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Clitic Reduplication in Bulgarian:
Towards a Unified Account

Olga Arnaudova
University of Ottawa

Iliana Krapova
University of Venice

In this paper, we argue that clitic reduplication in Bulgarian (often referred to as ‘clitic doubling’ and considered to be a unitary phenomenon) is not optional or linked exclusively to topicality and specificity, as previously claimed, and that there is a need for empirical, structural, and conceptual re-analysis of the conditions that license this phenomenon. More precisely, we argue that Bulgarian possesses a genuine Clitic Doubling (CD) construction, which exhibits many of the properties of its Romance counterpart with the difference that in Bulgarian CD is found predominately with Experiencer predicates, as illustrated in (1):

(1) a. Ivan *(go) boli gârloto.
    Ivan him\textsubscript{CLACC} aches throat\textsubscript{DEF}

b. Na Ivan *(mu) xaresa filmât.
    to Ivan him\textsubscript{CLDAT} liked film\textsubscript{DEF}
    (lit. ‘The movie appealed to Ivan Ivan’)

* Note that the title of the paper contains the preposition towards. This means that we will not be aiming at actually arriving at a unified analysis of what we here call clitic reduplication. Rather, we will posit the more modest and empirically motivated goal of carefully distinguishing several clitic reduplication constructions, which are generally lumped together in the already quite vast literature on this topic in Bulgarian. We thank the audience of FASL 15 and the reviewers for their helpful comments.
Following an already quite solid tradition in the generative literature (Belletti and Rizzi 1988, Anagnostopoulou 1999, among others), we show that the Experiencer argument, whether dative (prepositional) or accusative, displays subject-like properties and hence qualifies as a *quirky subject*. We also provide ample evidence that Experiencer objects, unlike topicalized/dislocated constituents which are located in some A'-position within the CP domain, seem to occupy an IP/TP-internal A-position. We consider this to be an important step towards teasing apart genuine clitic doubling as illustrated in (1) from other superficially similar constructions involving doubling clitics, such as the Topic/dislocation constructions shown in (2):

2 a. Na Maria ne sâm j kazval ništo.
to Maria NEG Aux her_CLAcc told nothing
lit.‘To Mary, I have not told her anything.’

b. Ne sâm j kazval ništo na Maria
NEG Aux her_CLAcc told nothing to Maria
lit.‘I have not told her anything, to Mary.’

1 Preliminary Discussion

In the literature on Bulgarian, ‘clitic doubling’ has been associated with various features such as Case disambiguation and marked word order (Nicolova 1986:55, Popov 1962), definiteness (Cyxun 1962, Ivančev 1978), specificity (Augustinova 1997: 92-95), Topicality (Leafgren 1997, Guéntcheva 1994), emphasis (Rudin 1986: 17-18), and argument saturation (Arnaudova 2002). (Compare also the discussion in Jaeger and Gerassimova 2002.) More recently, it has become clear that no single feature can be held responsible for the vast range of reduplication environments, and it has been proposed that the phenomenon relies rather on some combination of features such as specificity and topicality (as in e.g., Tomić 2000, cf. also Franks & King 2000), or Topicality and Case (Schick 2000). Different proposals outline how these two features can be tied up either to Case checking by the clitic within the clause (Rudin 1997, Tomić 2000, Franks & Rudin 2005), or to discourse factors involving (sometimes) a separate Topic projection (e.g. Rudin 1986).

Question-answer pairs of the type in (3)-(4) show, however, that with Experiencer predicates the associate of the clitic can be focused, since it
can serve as an answer to a wh-question. This would be unexpected under a view that reduplication is exclusively linked to topicality.

(3) Na kogo *(mu) stana žal?
to whom himCL, Det got3SG pity
‘Who felt sorry?’

(4) [F Na deteto] *(mu) stana žal. / Stana *(mu) žal [F na deteto].
to childDEF himCL, Det got3SG pity / got3SG himCL, Det pity to childDEF
‘The child felt sorry.’

In addition, it can easily be seen that specificity and topicality are sufficient but not necessary conditions on doubling, since firstly, postverbal definite or indefinite specific constituents are often not reduplicated, cf (5):

(5) Maria šte zanese kufara/edin kufar.
Maria will bring suitcaseDEF / one suitcase
‘Maria will bring the suitcase / one suitcase.’

and secondly, although reduplication is more frequent in the preverbal domain, it is not the case that all preverbal (definite) Topic elements need to be reduplicated, cf. (8), and Krapova (2002), Arnaudova (2002, 2003):

(6) Kufara šte donese Maria.
suitcaseDEF will bring3SG Mary
lit. ‘The suitcase, Mary will bring.’

Additionally, there are a number of left-right asymmetries that need to be taken into account. For example, reduplication of indefinites seems prohibited or highly marginal in the postverbal domain, regardless of intonation, while it is perfectly possible, and sometimes preferable, in the preverbal domain. This is illustrated in the following pairs of examples, featuring the indefinite marker ‘edin’ (7), distributive phrases (8), and quantified phrases (9). (7) and (9) are taken from Asenova 2002: 114:

(7) a. Edna prikazka ja razkazvaše vsjaka večer.
one story tCL, Acc was telling every evening
lit. ‘One story he/she was telling it every evening.’
   was telling 1CL,Acc a/one fairy tale every evening

(8) a. Na vseki šte mu napiša pismo.
    to everyone will him CL, Dat write1sg letter
    lit. ‘To everyone, I will write him a letter.’

b. ?? Šte mu napiša pismo na vseki
    will him CL, Dat write1sg letter to everyone

(9) a. Pet glarusa kak da gi nasitja s xljab
    five seagulls how MOD them CL, Acc feed up1 sg with bread
    i sirene?
    and cheese
    lit. ‘Five seagulls, how should I feed them up with bread and
    cheese?!’

b. *Kak da gi nasitja s xljab i sirene pet
    how MOD them CL, Acc feed up1 sg with bread and cheese five
    glarusa?
    seagulls

What we want to show in the next section is that Bulgarian possesses
a genuine clitic doubling construction with well-defined properties, as can
be inferred by a number of tests. This construction is to be strictly
distinguished from Topicalization/dislocation constructions, also
involving a clitic. Following again plausible comparisons with Romance,
we reserve for the latter the terms CLLD (Clitic left dislocation) and
CLRD (Clitic right dislocation), which reflect the position of the
reduplicated element in the left or the right periphery, respectively (cf.
Krapova 2002).

2 Genuine Clitic Doubling: Classes of Predicates Requiring
Obligatory Doubling

In contrast with Romance, and similar to Modern Greek
(Anagnostopoulou 1999), Bulgarian CD is found predominantly although
not exclusively with Experiencer predicates belonging to class 2
(preoccupare-frighten) and to class 3 (piarcer-appeal to) of Belletti and
Rizzi’s (1988) original classification of psych constructions. Most
Bulgarian Experiencer predicates seem to belong to class 3, but there are also quite a few in class 2.¹ The two types are illustrated in (10) and (11) which also show that in both of them reduplication of the Experiencer is obligatory²:

¹ For the sake of convenience, in this paper we will not distinguish between the various types of psych constructions. A full list of these predicates which include verbs, non-agreeing adjectives and nouns, is provided in Krapova and Cinque (to appear). Here we limit ourselves to some representative examples:

A) Psych and physical perception predicates with Dative Experiencers:


b) Adjectives: skučen/skučno mi e ‘I find him/boring’, mâčen mi e ‘I find it difficult’, etc. lošo mi e ‘I feel faint’, studen mi e ‘I am cold’, toplo mi e ‘I am hot’, etc. (Maslov 1982: 291-292);

c) Adverbs: dobri mi e ‘I feel good’ (lit. ‘well to me is’), zle mi e ‘I feel bad’, etc.

d) Nouns: žal mi e ‘I feel sorry’ (lit. ‘pity to me is’), etc.

B) Psych and physical perception predicates with Accusative experiences:

a) Verbs: mârzi me/ domârjava me ‘I feel lazy’, krese me ‘I am feverish’, etc.

b) Nouns: juž me ‘I am mad’, sram me e ‘I am ashamed’, strax me e, ‘I am afraid’ etc.

C) Psych predicates with (inalienable) possessor Datives: olêkva mi (na sârceto) ‘my heart lightens; I feel relief’, etc.

D) Psych predicates with (alienable) possessor Accusatives: boli me (glavata) ‘my head is aching’, sîvva me (sârceto) ‘my heart is aching’, probožda me ‘I have a shooting pain’, etc.

E) Predicates in the feel-like construction:

a) spi mi se ‘I feel like sleeping’; pie mi se ‘I feel like drinking’, etc.

b) idva mi da ‘I almost feel like! have the urge’, pïna mi da ‘I am sick of’.

² This applies to the predicates listed in fn. 1 which are all stative and which will be the focus of our attention. Class 2 predicates contain also transitive verbs, as in (i) below, but they will not be discussed here. Interestingly, such predicates receive a stative or an agentive interpretation (cf. Slabakova 1996), and reduplication seems to be sensitive to the position of the Experiencer:

(i) a. Filmtâ podrazâ/nadâ/razvânu/uzâsâ Ivan.

fântâ irritated/angered/moved/horrified Ivan

‘The film irritated/made angry/moved/horrified Ivan’
(10) Ivan *(go) boili/ sárbi/ štipe gárloto. class 2
Ivan him_CLACC ache3SG/ itch3SG/ pinch3SG throat3DEF
‘Ivan’s throat aches/ itches/ pinches’

(11) Na Ivan *(mu) xaresa/ doskuča filmát. class 3
to Ivan him_CLDAT liked3SG/ bored3SG film3DEF
‘Ivan liked/ was bored by the film’
(lit. ‘The movie appealed to Ivan’/ ‘The movie bored Ivan’)

As noted in Slabakova (1996), the two classes of Experiencer predicates have a common thematic structure, involving a Cause of the Emotion/Theme syntactically realized as Nominative (hence a Nominative Theme), and differ in the Case realization of the Experiencer (the Recipient of the Emotion), which with class 2 verbs is syntactically realized as an accusative object, cf. (13), but with class 3 verbs as a dative (prepositional) object, cf. (14).3

Following an already quite solid tradition in the generative literature (Belletti and Rizzi 1988, Anagnostopoulou 1999, among others), we show below that the Experiencer argument, whether dative or accusative, displays subject-like properties and hence qualifies as a quirky subject. It is precisely this structural property of the Experiencer that we want to correlate with obligatory CD and in order to do that, we will first review some arguments which show that Experiencer objects are not dislocated constituents in an A’-position, but rather seem to occupy an IP/TP-internal A-position.

2.1. Dative Experiencers
In this subsection, we consider the syntactic behaviour of Dative Experiencers. In the next subsection (2.2), we show briefly that the conclusions reached here fully apply to Accusative Experiencers as well.

Consider first word order facts and recall the left-right asymmetry

b. Ivan *(go) podrazni/jadosu/razváluvatužasi filmát.
Ivan him_CLACC irritated/ angered/ moved/ horrified film3DEF
‘Ivan got irritated/ angry/ moved/ shocked by the film’

3 A number of additional class-internal differences have to do with the presence vs. absence of an overt Theme, as well as with the types of Theme (e.g., PPs) and their exact semantic import, but since such details are beyond the scope of the paper, we will leave them aside.
noted in (7)-(9) above with respect to topoplated constituents. No such asymmetry is found in the Experiencer construction. In fact, the construction is completely reversible, as shown in (12a-b): either the Theme or the Experiencer can be preposed, the order in (12a) being the unmarked order.

(12) \textit{Exp DAT-V-Theme NOM}  
\begin{enumerate}
\item a. Na Ivan mu omrázvat/xaresvat filmite.\textsuperscript{4} to Ivan him\text{CL,DAT} bore\text{3PL}/appeal\text{3PL} films\text{DEF}  
Theme NOM-V-Exp DAT  
\item b. Filmite mu omrázvat/xaresvat na Ivan. films\text{DEF} him\text{CL,DAT} bore\text{3PL}/appeal\text{3PL} to Ivan  
\end{enumerate} 
‘Films bore/appeal to Ivan.’

A second piece of evidence for treating Experiencer Datives as filling a position distinct from that of topicalized datives comes from the fact that in Bulgarian, as in other languages (e.g., Italian, Belletti and Rizzi 1988: 337, and Modern Greek, Anagnostopoulou 1999: 69) there are contexts where Experiencer fronting is perfectly fine, while fronting of a dative object of a transitive verb, which is an instance of left dislocation, is quite marginal. Two such cases are provided by the adverbial and the relative clauses illustrated below.

(13) ?? Vsički se pritesnixa, zaštoto na Ivan (mu) pomaga Petar.  
all got worried because to Ivan him\text{CL,DAT} help\text{3SG Peter}  
‘Everybody got worried because Peter was helping Ivan.’

(14) Vsički se pritesnixa, zaštoto na Ivan mu dopada lingvistikata.  
all got worried because to Ivan him\text{CL,DAT} appeal\text{3SG lingvistikata}  
‘Everybody got worried because Ivan likes linguistics.’

(15) Vsički se pritesnixa, zaštoto Ivan predpočita lingvistikata.  
all got worried because Ivan prefer\text{3SG lingvistikata}  
‘Everybody got worried because Ivan prefers linguistics.’

\textsuperscript{4} Note that the Nominative Theme need not be definite, and can be also indefinite (specific or not), or bare. Cf. (i):

\begin{enumerate}
\item a. Na Ivan mu xaresvat edni filmi (za vojnata)/film to Ivan him\text{CL,DAT} appeal\text{3PL} some films about war\text{DEF}/films  
\item b. Edni filmi (za vojnata) mu xaresvat na Ivan. some films about war\text{DEF} him\text{CL,DAT} appeal\text{3PL} to Ivan  
\end{enumerate}
(16) ?? Knigite, deto na Ivan (mu) dadoX, na men sa mi skučni.
booksDEF that to Ivan himCLDAT gave1SG to me are meCLDAT boring
'The books I gave Ivan are boring for me.'

(17) Knigite, deto na Ivan mu xaresvat, na men sa mi skučni.
booksDEF that to Ivan himCLDAT appeal3PL to me are meCLDAT boring
'The books Ivan likes are boring for me.'

(18) Knigite, deto Ivan čete, na men sa mi skučni.
booksDEF that Ivan read3SG to me are meCLDAT boring
'The books Ivan is reading are boring for me.'

As seen above, Dative Experiencers in (14) and (17) pattern with structural subjects in (15)-(18), and not with dislocated phrases, (13)-(16). According to Belletti and Rizzi (1988), the degraded status of examples like (13) and (16) is due to a discourse-motivated difficulty of topicalizing the indirect object in because-clauses, and of extracting some other phrase across it in relative clauses.

Next, consider the co-occurrence of bare quantifiers and indefinites with clitic structures. There is a sharp difference in grammaticality between left-dislocating and Experiencer fronting of a negative quantifier, as the contrast in (19) shows. The same holds for other bare quantifiers like the indefinite njakoj ‘someone’, edin ‘one’, etc. (not shown here):

(19a) a. *Na nikogo ne sâm mu pisl.5

      to nobody NEG am himCLDAT written

      'To nobody have I written.'

b. Na nikogo ne mu xaresa pismoto mi.

      to nobody NEG himCLDAT appeal3SG letterDEF my

      'Nobody liked my letter.'

(19a) is hardly surprising given the robust cross-linguistic restriction on quantifiers to function as topics and consequently, to appear in the Clitic Left Dislocation construction. Interestingly, if the quantifier is an Experiencer object, no restriction shows up, which once again points towards its non-dislocated clause-internal status.

Perhaps the strongest argument for (quirky) subjecthood of Experi-

5 As expected, the example becomes grammatical when the clitic is removed, since in this case the DP is focus-moved and as is well-known, focus is compatible with quantifiers.

Bulgarian possesses non-agreeing (in person features) adjunct and gerundive constructions, which are perhaps one of the very few instances of Control structures in that language.

(20) a. [PRO\textsubscript{PR} veče razbral \textsubscript{S} istinata, Ivan\textsubscript{S} samo podade \textsubscript{S} telegramata already learned\textsubscript{PRT} truth\textsubscript{DEF} Ivan only handed\textsubscript{SSG} telegram\textsubscript{DEF} na Petar\textsubscript{S} i pro\textsubscript{S} vednaga pripadna, to Petar and immediately fainted\textsubscript{SSG}.

‘Now that he has learned the truth, Ivan just handed the telegram to Peter and fainted immediately.’

b. [PRO\textsubscript{PR} vlizajki v stajata], Ivan\textsubscript{S} samo podade \textsubscript{S} telegramata entering\textsubscript{GER} into room\textsubscript{DEF} Ivan only handed\textsubscript{SSG} telegram\textsubscript{DEF} na Petar\textsubscript{S} i pro\textsubscript{S} pripadna, to Petar and fainted\textsubscript{SSG}

‘Upon entering the room, Ivan just handed the telegram to Peter and then fainted.’

(21) a. [PRO\textsubscript{PR} veče razbral \textsubscript{S} istinata], na Petar\textsubscript{S} Ivan\textsubscript{S} samo already learned\textsubscript{PRT} truth\textsubscript{DEF} to Peter Ivan only mu podade \textsubscript{S} telegramata, i pro\textsubscript{S} pripadna, him\textsubscript{CL Dat} handed\textsubscript{SSG} telegram\textsubscript{DEF} and fainted\textsubscript{SSG}

b. [PRO\textsubscript{PR} vlizajki v stajata], na Petar\textsubscript{S} Ivan\textsubscript{S} samo mu entering\textsubscript{GER} into room\textsubscript{DEF} to Peter Ivan only him\textsubscript{CL Dat} podade \textsubscript{S} telegramata i pro\textsubscript{S} vednaga pripadna, handed\textsubscript{SSG} telegram\textsubscript{DEF} and immediately fainted\textsubscript{SSG}

(22) a. [PRO\textsubscript{PR} veče razbral \textsubscript{S} istinata za nego], na Ivan\textsubscript{S} zapocina already learned\textsubscript{PRT} truth\textsubscript{DEF} about him to Ivan began\textsubscript{SSG} vse povece da mu dopad Petar, still more MOD him\textsubscript{CL Dat} appeal\textsubscript{SSG} Peter

‘Now that he has learned the truth about him, Ivan began liking Peter more and more.’
b. \( \text{PRO}_{i} \) besedvajki poodcelno s kandidatite, na Ivan\(_{i} \) conversing\(_{GER} \) separately with candidates\(_{DEF} \) to Ivan
    naj-mnogo ot vsi\( \text{c}\)ki mu dopada Pet\( \text{\`a}\)\(_{j} \) most of all him\(_{CLDAT} \) appealed\(_{SG} \) Peter.

‘Having talked to each of the candidates, Ivan liked Peter most of all.’

(20a&b) show that in regular transitive sentences, the matrix subject but not the matrix indirect object may control the adjunct/gerundive clause. This difference persists when the indirect object is left-dislocated (21a&b). By contrast, Dative Experiencers, similarly to structural subjects, can act as controllers, (22). Nominative Themes, on the other hand, seem to be impossible controllers, regardless of their surface position, and hence seem to behave like structural objects.\(^6\)

### 2.2 Accusative Experiencers

Recall that Bulgarian also possesses Accusative Experiencers and belongs to the class of languages (Modern Greek, Icelandic, Faroese) in which Experiencers can appear in any case (Landau 2003: 77). If we apply the tests to Accusative Experiencers, i.e. to Experiencers in psych constructions with accusative clitics, we get practically the same results as with Dative Experiencers. The cluster of properties illustrated below lead us to consider Accusative Experiencers as quirky subjects.

---

\(^6\) This peculiarity of Bulgarian seems to be shared by Greek (as can be seen by the data in Anagnostopoulou 1999), but not by other languages, like Italian, Japanese (Perlmutter 1984) and French (Landau 2003: 87-9), where both the Dative Experiencer, and the Nominative subject (the Theme) can act as controllers, especially when participle agreement in the adjunct clause forces choice of controller. In Bulgarian, manipulating participle agreement and changing the Nominative Theme to match with the participle in gender does not bring about a change in Control possibilities and produces ungrammaticality.

(i) \* [PRO\(_{j} \) ve\( \text{c}\) razbrala istinata za nego], na Ivan zapo\( \text{\`c}\)na vse pove\( \text{c}\)\( \text{\`e}\) already learned\(_{PTFEM} \) truth\(_{DEF} \) about him to Ivan began\(_{SG} \) still more da mu dopada Mari\( \text{ja}\)\(_{j} \) MOD him\(_{CLDAT} \) appealed\(_{SG} \) Mary
Word order: AccExp -V- Theme NOM and Theme Nom -V- AccExp
(23) a. Петарче го боли гърлото/гърло.
   Little Peter him_CLDat ache2SG throat_DEF/throat
b. Гърлото/гърло го боли Петарче.
   throat_DEF/throat him_CLDat ache2SG Little Peter
   ‘Little Peter has a sore throat’

Accusative Experiencers vs CLLD
(24) a. всички се притесниха, защото Мария я срешила Иван.
   everybody worried because Mary her_CLAcc metEvid Ivan.
   lit. ‘Everybody got worried because [they say] Mary, Ivan met her’
b. всички се притеснали, защото Мария ѝ заболял
   everybody worriedEvid because Mary her_CLAcc started-to-acheEvid koremat.
   stomach_DEF
   ‘Everybody got worried because [they say] Mary got a stomach ache’

(25) a. някои, дето Иван (го) наказва, са неговите студенти.
   those that Ivan him_CLACC waitPPL are his_DEF students
   ‘Those [people] that are waiting for Ivan are his students’
b. Онова, дето Иван го боли най-много, е душата.
   that that Ivan him_CLACC ache2SG most is soul_DEF
   ‘What hurts Ivan most is his soul.’

Accusative Experiencers and bare quantifiers/indefinites are fine:
(26) a. никога не го среших по пътя насам.
   nobody NEG him_CLACC met1SG on way_DEF here
   ‘I met noone on my way here’
b. някакво го среших по пътя насам.
   someone him_CLACC met1SG on way_DEF here
   ‘I met someone on my way here’

(27) a. никога не го боли главата.
   nobody NEG him_CLACC ache1SG head_DEF
   ‘Nobody has a headache’
b. някакво го боли главата.
   somebody perhaps him_CLACC ache1SG head_DEF
   ‘Perhaps someone has a headache.’
Control

(28) a. PRO_vljazkivstajata, Ivan; samo pogledan Petar
    enteringGER into roomDEF Ivan only looked3SG Peter
    i pro3 pripadna
    and fainted3SG

    ‘Upon entering the room, Ivan only took a glance at Peter and
    fainted’

b. PRO_večerazbral istinata, Ivan; go xvana jad
    already learnedPRT truthDEF Ivan himCLACC got3SG angry
    na Petar;?
    at Peter

    ‘Now that he has learned the truth, Ivan got angry at Peter’

c. ?PRO večerazbral;ij istinata, Ivan; Petar; reši
    already learnedPRT truthDEF Ivan Peter decided3SG
    pro3 da go uvolnil.
    MOD himCLACC fire3SG

    ‘Now that he has learned the truth, Peter decided to fire Ivan.’

Given the set of examples (23)-(28), it becomes highly plausible to ana-
lyze Accusative Experiencers in Bulgarian in a manner analogous to that
of Dative Experiencers, i.e. as quirky or inherent subjects, rather than as
structural objects. In order to capture the parallel behaviour between
Datives and Accusatives, various authors have proposed that the latter,
too, are PPs but with a silent preposition, thus collapsing the two types
under a single structure. Without argumentation, in what follows, we will
treat Dative and Accusative Experiencers in Bulgarian as a single class
from a syntactic point of view. We have seen so far that both types pass
successfully the above discussed (and other) tests for subjechthood and are
thus true quirky subjects.

7 Since Accusative Experiencers in Bulgarian are incompatible with animate
Nominative Themes, we have used a prepositional Theme in the example, which,
trivially, makes the same point with respect to Control.
8 See also Rivero (2004: §4.1).
2.3 Experiencers Are in an A-position

Here, we want to give more specific evidence that Experiencer fronting targets an A-position and that, in terms of hierarchy, this position is higher than the standard subject position (Spec,TP) but lower than the A'-position which hosts left-dislocated (Top) elements.

Consider again the Control facts reviewed above and in particular, (21a&b) and (28b) which contain a left-dislocated dative and accusative, respectively. Given the widespread assumption that left-dislocated constituents occupy an A'-position (a separate TopP within the CP field or an IP/CP-adjoined position, cf. Rudin 1986, 1994, Lambova 2001, Arnaudova 2002, Krapova 2002, among others), the fact that they cannot control, while Experiencers can control, shows that the latter occupy an A-position (in accordance with standard views on Control as available only from A-positions). On the other hand, given that in passive and unaccusative contexts, internal objects raised to subject position can control (cf. (29) below and Moskovsky 2002: 129) in the absence of another possible controller, such as the Experiencer in a psych-construction, it is plausible to think that the position targeted by the Experiencer is higher than the standard subject position.

(29) a. PRO, edva vljazal v stajata, Ivan, beše zastreljan na mjasto.
        hardly entered in room[DEF], Ivan was shot to place
        'Having just entered the room, Ivan was shot dead.'

    b. PRO, ostavajki vse taka bezučastno kâm trevojite na xorata,
       remaining still so indifferent towards worries[DEF] of people[DEF]
       slânceto, zaleze kâm xorizonta.
       sun[DEF] set[3SG] towards horizon[DEF]
       'Indifferent as it has always been towards the worries of
       the people, the sun set down over the horizon.' (adapted from D. Dimov)

Before we proceed with the analysis, we give two additional facts to strengthen the proposal that the Experiencer is located in an A-position: anaphor binding and pronominal binding. The contrast in (30) shows that similarly to other languages (e.g., Russian, as discussed in Franks 1995: 253, Bailyn 2004: 22, among others) the Dative Experiencer, on a par with subjects, shows the potential to bind an anaphor, which directly
indicates an A-status. Failure to front the appropriate kind of constituent affects binding relations and produces ungrammaticality as a Principle A violation, cf. (30b):

(30) a. Ivan go dojadja na sebe si.
    Ivan himCLACC got-angry3SG at himself
    'Ivan go angry with himself.'
    b. *Na sebe si go dojadja Ivan.9
    to himself himCLACC got-angry3SG Ivan.

Finally, as (31) shows, the pronominal binding facts illustrate lack of WCO effects in the a. example, as opposed to the b. example, which once again indicates that the fronted Experiencer occupies an A-position:

(31) a. ?Na vsjaka krasiva žena j xaresva nejnoto sobstveno kuće.
    to every beautiful woman herCLDAT appeal3SG herDEF own dog
    'Every beautiful woman likes her own dog.'
    b. *Njeto sobstveno kuće j xaresva na vsjaka krasiva žena
    herDEF own dog herCLDAT appeal3SG to every beautiful
    woman

Our conclusions from Bulgarian strongly support the analysis of non-agreeing subjects in other (Slavic) languages, according to which the preverbal non-Nominaive Experiencer occupies an IP/TP-internal A-

9 A reflexive Nominative Theme would produce an ungrammatical example (i),
given the general ban in Bulgarian on subject reflexives (Moskovsky 2002: 127). The minimal pair between (30a) and (i) below corresponds exactly to the one in Italian (ii), as observed by Rizzi (2000: 163) who subsumes the subject anaphor restriction under the more general 'anaphor-agreement effect' not reducible to the Binding Principle nor to the ECP: anaphors are incompatible with agreement

(i) *Na nego mu xaresva samo sebe si.
    to himPRES himCLACC appeals only himself

(ii) a. A loro importa solo di se stessi.
    to them interests only P themselves
    b. *A loro interessano solo se stessi.
    to them interest only themselves
the canonical subject, while for others this position is a separate one, higher than the standard subject position in Spec,TP – Spec,LogP, as in Williams (2006) or Spec,SubjP (Subject-of-predication), in Cardinaletti (2004).\(^{10}\) We assume, for convenience, the latter proposal, and we emphasize our point that the Experiencer is in a TP-related position, i.e. lower than the lowest CP position, which, within a fine left periphery approach (Rizzi 1997), can be identified as FinP. See the hierarchy sketched in (32) and Cardinaletti (2004):

(32) TopP FocusP FinP...ExpSubjP/Non-NonSubjP TP... VP NomTheme

\[\text{C-domain} \quad \text{T-domain} \quad \text{V-domain}\]

We also adopt what is common to a host of analyses, namely that Experiencer fronting is triggered by the need to check the EPP feature (Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou 1998, Landau 2003, Bailyn 2004, among others), given that EPP can be satisfied by any overt XP movement and is no longer associated with Case (Chomsky 2000). Alternatively, Experiencer fronting could be related to some feature with semantic import related to the position targeted (like the Subj-of-Predication feature of Cardinaletti 2004). The Theme checks Nomative case and phi-features, which can be done from its postverbal position (within VP) via a chain with an expletive pro in SpecTP, via covert movement (Chomsky 1995), or long-distance agreement (Chomsky 2000).

3 Back to Clitic Doubling

We take the following three properties as criteria for the presence of a CD construction in a given language.\(^{11}\) First, the clitic is obligatory in the presence of the full DP, whether the latter is pre- or postverbal; second, the associate of the clitic can serve as new information and it can also be

\(^{10}\) Alternatively, within an approach that adopts multiple specifiers, as in Landau (2003), Experiencer can be said to move to a higher specifier of TP, overtly or at LF, depending on its surface position.

\(^{11}\) Following Krapova and Cinque (to appear), who in turn follow much solid work on CD in Romance (Jaeggli 1982, 1986).
contrastively focused and wh-moving; and third, the clitic and the associate form one prosodic domain.\textsuperscript{12}

Now, Experiencer objects satisfy all three requirements, while dislocation constructions do not. As mentioned before, the former must always appear clitic doubled and under no circumstances can the full DP stand alone (e.g. *Boli glavata Ivan/*Ivan boli glavata). Quite different is the notion of obligatoriness of the clitic in the dislocation constructions, e.g. Ivan vsički *(go) poznavat lit. ‘Ivan all him know’ Vsički (go) poznavat Ivan.\textsuperscript{13} First of all, with postverbal DPs the clitic is not obligatory, and second, with preverbally fronted DPs, the presence of the clitic is epiphenomenal on the choice of the construction: if the object is not dislocated, it need not be doubled and can very well stand alone, as in Vsički poznavat Ivan ‘Everybody knows Ivan’. In the Experiencer construction, on the other hand, the clitic has to be present irrespective of positional motivation, or intonation.

Next, consider the minimal pairs in (33), (34) and (35):

(33) a. Kogo *(go) poznavam?
   who him\textsubscript{CL-ACC} know\textsubscript{SG}

b. Ivan go poznavam./Poznavam go Ivan.
   Ivan him\textsubscript{CL-ACC} know\textsubscript{SG} know\textsubscript{SG} him\textsubscript{CL-ACC} Ivan.
   lit. ‘Ivan, him I know/I know him, Ivan’

(34) a. Kogo go boli glavata?
   whom him\textsubscript{CL-ACC} ache\textsubscript{SG} headache\textsubscript{DEF}?
   ‘Who has a headache?’

\textsuperscript{12} 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) seem bona fide diagnostics distinguishing CD from Clitic Right Dislocation. Thus, even if in some varieties of Spanish the associate of a doubling accusative clitic cannot be wh-moving, nor can it be a non-specific indefinite quantifier (see Jaeggli 1986: 39ff., and references cited there), it can always bear the nuclear stress of the sentence and hence be new information focus. Moreover, in all varieties of Spanish doubling is obligatory with pronominal direct and indirect objects (cf. Jaeggli 1982, 1986).

\textsuperscript{13} Strictly speaking, only with Clitic Left Dislocated direct objects is the resumptive clitic obligatory, as the contrast between Ivan vsički *(go) poznavat ‘Ivan all him know’ vs. Na Marija až mnogo sám (i) pomagal ‘To Mary, I have helped (he\textsubscript{CL-DAT}) a lot’ shows. See Cinque (1990, §2.3.5) for a possible account of the corresponding contrast in Romance.
b. Ivan go boli glavata. / Glavata go boli Ivan
Ivan him\textsubscript{CL.Acc} ache\textsubscript{SG} head\textsubscript{DEF}/head\textsubscript{DEF} him\textsubscript{CL.Acc} ache Ivan
‘Ivan has a headache.’

(35) a. *Poznavam go samo čoveka. \textit{CLRDF}
know\textsubscript{IP} him\textsubscript{CL.Acc} only man\textsubscript{DEF}
b. Boli go glavata samo Ivan. \textit{CD}
hurt\textsubscript{SG} him\textsubscript{CL.Acc} head\textsubscript{DEF} only Ivan
‘Only Ivan has a headache.’

The Experiencer Subject appears as an answer to a wh-question (34b) and is compatible with focusing adverbs such as a samo ‘only’, dori ‘even’, and i ‘also’ (35b), i.e., Experiencer can carry new information or contrastive focus either in situ or as a result of movement. By contrast, in the right dislocation construction, as shown in (33b) and (35a), the reduplicated object cannot be focused since it cannot be used as an answer to a wh-question and cannot combine with focusing adverbs. Additionally, as the contrast between (33a) and (34a) shows, only Experiencer subjects must be wh-moved and clitic doubled at the time. The facts in (33)-(35) are well-known from the literature, but they now receive a different theoretic value in terms of our proposal.

Finally, in the CD construction the verb, the clitic and the associate form one prosodic domain, as illustrated in (36):\textsuperscript{14}

(36) Boli go samo Ivan]\varphi [glavata]\varphi

In the dislocation construction on the other hand, the dislocated constituent belongs to a different prosodic domain since stress is independently prevented from falling on it:

(37) a. Poznavam go az, čoveka \rightarrow [\textit{F} Poznavam go az]\varphi [čoveka]\varphi
know\textsubscript{SG} him\textsubscript{CL.Acc} I man\textsubscript{DEF}
b. Poznavam go, čoveka az \rightarrow [\textit{F} Poznavam go]\varphi [čoveka ]\varphi [az]\varphi
know\textsubscript{SG} him\textsubscript{CL.Acc} man\textsubscript{DEF} I

The prosodic contrast between (36) and (37) is reminiscent of the

\textsuperscript{14}The subject, if present, cannot participate in the same domain, but is parsed as a separate prosodic unit and is necessarily de-stressed (right-dislocated).
situation in Romance languages, like Spanish and Catalan, which, like Bulgarian, have dislocation constructions alongside CD constructions. As pointed out by Jaeggli (1986) for Spanish, and by Vallduví (1992) for Catalan, dislocated constituents in Romance are typically set off from the rest of the sentence with a sharp intonational break (Jaeggli 1986), and it has also been noted that they are always de-accented with the main stress/intonational peak (i.e. the focus of the sentence) falling on some previous constituent, typically the V-cluster (Vallduví 1992, 96, 98):

(38) La vaig VEURE la barilla.  
    it, 3SG,Past see the fight
    'I SAW the fight /I did see the fight.'

As a result, such languages allow more than one dislocated phrase per clause, and in any order. Cf. (39), Zubizarreta (1998) for comparable cases in Spanish, Benincà (1988: 130ff.) for Italian, Philippaki-Warburton et al. (2004) for Greek, and Arnaudova (2002, 2003) for Bulgarian:

(39) a. DADOX mu go #pimoto #na Ivan.  
    gave,1SG him,CL,Dat its,CL,Acc letter,DEF to Ivan

    a' DADOX mu go #na Ivan #pimoto.  
    gave,1SG him,CL,Dat its,CL,Acc to Ivan letter,DEF

To summarize, we have used three criterial properties to test the presence of CD in the Experiencer object construction in Bulgarian and we have interpreted these properties as conditions on CD proper. We have also examined (briefly) other constructions that resemble CD only superficially, but in fact have been found to feature a Right dislocation analysis, given that they do not satisfy the conditions on CD proper.15

---

15 Although we have not discussed binding and licensing properties of RD, it seems that they clearly point to a clause-external analysis. According to the latter, dislocated constituents first move leftwards to the specifier of a topic projection TopP but are eventually stranded in rightmost position by leftward raising of the remnant IP, as in Samek-Lodovici (2005), who follows Cechetto (1999) who in turn follows Kayne (1995 Harvard class lectures).
4 How Does the Clitic and Its Associate Get Together?

In this last part we briefly sketch our suggestion for a formal analysis of the derivation of clitic reduplication structures, that is, CD and dislocation structures. To analyze the facts reported in the previous sections, we adopt Franks and Rudin's (2005) proposal that clitics in Bulgarian require more structure and are KP elements with K as the head and the DP (whether an Experiencer object, or a constituent with some discourse-given property) as its complement (following in the steps of Uriagereka 1995 and Kayne 2002, cf. also Werkmann 2003 for a similar proposal). Postulating a KP as a sort of 'big DP' has the advantage of solving the theta problem since the entire KP is assigned a theta role.

(40) [KP [K cl] [DP]]

However, in contrast to Franks and Rudin (2005), we follow Kayne (2005) in assuming that no movement of the complement of a head can target the specifier of that head, which means that for us the clitic does not have to pass through the specifier of KP, triggering agreement. Rather, as in Poletto 2006, we postulate an additional layer above KP (XP) which attracts the clitic's associate (the DP) and serves as an intermediate landing site on its way to its final destination – the Spec,Subject-of-PredicationP, in the Experiencer construction case (the CD proper, illustrated in (41) below for the sentence Ivan go boli glavata ('Ivan has a headache'), and to Spec,TopP position within the CP field, in the left-dislocation/topicalization case (not shown here).
We also postulate that after extraction of the associate, the clitic moves up, although not as a head (pace Franks & Rudin 2005), but pied-piping the remnant KP containing the clitic and the trace of the raised associate. We tentatively propose that KP checks case in Spec AgrOP after which the clitic leaves KP and left-joins to the verb in T.\(^\text{16}\) The

\(^{16}\) For reasons of space we are not discussing here other proposals on clitic
derivation of Clitic Left Dislocation structures proceeds in a similar way, with the difference that DP targets the specifier of TopP, located in the CP domain.

To summarize, we have presented in this paper evidence that clitic reduplication in Bulgarian falls under two clearly defined cases with distinct properties: 1) Clitic Doubling in the Experiencer constructions (within the IP/TP domain) and 2) Clitic left and right dislocations (outside of the IP/TP domain). In our view, this new approach opens the door for a re-examination of the conditions that underlie clitic reduplication in Bulgarian and other languages and could be an important step towards an attempt of providing a unified account of the various clitic reduplication constructions in Bulgarian.

References


movement and (left) adjunction to V in Bulgarian (e.g., Bošković 2002).


Cyxun, G. 1969 *Sintaksis mestoimennyx klitik v južnoslavjanskix jazykax (Balkanoslavjanskaja model)>. Minsk.


Olga Arnaudova
arauadova_olga@yahoo.com

Iliana Krapova
krapova@unive.it