

ILIANA KRAPOVA krapova@unive.it


DICHIARAZIONE AI FINI DELL' ATTRIBUZIONE DEL CONTRIBUTO
INDIVIDUALE NEI LAVORI CON PIU' AUTORI IN CUI ESSA NON SIA
ESPLICITA

Io Sottoscritta, Iliana Krapova, nata a Plovdiv, Bulgaria, il 17/12/1960, residente a Venezia (VE), in via Lungomare G. Marconi 76, 30126, codice fiscale KPRLNI60T57Z104Q, DICHIARO di essere autrice, con Guglielmo Cinque, del seguente articolo: Clitic reduplication constructions in Bulgarian. In: Dalina Kallulli and Liliane Tasmowski, eds., *Clitic Doubling in the Balkan Languages*. pp. 257-287, Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2008. ISBN: 9789027255136

Anche se i due autori hanno contribuito pariteticamente alla costruzione della ricerca e alla redazione del testo, il mio contributo specifico riguarda le sezioni 2,4,5,6.

Venezia, 15/07/2017

In fede

Handwritten signature of Iliana Krapova in black ink.

Linguistik Aktuell Linguistics Today 130

Clitic Doubling in the Balkan Languages

Edited by

Dalina Kallulli

Liliane Tasmowski

John Benjamins Publishing Company

Clitic Doubling in the Balkan Languages

Edited by

Dalina Kallulli

University of Vienna

Liliane Tasmowski

University of Antwerp & KVAB

John Benjamins Publishing Company

Amsterdam / Philadelphia



The paper used in this publication meets the minimum requirements of American National Standard for Information Sciences - Permanence of Paper for Printed Library Materials, ANSI Z39.48-1984.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Clitic doubling in the Balkan languages / edited by Dalina Kallulli and Liliane Tasmowski.

p. cm. (Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics Today, ISSN 0166-0829 ; v. 130)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

1. Balkan Peninsula--Languages--Clitics. I. Kallulli, Dalina. II. Tasmowski, Liliane.

P381.B3.C55 2008

415'.7--dc22

2008019877

ISBN 978 90 272 5513 6 (Hb; alk. paper)

© 2008 - John Benjamins B.V.

No part of this book may be reproduced in any form, by print, photoprint, microfilm, or any other means, without written permission from the publisher.

John Benjamins Publishing Co. · P.O. Box 36224 · 1020 ME Amsterdam · The Netherlands

John Benjamins North America · P.O. Box 27519 · Philadelphia PA 19118-0519 · USA

PART III. Morpho-syntactic properties and modelling of clitic doubling

8. Clitic doubling, agreement and information structure:
The case of Albanian 227
Dalina Kallulli
9. Clitic reduplication constructions in Bulgarian 257
Iliyana Krapova and Guglielmo Cinque
10. Clitic doubling, complex heads and interarboreal operations 289
Alexandra Cornilescu and Carmen Dobrovie-Sorin
11. Rethinking the Clitic Doubling parameter: The inverse
correlation between clitic doubling and participle agreement 321
Vina Tsakali and Elena Anagnostopoulou

PART IV. Clitic doubling within the DP

12. Romanian possessive clitics revisited 361
Larisa Avram and Martine Coene
13. Possessive clitics in the DP: Doubling or dislocation? 389
Giuliana Giusti and Melita Stavrou

Name index 435

Language index 437

Subject index 439

Clitic reduplication constructions in Bulgarian*

Iliyana Krapova & Guglielmo Cinque
University of Venice

This paper discusses clitic reduplication constructions in Bulgarian. In contrast to traditional analyses, it distinguishes clitic doubling proper, which is restricted to clauses with psych and physical perception predicates, from other constructions that involve reduplication of an argument by a clitic, notably, left and right dislocation, focus movement, and hanging topic construction. Several properties of clitic doubling proper are identified, among which obligatory doubling of quantifiers, wh-phrases and focus phrases. These are argued to be the distinguishing features of this construction in Bulgarian, given the cross-linguistic evidence from Romance and other languages.

1. Introduction

Both in the traditional literature and in some contemporary studies on Bulgarian the reduplication of an argument by a clitic (whether the argument precedes the clitic, as in (1)–(3), or follows the clitic, as in (4)–(5)), is considered a unitary phenomenon, referred to as “clitic doubling”.¹

- (1) *Tja i bez tova ne moga da ja*
she(NOM) and without that not can.1SG Mod.prt her.CL.ACC
nakaram da jade²
make.1SG Mod.prt eat.3SG
‘Her, anyway, I cannot make her eat’ (colloquial)

*We wish to thank Liliane Tasmowski and three anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments.

1. See, for example, Assenova (1980, 2002), Guentchéva (1994), Leafgren (1997), Franks & Rudin (2005). Some authors (Minčeva 1969; Lopašov 1978) refer to (1) through (3), in which the full NP precedes the clitic, as cases of *reprisa* (resumption), and to the constructions in (4) and (5), in which it follows, as cases of *anticipatio* (anticipation).

2. This, as well as all the other examples referred to as “colloquial” in the text below, are taken from the corpus of colloquial Bulgarian utilized in Džonova (2004), subsequently digitalized and available at www.bgspeech.bg.

- (2) *Na Maria njama da i piša.*
to Maria will-not Mod.prt her.CL.DAT write.1SG
'To Maria I will not write'
- (3) *Samo na Ivan mu se speše.*
only to Ivan him.CL.DAT REFL was-sleeping
'Only Ivan felt like sleeping'
- (4) *Poznavam go tova čuvstvo.*
know.1SG it.CL.ACC this sentiment
'I know this sentiment'
- (5) *Ne mu se speše samo na Ivan.*
not him.CL.DAT REFL was-sleeping only to Ivan
'Only Ivan didn't feel like sleeping'

Here, we will argue that (1)–(5) do not represent a unitary phenomenon, but in fact five separate cases, with clearly distinct properties: (1) Hanging Topic, (2) Clitic Left Dislocation, (3) Focus Movement, (4) Clitic Right Dislocation, (5) Clitic Doubling proper. We will eventually focus our attention on the one exemplified in (5), which we refer to simply as *Clitic Doubling* (henceforth CD).

It is possible that Clitic Left Dislocation (CLLD), Clitic Doubling (CD), and perhaps Clitic Right Dislocation (CLRD), will eventually turn out to be different manifestations, at a more abstract level, of one and the same structure, possibly with the clitic and the associate merged together as a single constituent (for different variants of this idea cf. Kayne 1972, 2001; Uriagereka 1995; Torrego 1995; Papangeli 2000; Franks & Rudin 2005).³ However, we believe that before trying any higher order unification of the above constructions, it is important to consider the syntactic and pragmatic properties of each separately.

We begin with (1) and (2), which, following more recent literature on Bulgarian and other languages, we will call Hanging Topic Left Dislocation (HTLD) and Clitic Left Dislocation (CLLD), respectively.⁴

3. If Sportiche (1999) is correct in merging D separately from NP and higher in the structure of the clause, then the clitic double will also have to be merged higher (essentially as in Sportiche 1996). Any attempt at a unification of such constructions will also have to derive the differences among them discussed below, and in Cinque (1990, chapter 2), Iatridou (1995, 11f), Krapova & Cinque (2006), among others.

4. Cf. Rudin (1986, 33ff), Arnaudova (2002, 2003, 165f), Krapova (2002), and, for Romance, Cinque (1977, 1990, chapter 2), Benincà (1988, 130ff), Dobrovie-Sorin (1994), Samek-Lodovici (2005), among others.

2. Hanging topic versus Clitic Left Dislocation

Hanging Topics have clear pragmatic, prosodic and structural properties that distinguish them from CLLD Topics. First of all, from a pragmatic point of view, the relation of this type of Topic and the following Comment is rather loose, i.e., the HT creates only a general context for the Comment, which is why in Guéntcheva (1994) and Assenova (2002) such constructions are also referred to as *extraposition Topics, segmented phrases* (in the sense of Bally 1932, 1965) or *thématisation forte* (“strong Themes”). Additionally, from a prosodic point of view, there can be a sharp intonational break between the left dislocated phrase and the rest of the sentence. Despite these peculiarities, HTLD may be hard to distinguish from CLLD when the dislocated phrase is a simple DP without overt Case marking. Therefore, it is important to consider those syntactic properties that diagnose each construction as distinct from the other.

One first distinction between HTLD and CLLD has to do with the fact that while HTLD can be found only in root contexts (see the contrast in (6)),⁵ CLLD appears in both root and non-root contexts. See (7):

- (6) a. *Toj ne mogat da go prikrepjat kam nikogo* (HTLD)
 he.NOM not can.3PL Mod.prt him.CL.ACC attach.3PL to nobody
 ‘Him, they cannot attach him to anyone’⁶
- b. **Ivan kaza če toj ne mogat da go prikrepjat kam nikogo*
 Ivan said that he.NOM not can.3PL Mod.prt him.CL.ACC
 attach.3PL to nobody
 ‘Ivan said that they cannot attach him to anyone’
- (7) a. *Na Marija ti s ništo ne si i pomognal.* (CLLD)
 to Maria you.NOM with nothing not be.2SG her.CL.DAT
 helped.PART
 ‘Maria, you haven’t helped her at all’
- b. *Ivan kaza, če na Marija ti s ništo ne si i pomognal.*
 Ivan said that to Maria you.NOM with nothing not
 be.2SG her.CL.DAT helped.PART
 ‘Ivan said that you haven’t helped Maria at all.’

5. This can be seen when the presence of other properties (like lack of Case connectivity – see below) rules out the possibility of having an instance of CLLD as well.

6. In the translation, we rendered the Bulgarian HTLD with English “Left Dislocation”, which appears to be its closest correspondent. See Rudin (1986, chapter 2).

A second difference between CLLD and HTLD is the presence vs. absence of Connectivity effects (cf. in particular Rudin 1986, 33ff, who uses the terms Topic construction and Left Dislocation, respectively). One class of Connectivity effects involves Case matching between the dislocated phrase and the resumptive element inside the clause.⁷ Since in Bulgarian only pronouns show overt Case distinctions, Connectivity effects will be visible only with this type of DPs. Pronouns qua Hanging Topics do not exhibit Case connectivity with the resumptive element and consequently the Topic appears in the default Nominative case (*Nominativus pendens*) – cf. (8) (“#” indicates a pause which is often optional):

- (8) a. *Ti(#) ne mogat li da te prikrepjat* (colloquial)
 you.NOM not can.3PL Q Mod.prt you.CL.ACC attach.3PL
kăm njakoj?
 to someone
 ‘You, can’t they attach you to someone?’
- b. *Tja i bez tova ne moga da ja*
 she.NOM and without that not can.1SG Mod.prt her.CL.ACC
nakaram da jade
 make.1SG Mod.prt eat.3SG
 ‘Her, I cannot make her eat anyway’ (colloquial)

In the CLLD construction on the other hand, Case connectivity effects show up obligatorily. This is illustrated by (9), which is identical to (8) except for the overt Accusative Case marking on the topicalized pronoun:

- (9) a. *Az mislia, če *ti/tebe ne mogat da te*
 I think that you.NOM/ACC not can.3PL Mod.prt you.CL.ACC
prikrepjat kăm njakoj
 attach.3PL to someone
 ‘I think that they can’t attach you to anybody’
- b. *Ivan kaza, če *tja/neja i bez tova ne može*
 Ivan said that she.NOM/ACC and without that not can.3SG
da ja nakara da jade
 Mod.prt her.CL.ACC make.3SG Mod.prt eat.3SG
 ‘Ivan said that he cannot make her eat anyway’

7. In addition to Case connectivity, which is the only type of connectivity considered here, Bulgarian CLLD shows various other types of connectivity effects (category matching, bound anaphors, bound pronominals, etc.), much like its Romance equivalent (for which see Cinque 1977, 1990, chapter 2).

A third property distinguishing HTLD from CLLD is the type of the resumptive element. In HTLD the resumptive element can be any DP (a clitic pronoun, a tonic pronoun, a definite description, a quantifier, etc.). All of these possibilities exist in colloquial speech and are exemplified in (10):

- (10) a. *Marija nikoj ne ja običa.*
 Maria nobody not her.CL.ACC love.3SG
 ‘[As for] Maria, nobody loves her’
- b. *Marija znaeš li će nikoj ne govori s neja ot godini.*
 Maria know.2SG Q that nobody not talk.3SG with her since years
 ‘[As for Maria], do you know that nobody has talked to her for years?’
- c. *Marija az izobšto njama da govori s taja patka veče.*
 Maria I at-all will-not Mod.prt talk.1SG with this fool already
 ‘[As for] Maria, I will not talk to this fool any more.’
- d. *Toj njama nikoj da dojde.*⁸
 he.NOM will-not nobody Mod.prt come.3SG
 ‘Nobody will come’

Only (10a) above is ambiguous between HTLD and CLLD since as can be seen in (11a) below, CLLD is compatible only with a clitic resumptive element:⁹

- (11) a. *Ivan kaza, će Marija nikoj ne ja običa.*
 Ivan said that Maria nobody not her.CL.ACC loves.3SG
 ‘Ivan said that [as for] Maria, nobody loves her’
- b. **Ivan kaza, će Marija nikoj ne govori s neja ot godini.*
 Ivan said that Maria nobody not talk.3SG with her since years

8. The negative quantifier can also be found before the auxiliary (i), or in the inverted subject position (ii). Being a quantifier, *nikoj* cannot be dislocated and therefore must be assumed to occupy one of the possible subject positions in (10d), as well as in (i)/(ii).

- (i) *Toj nikoj njama da dojde* (colloquial)
 He nobody will-not Mod.prt come.3SG ‘Nobody will come’
- (ii) *Toj njama da dojde nikoj* (colloquial)
 He will-not Mod.prt come.3SG nobody ‘Nobody will come’

9. This can be seen only if we exclude a HTLD source (e.g., by setting the dislocated phrase in an embedded context).

- c. **Ivan kaza, če Marija izobšto njama da govori s*
 Ivan said that Maria at-all not-will Mod.prt talk.3SG with
*taja patka večē.*¹⁰
 this fool any more
- d. **Ivan kaza, če toj njamalo nikoj da dojde.*
 Ivan said that he.NOM will-not.evid. nobody Mod.prt come.3SG

On the basis of the above examples we can generalize that regardless of its grammatical function, the dislocated phrase in the HTLD construction can only be a (Nominative case marked) DP. This restriction is illustrated by the ungrammaticality of (12b) where the dislocated phrase is a PP resumed by a tonic pronoun (as well as by a clitic). Compared to the otherwise similar case of (10b), the ungrammaticality of (12b) shows that PPs are not available as Hanging Topics. On the other hand, PPs can freely appear in CLLD, as illustrated by (13b). More generally, the only requirement that CLLD poses is for the dislocated phrase to be matched by a resumptive clitic (with the same Case and phi-features). Cf. (13c). Given that HTs cannot be PPs, nor CPs, we can conclude that wherever we encounter a simple non pronominal DP in a left dislocated position, as in (13a) below, this DP will always be ambiguous between a HTLD and a CLLD Topic.

- (12) a. *Ivan otdavna ne sa mu plaštali* (colloquial)
 Ivan for-a-long-time not be.3PL him.CL.DAT paid.PART.PL
 ‘Ivan has not been paid for a long time’
- b. **Na Ivan šte mu se obadja na nego.*
 to Ivan will him.CL.DAT REFL call.1SG to him.
- (13) a. [_{DP} *Pismoto*] *go napisax az.*
 letter.ART it.CL.ACC wrote.1SG I
 ‘The letter, I wrote it’
- b. [_{PP} *Na Ivan*] *otdavna ne sa mu plaštali.*
 to Ivan for-a-long-time not be.3PL him.CL.DAT paid.PART.PL
 ‘Ivan, he has not been paid for a long time’
- c. [_{CP} *Če Rusia ni e osvobodila ot turscite*],
 That Russia US.CL.ACC be.3SG liberated.PART from Turks.ART
go znajat i decata
 it.CL.ACC know.3PL also children.ART
 ‘Even children know that Russia has liberated us from the Turks.’

10. The sentence is ungrammatical under the intended reading that *Marija* and *taja patka* refer to the same individual.

Yet another property of Hanging Topics is their insensitivity to (strong) islands such as the Complex NP island (as in (14a)) or the Adjunct island (as in (14b)).

- (14) a. *Ivan(#) poznaváš li onova momiče, koeto/deto mu*
 Ivan know.2SG Q that girl who/that him
dava knigi? (Complex NP island)
 lend.3SG books
 [As for] Ivan, do you know that girl that lends him books?
- b. *Ivan# Marija izbjaga, kato mu dade*
 Ivan, Maria ran-away.3SG when him.CL.DAT gave.3SG
rozata (Adjunct island)
 rose.art
 '[As for] Ivan, Maria ran away after giving him the rose.'

CLLD, on the other hand, does show sensitivity to (strong) islands (Arnaudova 2002, 2003, 179f):

- (14) a'. **Na Ivan poznaváš li onova momiče, koeto mu dava*
 to Ivan know.2SG Q that girl who/that him.CL.DAT lend.3SG
knigi?
 books (Complex NP island)
- b'. **Na Ivan Marija izbjaga, kato mu dade rozata*
 to Ivan Maria ran-away.3SG when him.CL.DAT gave.3SG rose.ART
 (Adjunct island)

In case a Hanging Topic co-occurs with a CLLD Topic, the former precedes the latter. No other linear order is possible between the two topicalized expressions, as indicated by the ungrammaticality of (15b) where the Nominative Hanging Topic pronoun *az* 'I' follows the CLLD-ed tonic pronoun *mene* 'me', in clear violation of the ordering constraints.

- (15) a. *Az# mene ošte me e jad, če togava ne te*
 I.NOM me.ACC still me.CL.ACC is anger that then not you.CL.ACC
poslušax.
 listened.1SG
 'Me, I am still angry that I didn't listen to you then'
- b. **Mene az ošte me e jad, če togava ne te pošlušax.*
 me.ACC I.NOM still me is anger that then not you.CL.ACC listened.1SG

While there can only be a single HT per clause, multiple CLLD Topics are perfectly possible (Krapova & Karastaneva 2002; Arnaudova 2002). Cf. (16) and (17):

- (16) *A ti# tebe xapalo li te e kuče?* (colloquial)
 and you.NOM you.ACC bitten.PART.SG Q you.CL.ACC be.3SG dog
 ‘And you, have you been bitten by a dog?’
- (17) a. *Tija knjigi na vas koj vi gi e*
 these books to you.DAT who you.CL.DAT them.CL.ACC be.3SG
pratil?
 sent.PART.SG
 ‘These books, who sent them to you?’
- b. *Na vas tija knjigi koj vi gi e pratil?*
 to you.ACC these books who you.CL.DAT them.CL.ACC be.3SG sent.PART.SG

From these contrasts we can thus conclude that CLLD and HTLD are two different types of Topic constructions, which are possible with any type of predicate.¹¹

11. To be more precise, HTLD and CLLD should be distinguished from another (root-only) topic construction – the *kolkoto do DP* “as for DP” construction, not only because the three constructions can co-occur (in the order *kolkoto do DP*>HTLD>CLLD – see (i)a–c), but also because CLLD and HTLD phrases count as occupants of the first position with respect to Tobler-Musafia effects (proclisis vs. enclisis) while *kolkoto do DP* phrases do not – see (ii)a–c. We interpret this last fact as suggesting that while CLLDed phrases and Hanging Topics are hosted in the CP space, presumably in the specifier position of dedicated functional projections, *kolkoto do* phrases are outside of the clause altogether:

- (i) a. *Kolkoto do Ivan, toj nego nikoj ne go običa*
 As for Ivan, he him.ACC nobody not him.CL.ACC love.3SG
 ‘As for Ivan, him nobody likes’
- b. **Kolkoto do Ivan, nego toj nikoj ne go običa*
 As for Ivan, him.ACC he.NOM nobody not him.CL.ACC love.3SG
- c. **Toj, kolkoto do Ivan, nego nikoj ne go običa*
 he.NOM, as for Ivan, him.ACC nobody not him.CL.ACC loves
- (ii) a. **Kolkoto do mene# me pokanixa na sreštata ošte včera*
 As for me, me.CL.ACC invited.3PL to meeting.Art already yesterday
 (cf. *Kolkoto do mene# pokanixa me na sreštata ...*)
- b. *Mene me pokanixa na sreštata ošte včera*
 Me.ACC me.CL.ACC invited.3PL to meeting.Art already yesterday
- c. *Az me pokanixa ošte včera na sreštata*
 I.NOM me.CL.ACC invited.3PL already yesterday to meeting.Art

3. Focus movement versus CLLD

CLLD should also be kept distinct from the construction standardly called Focus movement, which also involves a left peripheral constituent construed with an IP-internal position. In addition to the contrastive nature of the focused phrase, Focus movement differs from CLLD in not allowing a clitic to resume it. So, for example, in (18) which is a case of Focus-moved PP, as also indicated by the focusing adverb *samo* “only”, the presence of a resumptive clitic leads to an ungrammatical, or at least marginal, result (Nitsolova 2001). Example (18) thus contrasts with (2) above (repeated below for convenience) where the clitic is perfectly fine due to its being inside a CLLD construction:

- (18) *Samo na Marija njama da (??) piša.*
 only to Maria will-not Mod.prt her.CL.DAT write.1SG
 ‘I will not write only to Maria’
- (2) *Na Maria njama da i piša.*
 to Maria will-not Mod.prt her.CL.DAT write.1SG
 ‘To Maria I will not write’

The only exception to the generalization regarding the distribution of clitic resumption is provided by those cases to which we refer here as CD (*Clitic Doubling*), where a doubling clitic remains obligatory regardless of the type of construction – CLLD or Focus movement. This basically shows that the Topic-Focus distinction is irrelevant for the characterization of CD.

- (19) *Samo na Ivan ne *(mu) se speše.*
 only to Ivan not him.CL.DAT REFL was-sleeping.3SG
 ‘Only Ivan didn’t feel like sleeping’

4. Clitic Doubling and Clitic Right Dislocation

Going back to examples (4) and (5) (repeated below for convenience) in which the clitic precedes the associate, we find good reasons to treat them as belonging to two quite different cases: (4) is an instance of Clitic Right Dislocation (CLRD), while (5) is an instance of CD proper:

- (4) *Poznavam (go) tova čuvstvo.*
 know.1SG it.CL.ACC this sentiment
 ‘I know this sentiment’
- (5) *Ne *(mu) se speše samo na Ivan.*
 not him.CL.DAT REFL was-sleeping only to Ivan
 ‘Only Ivan didn’t feel like sleeping’

Similarly to what we saw above in the case of HTLD and CLLD, in the CLRD construction doubling is optional, it does not depend on the type of predicate involved, and whenever it is present, it correlates with Topicality of the associate, which cannot be wh-moved, nor be contrastively focused, nor contain a (non-specific) indefinite quantifier.

In the case exemplified by (5), instead, doubling is obligatory, crucially depends on the predicate involved rather than on word order (cf. also Franks & Rudin 2005; Guentchéva this volume), and more importantly, the reduplicated element (the clitic's associate) can carry new information (i.e., bear the nuclear stress of the sentence), can be wh-moved and contrastively focused; additionally, a (non-specific) indefinite quantifier can be used as the associate of the clitic. It is to this case that we reserve the term Clitic Doubling (CD).

The predicates that trigger *obligatory* CD in Bulgarian are given in the list below:¹²

(A) Psych and physical perception predicates with dative experiencers

- i. Verbs: *xaresva mi* "it appeals to me", *domáčnjava mi* "I feel sad", *lipsva mi* "I miss", *dosazda mi* "it bothers me", *doskučava mi* "I feel bored", *dotjaga mi* "I am bored with/I am fed up with", *xrumva mi* "it occurs to me", *omržava mi* "I get tired of", *teži mi* (na dušata) "my heart is heavy", *dokrivjava mi* "feel out of sorts"; *pri-zljava mi* "it makes me sick", *pričernjava mi* "feel faint", *primaljava mi* "feel/grow faint", *prilošava mi* "feel faint/unwell" (Rožnovskaya 1959: 413, 1971: 229–230; Manolova 1979: 147).
- ii. Adjectives: *skučen mi e* "I find him/it boring", *māčen mi e* "I find it difficult", *skučno mi e* "I am bored", *māčno mi e* "I miss/I am sad", *lošo mi e* "I feel faint", *studenno mi e* "I am cold", *toplo mi e* "I am hot", etc. (Maslov 1982: 291–292);
- iii. Adverbs: *dobre mi e* "I feel good" (lit. "well to me is"), *zle mi e* "I feel bad", etc.
- iv. Nouns: *žal mi e* "I feel sorry" (lit. "pity to me is"), etc. (Maslov 1982, 304)

(B) Psych and physical perception predicates with accusative experiencers

- i. Verbs: *mārzi me/ domārzjava me* "feel lazy", *dostrašava me* "be afraid of", etc. *trese me* "I am feverish", *sārbi me* "it's itching", *prerjazva me* "I feel a sudden sharp pain", *izbiva me* (na plač) "I feel like crying", etc.
- ii. Nouns: *jad me e* "I am mad at", *sram me e* "I am ashamed of", *strax me e* "I am afraid", *gādel me e* "I am ticklish" ...

12. Cf. Rožnovskaya (1959, 1971), Slabakova (1994), Franks & Rudin (2005). The predicates in boldface are those that will be exemplified below.

(C) Predicates with possessor datives:

olekva mi (na sǎrceto) ‘my heart lightens; feel relief’; *bučat mi ušite* ‘my ears ring’; *pari mi* (na ezika) ‘my tongue is burning’ ...

(D) Predicates with possessor accusatives:

boli me (glavata) ‘my head is aching’,¹³ *sviva me* (sǎrceto) ‘my heart is aching’, *probožda me* ‘I have a shooting pain’, *vǎrti me ramoto* ‘I have a stitch in the shoulder’, *stjaga me* (sǎrceto) ‘be sick at heart’, *grize me* (sǎvestta) ‘my conscience pricks me’ ...

(E) Predicates in the *feel-like* construction:¹⁴

spi mi se ‘I feel like sleeping’; *pie mi se* ‘I feel like drinking’, *jade mi se* ‘I feel like eating’, *iska mi se* ‘I feel like’, *idva mi da* ‘I feel like’...

(F) (Certain) modal predicates:

nalaga mi se ‘I have to’, *trjabva mi* ‘I need’, *slučva mi se* ‘it happens to me’, *vǎzmožno mi e* ‘it is possible for me’, *neobxodimo/nužno mi e* ‘it is necessary for me’.

(G) Predicates indicating presence/absence:

ima ‘there is’, *njama* ‘there isn’t’ (Cyxun 1968: 71; Lopašov 1978: 30; Assenova 1980).

The examples in (20) below show that doubling is obligatory with each one of the above classes of predicates even when the DP carries new information and nuclear stress, and under no circumstances can it stand alone.¹⁵ Quite different is the notion of obligatoriness of the clitic in Clitic Left Dislocation contexts reviewed in section 2 (e.g., *Ivan vsički *(go) poznavat* lit. ‘Ivan all him know’), since in this case, the presence

13. We add the clitic to the impersonal verb, following the Bulgarian grammatical tradition, which takes the clitic to be part of the lexical item.

14. This construction is productive throughout Slavic with transitive and intransitive verbs, and is used to express the fact that someone (the dative experiencer) ‘feels like V-ing’, e.g., *spi mi se* (‘I feel like sleeping’ lit.: it sleeps to me). For a recent discussion of this construction in Slavic cf. Rivero & Sheppard (2003, section 5) and Marušič & Žaucer (2003a,b; 2005).

15. Strictly speaking, only with Clitic Left Dislocated-DO is the resumptive clitic obligatory, as the contrast between *Ivan vsički *(go) poznavat* ‘Ivan all him know’ vs. *Na Marija az mnogo sǎm (i) pomagal* ‘To Maria, I have helped her (CL.DAT) a lot’ shows. See Cinque (1990, §2.3.5) for a possible account of the corresponding contrast in Romance.

of the clitic is epiphenomenal on the choice of the construction: if the object is not Clitic Left Dislocated, it need not be doubled and can very well stand alone, as in *Vsički poznavat Ivan* ‘Everybody knows Ivan’. In what we call CD proper, on the other hand, the clitic has to be present irrespective of the choice of construction.

- (20) a. *Filmăt *(mu) xaresa na Ivan.*
 film-the him.CL.DAT appealed.3SG to Ivan
 ‘Ivan liked the film’
- b. *Jad *(go) e Ivan*
 anger him.CL.ACC is Ivan
 ‘Ivan is angry’
- c. *Olekna *(mu) na nego*
 relieved.3SG him.CL.DAT to him
 ‘He felt relief’
- d. *Boli *(go) glavata Ivan.*
 hurt.3SG him.CL.ACC head.ART Ivan
 ‘Ivan’s head is hurting’
- e. *Spi *(mu) se na Ivan.*
 sleep.3SG him.CL.DAT REFL to Ivan
 ‘Ivan feels like sleeping’
- f. *Naloži *(mu) se na Ivan da zamine za Sofia.*
 was-necessary him.CL.DAT REFL to Ivan Mod.prt leave.3SG for Sofia
 ‘Ivan had to leave to Sofia’
- g. *Ima *(go) Ivan v spisăka.*
 there-is him.CL.ACC Ivan in list.ART
 ‘Ivan is [present] in the list’

The examples in (21)–(23) below further show that with precisely the same class of predicates the associate of the clitic can be (contrastively) focused with such focusing adverbs as *samo* ‘only’, *dori* ‘even’, *i* ‘also’ (see (21)), can be wh-moved ((22)), and can contain a (non-specific) indefinite quantifier (see (23)).¹⁶

16. This recalls Psych and Possessor Dative Clitic Doubling in Spanish, Romanian, and the Veneto dialects of Northern Italy, where obligatoriness of the clitic correlates with the possibility for the associate to be new information and bear nuclear stress, to be focused, to be wh-moved, and to be an indefinite quantifier (see Jaeggli 1982, 1986, 24; Dobrovie-Sorin 1990, 1994; Cordin 1993 among others). The fact that Accusative Clitic Doubling has different properties from Dative Clitic Doubling in those Romance languages and dialects that allow it can possibly be related to independent requirements on the preposition/case marker which precedes the associate (in addition to the above references, see Suñer 1988; Dobrovie-Sorin 1990, 1994; Brugè & Brugger 1996).

- (21) a. *Filmăt *(mu) xaresa dori na Ivan.*
film-the him.CL.DAT appealed even to Ivan
'Even Ivan liked the film'
- b. *Jad *(go) e samo Ivan*
anger him.CL.ACC is only Ivan
'Only Ivan is angry'
- c. *Šte mu olekne naj-nakraja i na nego*
will him.CL.DAT become-lighter at last and to him.ACC
'He will finally feel relief as well'
- d. *Ne *(go) boli glavata samo Ivan.*
not him.CL.ACC hurts head.Art only Ivan
'Only Ivan's head is not hurting'
- e. *Spi mu se samo na Ivan.*
sleep.3SG him.CL.DAT REFL only to Ivan
'Only Ivan feels like sleeping'
- f. *Šte mu se naloži dori na Ivan da*
will him.CL.ACC be-necessary even to Ivan Mod.prt
poraboti malko
work.3SG little
'Even Ivan will have to work a while'
- g. *Njama *(go) samo Ivan v spisăka.*
there isn't him.CL.ACC only Ivan in list-the
'Only Ivan is not [present] on the list'
- (22) a. *Na kogo *(mu) xaresa filmăt?*
to whom him.CL.DAT appealed.3SG film-the
'Who liked the film'
- b. *Kogo *(go) e jad?*
whom him.CL.ACC is anger
'Who is angry?'
- c. *Na kogo šte *(mu) olekne naj-nakraja?*
to whom will him.CL.DAT feel-relief.3SG at last
'Who will finally feel relief?'
- d. *Kogo *(go) boli glavata?*
whom him.CL.ACC ache.3SG head-the?
'Who has a headache?'
- e. *Na kogo *(mu) se spi?*
to whom him.CL.DAT REFL sleep.3SG
'Who feels like sleeping?'

- f. *Na kogo šte *(mu) se naloži da poraboti malko?*
to whom will him.CL.ACC REFL is-necessary Mod.prt work.3SG a little
'Who will have to work a little?'
- g. *Kogo *(go) njama v spisāka?*
whom him.CL.ACC there-isn't in list.Art
'Who is not [present] on the list?'
- (23) a. *Filmāt ne *(mu) xaresa na nikogo.*
film.Art not him.CL.DAT appealed.3G to nobody
'Nobody liked the film'
- b. *Ne *(go) e jad nikogo.*
Not him.CL.ACC is anger nobody
'Nobody is angry'
- c. *Ne *(mu) olekna na nikogo.*
not him.CL.DAT felt-relief to nobody
'Nobody felt relief'
- d. *Ne *(go) boli glavata nikogo.*
not him.CL.ACC hurts head.Art nobody
'Nobody has a headache'
- e. *Ne *(mu) se speše na nikogo.*
not him.CL.DAT REFL slept to nobody
'Nobody felt like sleeping'
- f. *Ne *(mu) se naloži na nikogo da raboti.*
not him.CL.DAT REFL was-necessary to nobody Mod.prt work.3SG
'Nobody had to work'
- g. *Njama *(go) nikogo v spisāka.*
there-isn't him.CL.ACC nobody in list.Art
'Nobody is [present] on the list'

We take the properties illustrated in (21) through (23) by the predicates listed under (A)–(G) to be characteristic of CD (Clitic Doubling) proper (Cf. Jaeggli 1982, 1986). Conversely, in the CLRD construction neither of these properties are present. Thus, the associate of the clitic cannot be focussed (24a); cannot be wh-moved (24b), cannot be a non-specific indefinite quantifier (24c):¹⁷

17. Not all of these properties, however, seem to be necessary conditions for CD. For example, as noted, there are varieties of Spanish where the associate of a doubling *accusative* clitic can be new information focus, but cannot be wh-moved, nor can it be a non-specific indefinite quantifier (see Jaeggli 1986, 39ff, and references cited there). Furthermore, in all varieties of Spanish

- (24) a. **Poznavam go samo tova čuvstvo.*
 know.1p it.CL.ACC only this sentiment
- b. **Kakvo go poznaš?*
 what it.CL.ACC know.2p
- c. **Ne go poznavam ništo.*
 not it.CL.ACC know.1p nothing

We have analysed (4) as a case of CLRD (Clitic Right Dislocation) as such properties are typical of the CLRD construction of Romance and other language families.¹⁸

The two constructions (CD and CLRD) also differ intonationally. Thus, for example, (4) requires an intonational “break” between the clitic and its associate, which is parsed as a separate prosodic unit.¹⁹

- (25) a. *Poznavam go, tova čuvstvo.* → [_F *Poznavam go*]φ
 [*tova čuvstvo*]φ VclO
- b. *Poznavam go, tova čuvstvo, az* → [_F *Poznavam go*]φ [*tova čuvstvo*]φ
 [_F *az*]φ VclOS

In the real clitic doubling cases, on the other hand, the verb, the clitic and the associate form one prosodic domain, as illustrated in (26):²⁰

- (26) [*Boli go samo Ivan*]φ [*glavata*]φ

The fact that the putative cases of DO-Clitic Doubling in Greek discussed in the literature (e.g., *Ton idha ton Petro* “Him I saw Petro”, Anagnostopoulou 1999: 762) do not

doubling is obligatory with pronominal direct and indirect objects (cf. Jaeggli 1982, 1986). Obligatoriness of the clitic (independently of the construction), and the ability of the associate to count as new information (bearing the nuclear stress of the sentence) thus seem bona fide diagnostics distinguishing CD from Clitic Right Dislocation.

18. See Benincà (1988, 130ff), and Samek-Lodovici (2005) for relevant discussion.

19. If there is no clitic, the in situ object can be parsed either as forming one phrase together with the verb, or as an independent phrase. No such option is available for the clitic right dislocation construction, which only has the second option.

- (i) *Poznavam tova čuvstvo az.* → [*Poznavam tova čuvstvo*]φ [*az*]φ VOS
 [*Poznavam*]φ [*tova čuvstvo*]φ [*az*]φ

Note that in (i) a sentence-final focussed subject is added, which does not affect the information structure of the sentence. It is intonationally distinct from the CLRD construction and is parsed as a separate prosodic unit. Thus Anagnostopoulou’s argument (1994, 1999) that the possibility of having a focused subject after the associate of a clitic indicates clitic doubling and not CLRD does not hold for Bulgarian (if it holds in Greek. See Philippaki-Warburton et al. 2004, and the text below).

20. The subject, if present, cannot participate in the same domain, but is parsed as a separate prosodic unit and is necessarily distressed (marginalized or CLRD-ed).

allow the associate to be new information bearing nuclear stress (Androulakis 2001: 93), to be a *wh*-phrase (27a), a focused phrase (27b) and a (non-specific) indefinite quantifier (see Iatridou 1995: 25, and Philippaki-Warburton et al. 2004: 981, for discussion) would seem to suggest that they should be analysed as cases of CLRD rather than cases of CD proper.²¹

- (27) a. *Pion (*ton) idhes?* (Iatridou 1995: 25; cf. also Kallulli 1999: 31) (Greek)
 who him saw.2SG
 ‘Whom did you see?’
- b. *(*Ton) idha ton KOSTA* (Iatridou 1995: 25; cf. also Androulakis 2001: 93)
 him saw.1SG the Kosta (focus)
 ‘I saw Kostas.’

Anagnostopoulou (1999, 765f) and Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou (2000) take the apparent possibility of clitic doubling an ECM subject (as in (28a)), and an object in the presence of a focused inverted subject (as in (28b)), as evidence that such cases must be genuine CD rather than CLRD cases:

- (28) a. *O Jannis tin ekane [tin Maria] na klapsi* ECM
 the Jannis her.CL.ACC made the Maria Mod.prt cry.3SG
 ‘Jannis made M. cry’
- b. *Tin efaghe tin turta o JANNIS* Focus
 her.CL.ACC ate.3SG the cake the Jannis (focus)
 ‘It was John who ate the cake’

This evidence however is not conclusive, not only in light of the facts just reviewed but also because Italian, which has CLRD but no productive CD (apart from the limited cases mentioned in Cinque 1990: 178 fn4 and fn5) appears to allow forms corresponding to (28a–b), with properties characteristic of CLRD. See (29a–b) (see also the acceptability of a focused subject after a CLRDed object in the Bulgarian sentence (i) of fn.15).²²

21. Albanian direct object clitic doubling appears to behave like its Greek analogue (see Kallulli 1999, chapter 2).

22. Revithiadou & Spyropoulos’s (2003) experimental evidence, quoted in Philippaki-Warburton et al. (2004, 974), shows that in *clVOS* cases such as (27b) *V* and *O* belong to different prosodic units (suggesting a CLRD configuration).

Note that in Greek, as in Bulgarian, *psych* and *physical perception* predicates do appear to constitute genuine cases of CD as doubling with them is obligatory, and the associate can be focussed, can be *wh*-moved and can be an indefinite quantifier. See section 6. below for some examples.

- (29) a. *Io non l' ho mai lasciáta/vísta, Maria, piángere.* (Italian)
 I not her have.1SG ever let.PART/see.PART Maria cry
 'I never let/saw Maria cry.'
- b. *Non l' ha mangiáta, la torta, neanche GIANNI.*
 not it has.3SG eat.PART the cake not even Gianni. (focus)
 'Not even Gianni ate the cake.'

5. CD with tonic pronouns

The type of clitic doubling discussed above, which was seen to require a doubling clitic even with full DPs, should be differentiated from another, and more complex, type of clitic doubling available in Bulgarian, where the associate of the clitic is a tonic pronoun. Both the clitic and the tonic pronoun are morphologically marked for Case – see the examples in (30):

- (30) a. *Poznavam go nego* (Bulgarian)
 know.1SG him.CL.ACC him (tonic.ACC)
 'I know him'
- b. *Pitaj go nego - na men*
 ask.IMP.2SG him.CL.ACC him(tonic.ACC) - to me
ne mi e kazval.
 not me.CL.DAT be.3SG tell.PART
 'Ask HIM – to me he hasn't said anything'

Clitic doubled pronouns, particularly frequent in colloquial speech, are typically used as topics (Ivančev 1978: 166; Maslov 1982: 304–5; Nitsolova 1986: 53, 2001: 82; Guentchéva 1994: 111 and this volume). Depending on context, they can also be used as contrastive topics,²³ or as contrastive foci,²⁴ accompanied by appropriate contrastive stress (Mel'ničuk 1971: 190).

23. Nitsolova (2001, 82) gives the following context to illustrate the contrastive topic feature of the pronominal construction:

- (i) [KAKVO STANA]F *s našite prijатели?* – 'What happened to our friends?'
 [Nego]T [go izbraxa (za DIRECTOR)F] a [neja]T
 him him.CL.ACC elected.3PL for director while her
 [ja UVOLNIXA]F.
 her.CL.ACC fired.3PL
 'He was elected director, while she was fired'

24. Clitic doubling in focalization contexts should be differentiated from reduplication/ "anticipatio" in topicalization contexts. Ivančev (1978, 166) has noted that while the former is an optional phenomenon, the latter is always obligatory. Cf. his example: *IVAN *(go) vižda nego.*

The function of contrastive focus can also be achieved by the tonic pronoun, undoubled by the clitic, as in (31)a–b:

- (31) [-Who do you know, Peter or Maria?]
 a. -Poznavam nego/*nego.
 'I know him'
 b. -Poznavam (samo) nego.
 know.1SG only him.
 'I know only him.'

In view of the pragmatic conditions under which (30) and (31) are felicitous, we can generalize that the type of focus in (30) is specified as [+contrastive], while the one in (31), although still available under the contrastive reading, has the specification [+exhaustive]. The exhaustive reading requires that the object argument get identified as the only element for which the predicate phrase actually holds, to the exclusion/cancellation of all other potential candidates (Kiss 1998). The notion of exhaustiveness (Vallduvì & Vilkkuna 1998: 84) can explain the frequent use of operators/exclusive particles like *samo* "only" (or the implicit presence thereof) with undoubled tonic pronouns.

The parallel existence of (30) and (31) shows that clitic doubling with accusative tonic pronouns is optional save for information structure purposes. However, this is not the right generalization, as the following two cases of accusative-dative asymmetries show.

The first asymmetry derives from the fact that despite the optionality of clitic doubling with indirect object arguments,²⁵ which seems to be parallel to that of direct object arguments, there is a subset of predicates taking indirect object arguments

"It is Ivan who sees him." As discussed in section 3. above, we believe that this latter type of reduplication should be associated with CLRD, and not with CD, given the completely different pragmatic conditions, semantic-communicative role and intonation structure in (i) (necessarily flat intonation) as opposed to (ii):

- (i) *Lelja Cvetanka dnes *(mi) donese [F smokini] na men.* CLRD
 auntie Cvetkanka. today me.CL.DAT brought.3SG figs to me
 'Aunt Cvetanka brought me figs today'
- (ii) *Lelja Cvetanka dnes (mi) donese smokini [F na men].* CD

25. For example dative arguments with verbs like *obaždam se* "call", *davam* "give", *donasjam* "bring", *kazvam* "say", *zapovjadvam* "order", *napominjam* "remind", *spomenavam* "mention", *podarjavam* "donate" can optionally take a doubling clitic (highly preferred in colloquial speech):

- (i) *Ivan (mu/mi) se obadi na nego/mene.*
 Ivan (him/me.CL.DAT) REFL called.3SG to him/me
 'Ivan called him/Ivan called me'

which require doubling regardless of information structure. These arguments feature non-experiencer datives with psych predicates like *radvam se na X* ‘be happy with X’, *sārdja se na X* ‘be angry with X’, *jadosvam se na X* ‘be mad at X’, benefactive/malefactive datives, and possessive datives:^{26, 27}

- (32) a. *Tja taka *(mu) se zaradva na nego, če ne se*
 she so him.CL.DAT REFL got-happy to him that not REFL
stārpja i go celuna
 restrained.3SG and him.CL.ACC kissed
 ‘She was so happy to see him that she could not restrain herself and kissed him.’
- b. *Šte *(i) napravja inžekcia na neja i šte vidiš,*
 will her.CL.DAT make.1SG injection to her and will see.2SG
če šte se uspokoi.
 that will REFL calm-down.3SG
 ‘I will give her an injection and you will see that she will calm down’
- c. *Az *(mu) udarix edin šamar na nego.*
 I him.CL.DAT slapped one slap to him
 ‘I slapped him in the face’
- d. *Vidjax *(ti/i) liceto na tebe/na neja.*
 saw you/her face.Art of you/of her
 ‘I saw your/her face’

The second asymmetry regards the use of the focusing particle *samo* ‘only’ which, as hinted above, and illustrated in (34), is incompatible with clitic doubled accusative

26. This restriction is relevant only for clitic doubled pronouns. Cf. (i). which shows that optionality of the clitic gets restored with full DPs (as opposed to the psych predicates discussed in section 3. where also full DPs are obligatorily clitic doubled):

- (i) *Ivan (mu) udari edin šamar na Petār.*
 Ivan (him.CL.DAT) slapped one slap to Peter

27. Somewhat less clear are cases selecting a possibly Benefactive dative such as *pomagam* ‘help’, *karam se* ‘scold’, *prigotviam* ‘prepare’, *zapoviadvam* ‘order’, *slagam* ‘put’, *otdavam se* ‘dedicate oneself’, *radvam se* ‘rejoice’, etc., with which a 1st or 2nd (but not 3rd) person Dative tonic pronoun is obligatorily doubled:

- (i) *Az pomognax na nego*
 I helped.1SG to him “I helped him.”
- (ii) *Toj *(mi) pomogna na mene*
 He me.CL.DAT helped.3SG to me “He helped me.”

tonic pronouns. The contrast between (33) and (34) with respect to the status of the doubling clitic shows however that this generalization does not extend to the case of clitic doubled dative pronouns which are perfectly compatible with *samo*:

(33) *Tja (mu) pomaga samo na nego.*
 she him.CL.DAT help.3SG only to him

(34) *Tja (*go) običa samo nego.*
 she him.CL.ACC love.3SG only him

We seem therefore, to be having a parameter which distinguishes between Accusative and Dative pronouns. Even a superficial look at the data reveals that other parameters are also involved in the distribution of clitic doubling in standard Bulgarian and in Bulgarian dialects.

Although clitic doubling with pronouns is widespread in Bulgarian dialects, there is a dialectal area (subpart) referred to by Stojkov (1963a,b) as “the periphery zone of the Bulgarian linguistic territory,” which includes “bigger or smaller parts of the North-Western, South-Western, and South-Eastern Bulgaria” and which contains a number of archaic (and common Slavic) features, where clitics are available but clitic doubling is either lacking or at least severely restricted (cf. Krapova & Tisheva 2006 for a recent overview of the distribution of the various types of reduplication across the Bulgarian dialectal territory). One such case is provided by the South-Western dialect of Ixtiman which, as reported by Mladenov (1965),²⁸ appears to have clitic doubling with 3rd person (dative) tonic pronouns, but not with 1st and 2nd person (dative) pronouns, which points that a distinction between 1st/2nd person and 3rd person is relevant for this dialect. See (35) and (36).^{29,30}

28. Dialects with restrictions on clitic doubling include the area of Kjustendil in South-West Bulgaria (as reported by Umlenski 1965), the dialectal area of Gjumjurdžina in Eastern Thrace (as reported by Bojadžiev 1972, 1991), the North-Western dialect of Godeč (as reported by Videnov 1978), as well as the Rhodope dialects in the area of Smoljan (Ivanov 1978).

29. Note that, apart from the lack of a clitic, in (36) there is no preposition *na* “to” to introduce the indirect object even if the verb *scold* requires an indirect object. Since, as in standard Bulgarian, the dative form of 1st and 2nd person pronouns is differentiated from the accusative form only through the preposition *na*, there is no way to tell apart a dative from an accusative 1st and 2nd person pronoun. Given the lack of doubling with such pronouns, as well as with dative DPs, which are always preposition-less in this dialect, Mladenov (1965) hypothesizes that there is a correlation (in this and other dialects) between morphological Case marking and clitic doubling. This is confirmed by the fact that only 3rd person pronouns, which systematically differentiate dative (*nim*) from accusative Case (*nix*), have also obligatory clitic doubling (with datives).

30. The Accusative vs. Dative distinction (see (ii) vs. (iii) below), and the 1st/2nd vs. 3rd person distinction (see (i) vs. (ii) is also found in French, where, however, differently from standard

- (35) a. *Kazvame *(im) nim maslofki.*
 call.1PL them.CL.DAT them(tonic.DAT) maslofki
 'We call them maslofki.'
- b. *Kakvo*(im) trekne nim taka pravat*
 what them.CL.DAT occur.3SG them(tonic.DAT) so do.3PL
 'They do whatever occurs to them to do'
- (36) a. *Učitelata se pak nas kara.*
 teacher.Art REFL again us(tonic) scold.3SG
 'The teacher scolds us again'
- b. *Sega po plana da ja dadat nas.*
 now in plan.Art Mod.prt it.CL.ACC give.3PL us(tonic)
 'Now, according to the plan, they should give it to us.'
- c. *Posadix tebe i mene po edno cvete.*
 planted.1SG you(tonic) and me(tonic) each one flower
 'I planted a flower for you and for me'

Yet another distinction, namely [+human] vs. [-human], is manifested, it seems, in the Bulgarian dialects spoken in the Romanian regions of Oltenia and Muntenia (as well as in Romanian). As reported by Mladenov (1993), clitic doubling in these dialects is obligatory with human (or animate) nouns, accusative pronouns and quantifiers referring to humans but only in the presence of the animacy marker *pă*, which is a direct borrowing from Romanian *pe*:

- (37) a. *Či gu izedi pă negu;*
 will himCL.ACC eat.3SG pe him(tonic)
 'He will be furious with him.'
- a' *Az gu ištef pă negu.*
 I him.CL.ACC looked-for.1SG PE him(tonic)
 'I was looking for him'

Bulgarian, and the Bulgarian dialects, 1st/2nd person pronouns are obligatorily doubled while 3rd person pronouns are only optionally doubled. See again (i) and (ii). All three examples are from Kayne (2001):

- (i) *?Je connais LUI (mais pas son frère) vs. Je le connais lui.* (French)
 I know him (but not his brother) vs. I him.CL.ACC know him
- (ii) **Jean connaît MOI. vs. Jean me connaît moi/MOI.*
 Jean knows me vs. Jean me.CL.ACC knows me
- (iii) *Jean parle volontiers à MOI (mais pas à mon frère).*
 Jean talks willingly to me (but not to my brother)

- b. *Tejku jā ze pã maminata majka;*
 dad her.CL.ACC took PE mother's.Art mother
 'Dad took my grandmother.'
- b' *Senne, kãd gi ubil pã sičkite. ...*
 sat-down.3SG after them.CL.ACC killed.3SG PE all.Art
 'He sat down after killing them all'

6. Some Balkan parallels

Clitic doubling with pronominal objects is a widespread Balkan phenomenon, as the examples below show.

- (38) a. *Otan *(me) vlepete emena* (Modern Greek, Ilievski 1988: 167)
 when me.CL.ACC see.2PL me
 'when you see me.'
- b. *Ai *(më) njuh mue.* (Albanian, Ilievski 1988: 167)
 he me.CL.ACC knows me.ACC
 'He knows me'
- c. *Am asteptat- *(o) pe ea* (Romanian, Gierling 1996: 121)
 have.1SG waited.PART her.CL.ACC pe her.ACC
 'I have waited for her'
- d. **(Mu) dadov nemu.* (Standard Macedonian, Ilievski 1988: 169)
 him.CL.DAT gave him.DAT
 'I gave him'

In his study of Balkan dialects back in the early 20th century, Selišček (1918) notes that doubling of tonic pronouns is to be found across the entire Balkan territory (in the dialects of Bulgaria, especially in Western Bulgaria, in Modern Greek, in Aromanian, Megleno-Romanian and in the Daco-Romanian dialects) and is particularly prominent (obligatory) in all dialects of Albania (1918, 1981: 255) and (South-)Western Macedonia. Reduplication of nouns on the other hand, referred to in the text above as CLLD and CLRD, seems more unevenly distributed and is most frequent in the South-Western parts of the Balkan Peninsula, an area currently said to have constituted the centre of innovations w.r.t. this and other common Balkan phenomena (see also Lindstedt 2000; Tomić 2006b; Assenova 1977: 28–29, 2002: 116). Selišček (1918, 1981: 250–253) further notes that immediately outside of this area, as one leaves the dialectal boundaries of Macedonia, the conditions on doubling begin to change and further north and northwest one finds fewer and fewer cases of doubling, as well as other patterns of variation, especially word order differences (adjacency between the two pronominal forms, lack of proclitics, preverbal position of the tonic pronoun, etc.;

cf. also the examples in (39) below).³¹ Thus, in the South-Eastern Serbian dialects (in Old Serbia and South-Eastern Serbia, the Morava basin, Kosovo and along the Timok river)³² only pronominal doubling exists and no reduplication of nominal arguments at all.³³ In other words, what we have here referred to as *Clitic Doubling* (i.e., obligatory doubling in the conditions specified in section 4 above) need not depend on DP reduplication and can exist in the absence of it.

Contemporary studies on South-Eastern Serbian dialects and more generally, on cross-Balkan syntactic variation not only confirm Seliščev's accurate observations but also reveal that the linguistic situation in the Balkan Slavic area has not changed considerably in the last century (cf. e.g., Sobolev 1998: 142; Tomić 2006a,b). The examples in (39) below are taken from Seliščev's work (1918, 1981: 249–253):

- (39) a. *kaži mi mene; imaš me mene*
 tell.IMP me.CL.DAT me; have.2SG me.CL.ACC me
 "Tell me" "You have me" (Struga – S.W. Macedonia)
- b. *mi dade i na mene nogu pari* (Voden – W. Macedonia)
 me-CL.DAT gave.3SG and to me much money
 'He gave a lot of money to me as well.'
- c. *koj te tebe zapoveduje?* (Dolni Polog – N.W. Macedonia)
 who you.CL.ACC you give-orders.3SG
 'Who gives you orders?'
- e. *Blago majke što ga njega rodi!* (Kosovo)
 lucky mother.DAT who him.CL.ACC him gave-birth.3SG
 'Lucky the mother who gave birth to him!'
- f. *kuj te tebe pije, bez nevesta spije.*
 who you.CL.ACC you drink.3SG., without bride sleep.3SG
 'He who drinks from you[r waters], sleeps without a bride/[alone]'
 (the Middle Timok river)

31. Naturally, these correlations need to be studied in a more systematic way.

32. The South-Eastern Serbian dialects (also known as the Prizren-Timok group) constitute a typologically well-defined area which has incorporated a number of Balkan features after having gone through a convergent development, marking their full-fledged membership into the Balkan Sprachbund (Sobolev 1998, 142 but see Assenova 2002).

33. In all of the Balkan languages pronominal doubling seems much older than doubling with DPs (Mirčev 1966; Minčeva 1969; Ilievski 1988; Assenova 2002). In Bulgarian manuscripts it is attested since the 13th–14th c. (Rusek 1963), in Macedonian since the 16th c. (Ilievski 1988). Plausibly, this means that the phenomenon has been well-established at the time, if not earlier. When observed in translations of Greek canonical texts, doubling is often used despite the lack of such construction in the original. This, alongside other factors, points to a parallel but independent development (independent also from the emergence of the definite article).

- g. *šo mi mene ti napra(j)i?* (Skopska černa Gora, Serbia)
 what me.CL.DAT me you did.2SG
 ‘What did you do to me?’
- h. *ostail go na mira nego* (South-Western Bulgaria dialects)
 left him.CL.ACC at peace him
 ‘He left him in peace’

In recent work, Olga Tomić (cf. Tomić 2006a) summarizes the complex areal distribution of the doubling phenomena in the western part of the Balkan Slavic dialectal continuum in the following way: “in all the South-Eastern Serbian dialects we have pronominal Clitic-doubling, in the eastern boundary of these dialects, and the Easternmost Macedonian dialects there is optional DP clitic-doubling, in the majority of the Macedonian dialects DPs are also clitic-doubled, whereas in the South-Westernmost Macedonian dialects clitic-doubling of (at least indirect) objects becomes almost obligatory”³⁴

In certain cases reduplication of DP arguments, as opposed to pronominal doubling seems to depend on the syntactic function of the argument (Dative vs. Accusative objects). Thus, as reported by Topolinjska (2001), in the entire Prizren dialect (Kosovo) pronominal doubling is obligatory, while DP reduplication is found only with Dative objects; with Accusative objects this Balkan innovation is inexistent. Examples are given in (40):

- (40) a. *Poslje ne sбраše nas.*
 then us.CL.ACC gathered.3SG us.ACC
 ‘Then he would gather us together’
- b. *Ona mi zbori mene.*
 she me.CL.DAT talk.3SG to me.DAT
 ‘She is talking to me’
- c. *Ja gi vikam ženama.*
 I them.CL.DAT say.1SG women.DAT
 ‘I am saying to the women’

While there nevertheless seems to be (considerable) variation w.r.t. reduplication of DP arguments in both CLLD and CLRD (and in particular in the latter type of construction), due to the degree of involvement of features such as definiteness/specificity or Topicality (cf. Assenova 2002, 2004, 2005; Lopašov 1978; Rudin 1994; Franks & King 2000; Alboiu 2000; Tomić 2006b, a.o.), the type of doubling which seems strictly obligatory across the entire Balkan territory is the one in which a psych or a physical

34. The author relates these conclusions to Poletto’s (2006) implications, according to which if in a given dialect DPs are doubled, tonic pronouns are also doubled; if QPs are doubled, both tonic pronouns and DPs are doubled.

perception predicate is involved.^{35,36} The Bulgarian data which we have examined above (cf. sections 4 and 5) find exact parallels in all the other Balkan languages and dialects. See examples (41)–(46):

- (41) a. **(Tu) aresi tu Yani i musiki*
 CL.GEN. likes the Yanni.GEN the music.NOM
 ‘Yani likes the music’ (Modern Greek, Papangeli 2000: 485)
- b. *Ton Yánni *(ton) ponái to kefáli tu*
 the Yanni him.CL.ACC. hurt.3SG the head his
 ‘Y. has a headache’ (Modern Greek, Kallulli 1999: 20)
- (42) a. *Jan-it *(i) mungojnë dhjetë libra*
 Jan-the.DAT him.CL.DAT. miss ten books
 ‘Jan is missing ten books’ (Albanian, Kallulli 1999: 19)
- b. *Ben-in *(e) merzit vetmia* (Albanian, Kallulli 1999: 20)
 Ben-the.ACC him.CL.ACC bores solitude
 ‘Solitude bores Ben’
- c. *Atë *(e) trëmb puna.* (Albanian, G. Turano, p.c.)
 he.ACC him.CL.ACC frightens work.Art.NOM
 ‘The work scares him.’
- d. *Atij *(i) dhemb koka.* (Albanian, G. Turano, p.c.)
 him.DAT him.CL.DAT aches head.NOM
 ‘He has a headache.’
- (43) *Nu-*(l) doare capul pe băiatul ăsta.*³⁷
 not him.CL.ACC aches head.Art PE this boy
 ‘This boy does not have a headache’ (Romanian, Dobrovie-Sorin 1994: 197)

35. Also shared by the Balkan languages is the fact that doubling is required by inalienable possession arguments and other constructions which involve an indirect object or a quirky subject, not discussed here.

36. Few very interesting exceptions exist in the above mentioned Bulgarian dialects of Ixtiman, Kjustendil, Gjumjurdžina, and Godeč (cf. fn. 28), where clitic doubling is absent even in this type of construction (for examples and a discussion see Krapova & Tisheva 2006).

37. For Romanian Tasmowski (1987, 395) has noted that Experiencers (even (-def)(-spec) like *nimeni* ‘nobody’ and *cine* ‘who’) trigger obligatory clitic doubling in Romanian, as in (ia). Cf. also Dobrovie-Sorin (1994, 197) from which the examples below have been taken:

- (i) a. *Pe cine- l doare capul?* (Dobrovie-Sorin 1994, 197) (Romanian)
 pe whom CL.ACC aches.3SG head.Art. ‘Who has a headache?’
- b. **Pe cine l- ai văzut?* (Dobrovie-Sorin 1994.)
 pe whom him.CL.ACC have.2SG seen.PART ‘Whom have you seen?’

- (44) a. *Glavata *(go) boli (samo) Petre* (Macedonian)
 head.the him.CL.ACC aches (only) Peter
 ‘Petre has a headache’
- b. *Teško *(mi) e samo na mene.*
 Difficult me.CL.DAT is only to me
 ‘It is hard only for me.’

These comparative data would seem to further justify the already well-established opinion that Clitic reduplication is one of the most characteristic Balkan phenomena (Balkanisms) (cf. e.g., Assenova 2002), were it not for the fact that, as is well-known, in Spanish and/or its dialects one also finds a similar situation: doubling is obligatory with psych predicates and with accusative and dative tonic pronouns, with indirect object of inalienable possession, but is optional for non-pronominal indirect objects, and either impossible or optional for non-pronominal direct objects, depending on the particular variety involved (Jaeggli 1982; Gierling 1996). Be as it may, the cross-linguistically common restrictions as well as the factors which are at the basis of the obligatoriness vs. optionality of clitic doubling need a more systematic investigation, once the constructions have been singled out which is what we hope to have done for Bulgarian. The great cross-linguistic variability of the phenomenon shows that it is subject to constraints of different kinds, which can be traced down to two main classes. The first class regards the grammatical function carried by the doubled phrase: direct vs indirect object. The second class regards its semantic features. Different languages in fact show different conditions which govern doubling, based on the presence of features such as [+/-pronominal], [+/-human], [+/-definite], [+/-possessor], etc. (cf. also Gierling 1996).

7. Conclusion

In this paper, we have been able to identify two cases of *Clitic Doubling* (CD) proper in Bulgarian: (1) with psych and physical perception predicates, and (2) with tonic pronouns, and while discussing these cases we have also identified the presence of the following parameters summarized informally in (45):

- (45) a. Pronominal vs. Full Phrase (DP);
 b. Indirect vs. Direct object;
 c. 1st/2nd person vs. 3rd person;
 d. Animate vs. Inanimate argument;
 e. Definite vs Indefinite argument.

These parameters of variation seem to be instantiated not only in Bulgarian, which has been the main object of this study, but also in the other Balkan languages and dialects, and although their manifestations may turn out to have different prominence and uneven distribution, we may be dealing with a common Balkan development. In any case, one or another parameter, or some combination of parameters can be held responsible for shaping the exact conditions under which CD may occur in each particular language system. Needless to say, the exact identification of each parameter, as well as its manifestation in each particular language or dialect system requires an extensive research which we believe is worth undertaking.

References

- AG. 1994. = *Akademična gramatika na sǎvremennija bǎlgarski knižoven ezik*. Vol. 3. *Sintaksis*. Sofia, Izdatelstvo na BAN.
- Alboiu, G. 2000. The Features of Movement in Romanian. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Manitoba.
- Alexiadou, A. & Anagnostopoulou, E. 2000. Clitic-doubling and (Non-) configurationality. In M. Hirotani et al. (Eds), *Proceedings of NELS 30*: 17–28.
- Anagnostopoulou, E. 1994. Clitic Dependencies in Modern Greek. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Salzburg.
- Anagnostopoulou, E. 1999. Conditions on clitic doubling in Greek. In H. van Riemsdijk (Ed.), *Clitics in the Languages of Europe*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 761–798.
- Androulakis, A. 2001. Clitics and doubling in Greek. *Reading Working Papers in Linguistics* 5: 85–111.
- Arnaudova, O. 2001. Prosodic movement and information focus in Bulgarian. In S. Franks, T.H. King & M. Yadroff (Eds), *Annual Workshop on Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics* 9. Ann Arbor MI: Michigan Slavic Publications. 19–38.
- Arnaudova, O. 2002. Clitic left dislocation and argument structure in Bulgarian. In J. Toman (Ed.), *Annual Workshop on Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics* 10. Ann Arbor MI: Michigan Slavic Publications. 23–46.
- Arnaudova, O. 2003. Focus and Bulgarian Clause Structure. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Ottawa.
- Assenova, P. 1977. La notion de l'interférence et l'union linguistique balkanique. *Linguistique balkanique* XX (1–2): 23–31.
- Assenova, P. 1980. Aperçu sur le redoublement de l'objet en bulgare et en français. *Linguistique Balkanique* XXIII (4): 51–57.
- Assenova, P. 2002. *Balkansko ezikoznanie. Osnovni problemi na Balkanskija ezikov sǎjuz*. Sofia: Faber.
- Assenova, P. 2004. Arxaizmi i dialektizmi v edin izoliran bǎlgarski govor (Kukǎska gora, Albania). In *Deset godini specialnost Balkanistica V Sofijskia universitet*. Sofia: Universitetsko izdatelstvo.
- Assenova, P. 2005. Nabljudenija vǎrxu uslovijata za udvojavane na dopǎknenieto. In *Ezikǎt i negovata dinamična priroda. Jubileen sbornik po slučaj 70-godišninata na Ivan Kǎnčev*. Sofia. 76–83.

- Bally, C. 1932/1965. *Linguistique générale et linguistique française*. Berne: Francke.
- Benincà, P. 1988. L'ordine degli elementi della frase e le costruzioni marcate. In L. Renzi (Ed.), *Grande grammatica italiana di consultazione*. Vol. I. Bologna: Il Mulino. 115–225.
- Bojadžiev, T. 1972. *Govorät na s. Sačanli, Gjumjurdžinsko*. Sofia.
- Bojadžiev, T. 1991. *Bälgarskite govori v Zapadna (Belomorska) i Iztočna (Odrinksa) Trakija*. Sofia.
- Brugè, L. & Brugger, G. 1996. On the accusative *a* in Spanish. *Probus* 8: 1–51.
- Cinque, G. 1977. The movement nature of Left Dislocation. *Linguistic Inquiry* 8: 397–412.
- Cinque, G. 1990. *Types of A'-Dependencies*. Cambridge MA: The MIT Press.
- Cordin, P. 1993. Dative clitics and Doubling in Trentino. In A. Belletti (Ed.), *Syntactic Theory and the Dialects of Italy*. Turin: Rosenberg & Sellier. 130–154.
- Cyxun, G. 1968. *Sintaksis mestoimennyx klitik v juzhnoslavjanskix jazykax* (Balkanoslavjanskaja modelj). Minsk.
- Dobrovie-Sorin, C. 1990. Clitic doubling, Wh-movement, and quantification in Romanian. *Linguistic Inquiry* 21(3): 351–398.
- Dobrovie-Sorin, C. 1994. *The Syntax of Romanian*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Džonova, M. 2004. Izrečenija säs semantičnata rolja experiercer v sävremennija bälgarski ezik. Doktorska disertacia. University of Sofia.
- Franks, S. & King, T. (Eds). 2000. *Clitics in Slavic*. Oxford: OUP.
- Franks, S. & Rudin, C. 2005. What makes clitic doubling obligatory. MS.
- Gierling, D. 1996. Further parallels between clitic doubling and scrambling. *ESCOL* 96: 116–123.
- Guentchéva, Z. 1994. *Thématisation de l'objet en bulgare*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
- Guentchéva, Z. 2005. Object clitic doubling in Bulgarian. MS. LACITO, CNRS, Paris.
- Horvath, J. 1986. *Focus in the Theory of Grammar and the Syntax of Hungarian*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Iatridou, S. 1995. Clitics and island effects. *Penn Working Papers in Linguistics* 2: 11–30.
- Ilievski, P. 1988. Kon interpretacijata na modelot na udvoeniot object vo makedonskiot jazik. In *Balkanoloshki lingvistikčni studii (so poseben osvrt kon istorikiot razvoj na makedonskiot jazik)*. Skopje.
- Ivančev, S. 1978. *Prinosi v bälgarskoto i slavjanskoto ezikoznanie*. Sofia: Nauka i izkustvo.
- Ivanov, J. 1978. (Ed.). *Bälgarska dialektologija*. Plovdiv: Hristomatija.
- Jaeggli, O. 1982. *Topics in Romance Syntax*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Jaeggli, O. 1986. Three issues in the theory of clitics: Case, doubled NPs, and extraction. In H. Borer (Ed.), *The Syntax of Pronominal Clitics* [Syntax and Semantics 19]. New York NY: Academic Press. 15–42.
- Kallulli, D. 1999. The Comparative Syntax of Albanian: On the Contribution of Syntactic Types to Propositional Interpretation. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Durham.
- Kayne, R. 1972. Subject inversion in French interrogatives. In J. Casagrande & B. Saciuk (Eds), *Generative Studies in Romance Languages*. Rowley MA: Newbury House. 70–126.
- Kayne, R. 2001. A note on clitic doubling in French. In G. Cinque & G. Salvi (Eds), *Current Studies in Italian Syntax. Essays offered to Lorenzo Renzi*. Amsterdam: Elsevier. 189–212.
- Kiss, K.É. 1998. Identificational focus versus Information focus. *Language* 74: 245–273.
- Krapova, I. 2002. On the left periphery of the Bulgarian sentence. *University of Venice Working Papers in Linguistics* 12: 107–128.
- Krapova, I. & Cinque, G. 2006. Two asymmetries between clitic left and clitic right dislocation in Bulgarian. In H. Broekhuis, N. Corver, R. Huybregts, U. Kleinhenz & J. Koster (Eds), *Organizing Grammar. Linguistic Studies in Honor of Henk van Riemsdijk*. 359–364. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

- Krapova, I. & Karastaneva, T. 2002. On the structure of the CP field in Bulgarian. In M. Dimitrova-Vulchanova, D.L. Dyer, I. Krapova & C. Rudin (Eds), *Balkanistica*. Vol. 15. *Papers from the Third Conference on Formal Approaches to South Slavic and Balkan Languages*. Oxford: Mississippi. 293–321.
- Krapova I. & Tisheva, J. 2006. Clitic Reduplication structures in the Bulgarian dialects. In M. Koletnik & V. Smole (Eds), *Diahronija in sincronia v dialektoloških raziskavah*. Maribor. 415–422.
- Leafgren, J.R. 1997. Bulgarian clitic doubling: Overt topicality. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 5: 117–143.
- Lindstedt, J. 2000. Linguistic balkanization: Contact-induced change by mutual reinforcement. In D. Gilberts, J. Nerbonne & J. Schaeken (Eds), *Languages in Contact*. Amsterdam: Rodopi: 231–246.
- Lopašov, J.A. 1978. *Mestoimennye povtory dopolenija v balkanskix jazykax*. Leningrad.
- Manolova, L. 1979. **Upotreba na udvoenoto dopälнение V bälgarskija knižoven ezik. Väprosi na sävremennija bälgarski knižoven ezik**. Sofia: BAN. *Izvestija za Institut za bälgarskija ezik* 13.
- Marušič, F. & Žaucer, R. 2003a. A reanalysis of the Feel-like dative-reflexive construction in Slovenian. Paper presented at FASL 12 (University of Ottawa).
- Marušič, F. & Žaucer, R. 2003b. The Feel-like construction in Slovenian. Paper presented at NELS 34, Stony Brook University, Stony Brook NY.
- Marušič, F. & Žaucer, R. 2005. On the intentional Feel-like construction in Slovenian: A case of a phonologically null verb. MS. Stony Brook University and University of Ottawa. (To appear in NLLT).
- Maslova, Ju S. 1982. *Gramatika na bälgarskija ezik*. Sofia: Nauka i izkustvo.
- Mel'ničuk, A.C. 1971. Sintagmatičeskie uslovija upotreblenija kratkix i polnyx mestoimenij v bolgarskom jazyke. *Issledovanija po slavjanskomu jazykoznaniju*. Moskva: Nauka: 189–201.
- Minčeva, A. 1969. **Opit za interpretacia na modela na udvoenite dopälnenija v nälgarskija ezik**. *Izvestija na Instituta za bälgarski ezik XVII (Sofia)*. 3–50.
- Mirčev, K. 1966. Za xronologijata na osnovnite balkanizmi v bälgarskij ezik. *Bälgarski ezik XVI(4)*, 284–286.
- Mladenov, M.S. 1965. **Beležki värxu sintaksisa na ixtimanskija govor**. *Bälgarski ezik XV(3)*: 208–224.
- Mladenov, M. Sl. 1993. *Bälgarskite govori v Rumänija*. Sofia. Izdatelstvo na BAN.
- Nitsolova, R. 1986. *Bälgarskite mestoimenija*. Sofia, Nauka i izkustvo.
- Nitsolova, R. 2001. Za kontrastnija fokus s častici v bälgarskija ezik. In *Pomagalo po sintaksis. Sävremenni lingvistični teorii*. Plovdiv: Plovdiv University Press.
- Papangeli, D. 2000. Clitic doubling in Modern Greek: A head-complement relation. *UCL Working Papers in Linguistics* 12: 473–498.
- Philippaki-Warbuton, I., Varlokosta, S., Georgiäfentis, M. & Kotzoglou, G. 2004. Moving from theta-positions: pronominal clitic doubling in Greek. *Lingua* 114: 963–989.
- Poletto, C. 2006. Doubling as a spare movement strategy. Paper presented at the *Workshop on Doubling*, Meertens Instituut, Amsterdam, March 2006.
- Revithiadou, A. & Spyropoulos, V. 2003. “Trapped within a phrase”: Effects of syntactic derivation on p-phrasing. In A. Mettouchi & G. Ferre (Eds), *Proceedings of IP2003 Prosodic Interfaces*. Nantes. 167–172.
- Rivero, M.L. & Sheppard, M.M. 2003. Indefinite reflexive clitics in Slavic: Polish and Slovenian. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 21: 89–155.

- Rožnovskaya, M.G. 1959. **Bezličnye predloženiya v sovremennom bogarskom literaturnom jazyke**. In *Voprosy bolgarskogo lityeraturnogo jazyka*. Moskva: AHSSSR. 379–432.
- Rožnovskaya, M.G. 1971. **Proizvodye bezličnye glagoly v bolgarskom literaturnom jazyke**. *Issledovanija po slavjanskomu jazykoznaniju*. Moskva: Nauka.
- Rudin, C. 1986. *Aspects of Bulgarian Syntax: Complementizers and wh- constructions*. Columbus OH: Slavica.
- Rudin, C. 1994. Topic and focus in Bulgarian. *Acta Linguistica Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 40(3–4): 429–447.
- Rusek, J. 1963. Po vāprosā za xronologiatā na udvojavane na dopālnenijata v bālgarskija ezik. *Bālgarski ezik XIII*: 141–143.
- Samek-Lodovici, V. 2005. When right dislocation meets the left-periphery. A unified analysis of Italian non-final focus. MS. UCL, London.
- Seliščev, A.M. 1918. *Očerki po makedonskoj dialektologii*. Kazanj.
- Slabakova, R. 1994. Bulgarian psych verbs. In *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics. The College Park Meeting*: 249–272.
- Sobolev, A.N. 1998. Serbohorvatskij jazyk. In A.V. Desnitskaja & N.I. Tolstoj (Eds), *Osnovy balkanskogo jazykoznanija. Jazyki balkanskogo regiona*. Vol. 2 (slavjanskije jazyki). Sankt-Peterburg: Nauka. 114–155.
- Sportiche, D. 1996. Clitic constructions. In J. Rooryck & L. Zaring (Eds), *Phrase Structure and the Lexicon*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic. 213–276.
- Sportiche, D. 1999. SplitDPs, splitVPs. Class lectures, University of Venice (a summary is available at: <http://www.linguistics.ucla.edu/people/sportich/papers/SplitDPsSplitVPs.pdf>).
- Stojkov, S. 1962/2002. *Bālgarska dialektologija*. Sofia: Akademično izdatelstvo “Prof. Marin Drinov”.
- Stojkov, S. 1963a. **Osnovnoto dialektno delenie na bālgarskija ezik**. *Slavjanska filologija III*: 105–114.
- Stojkov, S. 1963b. **Tri mestoimenni izoglosi v bālgarskija ezik**. *Slavistični studii*. Sofia: 149–163.
- Suñer, M. 1988. Agreement in clitic-doubled constructions. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 6: 391–434.
- Tasmowski-De Ryck, L. 1987. La réduplication clitique en roumain. In G.A. Plangg & M. Iliescu, (Eds), *Akten der Theodor Gartner-Tagung. (Rätoromanisch und Rumänisch)*. Innsbruck: AMAE. 377–399.
- Tomić, O. 2006a. Micro-variation in clitic doubling in the Balkan Slavic dialectal continuum. Talk given at Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics 15, Toronto, May 12–14, 2006.
- Tomić, O. 2006b. *Balkan Sprachbund Morpho-syntactic features*. Berlin: Springer.
- Topolinjska, Z. 2001. Izražavanje padežnih odnosa u srpskom prizrenskom govoru. *Zbornik Matice srpske za filologiju i lingvistiku XLIV*(1–2): 211–224.
- Torrego, E. 1995. On the nature of Clitic Doubling. In H. Campos & P. Kempchinsky (Eds), *Evolution and Revolution in Linguistic Theory*. Washington DC: Georgetown University Press. 399–418.
- Umlenski, I. 1965. *Kjustendilskijat govor*. Sofia: Bulgarian Academy of Sciences.
- Uriagereka, J. 1995. Aspects of the syntax of clitic placement in Western Romance. *Linguistic Inquiry* 26: 79–123.
- Vallduví, E. & Vilkkuna, M. 1998. **On rheme and contrast**. In P.W. Culicover & L. McNally (Eds), *The Limits of Syntax*. In *Syntax and Semantics* 29. San Diego CA: Academic Press: 79–108.
- Videnov, M. 1978. *Godečkiat govor*. Sofia: Bulgarian Academy of Sciences.