

Dative Clitics and Case Licensing in Standard and Macedonian Greek

Alexis Dimitriadis
University of Pennsylvania

1 Introduction

Doubling in Romance languages is subject to *Kayne's generalization*, which states that a doubled object must be introduced by a preposition.

- (1) Lo vimos *(a) Juan. (Spanish)
CL we-saw Juan

This behavior suggests that clitics absorb Case, requiring the presence of another Case assigner in order for doubling to be licit. But other languages systematically violate Kayne's generalization:

- (2) a. Ton idame to Giorgo. (Greek)
CL we-saw the George

In this paper, I will address the question of Case absorption from a somewhat different angle: rather than focus on the conditions that must be met in order to *allow* a clitic to co-occur with a full NP, I will examine constructions that *require* a clitic (sometimes allowing, but at others prohibiting a doubled NP). I will argue that the existence of such constructions demonstrates that clitics can participate in Case assignment. In answer to the question of *why* the clitics are obligatory, I will argue that although Modern Greek NPs lack the morphological dative of Ancient Greek, Greek verbs continue to assign dative to their oblique complements; thus oblique NPs can only receive Case through the "mediation" of a clitic or a (light) preposition, which assign genitive or accusative instead of dative.

Clitic doubling has semantic consequences that have been studied at some length (e.g., see Anagnostopoulou (1993), Uriagereka (1995)). Here, however, I will focus exclusively on the syntactic conditions involved.

2 Indirect objects in Greek

Modern Greek has lost the morphological dative case of Ancient Greek; formerly dative constructions are typically expressed with the preposition *se* ('at' or 'to') followed by an NP carrying morphological accusative. When followed by a determiner, *se* obligatorily incorporates to it and appears as the prefix *s-*.

- (3) Edosa ta vivlia s-to Giorgo.
I-gave the books to-the George/acc

- (4) Egrapsa s-ti Maria.
I-wrote to-the Mary/acc

Depending on the verb, a number of prepositions are used. Of these *se* is by far the most common, but *apo* ‘from’ and *me* ‘with’ are also seen.

- (5) a. Zita apo to Giorgo ena potiri nero.
ask from the George/acc one glass water/acc
‘Ask George for a glass of water.’

I will refer to this construction as “periphrastic dative,” a term intended to be purely descriptive: I will leave open for now the question of whether *se* should be considered a Case assigner or a reflex of dative morphology.

Indirect objects are not always expressed in the periphrastic dative. In the standard dialect, spoken in Athens and most of southern Greece, (abbreviated SG), an indirect object may instead carry morphological genitive. This construction is slightly awkward with some verbs, clitic doubling being the preferred alternative, but is quite grammatical. Genitive and periphrastic dative constructions are synonymous, and the use of one or the other appears to be an optional stylistic matter.

- (6) a. Edosa tou Giorgou ta vivlia. (SG)
I-gave the George/gen the books/acc
‘I gave George the books.’
b. Egrapsa tis Marias.
I-wrote the Maria/gen
‘I wrote to Mary.’

If a clitic appears, it invariably receives morphological genitive:

- (7) a. Tou edosa ta vivlia.
CL/masc/gen I-gave the books/acc
‘I gave him the books.’
b. Tis egrapsa.
CL/fem/gen I-wrote
‘I wrote to her.’

In doubling constructions, clitic and overt NP must always receive the same Case; when a dative clitic is doubled, both the clitic and the overt object must appear in the genitive, that is, periphrastic dative is disallowed on the doubled NP:

- (8) a. Tou edosa ta vivlia tou Giorgou.
CL/gen I-gave the books/acc the George/gen
‘I gave George the books.’
b. * Tou edosa ta vivlia sto Giorgo.
CL/gen I-gave the books/acc to-the George/acc

- (9) a. Tis egrapsa tis Marias.
 CL/gen I-wrote the Maria/gen
 'I wrote to Maria.'
- b. * Tis egrapsa sti Maria.
 CL/gen I-wrote to-the Maria/acc

This in effect makes Greek diametrically opposite to the pattern described by Kayne's generalization: far from being necessary to clitic doubling, prepositions are actually incompatible with it.

In the dialect spoken in most of northern Greece, especially rural areas of Macedonia, periphrastic dative is again universally available. But instead of using a genitive clitic to refer to an indirect object, the Macedonian dialect uses accusative clitics; clitic doubling is readily available, and as expected the doubled object must also receive (bare) accusative.

- (10) a. Ton edosa ta vivlia (to Giorgio). (SG)
 CL/acc I-gave the books/acc (the George/acc)
 'I gave him (George) the books.'
- b. * Ton edosa ta vivlia sto Giorgio.
 him/acc I-gave the books/acc to-the George/acc

So far Macedonian Greek is just like the Athenian version, with the substitution of accusative for genitive as the reflex of dative. But while a bare genitive object is grammatical in the southern dialect (SG), as in sentence (6), the Macedonian dialect typically does not allow a dative object to carry bare accusative in the absence of a clitic.¹ Thus sentences (11b) and (12b) are ungrammatical, unlike their SG counterparts in (6).

- (11) a. Edosa sto Giorgio ta vivlia.
 I-gave to-the George/acc the books/acc
- b. * Edosa to Giorgio ta vivlia.
 I-gave the George/acc the books/acc
- (12) a. Egrapsa sti Maria.
 I-wrote to-the Maria/acc
- b. * Egrapsa ti Maria.
 I-wrote the Maria/acc

Thus the presence of the clitic *adds* to the options for Case-assignment, suggesting that clitics somehow participate in the assignment of Case in doubled constructions.

The same phenomenon can be seen, in a less extreme form, in the indirect objects of Spanish; as Jaeggli (1986) reports, indirect objects in most dialects of Spanish are markedly degraded unless doubled by a dative clitic.

- (13) ??(Le_i) entregué el libro al profesor_i.
 CL I-gave the book to-the professor

Although the clitic is in principle optional, the resemblance to the Macedonian pattern is obvious.

3 More Obligatory Clitics

The indirect objects of Macedonian Greek and Spanish are not the only context in which a clitic argument is required or preferred. A variety of marked constructions in both Greek and Spanish also require clitics doubling.

3.1 Datives of possession

The so-called “datives of inalienable possession” (which does not actually need to be inalienable) must also be expressed with a clitic. Jaeggli (1986) proposes that they augment the thematic grid of the verb they are used with. As the following example shows, datives of possession can be doubled.

- (14) a. Le_i examinaron los dientes al caballo $_i$.
 ‘They examined the horse’s teeth.’
 b. Le duele la cabeza a Juan.
 ‘John has a headache.’

Greek also have datives of possession; like indirect objects, they are expressed in the genitive in southern Greek, and in the accusative in Macedonian. As in Spanish, the clitic is obligatory (in *both* dialects).

- (15) a. Tou Giorgou tou ponai to kefali (tou). (SG)
 the George/gen CL/gen hurts the head (his/gen)
 ‘George has a headache.’
 b. Ton Giorgio ton ponai to kefali (tou). (NG)
 the George/acc CL/acc hurts the head (his/gen)
 ‘George has a headache.’

The presence of the (optional) possessive *tou* ‘his’ demonstrates that the NP *tou Giorgou* is a doubled NP, not a scrambled possessor. Note also that the possessive is in the genitive in both dialects.

Datives of possession should not be confused with *ethical datives*, which both Greek and Spanish also have.

- (16) a. Juan me le_i arruinó la vida a esa chica $_i$.
 Juan eCL CL ruined the life to that girl
 ‘Juan ruined that girl’s life (and this affects me).’
 b. Mi mou stenachorite to pedi.
 not CL/gen/1sg upset the kid
 ‘Don’t upset the kid (which concerns me).’

In such constructions the referent of the clitic is not an argument of the verb, but is somehow interested in the situation being described. An ethical dative clitic must be in the first or second person, and can never be doubled.²

3.2 Various oblique complements

Both standard and Macedonian Greek have numerous verbs that require an oblique complement to be expressed as a clitic. Some allow a doubled NP, but others do not. Some, but not all, allow a full NP to be introduced by a preposition. The following examples, both in the standard dialect, allow a clitic or a clitic-doubled NP. Sentence (17c) shows that the argument of *epese* ‘fell’ cannot be introduced by the preposition *apo* ‘from’ (or any other); while as (18b) shows, the object of *antistathike* ‘resisted’ can be introduced by the preposition *se*. (A clitic is as usual incompatible with a preposition).

- (17) a. *(Tis) epese to potiri tou papa (tis Marias).
 CL/gen fell the glass/nom the priest/gen the Maria/gen
 ‘She (Maria) dropped the priest’s glass.’
- b. * Epese tis Marias to potiri tou papa.
 fell the Maria/gen the glass/nom the priest/gen
 * ‘Maria dropped the priest’s glass.’
- c. * Epese apo ti Maria to potiri tou papa.
 fell from the Maria/acc the glass/nom the priest/gen
- (18) a. O Petros *(tis) antistathike (tis Marias).
 the Petros CL/gen resisted the Maria/gen
 ‘Petros resisted Maria.’
- b. O Petros (*tis) antistathike (s-ti Maria).
 the Petros CL/gen resisted to-the Maria/acc
 ‘Petros resisted Maria.’

3.3 Locative prepositions

Greek allows the complement of most complex locative prepositions (“near the house,” “with the children”) to be expressed with a genitive clitic.³ What is interesting is that such prepositions do not allow bare genitive objects: full NP objects must be introduced by a preposition, just like the indirect objects of verbs.

- (19) a. Brosta s-to spiti.
 in-front at-the house/acc
 ‘In front of the house.’
- b. Brosta tou.
 in-front CL/gen

- c. * Brosta tou spitiou.
in-front the house/gen
- (20)
- a. Mazi me ti Maria.
together with the Maria/acc
'With Maria'.
 - b. Mazi tis.
with CL/gen
 - c. * Mazi tis Marias.
together the Maria/gen

Thus locative prepositions behave very similarly to the obligatory-clitic verbs: an argument must be expressed either as a genitive clitic (in all dialects) or as a periphrastic dative NP.⁴ Clitic doubling in these constructions is usually degraded, but seems to be at least sometimes possible:

- (21) Ta klidia tis Marias itan brosta tou_i tou Giorgou_i, alla den ta
the keys the Maria/gen were in-front CL/gen the George/gen but not them
evlepe.
saw
'Mary's keys were in front of George, but he did not see them.'

We see then the same alternation as with the indirect objects of Macedonian Greek: a full NP must be licensed by either a preposition or a clitic.

4 Clitics assign Case

In the examples presented in the previous section, clitics do not alternate freely with full NP complements. Datives of possession must be expressed with a clitic (and optional doubled NP); indirect objects in NG can appear in the periphrastic dative, but accusative NP objects must obligatorily be doubled by a clitic; similarly, the complements of locatives must either be in the periphrastic dative or doubled by a clitic; and some verbs disallow periphrastic dative, allowing NP complements to appear only if they are doubled.

What is the proper analysis of these alternations? Jaeggli (1986) analyzes ethical datives and clitics of inalienable possession as adding an argument to the theta-grid of the host verb; the verb then assigns Case to any doubled NP. But this approach cannot account for indirect objects, which occupy subcategorized positions, or for the complements of locative prepositions and other environments where an NP can be licensed by a preposition when there is no clitic.

The ability of a preposition to license an NP suggests that what is at issue is Case licensing: a "bare" NP cannot appear because it fails to be Case-licensed. Since the presence of a clitic licenses an NP object in most of these environments, we conclude that clitics contribute to the Case-licensing capacity of the verb, that

is, that clitics can participate in the assignment of Case to doubled NPs.

There are a number of ways to flesh out this idea. Assuming, as is common, that an undoubled clitic licenses a null pronoun *pro* that occupies the structural argument position, we can adopt the analysis that clitics uniformly assign Case, whether or not a doubled NP is overtly present, and whether or not the presence of the clitic is required in order for the overt NP to appear. This in turn requires that clitics also *absorb* Case; otherwise in doubled constructions where the clitic is optional, the doubled NP would receive Case from both the clitic and the NP, violating the Case filter.

Since the evidence presented here involves indirect complements, I will restrict this analysis to indirect-object clitics (including morphologically accusative clitics in Macedonian Greek), leaving open the question of Case-assignment by direct object clitics; the most uniform approach would be to take these to absorb and assign Case as well.

To complete the description of the role of clitics in Case assignment, it is necessary to examine more closely the indirect-object construction I have named “periphrastic dative.” This is the subject of the next two sections; in section 7 I return to clitics and their relationship to the indirect objects of Greek.

5 The Double Object Construction in Greek

English ditransitive verbs can express their indirect object in two ways reminiscent of the alternation between genitive and the prepositionally introduced periphrastic dative of Greek:

- (22) a. I gave John the book. (double object)
b. I gave the book to John. (oblique dative)

It is well known that these two constructions are structurally different; the problems posed by their properties were pointed out by Barss and Lasnik (1986), and received a widely accepted analysis by Larson (1988, 1990).

Given the obvious resemblance of the Greek ditransitive alternations to the English double object/oblique dative constructions, it is tempting to analyze the Greek periphrastic dative as the analogue of the English oblique dative, and genitive indirect objects as parallel to English double objects. Such an analysis was argued for by Catsimali (1990), and is apparently assumed by Campos (1991). Nevertheless, on closer inspection such a parallel turns out to be untenable: the structural contrast that motivated Larson’s analysis is systematically absent in Greek. In the absence of any evidence of a structural difference, we can conclude that genitive (or accusative) and periphrastic dative indirect objects occupy identical structural positions.

In the English *double object* constructions, the indirect object necessarily appears first, and can bind the direct object.

(Order: V IO DO)

- (23) a. I showed Mary herself (in the mirror). IO > DO
b. * I showed herself Mary.
- (24) a. I gave every worker_i his_i paycheck.
b. * I gave its_i owner every paycheck_i.

In *oblique dative* structures, both linear order and binding possibilities are reversed: the direct object precedes and can bind the indirect object.

(Order: V DO to IO)

- (25) a. * I showed herself to Mary. DO > IO
b. I showed Mary to herself.
- (26) a. * I gave his_i paycheck to every worker_i.
b. I gave every check_i to its_i owner.

In Greek, we fail to find a similar contrast: reflexive binding in sentences with (bare) genitive, periphrastic dative and doubled complements consistently patterns with the English double-object sentences, not the obliques.⁵ Sentence (27) shows that a periphrastic-dative indirect object binds a reflexive direct object, but not vice-versa. Sentence (28) shows that the same is true of bare-genitive and doubled indirect objects in the standard (SG) dialect; the Macedonian dialect behaves similarly.

(Order: V IO > DO)

- (27) a. Ediksa sti Meri ton eafto tis (ston kathrefti).
I-showed to-the Mary the self/acc her (in-the mirror)
'I showed Mary herself (in the mirror).'
- b. * Ediksa ston eafto tis ti Meri (ston kathrefti).
I-showed to-the self her the Mary/acc (in-the mirror)
* 'I showed herself Mary (in the mirror).'
- (28) a. (Tis_i) ediksa tis Meris_i ton eafto tis. (SG)
CL I-showed the Mary/gen the self/acc her
'I showed Mary herself.'
- b. * (Tou_i) ediksa tou eaftou_i tis ti Meri.
CL/gen I-showed the self/gen her the Mary/acc
* 'I showed herself Mary.'

Greek, being a free word order language, can realize the direct object before the indirect object without reversing their dominance relationship:

(Order: V DO < IO)

- (29) a. Ediksa ton eafto tis sti Meri.
I-showed the self her to-the Mary
- b. * Ediksa ti Meri ston eafto tis.
I-showed the Mary to-the self her

- (30) a. (Tis_i) ediksa ton eafto tis tis Meris_i. (SG)
 CL/gen I-showed the self her the Mary_i
 b. * (Tou_i) ediksa ti Meri tou eaftou_i tis.
 CL/gen I-showed the Mary the self/gen her

The analysis of Greek ditransitives must remain beyond the scope of this paper. For my present purposes, what matters is the consistent *lack* of a structural contrast between genitive and periphrastic dative indirect objects. It is reasonable, then, to conclude that all types of oblique complement NP in Greek occupy the same structural position (presumably verb-complement).

6 The Case of periphrastic datives

What is the source of the Case assigned to the NP appearing in periphrastic dative constructions? Given that the Case filter requires NPs to receive Case from *somewhere*, there are two logical possibilities.

- a. There is no extrinsic source of Case, i.e., the preposition heading the periphrastic dative phrase is the sole source of Case. Verbs do not assign Case to periphrastic dative objects.
- b. Case is assigned extrinsically (e.g., by the verb or AgrO).

In this section I will argue in favor of option (b), which in its turn leads to the following two possibilities:

- b. i. The elements heading periphrastic dative phrases are not really prepositions; they are just bits of dative morphology, expressing the Case assigned directly by the verb or locative.
- ii. Case is assigned extrinsically, but cannot be “realized” directly by the NP; *se* or another “light” preposition heads a Case-assigned PP and “mediates” the assignment of Case to its complement.

The difference between these is small. Since different verbs and locative prepositions require different “light” prepositions to introduce their complements, I will adopt option (ii) to avoid positing a large number of dative “Case” subvarieties.

6.1 A straw-person theory

Suppose verbs don’t assign Case to periphrastic dative objects. Under this line of reasoning the prepositions are inserted not to mediate, but to introduce Case for theta-marked but Case-less arguments.

We would say that SG verbs assign Case to a bare genitive argument, but not to a periphrastic dative one.

There are numerous problems with such an analysis, which can be summarized with the observation that periphrastic dative objects behave as if they occupy

a Case-assigned, not a Case-less, position.

- Why don't "Case-less" indirect objects ever raise to a non-thematic, Case-assigned position? Indirect objects in Greek never become the subjects of passives, as the following examples illustrate.

- (31) a. * O Nikos diavastike ta dikeomata tou
the Nikos was-read the rights his
* 'Nikos was read his rights.'
b. * O Nikos apandithike.
the Nikos was-answered

- Conversely, why can't Caseless direct objects ever be licensed by *se*? For example, why can't the underlying direct objects of unaccusatives and passives stay *in situ*?

- (32) a. * *pro* Irthe sto Niko.
expl. came to-the Nikos/acc
'Nikos came.'

- Why can't doubled NPs be introduced by prepositions? It seems apparent that the problem is Case mismatch; but how exactly is Case mismatch to be understood? The problem cannot be a mismatch in the *morphological* case appearing on the clitic and on the doubled NP, since in Macedonian Greek clitic and periphrastic-dative NP both are marked with morphological accusative.

- (33) a. Ton milisa to Giorgo. (NG)
CL/acc I-spoke the George/acc
b. * Ton milisa sto Giorgo. (NG)
CL/acc I-spoke to-the George/acc

We must require that clitic doubling is only allowed when the same Case carried by the clitic is assigned to the doubled NP *position*; meaning that the presence of a PP instead of an NP there automatically results in Case mismatch, regardless of the Case carried by the embedded NP. But we cannot claim that (33b) *necessarily* suffers from Case mismatch: this is exactly the configuration *required* for direct objects in Spanish!

- (34) a. * Tou milisa sto Giorgo. (SG)
CL/gen I-spoke to-the George
b. Lo vimos a Juan. (Spanish)
CL we-saw Juan

Thus if there is Case mismatch here, this fact must be stipulated as an unpredictable difference between Greek and Spanish.

We have accepted that clitics assign Case to doubled NPs. Perhaps a clitic always does so, but the prepositions introducing periphrastic datives cannot tolerate Case assigned to them? This approach once again predicts that the Spanish

pattern of doubling should be impossible.

The issues discussed here demonstrate that periphrastic dative objects behave as if they occupy a Case-assigned, not Caseless, position. It is at best very messy to assume the converse, as I did in this section for the sake of demonstration.

Since a number of prepositions can head a periphrastic dative complement, they cannot be treated as morphological reflexes of Case unless we postulate a different “Case” for each one. It is better to assume that a single form of Case is assigned by the verb, and that it is *transmitted* to the NP by the preposition heading the periphrastic dative construction, along the lines suggested by Jaeggli for the Spanish preposition *a*.

7 The Proposal

Restricting our attention to the environments that disallow “bare” NP complements, we see that accusative or genitive oblique NPs are in complementary distribution with periphrastic datives: the former can co-occur with clitics but not with uncliticized verbs or locatives; while periphrastic datives co-occur with prepositions or cliticized verbs, but not with clitics.

Granted then that clitics (in conjunction with their host) assign Case to doubled NPs, and that verbs and locative prepositions assign Case to periphrastic dative objects, I propose to explain their distribution by assuming that clitics on the one hand, and verbs and locative on the other, assign different *types* of Case. Specifically, Greek verbs assign (abstract) dative to their oblique complements. Because Greek nouns no longer have morphological dative case, NPs cannot directly receive dative; Case assignment must be mediated by a preposition or clitic.

The prepositions *se*, *apo* etc. can function as “light” prepositions that “transmit” Case assigned by a verb or locative; when in this role they must be assigned (abstract) Dative Case and assign accusative to their argument. (cf. Jaeggli (1986)). A “light” preposition can be used as long as its semantics are *compatible* with those of the relationship it expresses. Thus most obliques are compatible with a goal or benefactive interpretation and are introduced with *se* ‘at/to’; those expressing source are introduced by *apo* ‘from’; and some arguments, not being compatible with any of the available prepositions, cannot be expressed through periphrastic dative.

Clitics can also receive dative directly; they *realize*, and transmit it, as morphological *genitive* or *accusative*, depending on dialect and the particular lexical item involved. Presumably Greek, although lacking morphological dative, allows a small number of words to realize dative as another Case. Clitics, being closed-class items, are treated in this exceptional way, and assign the Case they realize; but NPs can only be licensed by the Case passed on by a clitic or light preposition.

Locative prepositions also assign dative Case, which again can be assigned to clitics or prepositions but not to full NPs. Surprisingly, clitics in all dialects of

Greek realize (and transmit) as genitive the Case assigned in this configuration. We may leave this as a quirk of the system, or alternately, locatives might be said to assign “locative” Case, realized as genitive by clitics in all dialects of Greek; cf. Mahajan (1991). The conceptual cost of this option is that we must postulate another variety of very abstract Case.

The account developed here explains a characteristic of obligatory-clitic constructions that I have not addressed until now: none of them involve direct objects.⁶ The reason can now be readily seen: NPs can realize accusative Case directly, so the mediation of a clitic or preposition is never needed for direct objects, which are assigned accusative.

One more messy part remains to this story: Recall that the indirect objects of SG verbs can generally appear carrying “bare” genitive. We must assume that most verbs of SG have the option of assigning genitive to their indirect object instead of dative, often somewhat marginally. Similarly, but much less often, NG verbs may assign accusative to their indirect object.

For cases where an NP cannot appear even when a clitic is present, (i.e., where doubling is prohibited), we can assume that some verbs, even combined with a clitic, can simply fail to assign “well-formed” Case to their complement; hence doubling will fail because the doubled NP cannot pass the Case filter.

This framework works for Spanish dative clitics as well: In Spanish, dative is always realized through an *a* phrase, as in the analysis of Jaeggli (1986). The Case assigned by verbs to their indirect objects is slightly “defective,” hence clitic doubling is the preferred way to license dative objects. But Spanish, unlike Greek, has “real” dative clitics: Indirect-object clitics in Spanish assign dative to their doubled NPs (which is once again realized prepositionally).

Since none of the obligatory-clitic environments involved a direct object clitic, there is no evidence that such clitics actually assign Case. We may assume that they do for symmetry; if so, extraction asymmetries between accusative and genitive clitics cannot be explained through recourse to Case. (They may be explainable by reference to specificity effects, assuming that *these* are independent). I prefer to be conservative, making no claims about the operation of accusative clitics.⁷

Kayne’s generalization draws a sharp line between Spanish, which obeys it, and Greek, which violates it. The analysis I presented here treats the difference between the two languages as a difference not in the presence or absence of Case, but in the *identity* of the Case assigned by indirect object clitics. This reduces Kayne’s generalization to an accident of morphology: Languages that obey it have clitics that assign Case that cannot be realized by bare NPs. Languages that violate it have clitics that assign better-behaved Case. The correctness of this viewpoint can be seen by examining the Bulgarian clitic system, which appears to partly obey and partly violate Kayne’s generalization.

Bulgarian has almost completely collapsed the dative and genitive cases

(although the name “genitive” is traditionally used for possessives, and the name “dative” for oblique objects). Dative/genitive NPs (with the exception of prenominal genitives, which I will ignore) are expressed periphrastically, by prefixing the NP with the preposition *na*. Doubled dative/genitive NPs are expressed in exactly the same way.

- (35) a. *prijatelkata (mu_i) na Ivan_i.*
the-girlfriend CL/gen of Ivan
'Ivan's girlfriend'
b. *Dadoh (mu_i) pismoto na Ivan_i.*
I-gave CL/dat the-letter to Ivan
'I gave the letter to Ivan.'

Thus indirect objects and possessives appear to obey Kayne's generalization. However, direct objects also appear in the same form whether or not they are doubling a clitic:

- (36) *Vidjah (go) Ivan.*
I-saw CL/acc Ivan
'I saw Ivan.'

In this case Bulgarian appears to violate Kayne's generalization, since the doubled NP is not introduced by a preposition. It should be clear that there is no real “inconsistency” in the Bulgarian pattern. Bulgarian consistently puts doubled objects in the same form as when they are undoubled; it so happens that Bulgarian expresses dative/genitive periphrastically, and accusative holophrastically. Clitic doubling is simply irrelevant to this pattern.

Thus we have discovered a fair amount of symmetry and coherence in a superficially diverse set of environments, ranging from environments requiring a clitic to environments that prohibit clitic doubling, and allowing for the observance as well as the violation of Kayne's generalization.

Notes

I am grateful to Sabine Iatridou, Michael Heggarty, Spyridoula Varlokosta and Elena Anagnostopoulou for their contributions to the conception and expression of the ideas presented in this paper. I remain solely responsible for all errors.

1. Many speakers accept bare accusative with some verbs (usually very common ones). There is quite a bit of speaker variation on this point, although to my knowledge no speaker finds bare accusative universally acceptable as a way to express indirect objects.

2. Pace Warburton (1977), the clitic in (16b) cannot be replaced by the NP *gia mena* 'for me' without change in meaning:

- (i) *Gia mena, mi to stenachorite to pedi.*
'For my sake, don't upset the kid.'

3. There is no clear pattern to which of these prepositions exceptionally prohibit clitics. For example *kato* 'below' disallows clitics, while *pano* 'above' allows them.

4. The reader may wonder about the difference between prepositions that do not allow bare NP arguments and prepositions that are introduced in order to assign Case to NPs. Basically, I believe that the former are not true prepositions—I prefer to think of constructions like (19a) as adverbs with arguments. They have clear semantics (mostly locative), they can be used without arguments as (conventional) adverbs, and they are phonologically strong. Case-assigning prepositions, on the other hand, tend to be semantically vague, must always have a complement, and are phonologically weak.

Schneider-Zioga (1994) treats both types as prepositions; she notes that locative prepositions cannot take a reflexive complement; and conversely “lighter” prepositions, which do not accept clitics, allow reflexives.

At any rate it seems clear that the two types differ systematically in fundamental ways.

5. Curiously, quantifier binding appears to pattern with the English obliques. But again, there is no *contrast* between the different forms of indirect object.

6. Certain NPs, for example the bare quantifier *ola* 'all', cannot be used as direct objects unless they are doubled by a clitic. In these cases the requirement for a clitic is conditioned on the identity of the *object* rather than of the Case assigner. Since they differ so sharply from the phenomena presented in this paper, I will assume that they are indicative of a different phenomenon. See Anagnostopoulou (1993) for discussion of these examples.

7. On the basis of extraction facts, Sportiche (1992, p. 60) proposes that accusative double objects in Romance languages receive Case at Spec(AgrO), which is distinct from the accusative clitic phrase, CL_{acc}P; but that dative objects receive Case at Spec(CL_{dat}P). This asymmetry is wholly consistent with the conservative proposal that only dative clitics participate in Case assignment.

References

- Anagnostopoulou, Elena (1993) “On the Representation of Clitic Doubling in Modern Greek,” ms., U. of Salzburg/U. of Tilburg.
- Barss, Andrew, and Howard Lasnik (1986) “A Note on Anaphora and Double Objects,” *Linguistic Inquiry* 17:2, 347–354.
- Brugè, Laura, and Gerhard Brugger (1993) “On the Accusative ‘A’ in Spanish,” ms., Università di Venezia, October 1993.
- Campos, Héctor (1991) “Indirect Object Alternations in Modern Greek,” ms., Georgetown University, May 1991.

- Catsimali, Georgia (1990) *Case in Modern Greek: Implications for Clause Structure*, Doctoral dissertation, University of Reading.
- Iatridou, Sabine (1995) "To Have and Have Not," paper presented at WCCFL 14, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, March 1995.
- Jackendoff, Ray (1990) "On Larson's Treatment of the Double Object Construction," *Linguistic Inquiry* 21:3, 427–456.
- Jaeggli, Osvaldo (1986) "Three Issues in the Theory of Clitics: Case, Doubled NPs, and Extraction," in Hagit Borer, ed., *The Syntax of Pronominal Clitics*, volume 19 of *Syntax and Semantics*, Academic Press, 15–42.
- Kayne, Richard S. (1994) *The Antisymmetry of Syntax*, Linguistic Inquiry Monograph 25, M.I.T. Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- Larson, Richard K. (1988) "On the Double Object Construction," *Linguistic Inquiry* 19:3, 335–392.
- Larson, Richard K. (1990) "Double Objects Revisited: Reply to Jackendoff," *Linguistic Inquiry* 21:4, 589–632.
- Mahajan, Anoop (1991) "Clitic Doubling, Object Agreement and Specificity," in *Proceedings of NELS 21*.
- Schneider-Zioga, Patricia (1994) *The Syntax of Clitic Doubling in Modern Greek*, Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California.
- Sportiche, Dominique (1992) "Clitic Constructions," ms., UCLA, September 1992.
- Terzi, Arhonto (1991) "Genitive Clitics of Prepositions," ms., CUNY Graduate Center, November 1991.
- Terzi, Arhonto (1994) "Double Object Clitics, their Hosts and their Ordering," ms., University of Ottawa, September 1994.
- Uriagereka, Juan (1995) "Aspects of the Syntax of Clitic Placement in Western Romance," *Linguistic Inquiry* 26:1, 79–123.
- Warburton, Irene P. (1977) "Modern Greek Clitic Pronouns and the 'Surface Structure Constraints' Hypothesis," *Journal of Linguistics* 13, 259–281.

Department of Linguistics
 619 Williams Hall
 University of Pennsylvania
 Philadelphia, PA 19104-6305
 alexis@ling.upenn.edu