



Citation:

Ovcharova, B. (2018). Clitic Doubling of the Proposed Direct Object in Bulgarian. *Slavia Meridionalis*, 18. <https://doi.org/10.11649/sm.1606>

Bilyana Ovcharova

University of Forestry, Sofia

Clitic Doubling of the Proposed Direct Object in Bulgarian

1. Introduction

- **Preposing¹ as a non-canonical construction**

The research presented in this paper focuses on accusative clitic doubling in Bulgarian clauses with direct object preposing. In clauses with preposing an element whose basic (canonical) position is after the verb is placed in initial clause position, preceding the subject and verb (on *preposing* see Huddleston & Pullum, 2002, p. 1372). This is illustrated by the Bulgarian example below, where the underlined NP, realizing the direct object (Od), is a preposed con-

¹ Other terms that cover fully or partially *preposing* as understood in this paper include: *fronting*, *topicalization*, *focalization*, *thematization*, *long-distance dependency constructions*, *unbounded dependency constructions*, *filler-gap dependencies*, *extraction constructions* (for terminology differentiation see Ovcharova, 2016, pp. 17–21). In some studies *preposing* is discussed under *changes in the left periphery* (cf. Rizzi, 1997).

This work was supported by the Bulgarian Ministry of Education and Science.

Competing interests: no competing interests have been declared.

Publisher: Institute of Slavic Studies, Polish Academy of Sciences.

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 PL License (creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/pl/), which permits redistribution, commercial and non-commercial, provided that the article is properly cited. © The Author(s) 2018.

stituent. The preposed Od, single underlined, is followed by the subject and verb, and there is no doubling clitic:

[1] *Тя думи той изрече толкова тихо, че трябваше да се прочетат по устните му.*²

“These words he said so quietly that they had to read his lips.”

From a theoretical perspective, *preposing* is one of the non-canonical constructions in languages with an SVO order. In general, non-canonical clauses “differ syntactically from the most basic, or canonical, constructions in the language” and the differences between the canonical and non-canonical clauses is “not in truth condition or illocutionary meaning but in the way the informational content is presented” (Huddleston & Pullum, 2002, p. 1365).

The non-canonical position of the Od in Bulgarian is discussed in the sections on grammatical and actualized word orders in *The Grammar of the Contemporary Bulgarian Standard Language /Грамматика на съвременния български книжовен език/* (henceforth abbreviated as GSBKE, 1994, pp. 271–284). The basic and grammatical position of an Od realized by an NP is the position immediately after the verb, i.e. the third position in a clause when the subject is explicitly expressed. As the Od may realize both the theme (old information) or rheme (new information) in a clause, it may occupy both the first and the third position in a clause. In theory, in a Bulgarian clause the syntactic function of an initial NP can be both subject and direct object as Bulgarian lacks dependent marking. However, it is possible the object function to be disambiguated using a syntactic means: a doubling clitic as illustrated in the example below, in which the clitic disambiguates the first NP as the Od. Other uses of accusative clitics in clauses with an initial Od are not discussed in the quoted grammar book³.

² Unless indicated otherwise, the examples used in the paper are authentic examples obtained from a specially designed corpus of Bulgarian literary texts or other compiled examples with Od preposing.

³ A few pages earlier in the section on grammatical word order in GSBKE (1994, pp. 275–276) it is mentioned that an object in Bulgarian may be realized by two forms: the first time by an NP or a full pronoun, and the second time – by a clitic. Examples are provided for the Od and Oi. A claim is made that when a doubled object is realized by a full pronoun, it is usually placed at the beginning of the clause; when it is realized by an NP, its position is less fixed: pre-verbal or post-verbal. In my opinion, the form of the object is not the deciding factor but rather grammatical and pragmatic requirements/considerations determine the object position.

- [1] *Димов го уби Мери Ламур.* (GSBKE, 1994, p. 83)
Dimov him(acc clitic) killed(3 p sg) Meri Lamur.
 “Meri Lamur killed Dimov.”

In the discussion below I will show that accusative clitic doubling (its presence or absence) in Bulgarian clauses with direct object preposing is due to grammatical or pragmatic considerations.

Grammatical doubling occurs in clauses where the clitics are part of the verb’s morphological make-up and in clauses where the clitics serve as case markers for disambiguating the syntactic function of the initial noun phrase (NP). Pragmatic clitic doubling does not affect the clause grammaticality or semantics: it serves as a topicality marker, signaling the discourse-old status the preposed NPs’ referents or is used to activate such referents. Pragmatic clitic doubling may occur with focused discourse-old NPs, which at first sight may appear as an inconsistency: one would expect that the topic and focus should be differently identified in a language. In Bulgarian pragmatic accusative clitic doubling is not admissible only when the preposed NP realizes contrastive, emphatic focus.

- **A note on what constitutes Od preposing in Bulgarian**

It is necessary to note that when a clitic is the sole realization of an object and is in pre-verbal position, this is not a case of preposing. Clitics gravitate around the verb, depending on whether there are initial triggers for the clitics’ pre-verbal position, e.g. a negative particle:

- [3] *He ме тресе.*
 Not me(acc clit) shakes(3p sg)
 “I don’t have fever/I don’t shake.”⁴

2. Grammatically obligatory clitic doubling

In this section, I will argue that clitic doubling is grammatical in cases when dropping the clitic renders the clause ill-formed or changes its meaning. Therefore, in such clauses doubling is obligatory.

⁴ For the triggers of pre-verbal clitics’ positions see Ovcharova (2016, pp. 62–63) among others.

2.1. Obligatory clitics that are part of the verb morphology

In Bulgarian there are verbs with accusative or dative clitics that cannot be dropped:

- боли ме /hurt(3p sg) me(acc clit), “I have pain”, “I hurt”/,
- тресè ме /shake(3p sg) me(acc clit), “I have fever”, “I shake”/,
- мързи ме /idle(3p sg) me(acc clit), “I feel lazy”/,
- домъчня ми /get sad(3p sg) me(dat clit)“I get sad”/).⁵

Such clitics (and their respective non-clitic object realizations) have the semantic role of experiencer. For such verbs Avgustinova (1997, pp. 38–39) uses the term an *analytic verbal lexeme*⁶ of the type *phrasal experiencer verbs*. These verbs can be used:

a. as impersonal in clauses without a subject as in

- Тресè ме.
Shakes(3p sg) me(acc clit)
“I have fever/I shake.”

- Мързи го.
Idles(3p sg) him(acc clit)
“He feels lazy.”

b. as 3rd personal /третолични глаголи/ with a singular or plural subject, double underlined in:

- Тресè ме главата.
Shakes(3p sg) me(acc clit) head-the
“My head is shaking me.”

- Болят ме краката.
Hurt(3p pl) me(acc clit) legs-the
“My legs hurt.”

c. as 3rd personal /третолични глаголи/ in the singular and a clausal subject:

- Боли ме, че хората страдат.
hurts(3p sg) me(acc clit) that people suffer(1p pl)
“It hurts me that people suffer.”

⁵ For details on the classification of verbs in Bulgarian see Коева (Коева, 1998).

⁶ Bulgarian clitics as verbal morphemes are earlier described by Walter (Валтер, 1964, p. 22), which was commented by Venkova (Венкова, 2017).

– *Мързи я да чете.*

Idles(3p sg) her(acc clit) to read(3p sg)

“She doesn’t feel like reading.”

In all examples above the Od is realized only by a clitic. Avgustinova (1997, p. 40) argues that the clitics with such verbs are obligatory, and because of this they do not represent a case of clitic doubling when the Od is also realized by a non-clitic NP, which is, in fact, the grammatically optional element.⁷

For our discussion, it is important to note that if a speaker decides on using a non-clitic realization of the Od in initial position with the verbs which morphologically include a clitic, the doubling clitic is a grammatically obligatory element, and therefore, the presence of a clitic is not motivated by pragmatic considerations.

• **Interesting case 1: The verb *тресè* /shake(3p sg)/**

This verb is included in the list of verbs which morphologically include a clitic realizing the semantic role of experiencer. However, with *тресè* /shake(3p sg)/ the clitic is obligatory only when the non-clitic realization of the Od is preposed; when there is no preposing, the clitic may be dropped. In the examples below, the non-clitic NPs and clitics, if any, realizing the Od are single underlined (this underlining is used throughout the paper unless indicated otherwise):

[4] a. i. *Борисов го тресè тежка параноя.*

“Heavy paranoia shakes Borisov.”

ii. *Иван Костов и Атанас Атанасов ги тресеше треска дали царят ще се яви на избори.*

“Anxiety whether the king would participate in the elections shook Ivan Kostov and Atanas Atanasov.”

b. i. *Страх тресè Иван Искров.*

“Fear shakes Ivan Iskrov.”

⁷ As to whether and in what cases the non-clitic Od realization is optional, this needs to be investigated and is outside the scope of this paper. In the examples below the non-clitic realizations of the Od are hardly optional as they are required by the principles of text building, which will not be further addressed here:

i. *Добре ви е на вас, младите, а мен ме заболя и последният ми зъб.*

“You, the young people, are alright while I have a toothache in my last tooth.”

ii. *Щеше да е хубаво да покараме и мотори, но за известно време се ограничавам поради травмата. Пък и Жоро го мързеше.*

“It would have been nice to go motobike riding, but for a while I limit this due to my injury. Also Joro didn’t feel like it.”

- ii. *Треска тресеше собствениците на малките магазинчета.*
 “Anxiety shook the owners of small stores.”

The accusative clitics in examples [4] (a.i & a.ii) above are non-omissible: omitting them will render the clauses ungrammatical:

- [4'] a. i. **Борисов го тресè тежка параноя.*
 ii. **Иван Костов и Атанас Атанасов ги тресеше треска дали царят ще се яви на избори.*

The clitics may optionally be used in examples [4] (b.i & b.ii) without affecting the arrangement of syntactic functions or clause grammaticality as in:

- [4'] b. i. *Страх го тресè Иван Искров.*
 ii. *Треска ги тресеше собствениците на малките магазинчета.*

The optionality of clitics in clauses without preposing is not of interest in this paper, so it will not be further investigated here. However, I would like to express the hypothesis that doubling clitics in Bulgarian clauses without preposing are not due to grammatical or pragmatic considerations: they are simply optional grammatical transference from clauses with preposing where they have a grammatical or pragmatic function.

• **Interesting case 2: Impersonal existential *има* & *няма* (*има/nyama*-clauses)**

In existential *има/nyama*-clauses /”there is/are, has(3p sg) & there isn’t/aren’t, doesn’t have(3p sg)”, a doubling clitic⁸ is always required when a non-clitic NP realization of the Od is used, regardless of whether the non-clitic NPs are positioned pre- or postverbally.

- [5] i. *Опасността от токов удар я има, колкото и да се внимава.*
 “There is the risk of an electric shock, no matter how careful one is.”
 ii. *Има го размаха, има я целта, и най-вече има ги ентузиазма и настроението.*
 “There is the scale, there is the purpose, and above all there is the enthusiasm and good mood.”

In example [5] (i) the Od is preposed and the doubling clitic is obligatory; if the clitic is dropped, the clause is ungrammatical as shown in [5'] (i).

⁸ Doubling clitics in such clauses follow the general rules for clitics’ admissibility e.g. a non-clitic NP realization of the Od that is headed by an indefinite noun cannot receive clitic doubling. For doubling clitics’ admissible conditions see Ovcharova (2016, pp. 70–73) among others.

In example [5](ii) there are three instances of the existential *има* /'there is', and all three have doubling clitics and direct objects after the verbs. In the clause in [5](ii) the clitics are dropped and the clause can be understood as a personal clause with a subject pro-drop, i.e. the clause's semantics changes although the clause is grammatical.

[5'] i. **Опасността от токов удар я има, колкото и да се внимава.*

ii. *Има размаха, има целта, и най-вече има ентузиазма и настроението.*
 "[He/she/it] has the scale, has the purpose, and above all has the enthusiasm and good mood."

With nouns such as *опасността* /the danger, the risk/ and *възможността* /the possibility/ it is possible not to use clitic doubling when the non-clitic NP is placed after the verb as in [6]. The only explanation that comes to mind is that such an existential *има/няма*-clause is so obviously an existential one that it is not necessary to disambiguate it from a clause with a possessive verb⁹. Though I have not thoroughly investigated the issue, clauses of this type are rare and seem to be admissible due to the semantics of the non-clitic NP.

[6] *Има опасността от падащи камъни по пътните настилки по всички направления в региона.*

"There is the risk of falling stones on the roads in all directions in the area."

Existential *има/няма*-clauses (when contrasted with personal clauses having the verbs *има/няма* /has, doesn't have/ in the 3rd person singular) delineate the border between clauses with verbs which morphologically include a clitic and clauses where doubling clitics perform a case disambiguating function, i.e. the clitics act as true case markers.

2.2. Doubling clitics as true case markers in clauses with Od preposing

Clitics can act as case markers disambiguating the syntactic function of an initial NP in clauses with personal verbs. If dropped, the clause meaning changes, and because of this they are obligatory. Compare:

⁹ The existential verbs *има/няма* in Bulgarian coincide in form with the 3rd person, singular of the verb for possession *има/няма* /has(3p sg)/doesn't have(3p sg)/. NPs headed by indefinite nouns cannot perform the subject function, and therefore a disambiguating doubling clitic is not admissible (previous footnote).

[7] i. *Новият директор го чака много работа.*

New-the principal(masc) him(acc clit, 3p sg, masc/neut) waits(3p sg) much work(fem)

“Much work awaits the new principal.”

ii. *Новият директор чака много работа.*

New-the principal(masc) waits(3p sg) much work(fem)

“The new principal is expecting much work.”

The clitic in [7](i) establishes the function of the initial NP as realizing the Od. The comparison between [7](i) and [7](ii) shows that dropping the clitic in the latter makes the initial NP assume the syntactic function of subject. It can be argued that in writing the full definite article for masculine nouns will identify (if there isn't a spelling mistake) NPs of masculine gender as the subject or not. Therefore, the structural disambiguation of the accusative clitic is even more pronounced when the initial and postverbal NPs are headed by nouns of feminine gender, and, theoretically, the clitic may refer to both. The made-up examples below show this:

[8] i. *Новата директорка я удари топката.*

New-the principal(fem) her(acc clit, 3p sg, fem) hit(3p sg) ball-the(fem)

“The ball hit the new principal.”

ii. *Новата директорка удари топката.*

New-the principal(fem) hit(3p sg) ball-the(fem)

“The new principal hit the ball.”

Due to the presence of the clitic, in example [8](i) the initial NP is regarded as Od; in [8](ii) the same NP, not followed by a clitic, is the subject.

Below are authentic examples following the pattern of the doubling clitics acting as case markers. In all of them when the clitic is dropped, the pre-verbal NP becomes the subject, and the clause semantics changes. In the original clauses, the subject, if explicitly expressed, is double underlined. The underlining of the elements is preserved in the English translations regardless of whether they have the same syntactic function or not:

[9] i. *Пред киното Иван го чакаше изненада.*

“Outside the cinema Ivan was in for a surprise.”

¹⁰ The spelling mistake of the full definite article appears in the original clause (source: <http://shum.bg/index.php?item=115654&start=42&PHPSESSID=p4shibae82aun7v58fv1gslqq2>; “Сашко Кунев”, 2014).

- ii. *България се възражда отново и това го показва събора¹¹ на Рожен.*
 “Bulgaria is again experiencing a revival and this can be seen at the festival in Rozhen.”
- iii. *Та бих ѝ купила, но този го получи подарък за рождения си ден.*
 “I would have bought it to her, but [she] got it as a present for her birthday.”

These Bulgarian examples show one of the two reasons for a speaker to use clauses with Od preposing: the arrangement ensures unmarked information packaging from the old to the new information, from the topic to the focus. (the other reason being placing the focus on the initial element). In examples [9](i & ii) the focused element is the end-clause subject; the clause in [9](iii) has a pro-drop subject, and its focus is the information in the clause end. Information packaging such as the one shown in these examples is very productive in clauses with Od preposing in Bulgarian, with clitics having the pragmatic role of marking the topical status of the initial NP.

3. Pragmatic clitic doubling or absence of clitic doubling

Penchev (Бояджиев, Куцаров, & Пенчев, 1998, p. 639) claims that “if a preposed Od is not stressed (old information)¹², it is obligatorily doubled by a pronominal clitic, i.e. a preposed unstressed Od is always doubled or the verb is stressed”. This claim suggests that a preposed

Od not bearing stress always represents old information and obligatorily receives clitic doubling, and, by deduction, a preposed Od bearing stress represents new information and obligatorily lacks clitic doubling. The deduction is true for Bulgarian because NPs of discourse-new referents do not bear morphological markers for definiteness and, therefore, do

¹¹ Spelling mistake in the original source: <http://www.focus-news.net/news/2015/07/19/2094530/valentina-vasileva-obshtina-smolyan-balgariya-se-vazrazhda-otnovo-i-tova-go-pokazva-sabora-na-rozhen.html> (“Гайдите на Рожен замлъгнаха”, 2015). The subject at the end position does not bear the grammatical full definite article because its position wrongly “identifies” it as the object.

¹² Brackets are used in the original text in Penchev (Бояджиев et al., 1998, p. 639) as shown: Ако обаче изнесеното напред допълнение не е ударено (стара информация), то задължително се удвоява, т.е. началното неударено допълнение е винаги удвоено: *Писмото го донесе раздавачът* или с ударение върху глагола.

not admit clitics (see footnote 8). In the example below the preposed Od is underlined and as the clause has a pro-drop subject, in the English version the subject is in brackets (pro-drop subjects are indicated in same way throughout the paper):

[10] *Известиха, че предния ден турски ескадрон слязъл в селото на водопой. Зудуми не направиха.*

“It was reported that on the previous day a Turkish squadron came to the village to get water. [They] didn’t cause trouble.”¹³

Penchev’s claim fails to include cases when the preposed Od bears focus (primary or not) but represents old information. With such discourse-old expressions, in theory, clitic doubling is admissible.

I will argue below that:

(1) Clitic doubling obligatorily does not occur when the preposed NP bears contrastive, emphatic focus; if the focus is not contrastive, clitic doubling may occur;

(2) Clitic doubling as a topicality marker is inconsistent but strongly preferred in oral discourse for discourse-old referents or when a referent of an expression is activated into the discourse although such an element usually bears prosodic prominence.

3.1. Clitic doubling with preposed focused NPs realizing the Od

- **No clitic doubling with emphatic, contrastive focus**

Let’s look at these authentic examples with preposed direct objects:

[11] i. *Слепецът попи на камъчето, преглътна обидата и нищичко не каза, но в сляпото му око полека преля една бистра сълза и заблестя. Тая сълза сложих на лявото блюдо.*

“The old blind man felt the little rock [in his hand], swallowed the insult and said nothing, but into his blind eye rolled a crystal teardrop and sparkled. It was this teardrop that [I] had placed on the left scale-pan.”

¹³ In the Bulgarian clause in [10] the preposed Od, if placed in its canonical post-verbal position, will also be the clause focus but the non-canonical construction adds extra emphasis.

ii. Цяла седмица говорихме, че не трябва да грешим и да играем техния стил, а точно това направихме.

“All week we have been saying that we mustn’t make the mistake to follow their style, but that was exactly what [we] did.”

iii. „Ние можем само да способстваме за създаването на доверителна обстановка в хода на този възможен и крайно необходим преговорен процес. Това обсъдихме”, поясни Путин.

“We can only assist in creating an atmosphere of trust in the course of these potential and extremely necessary negotiations. That’s what [we] discussed.’ Putin explained.”

In [11](i) the preposed NP, *тая сълза* /this teardrop/, is old information, and, in the context of the tale where it is used, it is the important *measure* for the debt of the tale’s character who is not allowed to enter Heaven. The clause with preposing is key for understanding the moral of the tale, and the initial NP bears the strong tonic prominence. The clause does not have clitic doubling and such is not admissible because this preposed Od realizes a case of emphatic focus preposing. The preposed NP is discourse-old referent and bears the primary clause focus. This type of focus preposing involving emphatic, contrastive focus on a topical element does not admit clitic doubling in Bulgarian:

In examples [11](ii & iii) the preposed NPs are headed by the demonstrative *това* /that/, and bear the primary clause focus. The focus in [11](ii) is also lexically marked by including the intensifier *точно* /exactly/ in the preposed NP. Again, clitic doubling is not admissible pragmatically.

- **Admissible clitic doubling with focused but non-emphatic preposed Od**

Let’s consider the authentic examples below:

[12] i. Каква кола бихте предпочели – малка и бърза или голяма и бавна?
И двете ги искам.

“What car would you prefer – small and fast, or big and slow? I want both.”

ii. Каква искаш да станеш като пораснеш голяма? Дизайнер, дизайнер, дизайнер, много искам това, но много искам и писател. Ох, и двете искам много, много, много.

“What job would you like when you grow up? Designer, designer, designer, I want this a lot, but also I want to be a writer. Ohh, I want both, a lot, a lot, a lot.”

The preposed NPs are clearly discourse-old: they are linked to the respective referents in the preceding clauses underlined with a wavy line. The contexts of [12](i & ii) are very similar, and, therefore, it can be argued that the preposed NPs are identically stressed. Still, in [12](i) there is, and in [12](ii) there is not clitic doubling. What permits this doubling is the discourse-old status of the preposed NP; what permits the absence of clitic doubling is the fact that the preposed NP is stressed.

Additional research needs to be conducted on the frequency of clauses with preposed focused Od and clitic doubling but it can be expected that such instances are rare and limited to clauses with pro-drop subjects and no other elements in the right periphery to attract the clause focus.

- **Special case: Stressed full accusative pronouns with doubling clitics, e.g. мене ме /me(acc pro 1p sg) me(acc clit)/**

[13] i. *Аз съм обиден, мене ме пропусна.*

I am insulted, me(full acc pro 1p sg) me(acc clit) skipped(2p sg)

“I am insulted, [you] skipped me.”

ii. *Имам един гаден сън, него го помня много добре.*

have(1p sg) one nasty dream(masc), it(full acc pro, 3 p sg, masc) it(acc clit, masc) remember very well

“[I] have one nasty dream, [I] remember it very well.”

In these examples, the full accusative pronouns are used for additional emphasis because the grammar does not require them. At the same time, they could well be the only realization of the Od but in both sentences they are doubled by clitics. The primary clause focus is most likely to be on the verb in [13](i) and on the adjunct in [13](ii). My claim is that when the full accusative pronouns are not required by grammar (e.g. text cohesion considerations) and do not bear emphatic stress, they always bear some tonic prominence though doubled by a clitic.¹⁴

Having discussed the cases of focused initial direct objects, let's continue with direct objects that placed initially due to their topical status.

¹⁴ I believe that this claim will hold even if the full accusative pronouns are not preposed: *Аз съм обиден, пропусна ме мене* and *Имам един гаден сън, помня го него много добре*.

3.2. Clitic doubling with preposed topical NPs realizing the Od

- **Clitic doubling with discourse-old, familiar referents of the preposed NPs**

Clitic doubling with discourse-old, familiar referents of the NPs realizing the Od is usual in oral/colloquial Bulgarian as in example [14] (i); in writing it may not occur as in example [14] (ii):

[14] i. Нямам нищо [никакви дрешки] за даване аз. Хубавите ги взе сестра ми, а другите ги подарих на една жена със 7 деца от нашия квартал.

“I have nothing [clothes] to give away. The nice ones, my sister took them, and the others [I] gave away to a woman with 7 children living in the area.”

ii. Тази подробности беше открила случайно, докато учеше “*Онегин*” и Максимович ѝ беше дал да прочете всичко, с което разполагаше, за Чайковски.

“This detail [she] had found accidentally while studying *Onegin*, and Maksimovich had given her to read all he had about Tchaikovsky.”

In [14] (i) the subject *сестра ми* /my sister/ represents the clause focus in the first of the coordinate clauses; in the second coordinate clause with another preposed Od *другите* /the others/, the focus is on the Oi in the predicate. The two preposed objects in the two coordinated clauses are doubled by clitics to signal the topical status of the preposed NPs.

The clause in [14] (ii) is an example from a literary text without clitic doubling of the Od realized by an NP with a discourse-old referent, which is preposed to mark its explicit contextual linkage. The clause focus is again in the predicate.

Such clauses reveal an instance of a topic-focus articulation structure similar to that of clauses with *locative inversion* in English, termed *subject-dependent inversion* in Huddleston and Pullum (2002, p. 1385). Clauses such as *From inside the shed came a dull rolling thudding noise* allow preposing a locative complement and show inversion in compliance to the requirement that “the preposed phrase must not represent information that is less familiar to the discourse than that represented by the postposed NP” (Huddleston & Pullum, 2002, p. 1386). In other words, the preposed element is discourse-older than the inverted subject. In Bulgarian, Od preposing is often motivated by the same pragmatic requirements for topic-focus arrangement, and the respec-

tive NP may be double by a clitic. According to Danchev (2013, p. 247) direct object reduplication is part of the common historical development of fronting topicalized NPs (which in English has led to the SVO order).

- **Clitic doubling with activated referents of the preposed NPs**

In the examples discussed in the previous point the preposed NPs are all obviously discourse-old. However, in oral/colloquial Bulgarian, clitic doubling also occurs with activated referents of preposed NPs, or in other words, these NPs realizing the Od introduce inactive referents in the discourse and, therefore, bear an activation stress but do not represent the clause focus.

Mental representations of NP referents may be in three activation states in the addressee's mind: *active*, *semi-active (or accessible)* and *inactive* (Lambrecht, 1994, pp. 93–100, as cited in Chafe, 1987). Also, Lambrecht (1994, pp. 105–107) makes a distinction between *identifiable* but *inactive* referents and *unidentifiable*, *brand-new* referents. Identifiable but inactive referents can be activated.

In example [15] below the preposed NP, *решението за развода* /'the decision to divorce', which is followed by clitic doubling, is an example of an activated identifiable but inactive referent:

- [15] *Преди Коледа разбрах, че мъжът ми си има любовница – на годините на дъщеря ми. Всъщност, аз отдавна го подозирах, но със сигурност го научих скоро. Вярвайте, нищо не ми трепна. Просто си казах, че така е трябвало да стане. Решението за развод го взех на секундата.*
 “Before Christmas I found out that my husband has a lover – my daughter’s age. In fact I had suspected him for a while, but I became certain of it not long ago. Believe me, it didn’t affect me in any way. I simply said to myself that that’s how it is supposed to be. The decision to divorce, [I] took it in a split second.”

The preposed NP above represents contextually new information but is not the most prominent tonic element. It is stressed and bears an *activation accent* (Lambrecht, 1994, p. 219), and illustrates a case of *topic promotion* (Lambrecht, 1994, p. 177). In Bulgarian, the NP’s topic status is signaled by the clitic doubling.

The occurrence of clitic doubling in the example above is admissible due to the fact that, although the constituent is new to the discourse, it expresses *given* or *hearer-old* information in the sense that this information represents “knowledge which the speaker assumes to be in the consciousness of the addressee at

the time of the utterance” (Chafe, 1976, p. 30, as cited in Birner & Ward, 1998, p. 10). In a monologue of a wife about her husband’s infidelity, divorce is not an unexpected topic. Morphologically, the givenness is signaled by the use of the definite article *решението* /‘the decision’/ though “definiteness and topicalization are in fact independent” (Birner & Ward, 1998, p. 83). The preposed NP contains old, or rather hearer-old, information, and, therefore, clitic doubling is pragmatically admissible in Bulgarian while, it must be pointed out, the definiteness makes the use of a clitic grammatically admissible. If a preposed non-definite NP *решение за развода* /‘a decision to divorce’/ was used, then clitic doubling would not be admissible because of the grammar requirements **Решение за развод го взех на секундата* (see footnote 8).

In written discourse, semi-active referents can be activated without clitic doubling:

[16] i. *Мария продавала тялото си по силата на стар закон от Мойсеево време, когато всеки баща имал най-официалното право да продаде дъщеря си за наложница. [...] При това всичките пари, които оставали, след като вещицата си вземела пая, получавал бащата, а Мария получавала храна и правото на стая.*

“Maria sold her body by virtue of an old law from the time of Moses when a father had the official right to sell his daughter as a concubine. [...] What is more, it was her father who got all the money that was left after the witch kept her share, while Maria got food and the right to have a room.”

ii. *Хайсар Рашид познавал първото доказателство за бременност още от дете, когато по-големите му братя говорели за мръсната жена, от която течала кръв. [...] Тривиалната истина научил чак при лечителя Ейшу [...]*

“Haisar Rashid learned the first evidence of pregnancy when he was a child, when his elder brothers talked about the dirty woman who bled. [...] It wasn’t until he went to the healer Aishu that he found out the banal truth [...].”

Although in [16](i & ii) the preposed direct objects occupy the initial, topical clause position and the focus is in the right periphery – on the subject in [16](i) and on the adjunct in [16](ii), it can be deduced from the English translations, in which *it*-cleft clauses are used, that the pragmatic purpose is not so much to assign topical status to the initial NPs as to present them as bearing presupposed/old information. This claim and that fact that in writing it is easier for the hearer to process the information are possible reasons for the absence of clitic doubling.

- **More examples with preposed topical NPs realizing the Od: 1. Changing the line of narration by introducing a new-to-the-discourse topical referent**

When used to activate a referent in the discourse, clitic doubling may adhere to the principle of the separation of reference and role of Lambrecht (1994, p. 185). In simple words, the author formulates the rule as: “Do not introduce a referent and talk about it in the same clause”. Clitic doubling in Bulgarian achieves this in the same way left-dislocation accomplishes it in English. According to this principle, the preposed NP in [17] below introduces the respective referent into the discourse (referring function), and the doubling clitic realizes the respective syntactic function (relational function):

[17] *Никой и днес не може да обясни как така във войните българската военна администрация отива дотам, да обезоръжи изцяло българското село, да не може да произвежда. Примерно, колата му я вземат половината, да не му я вземат цялата, тя се дели на предна и задна част.*

“Even today no one can explain how, during the wars, it was possible for the Bulgarian military administration to manage to completely disarm Bulgarian villagers so that they were not able to produce anything. For example, your car, [they] would take half of it, not the whole car, it has a front and rear part.”

Lambrecht’s principle is easier to understand in the English variant where a clause with left dislocation is used. In it, the initial NP *your car* introduces a new referent to the discourse, and the anaphoric pronoun *it* realizes the Od of the transitive verb *take*.

In [17] the clause with preposing has a pro-drop subject, with the verb morphologically marked for 3rd person plural, the generic *they* (which in this particular case is more likely to be specific: the military).

- **More examples with preposed topical NPs realizing the Od: 2. Preposing, clitic doubling and information packaging of a passive clause**

Clauses with preposed direct objects with clitic doubling signaling their discourse-old or activated status and verbs morphologically marked for 3rd person plural, i.e. generic *they*, are a very productive construction in Bulgarian. The information packaging achieved is that of a passive clause: an argument which, semantically, is not the agent appears in clause-initial position. This constituent is topical, i.e. the proposition supplies relevant information about it. The clauses in [18] (i & ii) show this structure.

In [18](iii) similar information packaging is achieved but the verb is marked for 1st person singular. The example is from a car forum, and the speaker explains which parts of his car he has repaired. The three repaired items are in preposed position and two are doubled by clitics (most likely the third clitic is accidentally omitted when writing the post). The focus is on the verbs denoting the type of repair.

[18] i. *Разград обаче не го обявиха за най-добрия град за живеене.*

“Still, Razgrad has not been pronounced *the best city to live in*.”

ii. *“Даже след туй министъра на леката промишленост го поканиха на гости при Максвел.”*

“What’s more, after that, the minister of light industry was invited to visit Maxwell.”

iii. *Естествена кожа при първия обуцар (аз тъй направих). Топката си я претаницирах сам и след това си я потопих в вряла вода да се свие кожата. Ръчната не съм пипал, че не е имало нужда, но поста го преправих и си стана като оригинално.*

“Natural leather from the first shoemaker (that’s what I did). I upholstered the ball myself and then I put it in boiling water to shrink the leather. I didn’t touch the hand brake, there was no need to; but I re-did the gear handle, and it looks as good as new.”

Clauses with the type of structure as the ones discussed in point 3 above are all an example of pragmatics having the upper hand over syntax in Bulgarian in the sense that unmarked topic-focus information structure is achieved while at the same time syntax provides the indispensable aid through the clitics’ disambiguation potential (mostly in the oral discourse) for identifying the initial NP as object and topic.

4. Conclusions

1. Clitic doubling of preposed direct objects in Bulgarian is (1) obligatorily present when grammatical, and (2) obligatorily absent when pragmatic and the preposed Od receives emphatic, contrastive emphasis.

2. Pragmatic clitic doubling in clauses with Od preposing is a powerful tool allowing virtually any NP realizing the Od to be promoted to a topic status.

This topic promotion is motivated by the pragmatic consideration to achieve unmarked topic-focus articulation. Such clitic doubling is characteristic of the oral/colloquial Bulgarian.

3. In writing the same topic-focus articulation is achieved with the following special features. Preposing the direct object is motivated not so much by the reason for topic promotion but rather by the reason for (1) providing explicit contextual linkage to the immediate discourse (text coherence) and (2) presenting information as presupposed while the element in the end-clause position receives the clause focus. Such motivation may be the reason for the absence of clitic doubling in written texts.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Avgustinova, T. (1997). *Word order and clitics in Bulgarian*. Saarbrücken: DFKI. (Saarbrücken Dissertations in Computational Linguistics and Language Technology, 5).
- Birner, B., & Ward, G. (1998). *Information status and noncanonical word order in English*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company. <https://doi.org/10.1075/slcs.40>
- Chafe, W. (1976). Givenness, contrastiveness, definiteness, subjects, topics and point of view. In C. Li (Ed.), *Subject and topic* (pp. 27–55). New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Chafe, W. (1987). Cognitive constraints on information flow. *Typological Studies in Language*, 11, 21–51. <https://doi.org/10.1075/tsl.11.03cha>
- Danchev, A. (2013). *Linguistic interfaces: A collection of papers in historical linguistics*. Sofia: University Press "St. Kliment Ohridski".
- Huddleston, R., & Pullum, G. K. (2002). *The Cambridge grammar of the English language*. Cambridge: CUP. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316423530>
- Lambrecht, K. (1994). *Information structure and sentence form: A theory of topic, focus, and the mental representations of discourse referents*. Cambridge: CUP. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511620607>
- Ovcharova, B. (2016). *Preposing of clause constituents in English and Bulgarian* (Unpublished PhD dissertation). <https://doi.org/10.13140/rg.2.2.11788.51843>
- Rizzi, L. (1997). The fine structure of the left periphery. In L. Haegeman (Ed.), *Elements of grammar* (pp. 281–337). Dordrecht: Kluwer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-011-5420-8_7
- Бояджиев, Т., Куцаров, И., & Пенчев, Й. (1998). *Съвременен български език*. София: ИК "Петър Берон".
- Валтер, Х. (1964). Към проблемата за възвратните глаголи в съвременния български литературен език. *Български език*, 1964(4–5), 359–376.

- Венкова, Ц. (2017). Първи принос в българския генеративен синтаксис: Хилмар Валтер. *Проглас*, 26(2), 227–235.
- Гайдите на Рожен замлъкнаха. (2015, July 19). Retrieved from <http://focus-news.eu/scandal/2015/07/19/5080/gaydite-na-rozhen-zamlaknaha.html> (25.09.2017)
- Институт за български език. (1994). *Граматика на съвременния български книжовен език: Vol. 3. Синтаксис* [GSBKE]. София: Издателство на БАН.
- Коева, С. (1998). Граматичен речник на българския език: Описание на концепцията за организацията на лингвистичните данни. *Български език*, 1998(6), 49–58. Retrieved from <http://lml.bas.bg/~stoyan/gws/dokument1.html>
- Сашко Кунев: Парк “Шуменско плато” е за отдих, не за състезания. (2014, October 17). Retrieved July 2, 2018, from <http://shum.bg/index.php?item=115654&start=42&PHPSESSID=p4shibae82aun7v58fv1gslqq2>

BIBLIOGRAPHY

(TRANSLITERATION)

- Avgustinova, T. (1997). *Word order and clitics in Bulgarian*. Saarbrücken: DFKI. (Saarbrücken Dissertations in Computational Linguistics and Language Technology, 5).
- Birner, B., & Ward, G. (1998). *Information status and noncanonical word order in English*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company. <https://doi.org/10.1075/slcs.40>
- Boiadzhiev, T., Kutsarov, I., & Penchev, Ī. (1998). *Süvremenen búlgarski ezik*. Sofia: IK “Petür Beron”.
- Chafe, W. (1976). Givenness, contrastiveness, definiteness, subjects, topics and point of view. In C. Li (Ed.), *Subject and topic* (pp. 27–55). New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Chafe, W. (1987). Cognitive constraints on information flow. *Typological Studies in Language*, 11, 21–51. <https://doi.org/10.1075/tsl.11.03cha>
- Danchev, A. (2013). *Linguistic interfaces: A collection of papers in historical linguistics*. Sofia: University Press “St. Kliment Ohridski”.
- Гайдите на Rozhen zamlüknakha. (2015, July 19). Retrieved September 25, 2017, from <http://focus-news.eu/scandal/2015/07/19/5080/gaydite-na-rozhen-zamlaknaha.html>
- Huddleston, R., & Pullum, G. K. (2002). *The Cambridge grammar of the English language*. Cambridge: CUP. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316423530>
- Институт за български език. (1994). *Граматика на süvremenniia búlgarski knizhoven ezik: Vol. 3. Sintaksis* [GSBKE]. Sofia: Izdatelstvo na BAN.
- Koeva, S. (1998). Граматичен речник на búlgarskiia ezik: Opisanie na kontseptsiiaata za organizatsiiaata na lingvistichnite dannii. *Búlgarski ezik*, 1998(6), 49–58. Retrieved July 2, 2018, from <http://lml.bas.bg/~stoyan/gws/dokument1.html>

- Lambrecht, K. (1994). *Information structure and sentence form: A theory of topic, focus, and the mental representations of discourse referents*. Cambridge: CUP. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511620607>
- Ovcharova, B. (2016). *Preposing of clause constituents in English and Bulgarian* (Unpublished PhD dissertation). <https://doi.org/10.13140/rg.2.2.11788.51843>
- Rizzi, L. (1997). The fine structure of the left periphery. In L. Haegeman (Ed.), *Elements of grammar* (pp. 281–337). Dordrecht: Kluwer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-011-5420-8_7
- Sashko Kunev: Park “Shumensko plato” e za otdikh, ne za süstezaniia. (2014, October 17). Retrieved July 2, 2018, from <http://shum.bg/index.php?item=115654&start=42&PHPSESSID=p4shibae82aun7v58fv1gslqq2>
- Valter, K. (1964). Küm problemata za vüzvratnite glagoli v süvremenniaa bülgarski literatüren ezik. *Bülgarski ezik*, 1964(4–5), 359–376.
- Venkova, T. (2017). Pürvi prinos v bülgarskiia generativen sintaksis: Khilmar Valter. *Proglas*, 26(2), 227–235.

Podwajanie klityki zaimkowej dopełnienia bliższego w języku bułgarskim

Podwajanie klityki zaimkowej dopełnienia bliższego w języku bułgarskim (jej obecność lub brak) służy funkcji gramatycznej lub pragmatycznej i wiąże się z zagadnieniem szyku wyrazów, zwłaszcza we frazach nacechowanych na szyk.

Reprzyza występuje w funkcji gramatycznej w wyrażeniach, w których klityki stanowią część frazy werbalnej i służą ujednoznacznieniu funkcji składniowej frazy nominalnej, występującej w pozycji inicjalnej w zdaniu. Czynniki pragmatyczne nie naruszają kształtu gramatycznego czy semantyki frazy: pragmatyczne podwajanie służy topikalizacji, sygnalizując status referenta poprzedzającej frazy nominalnej, lub służy do aktywacji takiego referenta. Pragmatyczna repyza może wystąpić po frazie nominalnej, która jest specjalnie wyróżniona (*in focus*), co na pierwszy rzut oka może się wydawać niekonsekwencją: oczekiwalibyśmy raczej, że temat (topic) i fokus (specjalny akcent) powinny być identyfikowane językowo w sposób różny. W języku bułgarskim pragmatyczne podwajanie obiektu jest niedopuszczalne jedynie wówczas, gdy poprzedzająca fraza nominalna służy funkcji kontrastywnej, tj. wyrażaniu specjalnej emfazy.

Słowa kluczowe: podwajanie klityki zaimkowej dopełnienia bliższego, prepozycja, szyk wyrazów, akcent emfacyjny, język bułgarski

Clitic Doubling of the Proposed Direct Object in Bulgarian

The presence or absence of accusative clitic doubling in Bulgarian clauses with direct object preposing serves grammatical or pragmatic purposes and falls within the discussion on word order, in particular the analysis of clauses exhibiting marked word order.

Grammatical doubling occurs in clauses where the clitics are part of the verb's morphological make-up and in clauses where the clitics serve as case markers for disambiguating the syntactic function of the initial noun phrase (NP). Pragmatic clitic doubling does not affect the clause grammaticality or in terms of semantics: it serves as a topicality marker, signaling the discourse-old status of the preposed NPs' referents or is used to activate such referents. Pragmatic clitic doubling may occur with focused discourse-old NPs, which at first sight may appear as an inconsistency: one would expect that the topic and focus should be identified differently. In Bulgarian pragmatic accusative clitic doubling is not admissible only when the preposed NP realizes contrastive, emphatic focus.

Keywords: accusative clitic doubling, preposing, word order, emphatic focus, Bulgarian language

Notka o autorce

Bilyana Ovcharova (ovcharova_ltu@yahoo.com) – absolwentka filologii angielskiej; starszy wykładowca na Uniwersytecie Leśnictwa w Sofii; uczy składni angielskiej na Uniwersytecie Sofijskim. Autorka pracy *Preposing of clause constituents in English and Bulgarian* (praca doktorska, dostępna on-line: www.researchgate.net/). Zainteresowania naukowe: szyk w języku angielskim i bułgarskim; styl naukowy w języku angielskim i bułgarskim; nauczanie angielskiego języka technicznego.

Bilyana Ovcharova (ovcharova_ltu@yahoo.com) – graduate of English philology; Senior Lecturer in English at the University of Forestry, Sofia, part-time Assistant Professor in English syntax at Sofia University. Author of *Preposing of clause constituents in English and Bulgarian* (PhD dissertation available online at <https://www.researchgate.net/>). Research interests: word order in English and Bulgarian, scientific style of English and Bulgarian, teaching English for Specific Purposes.