This property differs from English nominal argument structure, in which the high Saxon genitive frame is reserved for [+animate] inalienable arguments whereas the postnominal *of* construction is reserved for inherently relational [+animate] arguments (See Barker 2010):

\[(25)\] English animate arguments:
\[a. \text{ John's jacket.}\]
\[b. *\text{The jacket of John.}\]

\[(26)\] English relational arguments:
\[a. \text{ John's brother.}\]
\[b. \text{ The brother of John.}\]

5.3 Evidence for peripheral applicativization within the nominal domain

Despite the homophony between the three nominal constructions, there is a clear hierarchy between the positions and the possible thematic relations. This can be tested and demonstrated with an object denoting nominal such as 'book', which potentially could have an author, a possessor and a theme argument and as a result of that can take more than one argument (see also Tasseva-Kurktchieva for similar findings 2005). Crucially, as shown below, the pronominal and the prepositional argument frame are symmetric and can be understood under any reading. I take this to mean that both prepositional and pronominal arguments are 'low' nominal modifiers that merge with the nominal expression within the functional nP domain.
(27) negovi-(te) dve knigi na decata
    his-(the) two book.PL of children
    'the children's two books' of his' / 'his two [children's books]' / '(the) children's [two books of his']

(28) available Interpretations:
    a. he = author; the children = theme or possessors
    b. he = possessor; the children = theme or author
    c. he = theme; the children = authors or possessors

I take (i) the symmetric distribution of the relational meanings, (ii) the agreement morphology between the pronominal and the head noun, (iii) and the non-obligatory co-occurrence with a definite marker, as evidence that PP and pronominal arguments are combined via Predicate modification, crucially within the nP domain.

On the other hand, in the clitic doubled frame, the argument occurs to the left-edge obligatory following the definite article and when co-occurring with another argument, the clitic doubled argument can only be interpreted as a 'possessor':

---

2 See Munn (1995) for a similarly claim that 'low' (modificational) possessives are available in English and are crucially different from compound constructions and most intriguingly show number agreement with the Possessee: This is a child's book, These are two children's books. This is a children's book (idiomatic).

3 Pronominal possessors consist of lexically specified possessive pronouns and a limited set of proper names (e.g. Ivan-ov 'Ivan's', Mari-in 'Maria's') and kinship nouns (e.g. tat-k-ov 'dad's'), which are derived via a relational morpheme -ov/-in (see Pancheva 2004 for an extended list). The morphological form of the pronouns is itself an intermediate b/w inflection and derivation, in which the initial segment of the lexeme indicates the number and gender of the possessor, while the ending indicates the number and the inherent gender of the Possessee and is virtually the same as the one of the adjectival attributes. Because of their adjectival-like agreement distribution, possessors of this type are called denominal adjectives (Corbett 1987, 1995), or adjectival possessors (Pancheva 2004), or genitival adjectives (Tasseva-Kurktchieva 2005).

4 The clitic doubled frame within the nominal domain is restricted to the definite marker and the dative clitic obligatory follows the highest nominal element that carries the definite inflection (Penčev 1998: 30; Dimitrova-Vulchanova and Giusti 1999: 169; Franks 2000: 59ff, Franks and King 2000: 275, 282, Schürcks and Wunderlich 2003, Koev 2011)
Available interpretations:

a. The children = possessors; he = author or theme
b. *he = possessor; the children authors or theme

I take this asymmetry in the meaning as well as the structural position of the clitic doubled argument as evidence that this is an argument related to the nP via an asymmetrically high functional head. In light of the fact, that Bulgarian does not restrict the clitic doubled relational construction only to possessors, but employs it with all types of relational semantics (see above examples) and it does not restrict this construction to [animacy] (as it is the case in English), I propose that this functional argument introducing head should not be specified for 'possession', but be left semantically empty. Similar to the peripheral clausal applicatives, I propose that the argument introducer within the nominal domain merely serves the structural purpose of adding an argument to the nP and relating it to the semantics of the property or the proposition in its complement:

(31) The Applicative within the nominal domain:

\[
\begin{aligned}
&[DP] \\
&\quad \uparrow \\
&\quad D \ APPLP \\
&\quad \uparrow \\
&\quad DP_{dative} \ APPL' \\
&\quad \uparrow \\
&\quad APPL \ [nP]
\end{aligned}
\]
5.4 Arguing against Possessor Raising

5.4.1 Evidence for structural constituency

In what follows, I argue that DP-internal dative clitic doubled arguments form a constituent with the nominal phrase. The following pieces of evidence support the current proposal that these are not arguments of the verb.

First and foremost, a low modificational adverbial can be inserted between the clausal dative and the direct object argument, or between a direct object and a PP object.

(32) Az izprat-ix [DP novi-te pisma] tajno [IO na Ivan]
     I.NOM send-Past.1SG [DP new.PL-the.PL letter.PL] secretly [IO to Ivan]
     'I have secretly send the new letters to Ivan'

(33) Az mu izprat-ix [DP novi-te pisma] tajno [IO
     I.NOM he.DAT send-Past.1SG [DP new.PL-the.PL letter.PL] secretly [IO
         na Ivan]
     to Ivan]
     'I have send Ivan the new letters secretly'

On the other hand, a clausal adverbial cannot separate the head noun and a DP-internal dative:

(34) Az izprat-ix [DP novi-te mu pisma (*tajno) na
     I.NOM send-Past.1SG [DP new.PL-the.PL he.DAT letter.PL secretly to
         Ivan]
     Ivan]
     'I have send secretly Ivan's new letters immediately'

Second, when we front a clitic modified nominal expression for focus or wh-movement, we move the entire constituent, not just the clitic doubled element:

(35) [DP knigi-*te] í na Maria]1 vidjax t1!
     [DP books-the.PL she.DAT of Maria] see-Past.1SG t
     'I saw MARIA'S BOOKS'!
This contrasts with the discontinuous sequence of focalized or wh-moved ‘recipient’ arguments of the DOC frame, which not only occur separated from the direct object argument, but also do not require a definite direct object:

(36) [DP knigi-*te] mu na kogo]_1 vidjax t
[DP books-the.PL he.DAT of who] see-Past.1SG t
'Whose books did I see?'

Third, a clitic modified DP constituency can be embedded under a Preposition. This is not possible with a clausal dative. Compare the difference in the meaning as demonstrated in the translation:

(37) na Maria i vidjax [DP knigi-(te)]!
to Maria she.DAT see-Past.1SG [DP books-(the.PL)]
'MARIA is such, that I saw (the) books for her (that might or might not be hers).’ / *I saw Maria’s books!

(38) na kogo mu vidjax [DP knigi-(te)]?
to whom he.DAT see-Past.1SG [DP books-(the.PL)]
'Who is such, that I saw books for him (that might or might not be his)?’ /
*Whose books did I see?

Fourth, the clitic modified DP constituency occurs as a constituency also in a predicative position where the relationship between the two nominal expressions is asserted in the proposition. Crucially the semantics of the nominal relation do not allow for a ‘beneficiary’ implication:

(39) Az izbârs-ax [PP s [DP kârpa-*(ta) i na Maria]].
I.NOM wipe-Past.1SG [PP with [DP towel-the she.DAT of Maria]]
'I wiped with Maria’s towel.'

(40) na Mariaf izbârs-ax [PP s [DP kârpa-(ta)]].
to Maria she.DAT wipe-Past.1SG [PP with [DP towel-(the)]]
'I wiped with (the) towel for the benefit of Maria (could be her towel or not).’
On the other hand, a DP-external dative might be understood as a possessor. Crucially, given the right context, one obtains also an eventive 'beneficiary' reading and a definite direct object is not required:

(42) Tova e [DP kârpa-(ta)] na Maria.
    this BE.3SG [DP towel-the] to Maria
    'This is Maria’s towel.' / 'This is the towel for Maria.'

To sum up, I given evidence that the DP-internal dative clitic doubled argument is indeed argument of the nominal and is different in its distribution from the dative clitic doubled arguments of an event predicate. As I have demonstrated, (i) a low modifying adverbial cannot separate a DP-argument from the head noun, (ii) focus dislocation pied-pipes the entire DP-constituent, (iii) the dative occurs together with its head noun as subject of a preposition and (iv) the dative occurs together with its head noun in predicate position.

In what follows I bring several arguments against possessor raising accounts that have been proposed for Bulgarian datives.

5.4.2 Co-occurrence of 'possessive' arguments

The first argument against a raising analysis of clausal dative possessors is the fact that the DP-external dative argument can freely co-occur with an independent DP-internal dative argument. Below we see that a clausal dative 'possessor' can co-occur either with DP-internal full pronominal 'possessor' or with a DP-internal 'dative possessor'. Importantly, as shown in the translation and with the indexation, a co-reference between the two 'possessors' in each structure is possible but not obligatory:

(43) na Ivan mu šcupix-a [DP novij-a negov telefon],
    on Ivan he.DAT broke.PL [DP new-the.SG his.SG phone.SG]
    'They broke his(i/j) new phone on Ivan(i)' i.e. 'They broke someone’s phone
to affect Ivan (it could be Ivan’s phone or not).’

(44) na Ivan mu sčupix-a [DP novij-* (a) mu telefon (na nego)]
on Ivan he.DAT broke.PL [DP new-the.SG he.DAT phone.SG of him]
'They broke his(i/j) new phone on Ivan(i)’ i.e. They broke someone’s phone
to affect Ivan (it could be Ivan’s phone or not).

In fact, that the dative ‘possessors’ in these doubly marked constructions need not refer to the same individual becomes transparent when we vary the person/number/gender properties of the arguments. For example, the clausal dative and the DP-internal dative can very well mark different referents as in the example below, where the clausal dative is the male participant ‘Ivan’ and the DP-internal dative is the female participant ‘Maria’. In such a case, one can potentially obtain different readings depending on the context in which the sentence is uttered. As shown in the translation, the clausal dative could either lead to a malefactive interpretation due to the generally negative connotation of the lexical meaning of ’break’, or lead to an inference of some shared ownership:

(45) na Ivan mu sčupix-a [DP novij-a i telefon na Maria]
on Ivan he.DAT broke.PL [DP new-the.SG she.DAT phone.SG of Maria]
Reading I: 'They broke Maria’s phone to affect Ivan’
Reading II: 'They broke Maria’s phone to affect Ivan, because he shares it
with Maria’

Note that the ‘shared’ ownership reading is insomuch of interest as it presents an intriguing interaction between the inferred ownership relations. In principle, one could come up with examples of body-part or kinship relations, where a shared ownership becomes pragmatically odd, thus highlighting the distinct meanings that the two datives bring into the overall semantics of the constructions. In any case, we have now evidence that the structural positions of the DP-external and DP-internal dative position are independent from each other and as such, they can be filled with transformationally unrelated dative arguments.
5.4.3 Availability of Idiomatic expressions

The second argument against the possessor raising account is the fact that there are plenty of clausal idiomatic expressions that fail to produce an idiomatic expression when in a DP-internal position. Note also that the following clausal idioms were purposely chosen to involve psych predicates, for which possessor raising supporters claim that it is ungrammatical to have beneficiary interpretation:

(46) na Ivan mu vidj-ax [DP smetka-ta].
    to Ivan he.dat see-Past.1SG [DP bill-the]
    'I finished Ivan.'

(47) na Ivan mu xares-ax [DP edna šapka].
    to Ivan he.dat like-Past.1SG [DP one hat]
    'I found Ivan a hat.'

(48) na Ivan mu razkar-ax [DP majka-ta].
    to Ivan he.dat move-Past.1SG [DP mother-the]
    'I finished Ivan.'

(49) na Ivan mu vârz-ax [DP tenekija].
    to Ivan he.dat tied-Past.1SG [DP tin]
    'I broke a promise on Ivan.'

Crucially, all these idioms lose their idiomatic reading in the DP-internal variants, supporting the current proposal that clausal datives are not derived from a DP-internal position even when understood as standing in some plausible 'possessive' relationship:

(50) vidj-ax [DP na Ivan smetka-*(ta) mu].
    saw-Past.1SG [DP of Ivan bill-the he.dat]
    'I saw Ivan's final bill.'

(51) xares-ax [DP na Ivan šapka-*(ta) mu].
    like-Pats.1SG [DP of Ivan hat-the he.dat]
    'I liked Ivan's hat.'

(52) razkar-ax [DP na Ivan majka mu]
    move-Past.1SG [DP of Ivan mother he.dat]
    'I moved away Ivan's mother.'
5.4.4 Binding of subject-oriented reflexive anaphors

Finally, evidence against a derivational link between external and internal ‘possession’ comes from binding of reflexives pronominals. As already discussed in chapter 4, Bulgarian has phrasal and possessive anaphors that are spelled out as a phi-feature-lacking pronominal sebe ‘self’ and svoja ‘own’, which are exclusively subject oriented (Franks 2013). In what follows, I demonstrate that in transitive event constructions that involve a nominative subject a possessive reflexive can only be bound the nominative subject. On the other hand, within the nominal domain the possessive reflexive is obligatory bound exclusively by a local dative applicative argument. Crucially a clausal dative of a transitive event cannot bind an possessive reflexive.

First observe the subject-oriented behaviour of the reflexive possessive:

(54) Petăr vidja svojata snimka.
Peter see-Past.3SG self-own photograph
'Peter saw his own photograph.'

(55) Petăr pokaza svojata snimka (tajno) na Ivan.
Peter show-Past.3SG self-own picture secretly to Ivan
'Peter showed his own picture secretly to Ivan.' /*'Peter showed Ivan's picture to Ivan.'

A clausal dative argument is possible since it is plausible for the nominative 'Peter' to see some picture for Ivan’s benefit (given we provide a sensible context for a beneficiary interpretation). Essentially, however, the clausal dative 'Ivan' cannot be understood as the owner, photographer, or theme of 'the picture', i.e. the dative cannot serve as the antecedent of the reflexive. Unambiguously the syntactic antecedent of the reflexive direct object is the nominative subject 'Peter':

(56) na Ivan Petăr mu vidja (tajno) [DP svoja-(ta) mu]
to Ivan Peter he.DAT see-Past.3SG (secretly) [DP self-own-(the) mu]
'Peter saw his own picture to affect Ivan' / '*Peter saw Ivan's picture'.

In spite of the fact of that the clausal dative could be linearly preceding (as in the above example) of follow (as in the example below) the nominative argument, it could not be understood as the antecedent of the reflexive:

(57) Petar mu vidja na Ivan (tajno) [DP svoja-(ta)]
    Peter he.DAT see-Past.3SG to Ivan (secretly) [DP self-own-(the)]
    snimka. photograph
    'Peter saw his own picture to affect Ivan' / '*Peter saw Ivan's picture'.

The intuition is especially strong with active transitive predicates, which do not require much context in order to allow affected reading:

(58) Petar mu otkradna na Ivan (tajno) [DP svojata snimka]
    Peter he.DAT stole-Past.3SG to Ivan (secretly) [DP self-own picture]
    'Peter stole his own picture to Ivan' / '*Peter stole Ivan's picture'.

On the other hand, when the subject-oriented anaphor svoja represents the theme or author argument of 'picture', a DP internal dative 'possessor' can be added. Automatically, this local dative possessor becomes the obligatory syntactic antecedent of the embedded reflexive variable. The clausal nominative subject is no longer serving as an antecedent of the possessive reflexive. Observe again that one cannot separate the DP constituent with a low manner adverbial, thus confirming that the dative is part of the nominal event:

(59) Petar vidja [DP svoja-ta mu snimka (*tajno) na Ivan)]
    Peter see-Past.3SG [DP own-the he.DAT photograph (*secretly) (of Ivan)]
    'Peter saw Ivan's photograph.' / '*Peter saw his photograph by Ivan.'

The following copular construction, which lacks a clausal participant altogether, confirms that it is indeed the local dative argument that serves as the structural antecedent of the DP-internal possessive reflexive:
With this evidence we have support for the applicative non-derivational account of datives and at the same time we have also an argument against Possessor Raising analyzes of Bulgarian. The nominal domain is the minimal syntactic binding domain of a reflexive possessive anaphor and a peripheral DP-internal dative by virtue of being a local structural subject, serves as the structural antecedent:

(61) \[ \text{NOM}_j \text{v} [\text{DP } \text{DAT}_i \ldots \text{svoja}_i/*_j] \]

On the other hand, as a clausal peripheral dative is added above a nominative subject of a transitive event, it is the nominative subject that serves as the structural antecedent of the reflexive possessive anaphor:

(62) \[ \text{DAT}_j \text{NOM}_i \text{v} [\text{DP svoja}_i/*_j] \]

Crucially, if the Possessor Raising account is correct, then by hypothesis a DP-internal dative possessor that serves as the local antecedent of a reflexive anaphor should be able to c-command its trace and with this be able to still serve as the antecedent of the embedded reflexive svoja. As we saw above, this is not borne out.

Furthermore, we have evidence from Bulgarian bi-clausal raising construction of the type 'John seems to see his own photograph', that a subject that raises into a matrix position can nevertheless bind the reflexive pronominal within the the embedded clause. This is direct evidence that in principle traces of movement are active for binding purposes in Bulgarian:

(63) Deca-ta izgležda [TP vidjaja svoite snimki] children-the.PLNOM seem.3SG [TP see-Past.PL own pictures] 'The children seem to have seen their own pictures.'
5.5 Refuting the Possessor Raising account for Bulgarian

In the linguistic literature on possessives, a relation that holds between two discontinuous nominal elements (possessor and possessee) is traditionally known as ‘External Possession Construction’ (EPC) (Szabolcsi 1981, 1993; Payne and Barshi 1999) with the term ‘external’ in this particular use reflecting the observation that something that is semantically related to a syntactic entity is outside of the (syntactic) domain of this entity. The distinction between internal and external possession is demonstrated schematically below:

(65) ...[DP POSSESSOR POSSESSEE] (local / DP-internal possessive relation)

(66) ...POSSESSOR ...[DP ...POSSESSEE] (non-local/ external possessive relation)

In the DP-internal possessive construction, the semantic ‘possessive’ relation between the two DPs and their (local) structural realization align. Both arguments are understood as a semantic constituent and they behave as a syntactic constituent. In a DP-external possessive construction, on the other hand, the semantic and syntactic realizations do not align. The two nominal expressions are understood as a unit, but they do not behave structurally as a unit. This failure to align semantic with syntactic realization has captured the interest of countless theoretical and empirical studies for decades. Lively debates on how to treat the empirical findings and what this mismatch between semantic interpretation and syntactic structure means for our general understanding of language, has led to quite distinct analyses on the theo-
retical side. A good comprehensive overview of the various approaches to EPCs is offered in Deal (2013), where she classifies the approaches into two general theoretical camps. The one camp, represented by so-called movement analyses of EPCs, in which the external possessor-element is treated as a local argument of the possessee and allows DP-internal elements to interact with the clausal structure via syntactic movement (Landau 1999, Deal 2013, Lee-Schoenfeld 2015 among others). The other camp, represented by so-called non-movement analyses of EPCs, in which DP-external possessive elements are treated as base-generated arguments of the verb that simultaneously control a DP-internal anaphoric possessive element (Borer and Grodzinsky 1986, Hole 2005, Lee-Schoenfeld 2006 among others).

Stateva (2002) as a proponent of the possessor raising account for Bulgarian proposes that all clausal dative clitic arguments that are interpreted as possessor arguments originate and raise from within a DP-internal structural position, in which they are assigned structural possessor theta role. In support of her claim, she uses almost exclusively transitive clausal configurations, in which the verbal predicate denotes psychological and physical perception, such as xaresvam 'like', poznavam 'know', želaja 'want', običam 'love', mrazja 'hate', pomnja 'remember', viždam 'see', čuvam 'hear'. A specific characteristic of such constructions is that when uttered out of the blue these structures hardly produce any other reading than 'possession':

(67) na Ivan mu xaresvam [DP šapka-ta]
    to Ivan he.DAT like.1SG [DP hat-the]
    'I like Ivan's hat' / ??? 'I like the hat for Ivan's benefit'

In a similar vein, Krapova and Cinque (2013) introduce data with transitive predicates of perception that, beside possession, involve also body part and social relational semantics (note that the original data are slightly adapted to add the clitic doubled participant overtly):
Based on these sets of data and following Landau’s (1999) movement analysis of Hebrew dative possessors, Stateva (2003) proposes that raising from a base-generated DP-internal position into the VP domain is triggered by the need for Case licensing in Bulgarian. Stateva adheres to Landau’s idea that possessive meaning is structural and that arguments obtain their possessor theta role locally from within the nominal domain and subsequently moves out into the verbal domain. The subsequent movement into the verbal domain enables the argument to establish a structural relation with a functional head that assigns it structural dative Case. For this to be possible, Stateva proposes that the DP-internal position in Bulgarian is Case-defective in Bulgarian and as such it is not able to license the possessor argument. There are, however, several problems with Stateva’s analysis of the dative ‘possessors’.

First, claiming that dative Case is structurally licensed only within the verbal domain is problematic for Bulgarian because dative clitics can very well appear DP-internally in Bulgarian as we already saw in the previous sections:

(68) na Ivan mu poznavam [DP prijatel-ta/xarakter-ta/sačinenija-ta] to Ivan he.DAT know.1SG [DP girlfriend-the/character-the/works-the] ‘I know Ivan’s girlfriend/his character/his works’ / ???’I know Ivan’s girlfriend/his character/his work for Ivan’s benefit or for Ivan’s dismay’

In fact, in a diachronic comparative study Pancheva (2004) as well as Krapova and Dimitrova (2015) demonstrate that from at least the period of Old Church Slavonic5, Bulgarian has the means of valuing dative case features within its nominal domain. The earliest recordings of the South Slavic language reveal namely that within the nominal domain, the language unambiguously had the dative clitic arguments in a parallel existence to genitive possessive constructions. For Stateva (2002), the ‘option’

5Old Church Slavonic refers to the period of the first recordings of the language used in the South Slavic Orthodox community that is around the 10th-11th century (see Duridanov et al 1993).
of having DP-internal dative possessors is taken to mean "[that this is] possibly, because the syntactic element that is responsible for case assignment is only sometimes present in the derivation" (Stateva 2002:674). Crucially, under Stateva (2002) the possessor DP is always first-merged into the possessee DP, but its overt position (i.e. whether it appears internally or externally of the DP) is a matter of the structural position of a Case licensing functional head.

Second inconsistency is the fact that we don’t have independent evidence that arguments in Bulgarian move for structural Case licensing. In fact, as already demonstrated in chapter 2, nominative subjects, accusative direct objects and prepositional phrases can remain in their first-merge position in Bulgarian and do not have to move for reasons of Case. I therefore proposed that arguments in Bulgarian are licensed via morphological Case. Any movement and dislocation of arguments, on the other hand, is correlated with discourse-related informational structure.

The third problem for the Possessor Raising account stems from the fact that the clitic doubled frame is not restricted merely to possessive constructions. As we have seen in the previous section, the language employs the peripheral applicative frame within the nominal domain to express all kind relational semantics. Thus, one would have to say that clausal datives understood as standing in a kinship or part-type (implied) relation to a direct object must be also raising from the DP-internal position of relational nouns:

(70)  Az vidjax [DP rëka-ta mu na Ivan]  
      I.nom saw [DP hand he.dat of Ivan]  
      'I saw Ivan’s hand.’

(71)  Az mu vidjax [DP rëka-ta] na Ivan  
      I.nom he.dat saw mother-the of Ivan  
      'I saw the hand to Ivan (it could be Ivan’s hand, it could be some other hand)’

Finally, most of the external dative 'possessors' not only mean simply 'possession', but also give rise to various circumstantially relevant 'affectee'-related interpretations. For Stateva the 'affectee' interpretation is the result of movement into a secondary
theta role position. In this respect, accommodating a benefactive reading with psych predicates is harder to obtain in an out-of-the-blue context. However, once a native speaker is presented with a plausible pragmatic context, in which the nominative 'experiencer' of a psych/perception predicate can be understood as experiencing the event for the favor or for the disadvantage of the clausal dative participant, the applicative argument is easily accommodated:

Context: Ivan really wants me to like a hat (could be of his possession or not), so I give in and I report to Maria:

(72) Abe dobre! Az mu xaresvam [DP edna šapka] na Ivan.
   'Well fine! I.NOM he.DAT like.1SG [DP a hat] to Ivan
   'Well fine! I like a hat for (the benefit of) Ivan.' (It could be his hat or not)

Context: Ivan does not want people to hear about a new car (could be of his possession), because he might get in some trouble. Well, I heard about it and he might indeed get in trouble:

---

6The idea of syntactic movement-into-a-secondary-theta-position has been proposed as an analysis for a variety of languages. Lee-Schoenfeld's (2015) analysis of German clausal dative which always produce 'affectee' and 'possessor' reading, the possessor raising into a clausal theta position (in this case into an object position), as being 'the most economical derivation of expressing combined possession and affectedness':

(i) Bello hat mir [PP in die Hand] gebissen
   Bellonom has me.DAT in the hand bitten
   'Bello bit me in the hand' / 'Bello bit my hand' / 'Bello bit me in my hand'

In a similar manner, possessor raising into a clausal theta position (in this case into a topic position) has been proposed also for Japanese indirect passives, also known as 'possessive passives' (see Kubo 1989):

(ii) Taro-wa Hanako-ni ude-o or-are-ta
    Taro-TOP Hanako-DAT arm-ACC brake-Pass-Past
    'Taro(i) had Hanako break (his(i)) arm'

The possessor raising analysis, however, has been independently refuted for both, German (see Hole 2005, Wunderlich 2000) and Japanese (see Kitagawa and Kuroda 1992; Matsuoka 2001 among others), by work demonstrating that interpretational and structural asymmetries disfavor a raising treatment.
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(73) Abe, az mu čux [PP za [DP edna kola]] na Ivan.
Well, I NOM he DAT heard 1SG [PP about [DP a car]] to Ivan
'Well, I heared about a car for (the detriment of) Ivan. (It could be his car
or not)'

In a more recent paper Krapova and Cinque (2013) as well as Iovtcheva (2017)
claim to identify opaque contexts for possessor movement in the form of structural
'islands'. The idea behind this is that movement will be blocked if it is to cross struc-
tural islands that are independently shown to be opaque for movement. Following
Landau's (1999) proposal that PPs constitute barriers to syntactic movement since a
moved element fails to c-command its traces, Krapova and Cinque (2013) bring in-
troduce the following example from wh-extraction out of a prepositional complement
and propose that this is evidence for locality effects:

(74) Na kogo₁ misliš [PP za [DP xaraktera t₁]]?
of who think.-Pres.2SG [PP about [DP character-the]]
Intended: 'Whose character do you think about?'

It is an independent fact, that when a wh-argument is embedded within a prepo-
sitional complement in Bulgarian, native speakers strongly prefer to piped-pipe the
entire PP complement to a designated pre-verbal focus position:

(75) [PP za [DP xarakter-a na kogo]₁ misliš t₁?
[PP about [DP the character of whom]] think-Pres.2SG t
'Whose character do you think about?'

Crucially, Krapova and Cinque (2013) and Iovtcheva (2017) fail to notice that the
wh-versions of sentences like the one above obligatorily occur with a dative clitic.
Compare the two minimal pairs below; the clitic version is perfectly grammatical
whereas the clitic-less version is rejected (due to the PP complement):

(76) Na kogo mu pljue-š [PP v [DP lice-to]]?
on who he DAT spit-Pres.2SG [PP in [DP face-the]]
'Whom did you spit in the face? / 'Whose face did you spit in?'
(77) *Na kogo pljue-š [PP v [DP lice-to]]?
on who pro spit-Pres.2SG [PP in [DP face-the]]
Intended: 'Whom did you spit in the ear?' / 'Whose ear did you spit in?'

The rejected clitic-less wh-utterance is automatically improved by overt pied-piping:

(78) [PP v [DP lice-to na kogo]1 pljue-š t1?
    [PP in [DP face-the of who] spit.-Pres.2SG t
 'In Whose ear did you spit in?'

Returning to the example with the psych predicate 'think', a clitic involving version
of Krapova and Cinque's (2013) and Iovtcheva's (2017) wh-example ameliorates the
acceptability significantly, to the extent that the speaker accepts the clitic version of
'think about' declarative:

(79) ??Na kogo mu pro misliš [PP za [DP xaraktera]]?
of who he.DAT pro think.-Pres.2SG [PP about [DP character-the]]
'Whose character do you think about?'

To sum up, in this section I engaged with several of the arguments that has been
employed in favor of a Possessor Raising analysis on Bulgarian clausal datives and I
demonstrated that the proposals and the empirical data less convincing for capturing
the general pattern of the dative arguments in the language.

Similar to English DOC constructions, 'possessive' inference is available with
clausal datives in transitive and unaccusative structures. Yet, the possessiveness
is merely one of the many contextually plausible inferences that are obtainable in
such structural frames. This semantic ambiguity derives from the nature of the ap-
plactivization. The arguments are added and related to the main proposition of the
event as high prominent arguments, but the exact semantics of their thematic role is
not encoded in the introducing functional head.

Compare the following data from the DP-internal clitic double frame, in which
the exact thematic role is implied based on the content of the applicative argument
and is derived form on our general knowledge about the world:
Evidence from binding, negation, idiomatic expressions, and co-occurrence of independent clausal and DP-internal possessors, confirmed that 'possessiveness' is implied both with peripheral datives within the nominal domain and with peripheral datives within the clausal domain. Crucially, external dative 'possessiveness' is not derived via Raising from within the nominal domain.
Chapter 6

Concluding Remarks and Outlook

In this thesis, I identified a systematic correlation between dative clitic doubled arguments and their high structural position in Bulgarian and I offered a unified treatment of these arguments as high peripheral applicative arguments. As I demonstrated by the intra-linguistics comparison, the applicativization pattern is very productive in Bulgarian. Beside ditransitive constructions that mimic the English DOC frame, dative clitics are involved also within the nominal domain as well as in various monoclusal predicative and bi-clausal subjunctive constructions. The novel and significant findings are that dative arguments are merged as non-agentive external arguments at the periphery of the vP and nP domain and bind and outscope any other available argument in each of the structural environments. In addition to the position and properties of the dative arguments, I also introduced novel findings regarding the syntax of Modern Bulgarian and proposed that the language is a low VS(O) with structural arguments being able to remain in their base-position where they are licensed by morphological Case. Throughout the dissertation I demonstrated that external nominative subjects of transitive events are introduced by little v, whereas datives are introduced by the Appl head of the High type (Pylkkänen 2002/2008). Proposing that Appl is of the type of a general argument introducer, provided a solution to the two puzzles: the structural integration and the semantic integration of these arguments. Structurally, it captures the hierarchically higher position of the datives and accounts for their non-trivial position as the most prominent arguments in
Bulgarian (Baker 1988, 1997, Kale and Keyser 1993, Miyagawa 2012, Marantz 2013). Semantically, it captures the fact that these non-agentive arguments assume thematic interpretation that correlates with the overall semantics of the predicate they attach to. With this the current dissertation has direct implications for the overall understanding of the Bulgarian morpho-syntax and it also has broader implication for the general theoretical understanding of argument structure and the mapping between syntax and semantics.

In future work, I hope to address the issue of clitic doubling more in detail and to explore also the distribution of accusative and reflexive clitics. As outlined in the introduction, I did not offer an account for dative clitic doubling and assumed throughout that the dative clitic is a form of agreement between a zero Applicative head and the dative argument licensed in its specifier. My assumption that dative clitics are agreement markers is supported in the work by Suñer (1988), Sportiche (1996), Legendre (2003), Diaconescu (2004), and Kallulli (2008, 2016) among others. Yet treating clitics as reflexes of agreement morphology is challenged by parallel proposals of clitics as reflexes of A-bar movement (see a recent updated overview on the literature on clitics in Anagnostopoulou (to appear)).

I also hope to address two more environments with obligatory dative clitics in Bulgarian that have been left out in this dissertation. The first environment is the one of locative predicates, which have been shown to support dative clitic-marked arguments parallel to accusative constructions with similar meaning:

(1) Taboretka-ta e zad tjax
ottoman-the.NOM be.3SG behind they.ACC
'The ottoman is behind them'

(2) Taboretka-ta e ot-zad(e) im
ottoman-the.NOM be.3SG from-behind they.DAT
'The ottoman is from behind them'

The second environment is dative clitics employed as a discursive device to express the speakers/hearers general understanding or perception of a given event or state:
Toj mi zaspal na zemja-ta!
'(unexpectedly to me) He feel asleep on the floor!'
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