

Clitic Doubling in Bulgarian: Between Optionality and Obligatoriness

In the present paper, I consider the interaction of the range of possible word orders and direct object clitic doubling in Bulgarian¹, discussing contexts of optional vs. obligatory CD. Contrary to the recent proposal in Krapova & Cinque's (2008), I claim that obligatoriness irrespective of syntactic structure should not and, in fact, *cannot* be a defining feature of the phenomenon of CD in Bulgarian.

Generally, there are three situations in which CD is obligatory in Bulgarian² (see among others Franks & Rudin 2004, Jaeger & Gerassimova 2002, Jaeger 2003): (I) when the associate is an oblique subject, as in (1); (II) when it is a topic, as in (2); and (III) when wh-movement appears to violate Superiority, as in (3). Bulgarian is characterized by great syntactic flexibility and structure information-driven word order despite a lack of a case marking system. Clitic doubling and the range of possible word orders in Bulgarian are often dependent on each other, and indeed there are cases when CD licenses certain word orders (cf. also Jaeger & Gerassimova 2002) (see (4), (5)). In fact, as it has been previously discussed (cf. Werkmann 2003, Rudin 1986), if the preferred SUBJ-V-DO-IO surface order is not followed, CD is necessary to identify the syntactic roles of object vs. subject. If this is not done, the correct interpretations for (6) and (7) are grammatically excluded.

In Krapova & Cinque's analysis of what they define as CD proper, word order turns out to be irrelevant. It is rather the choice of predicate (e.g. psych and physical perception predicates, modal predicates, predicates with possessor datives, etc.) and the obligatoriness of the doubling clitic that distinguish CD constructions. Under this analysis only (1) exemplifies real CD. I argue against this approach because: **1.** Not all of the predicates listed in Krapova & Cinque induce obligatory CD irrespective of the construction used, and **2.** Topichood and object identification in sentences like (6) and (7) can only be realized by the use of a doubling clitic.

1. If only the predicate mattered and the syntactic structure was irrelevant, then we would expect obligatory CD all over. This is not what we find as there is a number of psych and physical perception predicates that do not obligatorily induce CD when used in a different syntactic structure, cf. examples (8a) vs. (8b) and (9a) vs. (9b). Thus it is not only the kind of predicate that plays a role here, but also the syntactic frame into which such a predicate occurs, i.e. word order.

2. It is true that CD is optional in cases like (6) and (7) in constructions with the neutral SUBJ-V-OBJ word order, but since Bulgarian allows for objects to occur sentence initially, CD is necessary for the identification of syntactic and information structure if the object precedes the subject. In other words CD is the only means of signaling objecthood and topichood in such cases.³ This is particularly important when reciprocal verbs are used. In such cases the use of CD becomes obligatory (see (10)). The argument about CD irrespective of word order here is irrelevant, because it is precisely this concrete word order, i.e. SUBJ not first, that triggers the obligatory use of CD (cf. also the results of Jaeger & Gerassimova's (2002) online study showing that fronted, topical objects are always doubled).

Admittedly, there is a difference between the constructions in (6), (7) and (1). In (6) and (7) the doubling clitic plays a role in the syntax, whereas in (1), the clitic is part of the lexical item (i.e. impersonal verb+clitic). In other words, in one case the clitic is just part of the lexical entry like in *boli me* "it hurts me" whereas in the other case its use is necessitated by the syntax, (i.e. type of construction used) in order to identify syntactic roles, and often to resolve ambiguity. Evidence for this is supplied by the existence of pairs of predicates with and without a clitic, e.g. *haresva mi* "it appeals to me" and *haresvam; boli me* "it hurts me" and *boli; spi mi se* "I feel like sleeping" and *spja*, etc. This difference can explain the obligatoriness (but only in some cases) of CD with this special subset of predicates. Clitic doubling cannot be equalled to obligatory doubling in Bulgarian. I suggest that both instances, (6) and (1), present true cases of CD. Choice of word order, rather than predicate choice only, plays an essential role with regards to whether clitic doubling is optional or obligatory.

¹ I discuss only CD constructions where the associate of the clitic is a full DP and not a tonic pronoun.

² I concentrate only on the first two situations.

³ Apart from intonation.

Examples:

- (1) Ivan *(go) boli kraka.
Ivan him_{CL} hurt leg_{DEF}
'Ivan's leg hurt.'
- (2) Marija nikoj ne *(ja) obica.
Maria nobody not her_{CL} loves
'Nobody loves Maria.'
- (3) Kogo koj *(go) natupa?
whom who him_{CL} beat
'Who beat whom?'
- (4) Knigite *(gi) izgori Maria.
books_{DEF} them_{CL} burnt Maria
'Maria burnt the books.'
- (5) Izgori *(gi) Maria knigite.
burnt them_{CL} Maria books_{DEF}
'Maria burnt the books.'
- (6) Dvete nevinni gertvi *(gi) izjali valzi тази сутрин.
two_{DEF} innocent victims them_{CL} ate wolves this morning
'The two innocent victims were eaten by wolves this morning.'
- (7) Boris izvednag *(go) svali bolesta na legloto.
Boris suddenly him_{CL} knock down sickness_{DEF} onto bed_{DEF}
'Boris was knocked down by a sudden sickness.'
- (8) a. Omrazna í da gleda televizia (na Maria). → obligatory CD
got tired her_{CL} to watch TV (to Maria)
'Maria got tired of watching TV.'
- b. Televiziata/Gledaneto na televizia (í) omrazna barzo na Maria. → optional CD
TV_{DEF}/ watching_{DEF} of TV her_{CL} got tired quickly to Maria
'TV/Watching TV quickly got Maria tired.'
- (9) a. V poslednia moment mu hrumna, ce e zabravil da izkluci utiata. → obligatory CD
in last_{DEF} moment him_{CL} occurred that is forgot to switch-off iron_{DEF}
'It occurred to him in the last minute that he had forgotten to switch off the iron.'
- b. (Tova) ce e zabravil da izkluci utiata (mu) hrumna na Ivan v poslednia moment.
(this) that is forgotten to switch-off iron_{DEF} him_{CL} occurred to Ivan in last_{DEF} moment
'That he had forgotten to switch off the iron occurred to Ivan in the last moment.'
- optional CD
- (10) a. Maria nikoj ne celuna.
Maria nobody not kissed
'Maria kissed nobody.'
- b. Maria nikoj ne *(ja) celuna.
Maria nobody not her_{CL} kissed
'Nobody kissed Maria.'

References

- Franks, S., C. Rudin 2004. Bulgarian clitics as K⁰ heads. Presented at FASL 13, South Carolina.
- Jaeger, F., V.A. Gerassimova. 2002. Bulgarian word order and the role of the direct object clitic in LFG. In Butt, M., T.H. King (eds.). *Proceedings of the LFG Conference 2002*, 197-219. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- Jaeger, F. 2003. Topicality and superiority in Bulgarian wh-questions. Presented at FASL 12, Ottawa.
- Krapova, I., G. Cinque. 2008. In: Kallulli, D., L. Tasmowski (eds). *Clitic doubling in the Balkan languages*, 257-287. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Rudin, C. 1986. *Aspects of Bulgarian syntax: Complementizers and WH constructions*. Columbus: Slavica.
- Werkmann, V. 2003. *Objektklitika im Bulgarischen (= studia grammatica 57)*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.