

Bulgarian Clitics are Positioned in the Syntax*

Steven Franks, Indiana University

Two competing approaches to the placement of clitics are to adjoin them to their hosts by syntactic head movement or by a morphological operation. In this remark, I present an argument that the pronominal and verbal auxiliary clitics in Bulgarian must be positioned syntactically. The specific problem concerns complex heads (in compound tenses) of the type [participle + [auxiliary]], which freely allow clitics to intervene. Since the clitics interrupt a Morphological Word, the structure [[participle + [clitics + [auxiliary]]] implies a syntactic account in which the clitics adjoin to the auxiliary before the participle does.

Keywords: Bulgarian, morphological merger, clitics, participles, adjunction, scattered deletion

1 The Syntactic Head Movement Approach

Clitics in Bulgarian (Bg) ordinarily precede the verb and appear in a fixed order.¹ Consider a Bg sentence with several clitics, such as (1), from Bošković (2002); for ease of identification, relevant clitics are italicized throughout this paper:

- (1) *Ti* *si* *mu* *gi* dal.
 you aux.2SG him.DAT them.ACC gave
 ‘You gave him them.’

Bošković argues that the clitics are generated as non-branching XPs, but then, in their X⁰ guise, the clitics undergo successive left–adjunction to the verb once the verb has raised past them. Thus, given a base (or intermediate) structure as in (2a), the eventual result is a complex head with the general structure in (2b), Bošković’s (16a) and (16b), respectively.²

- (2) a. [_{VP} *si* [_{V'} [_{AgriOP} *mu* [_{AgriDOP} *gi* [_{AgriDO'} [_{VP} dal]]]]]]]]]
 b. [_{VP} *si*_n + [*mu*₁ + [*gi*_j + [*dal*_i]]]_k]_m] [_{VP} *t*_n [_{V'} *t*_m [_{AgriOP} *t*₁ [_{AgriIO'} *t*_k [_{AgriDOP} *t*_j [_{AgriDO'} *t*_i [_{VP} *t*_i]]]]]]]]]]]

Left–adjunction is the consequence of Kayne’s (1994) Linear Containment Axiom (LCA). In section 4, although I reject the kind of highly articulated structure in (2b), I too will exploit the LCA, although I will take it as a desideratum of linearization rather than as an inviolable principle of the syntax *per se*.

2 The Morphological Merger Approach

Alternatively, the process which positions the clitics with respect to their host could take place, as a morphological operation, on the PF–side of the grammar. Post–syntactic Morphological Merger approaches to clitics, as discussed in Embick and Noyer (2001) or Pancheva (2005), are often invoked to accommodate apparent rebracketing and reordering effects. Consider, for example, the well known “Tobler–Mussafia” (TM) effect in (3). As in (1) and (3a), the clitics precede the verb if they themselves are preceded by an overt element, but, as shown in (3b) and

* Acknowledgements ...

¹ For an overview of Bg clitics, see Franks and King (2000).

² The precise labels of the categories are not crucial.

(3c), if the syntax leaves the clitics in absolute initial position, they must then follow the verb instead:³

- (3) a. *Včera si mu gi pokazvala.*
 yesterday aux.2SG him.DAT them.ACC shown.FEM
 ‘You have shown him them yesterday.’
- b. *Pokazvala si mu gi.*
 shown.FEM aux.2SG him.DAT them.ACC
 ‘You have shown him them.’
- c. *Pokazvala mu gi e.*
 shown.FEM him.DAT them.ACC aux.3SG
 ‘She has shown him them.’

This can be handled in the morphology by rebracketing the clitics as a “Clitic Group” and subjecting them to the Local Dislocation process of Reordering Merger, so that they comprise a complex word with the verb:

- (4) a. [_v [_{CG} *si mu gi*] pokazvala]] → [_v pokazvala + [_{CG} *si mu gi*]]
 b. [_v [_{CG} *mu gi e*] pokazvala]] → [_v pokazvala + [_{CG} *mu gi e*]]

Crucial for the subsequent discussion will be the principle in (5), from Embick and Noyer (2001), their (47):

- (5) If a Merger operation moves an element A to a target B, then A and the head of B are either both MWds or both SWds.

This principle of morphology prevents Local Dislocation operations from attaching a subword (SWd) to a morphosyntactic word (MWd), where the former is defined as a terminal X⁰ contained in another X⁰ and the latter is defined as a maximal X⁰. It also prevents the morphology from situating a MWd internal to another MWd. It is this particular aspect of (5) which, I will show, creates a problem for the TM effect in Bg.

3 Clitics Can Split Compound Verbs

Bg has several compound tenses with tonic auxiliaries, as in perfect (6).⁴

- (6) *Ivana beše pročela knjigata.*
 Ivana had.3SG read.FEM book.DEF
 ‘Ivana had read the book.’

Arguably, the auxiliary and the participle do not form a complex head in (6), since certain material is able to split them. Consider the following examples, from Krapova (1999):⁵

³ Note that, whereas the clitic auxiliaries general precede the pronouns, third singular *e* exceptionally follows. This status of this fact will be examined in section 4.1 below.

⁴ Additional compound verb forms are discussed briefly in section 4.4.

- (7) a. Ivana beše veče pročela knjigata.
 Ivana had.3SG already read.FEM book.DEF
 ‘Ivana had already read the book.’
 b. Kakvo beše Ivan pročel?
 what had.3SG Ivan read.MASC
 ‘What had Ivan read?’

It is thus not surprising that pronominal clitics can also intervene between the auxiliary and the participle, when called for by the TM effect:

- (8) Beše *mu* *ja* pročela.
 had.3SG him.DAT it.ACC read.FEM
 ‘She had read it to him.’

Assuming that *beše* ‘had’ and *pročela* ‘read’ occupy distinct head positions, either a syntactic or a post-syntactic approach to positioning the clitics *mu ja* between them could be viable.

The participle can also, however, precede the auxiliary.⁶ As discussed by Lambova (2003), among others, this has a focusing effect:⁷

- (9) Pročela beše knjigata.
 read.FEM had.3SG book.DEF
 ‘She had READ the book.’

Crucially, here no splitting is possible, as in the following minimal pair, adapted from Lambova (2005):⁸

- (10) a. Beše opredeljeno pročela knjigata.
 had.3SG definitely read.FEM book.DEF
 ‘She had definitely read the book.’
 b. Pročela (*opredeljeno) beše (opredeljeno) knjigata.
 read.FEM definitely had.3SG definitely book.DEF
 ‘She had definitely READ the book.’

⁵ While these orders are not preferred and speaker judgments vary, particularly with regard to (7b), they are acceptable and, crucially, contrast with attempts to split a fronted participle from its auxiliary. The translation of (7a) is corrected from Krapova’s original.

⁶ There is a large literature on participle + auxiliary constructions in Slavic, originally discussed under the rubric of “Long Head Movement” by Lema and Rivero (1989). See, for example, Embick and Izvorski (1995, 1997), Krapova (1999), Lambova (2002, 2003, 2004a, 2004b, 2005), or Migdalski (2003, 2005).

⁷ The discourse effects of participle fronting are complex. While it always indicates focus, participle fronting is also compatible with focusing a lower element in the clause (e.g., in (9), ‘... THE BOOK (and not the newspaper)’ or even with verum focus.

⁸ Examples comparable to *wh-question* (7b) cannot be constructed, since participle fronting is incompatible with additional focal material preceding the participle.

I take this as evidence that participle fronting in Bg involves left–adjunction of the participle to the auxiliary, presumably on its way up to some sort of Focus Projection (FP), situated immediately below CP.

Similarly, all speakers find a contrast between (11a) and (11b):

- (11) a. Beše li Marija kupila kâšta?
 had.3SG Q Maria bought.FEM house
 ‘Had Maria bought a house?’
 b. Kupila li (*Marija) beše (Marija) kâšta?
 bought.FEM Q Maria had.3SG Maria house
 ‘Had Maria BOUGHT a house?’

It will be noted that the question particle *li* is able to intervene in (11b).⁹ However, in considering the nature of TM effects I put this element aside, since there are good (albeit, contested) reasons to entertain a purely prosodically driven Reordering Merger specifically for *li*. For example, if, as a simple enclitic, the syntax leaves *li* (presumably in C⁰) with no host to its left, at Spell–out it is linearized at the right edge of the prosodic word to its right. When the prosodic conditions so dictate, *li* not only separates the verb from the clitics (12a, b), but even splits clitic sequences that otherwise are never separable (12c):

- (12) a. Pokazvala li *si* *mu* *gi*?
 showed.FEM Q aux.2SG him.DAT them.ACC
 ‘Have you shown them to him?’
 b. Pokazvala li *mu* *gi* *e*?
 showed.FEM Q him. DAT them.ACC aux.3SG
 ‘Has she shown them to him?’
 c. Ne *mu* li *gi* *e* pokazvala?
 NEG him. DAT Q them.ACC aux.3SG showed.FEM
 ‘Hasn’t she shown them to him?’

In (12c), *ne* is a post-stressing proclitic, so that *ne mú* constitutes an independent prosodic word, indicated by “ ω ”, and *li* necessarily appears to its right:

- (13) li [ω *ne mú*] [ω *gi e pokazvala*] → [[ω *ne mú*] + *li*] [ω *gi e pokazvala*]

I return to the derivations of (12a) and (12b) in the following section.

Much more troublesome than splitting by *li*, however, is the fact that the pronominal and verbal auxiliary clitics can also appear between the participle and the auxiliary. Thus, parallel to (8), we have:

⁹ The literature on the syntax and semantics of *li* (in Bg and other Slavic languages) is far too vast to do justice to it in this remark; see, among others, Englund (1977), King (1994), Rudin, King, and Izvorski (1998), Rudin, Kramer, Billings, and Baerman (1999), Franks and King (2000: 349–57), Rudnickaya (2000), and especially Bošković (2001: 197–253) for discussion of the special prosodic and focus properties of *li*.

- (14) Pročela *mu ja* beše.
 read.FEM him DAT it.ACC had.3SG
 ‘She had READ it to him (and not sung it).’ OR ‘She HAD read it to him.’

If the TM effect involves Reordering Merger, roughly as in (4), and if *pročela beše* constitute a complex X^0 , as strongly indicated by their otherwise impenetrable cohesion, then the principle in (5) faces a dilemma, since there is no credible sense in which the clitic cluster is analyzable as a SWd. Local Dislocation of SWds, but not of MWds, places them internal to a MWd, but this is inconceivable with Bg clitics, as demonstrated by any attempt for the clitics to target the prefix *pro-*, the participial suffix *-l-*, or the agreement inflection *-a* of *pročela* in (15):

- (15) a. **pro-mu ja-čela* b. **proče-mu ja-la* c. **pročel-mu ja-a*

I therefore conclude that the TM effect cannot be analyzed as post-syntactic Reordering Merger of the clitics with the following verbal head.

4. Some Solutions and Compromises

This section considers possible accounts of the data and introduces some additional facts.

4.1. Against Scattered Deletion of Subwords

Must Bg TM be regarded as purely syntactic instead? Bošković (2002) does not discuss this effect, but, in Bošković (2001), he analyzes TM in terms of scattered deletion of SWds.¹⁰ Under his account, for example, (3b, c) and (12a–c) would have to be treated as follows, with pronounced copies in boldface:

- (16) a. [*si* + [~~*mu*~~ + [~~*gi*~~ + ***pokazvala***]]] [*si mu gi pokazvala* ... [= (3b)]
 b. [*e* + [~~*mu*~~ + [~~*gi*~~ + ***pokazvala***]]] [*e mu gi pokazvala*] ... [*e mu gi pokazvala*...] [= (3c)]
 c. [*si* + [~~*mu*~~ + [~~*gi*~~ + ***pokazvala***]]] + ***li*** [*si mu gi pokazvala* ... [= (12a)]
 d. [*e* + [~~*mu*~~ + [~~*gi*~~ + ***pokazvala***]]] + ***li*** [*e mu gi pokazvala*] ... [*e mu gi pokazvala*...] [= (12b)]
 e. [***ne*** + [*e* + [~~*mu*~~ + [~~*gi*~~ + ***pokazvala***]]]] + ***li*** [~~*ne e mu gi pokazvala*~~] ... [***ne e mu gi pokazvala*** ... [= (12c)]

This works because, for Bošković, there are complex PF stipulations determining which copy is ultimately pronounced: (i) the auxiliary and pronominal clitics cannot be initial; (ii) *li* must be second in its intonational phrase; and (iii) *e* must be last in the sequence of clitics. The result is a highly modulated scattered deletion of pieces of MWds, so that the copies of the five clitics (*ne*, *mu*, *li*, *gi*, and *e*) in (16e) that are actually pronounced each belong to different parts of the structure.

I do not see (16) as a particularly elegant or explanatory solution, and here very briefly point out some reservations about invoking scattered deletion so cavalierly. First, it is not clear that extending the copy and delete approach to SWds is either desirable or necessary; its application, like that of ellipsis in general, should rather be limited to syntactic constituents. Second, the scattered deletion account treats the same sequence of clitics very differently, depending on

¹⁰ See Billings (2004) and Franks (forthcoming) for additional critical discussion.

whether it is in its normal preverbal position or appears postverbally as the result of TM, although the actual clitic order internal to the cluster remains immutable. While templatic solutions, of which Bošković’s is to my mind a sophisticated variant, do not treat this as accidental, the order itself is stipulated and, under the modulated scattered deletion approach of (16), posits completely different constituencies depending on which copies end up being pronounced. Third, it is only when the clitics are grouped together that they can follow the verb, suggesting that TM targets the clitic group as some kind of unit. As shown in Franks (forthcoming), just as in the compound tenses, aspectual adverbs can marginally intervene at certain points when the clitics precede the verb, but this is absolutely impossible when they follow. An example is given in (17):

- (17) ?Az *sâm* večē *ti* *ja* dala?!
 I aux.1SG already you.DAT it.ACC given.FEM
 ‘I have already given it to you?!’

This is imaginable in a context which appropriately emphasizes the adverb. Imagine that I gave you a book but then I forgot that I had already done so; later, you come and ask about the book, and I am surprised that I gave it to you already. In this case, I could certainly respond as in (17). But, if I chose to leave out the subject pronoun *az* ‘I’ and thereby invoke TM, I could never say:

- (18) *Dala *sâm* večē *ti* *ja*?!
 given.FEM aux.1SG already you.DAT it.ACC

Fourth, there is reason even to doubt the empirical correctness of the PF stipulations Bošković needs in order to modulate the deletions. For example, when *li* is used to mark contrastive focus, it may freely follow multiple prosodic words, as in (19), from Bošković (2001: 232; 236; 242).¹¹

- (19) a. Novata kola li prodade?
 new.DEF car Foc sold.2/3SG
 ‘Was it the new car that she/he/you sold?’
 b. Sâvsem nova li roklja noseše?
 completely new Foc dress wore.2/3SG
 ‘Was it a completely new dress that she/he/you were wearing?’
 c. Koj kakvo li kupuva?
 who what Foc buys.3SG
 ‘(I wonder) who is buying what?’

¹¹ For ease of reference, I gloss this use of *li* as “Foc”; in (19a) and (19b) it bears both (Yes/No) [+Q] and [+Foc] features, whereas in (19c), where it lacks the [+Q] component (an option available in South Slavic but not in Russian), it adds a sense of “wonder” to the *wh*-question. Bošković (2001) offers (19c) as ungrammatical, but all speakers I have consulted find it credible. The key point is that the acceptability of such multiple *wh* focal *li* questions depends on the pragmatics of an appropriate context for the emphatic pair-list reading *li* entails, and not on prosodic constraints on where *li* can appear within its intonational phrase. (19c), for example, is a perfectly reasonable thing to ask oneself on one’s birthday.

Fifth, simply requiring that *e* appear last obscures some possible larger generalizations about its special status. For one thing, it exhibits this special behavior in virtually all the South Slavic languages, as well as in West Slavic Upper and Lower Sorbian; elsewhere in West Slavic (as well as in South Slavic Macedonian), the third person auxiliary is null. Moreover, the other clitic auxiliaries also once came last, suggesting that perhaps two head positions are involved, one before the pronominal clitics and one after. In Franks (forthcoming), it is suggested that these are AgrS and T, respectively.¹² One (small) reason to implicate tense is that, in Slovenian, it is precisely the future tense auxiliary clitic which also comes after rather than before the pronouns. Morphological evidence from Serbian/Croatian (SC) lends further support to a head movement approach, in that the tonic forms of the auxiliary clitics consist of third singular *je*, which I take to originate in T⁰, plus the AgrS portion (e.g. *jesmo* ‘(we) are’ = *je* + *smo*; *jeste* ‘(you) are’ = *je* + *ste*; *jesu* ‘(they) are’ = *je* + *su*), with the exception of third singular, which (alongside *jest(e)*) can be just tonic *je*. This follows from the assumption that the AgrS portion here is null. It thus seems that at one time AgrS lowered to T (as a morphological operation, following Embick and Noyer’s (2001) account of Def(initeness) lowering in the Bg DP), but now T raises to AgrS; this change is even complete in some Croatian dialects, where even *je* comes first. None of these facts finds any expression in a scattered deletion account, but are instead suggestive of an approach that attempts to read the fixed aspects of word order off of hierarchical structure.

4.2 On the TM Effect

I turn, at last, to the nature of the TM effect. Although most accounts motivate it with the assumption that the pronominal and auxiliary clitics are prosodically enclitic, there is clear evidence that this cannot be at the root of the reordering phenomenon. As observed in Pancheva (2005: 114), the clitics can be supported in either direction and, in fact, are generally prosodically parsed as proclitic on what follows them. Even more telling are the examples in (20), where the clitics remain in front of the verb even when preceded by syntactic units which necessarily induce an intonational boundary; cf. Nespov and Vogel (1986):¹³

¹² In that paper, I further argue that the pronominal clitics are left-adjoined to T⁰. Besides deriving the correct surface order, this accounts for the fact that aspectual adverbs cannot be interpolated. Compare (i) with (17) in the text:

- (i) Tja (veče) ti (*veče) ja (*veče) e (veče)
 she already you.DAT already it.ACC already aux.3SG already
 dala (veče).
 given.FEM already
 ‘She has already given it to you.’

Whereas *veče* ‘already’ can be marginally adjoined to TP, it cannot appear anywhere inside of the complex head [_T [*ti ja*] *e*].

¹³ Copular *e* is even able to constitute a completely independent intonational phrase, as in the following example:

- (i) Tova, koeto pravi neštata interesni, e, če toj ...
 that which makes things interesting is that he
 ‘That which makes things interesting is that he ...’

- (20) a. Petko, edin moj prijatelj, *mi* go dade.
 Peter a my friend me.DAT him.ACC gave
 ‘Petko, a friend of mine, gave it to me.’
- b. Ako njakoj, kojto e s men, *mi* dade njakolko čipa ...
 if someone who is with me me.DAT gives several chips
 ‘If someone, who is with me, gives me some chips ...’
- c. Ivan, spored Marija, go viždam vseki den.
 Ivan according Maria him.ACC see.1SG every day
 ‘(Talking about) Ivan, according to Maria, I see him every day.’
- d. Sled kato si živjal dosta s edna žena, *ja* poznaváš mnogo dobre.
 after as aux.2SG lived enough with a woman her.ACC know.2SG very well
 ‘After you have lived with a woman enough, you know her very well.’

This telling fact, sometimes noted in passing (cf. e.g. Bošković (2001: 218, fn. 7); Pancheva (2005: 114, fn. 7)) but typically suppressed, shows us that the appropriate generalization cannot be couched in prosodic terms. It is neither a consequence of lexical enclitic status, as typically claimed, nor is it a consequence of some need for the clitics to be second in their intonational phrase, as Pancheva (2005) proposes. I contend, instead, that a more accurate characterization of non-initiality must refer to the Spell–out domain, which, for the sake of explicitness, I take here to be the phase.

I assume that the syntax proper makes no statements about linear order *per se*. Linearization is instead a property imposed on language by virtue of the temporal exigencies of articulation, and ordering arises only as part of the Spell–out process mapping from syntax to PF.¹⁴ We thus need an account of the TM effects in (3) with the general flavor of the Distributed Morphology approach in (4), as indicated in (21), although we want Merger to apply cyclically. At the highest phase (which for the sake of discussion I take to be CP but could certainly be smaller if, following Bošković (1997), among others, only necessary functional structure is projected), when there is nothing to the left of the clitics they undergo Reordering Merger and appear to the right of the adjacent morphological word to their right. Note that prerequisite to this is the rebracketing of the clitics so that they constitute a MWd, in order not to violate (5).

- (21) a. [_{CP} [_{CG} *si mu gi*] + pokazvala ... → [_{CP} [pokazvala + [_{CG} *si mu gi*]]] ...
 b. [_{CP} [_{CG} *mu gi e*] + pokazvala]] ... → [_{CP} [pokazvala + [_{CG} *mu gi e*]]] ...

If so, a possible account of (12b, c) might be constructed by exploiting the cyclic nature of Spell–out.¹⁵ As noted, clitics canonically precede the verb, which I, like Bošković, regard as an artifact

¹⁴ This now widespread view was first, to my knowledge, developed in Sproat (1985). Since being suggested in Chomsky (1995), it has been at the core of much research, both within the Distributed Morphology framework (cf. e.g. Embick and Noyer 2001) and minimalism of various ilks (cf. e.g. Moro 2000).

¹⁵ This approach is an alternative to the scattered deletion account of Franks and Bošković (2001), although it shares a crucial reliance on Multiple Spell–out. It also makes material outside CP, such as the conjunction *i* ‘and’ in (i), irrelevant to linearization in the same way:

of the LCA. Thus, at some phase in the course of the derivation, which, for the sake of illustration, I take to be νP , an ordering with the clitics preceding the verb is established:

- (22) a. $[_{\nu P} [_{CG} \textit{si mu gi}] + \textit{pokazvala} \dots]$
 b. $[_{\nu P} [_{CG} \textit{si mu gi}] + \textit{pokazvala} \dots]$

When *li* is subsequently merged, as an enclitic it must appear to the right of the prosodic word consisting of the clitics followed by the verb; note that this implies prosodification, like syllabification within the word, is also iterative and can change as the structure is built. It is only subsequent to encliticization of *li*, which is merged in C^0 , that Reordering Merger applies, producing the famous splitting effect in (12b, c):

- (23) a. i. $li [_{\omega} [_{CG} \textit{si mu gi}] + \textit{pokazvala}] \rightarrow [_{\omega} [[_{CG} \textit{si mu gi}] + \textit{pokazvala}] li]$
 ii. $[_{CP} [[_{CG} \textit{si mu gi}] + \textit{pokazvala}] li] \dots \rightarrow [_{CP} [\textit{pokazvala} + li] + [_{CG} \textit{si mu gi}]] \dots$
 b. i. $li [_{\omega} [_{CG} \textit{mu gi e}] + \textit{pokazvala}] \rightarrow [_{\omega} [[_{CG} \textit{mu gi e}] + \textit{pokazvala}] li]$
 ii. $[_{CP} [[_{CG} \textit{mu gi e}] + \textit{pokazvala}] li] \dots \rightarrow [_{CP} [\textit{pokazvala} + li] + [_{CG} \textit{mu gi e}]] \dots$

Note that in closely related Macedonian, which lacks the prohibition against phase initial clitics, the second, Reordering Merger, step is unnecessary. The output in this language is thus simply *Si mu gi pokazvala li?* and *Mu gi pokazvala li?*

4.3 Getting the Right Order in Compound Tenses

We return, finally, to the puzzle posed by the compound tenses. Here, the problem was how the clitics, themselves a MWd, could ever get between the participle and the auxiliary, as in (14) repeated in (24), since the two comprise a complex syntactic head, hence also are a MWd:

- (24) Pročela *mu* *ja* beše.
 read.FEM him.DAT it.ACC had.3SG
 ‘She had READ it to him (and not sung it).’ OR ‘She HAD read it to him.’

Here I sketch the form a solution might take that is compatible with the Distributed Morphology principle in (5). Since *mu ja* cannot undergo Local Dislocation to be placed inside of the complex head *pročela beše*, the only way to construct this order is to adjoin the clitics *mu ja* to the auxiliary *beše* in the syntax, before the participle *pročela* fronts, as in (25):

- (25) $[\textit{pročela} + [[_{CG} \textit{mu ja}] + [\textit{beše}]]]$

Within Bošković’s general system, but eschewing scattered deletion of SWds, (25) implies that *beše* moves past the clitics, the clitics adjoin to it, and only later, when the Focus head is merged, is *pročela* attracted up to F^0 , adjoining on its way to *mu ja beše*.¹⁶

-
- (i) ... *i* *pokazvala* *li* *si* *mu* *gi?*
 and showed.FEM Q aux.2SG him.DAT them.ACC
 ‘... and have you shown them to him?’

¹⁶ The structure in (25) assumes no excorporation. Excorporation would imply (i) instead:

One problem with this account concerns how the order in (8), repeated as (26), is derived:

- (26) Beše *mu* *ja* pročela.
 had.3SG him.DAT it.ACC read.FEM
 ‘She had read it to him.’

I had regarded this as a TM effect, the result of Reordering Merger, with phase-initial *mu ja* forced to linearize to the right of *beše*. This still seems reasonable, assuming that the participle stays low in the absence of focus:

- (27) [[_{CG} *mu ja*] + beše] [pročela] → [beše + [_{CG} *mu ja*]] [pročela]

This correctly predicts that, when an overt subject precedes, as in (28a), there should be no TM. Surprisingly, however, this is not the only grammatical order; (28b) is also possible, with no special difference in meaning:

- (28) a. Tja *mu* *ja* beše pročela.
 she him.DAT it.ACC had.3SG read.FEM
 ‘She had read it to him.’
 b. Tja beše *mu ja* pročela.

I offer two speculations about the provenance of (28b), alongside (28a). One possibility is that the prohibition against phase-initial clitics applies at some point prior to the merger of the subject *tja* ‘she’ to induce TM effects. This seems very unlikely, since one would then expect to see instances of clause-internal TM with simplex verbs. A more productive avenue to pursue, in my opinion, would be to posit two possible positions for the auxiliary, one low, in an Aux head, the other high, possibly in AgrS. Although the details will require some fleshing out, the basic idea, within Bošković’s general system, would be that, when the low auxiliary moves to the head position immediately above the clitics (possibly, T), they then adjoin to it (subsequently linearized as left-adjunction). On the other hand, when the auxiliary is high, it never forms a syntactic constituent with the clitics, as indicated in (29).

- (29) [_{AgrS} beše] [_T *mu ja*] [_v pročela]

As possible corroboration for this approach, it is worth noting that, unlike in structure (25), interpolation of aspectual adverbs such as *veče* ‘already’ is freely before or after *mu ja* here. (Prosodically, of course, *mu ja* is proclitic on *pročela*.)

The approach in (29) implies that the clitics do not move just in order to be adjoined to some X⁰, but rather, as described in fn. 12 and the surrounding text, the pronominal clitics simply

- (i) [pročela] [pročela [*mu ja* [beše]]]

If so, we need to ask which copy in (i) is pronounced: either the higher copy, if *pročela* counts as a MWd rather than a SWd since its head is a MWd, or else the lower copy is pronounced, if the SWd portion of the complex head [*pročela mu ja beše*] cannot be targeted for deletion. One test might be the possibility of interpolating aspectual adverbs like *veče*. To the extent that this is not felicitous, either before or after *mu ja*, (cf., e.g., (35)), judgments support the structure in (25) (or (i) with the lower copy pronounced).

move to T (and the auxiliary clitics which show person agreement are in AgrS). While Bošković (2001, 2002) contends that the clitics in Bg differ from those in SC in that they form a single complex head, necessarily encompassing the verb, the adverb interpolation evidence discussed here and in Franks (forthcoming) argues against this. Bošković applies various tests which show that the clitics occupy distinct head positions in SC, but one cannot conclude from the failure of these tests when extended to Bg that other factors do not complicate the data. For one thing, the tests are much debated, as discussed in Progovac (1996, 2000), and, for another, they consistently also fail in Slovenian, as meticulously demonstrated by Golden and Milojević Sheppard (2000), despite the fact that, as shown by Bošković (2001) and Franks and King (2000), clitics in Slovenian have a virtually identical syntax (but not phonology!) to very closely related SC. To take just one example, consider the following (near) minimal pair, from Bošković (2002: 2001: 331, fn. 5):

- (30) a. Oni *su*, kao što vam rekla, predstavili *se* Petru. [SC]
 they aux.3PL as that you.DAT said introduced refl.ACC Peter
 ‘They, as I told you, introduced themselves to Peter.’
 b. *Te *sa*, kakto ti kazax, predstavili *se* na Petâr. [Bg]
 they aux.3 PL as you.DAT said.1SG introduced refl.ACC to Peter
 ‘They, as I told you, introduced themselves to Peter.’

One problem with (30b), however, is that Bošković has applied otiose TM to Bg, under the false assumption that this is prosodically driven. With the expected order, in fact, the sentence improves somewhat:

(31) ??Te *sa*, kakto ti kazax, *se* predstavili na Petâr.

It improves considerably more if a pronominal rather than reflexive direct object clitic is employed:¹⁷

- (32) ?Te *sa*, kakto ti kazax, *gi* predstavili na Petâr.
 they aux.3PL as you.DAT said.1SG them.ACC introduced to Peter
 ‘They, as I told you, introduced them to Peter.’

It thus seems to me that clustering in Bg, as in SC, is on the PF side of the grammar.

Given that there is no compelling reason for the clitics to form a single complex head with the verb in Bg, it is not especially surprising that aspectual adverbs, such as *veće* ‘already’, can intervene in the sequence. This is true not just when the clitics precede the auxiliary, as in (33a), based on (28a), but also when they follow, as in (33b), based on (28b):

- (33) a. Tja *mu ja* *veće* beše pročela.
 she him.DAT it.ACC already had.3SG read.FEM
 ‘She had read it to him already.’
 b. ?Tja beše *veće mu ja* pročela.

¹⁷ The difference between (31) and (32) is presumably due to the difference in adjunction sites for the parenthetical, which depends on the locus of reflexive *se* versus pronominal *gi*.

I assume that *veče* is adjoined to some higher functional projection, headed by *beše* in (33a) and headed by *mu ja* in (33b). So, if the only complex clitic heads are the pronominal subcluster, optionally followed, as in fn. 12, by *e* in T^0 , then we should reconsider (28a) in light of the possibility that the low auxiliary does not need to move in this example either.¹⁸ Observe, finally, that contrastive focusing of the *l*-participle can, in principle, lead to (highly marked) orders other than (28):

- (34) ?Pročela beše *mu* *ja*, (a ne razkazala).
 read.FEM had.3SG him.DAT it.ACC and not told
 ‘She had READ it to him (and not told).’

(34) might be derived either by moving the participle directly to the high auxiliary or by moving it first to the low auxiliary and then fronting that complex. This does not, however, change the fact that *only* clitics can intervene between a fronted participle and an auxiliary. Contrast the following with (7a) or (33b); cf. also (10b):

- (35) Pročela (*veče) *mu* *ja* beše.
 read.FEM already him.DAT it.ACC had.3SG
 ‘She had already READ the book.’

The problem thus remains, under any scenario: the participle + auxiliary unit forms a complex head, yet the clitics can appear internal to that head. Whenever this happens, I argue, the structure must be as in (25), created in the syntax rather than the morphology, by two successive adjunctions.

4.4 Other Auxiliaries

Although a fuller investigation of the possibilities is beyond the scope of this remark, some merit can be seen in the proposal that there are high and low positions for the Bg auxiliaries when the other tonic auxiliaries are considered. Relevant auxiliaries which can co-occur with the *l*-participle are *bix*, for the past conditional, *bâde*, for the future perfect, and *bil*, primarily for the perfect renarrated mood but with other much debated functions as well, such as (ad)mirative and dubitative. Concentrating on *bix*, we see that the data in (36) suggest that this only occupies the high auxiliary position (perhaps a Mood head), implying a structure as in (37):¹⁹

¹⁸ If so, however, Morphological Restructuring would need to apply to get the clitics to follow *beše* when initial.

¹⁹ Note also the following adverb facts, which suggest that the adverb *opredeleno* ‘definitely’ is adjoined below the clitics, even though prosodically they otherwise prefer to be proclitic; cf. also (10):

- (i) Az *bix* (*opredeleno) *mu* *ja* (opredeleno) pročela.
 I cond.1SG definitely him.DAT it.ACC definitely read.FEM
 ‘I would definitely have read it to him.’

- (36) a. Az bix *mu* *ja* pročela.
 I cond.1SG him.DAT it.ACC read.FEM
 ‘I would have read it to him.’
 b. *Az *mu ja* bix pročela.

(37) [_{Mood} bix] [_T *mu ja*] [_v pročela]

There is thus no way, with the inverted order, for the clitics to intervene:

(38) *Pročela *mu ja* bix.

The future perfect raises no problems, since it always cooccurs with the proclitic invariant future marker *šte*, which obviates TM effects:

- (39) Šte *mu* *ja* bâda pročela.
 will him.DAT it.ACC fut.1SG read.FEM
 ‘I will have read it to him.’

Finally, the renarrated, like the perfect, according for example to Hauge (1999: 195), seems to be able to appear in both high and low auxiliary positions, although speakers I have consulted ascribe semantic consequences to the different orders:

- (40) a. Tja *mu* bila kazala vsičko.
 she him.DAT ren.FEM told.FEM all
 ‘(They say although I suspect its veracity, that) she had told him everything.’
 b. Tja bila *mu* kazala vsičko.
 ‘(They say and I was very surprised to hear it, that) she had told him everything.’

In the unmarked renarrated (40a), *bila* starts lower than the clitics, which then left–adjoin to it, whereas in its admirative function in (40b), *bila* is merged above the clitics. Needless to say, more careful investigation of the possibilities remains to be carried out for these compound tense forms.

5 Conclusion

In this remark, I have considered two approaches to positioning the clitics in Bulgarian, one that relies on head–adjunction in the syntax and another that makes use of post–syntactic Morphological Merger mechanisms. These approaches were evaluated with respect to their ability to accommodate the Tobler–Mussafia effect, and problems were noted for each. The head–adjunction approach requires the heavily modulated use of word–internal scattered deletion, but the Merger approach cannot straightforwardly accommodate placement of the clitics between a participle that has been adjoined to its auxiliary. I argued for a compromise solution, that performs clitic–adjunction before participle–adjunction, and showed how such an approach might work in a variety of constructions. The envisioned model was highly modular and derivational, in that it relies on the idea that linearization is a consequence of Spell–out, which applies in a cyclic fashion.

References

- Billings, Loren. 2004. Review of Bošković 2001. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 12:291–328.
- Bošković, Željko. 1997. *The syntax of nonfinite complementation: An economy approach*. Cambridge, Mass: The MIT Press.
- Bošković, Željko. 2001. *On the nature of the syntax–phonology interface*. Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Bošković, Željko. 2002. Clitics as nonbranching elements and the linear correspondence axiom. *Linguistic Inquiry* 33: 329–40.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1995. Bare phrase structure. In *Government and binding theory and the minimalist Program*, ed. Gert Webelhuth, 383–439. Cambridge, Mass.: Blackwell.
- Embick, David, and Roumyana Izvorski. 1995. On long head movement in Bulgarian. In *Proceedings of ESCOL '94*, ed. Fuller, J. M., H. Han and D. Parkinson, 104–115.
- Embick, David, and Roumyana Izvorski. 1997. Participle–auxiliary word order in Slavic. In *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics: The Cornell Meeting, 1995*, ed. Wayles Browne et al., 210–239. Ann Arbor, Mich: Michigan Slavic Publications,
- Embick, David, and Rolf Noyer. 2001. Movement operations after syntax. *Linguistic Inquiry* 32:555–595.
- Englund, Birgitta. 1977. *Yes/no questions in Bulgarian and Macedonian*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International.
- Franks, Steven. forthcoming. Adverb interpolation in the Bulgarian clitic cluster. To appear in *A festschrift for Charles Gribble*, ed. Robert Rothstein, Ernest Scatton, and Charles Townsend, Bloomington, Ind: Slavica.
- Franks, Steven, and Željko Bošković. 2001. An argument for multiple Spell–out. *Linguistic Inquiry* 32:174–183.
- Golden, Marija, and Milena Milojević Sheppard. 2000. Slovene pronominal clitics. In *Clitic phenomena in European languages*, ed. Frits Beukema and Marcel den Dikken, 191–207. Amsterdam: J. Benjamins.
- Hauge, Kjetil Rå. 1999. *A short grammar of contemporary Bulgarian*. Bloomington, Ind: Slavica.
- Kayne, Richard. 1994. *The antisymmetry of syntax*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
- King, Tracy H. 1994. Focus in Russian yes–no questions. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 2:92–120.
- Krapova, Iliyana. 1999. The system of auxiliaries in Bulgarian. In *Topics in South Slavic syntax and semantics*, ed. Mila Dimitrova-Vulchanova and Lars Hellan, 59–89. Amsterdam: J. Benjamins.
- Lambova, Mariana. 2002. Is head movement syntactic: evidence from Bulgarian? *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* #43, ed. Tania Ionin, Heejeong Ko, and Andrew Nevins, 89–102.
- Lambova, Mariana. 2003. *On information structure and clausal architecture: evidence from Bulgarian*. Ph.D. dissertation. University of Connecticut.
- Lambova, Mariana. 2004a. V(P) fronting and V raising in Bulgarian. In *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics: The Ottawa Meeting, 2003*, ed. Olga Arnaoudova, Wayles Browne, Maria Luisa Rivero, and Daniela Stojanovic, 269–292. Ann Arbor, Mich: Michigan Slavic Publications.
- Lambova, Mariana. 2004b. On triggers of movement and effects at the interfaces. In *Triggers*, ed. Anne Breitbarth and Henk van Riemsdijk, 231–258, *Studies in generative grammar* # 75, Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

- Lambova, Mariana. 2005. On adjunction and excorporation. In *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics: The South Carolina Meeting, 2004*, ed. Steven Franks, Frank Gladney, and Mila Tasseva-Kurkchieva, 181–194. Ann Arbor, Mich: Michigan Slavic Publications.
- Lema, José, and María-Luisa Rivero. 1989. Long Head Movement: ECP vs. HMC. In *Proceedings of NELS 20*, 333–347. Amherst, Mass: GLSA, University of Massachusetts.
- Migdalski, Krzysztof. 2003. Participle Preposing in Bulgarian. In *Generative linguistics in Poland: Morphosyntactic investigations*, ed. Piotr Banski and Adam Przepiorkowski, 79–91. Warszawa: Instytut Podstaw Informatyki PAN.
- Migdalski, Krzysztof. 2005. To have or to be: On the syntax of perfect tenses in South Slavic. In *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics: The South Carolina Meeting, 2004*, ed. Steven Franks, Frank Gladney, and Mila Tasseva-Kurkchieva, 230–240. Ann Arbor, Mich: Michigan Slavic Publications.
- Moro, Andrea. 2000. *Dynamic antisymmetry*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
- Nespor, Marina, and Irene Vogel. 1986. *Prosodic phonology*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Pancheva, Roumyana. 2005. The rise and fall of second position clitics. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 23:103–167.
- Progovac, Ljiljana. 1996. Clitics in Serbian/Croatian: Comp as the second position. In *Approaching second: Second position clitics and related phenomena*, ed. Aaron Halpern and Arnold Zwicky, 411–428. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- Progovac, Ljiljana. 2000. Where do clitics cluster? In *Clitic phenomena in European languages*, ed. Frits Beukema and Marcel den Dikken, 249–258. Amsterdam: J. Benjamins.
- Rudin, Catherine, Tracy King, and Roumyana Izvorski. 1998. Focus in Bulgarian and Russian YES–NO questions. In *UMass Occasional Papers* 21, 209–225.
- Rudin, Catherine, Christina Kramer, Loren Billings, and Matthew Baerman. 1999. Macedonian and Bulgarian *li* questions: beyond syntax. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 17:541–586.
- Rudnickaya, Elena. 2000. The derivation of Yes–No *Li* questions in Russian: Syntax and/or phonology? *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics: The Philadelphia Meeting, 1999*, ed. Tracy H. King and Irina Sekerina, 347–362. Ann Arbor, Mich: Michigan Slavic Publications.
- Sproat, Richard. 1985. *On deriving the lexicon*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Working Papers in Linguistics.

Steven Franks
Department of Linguistics
Memorial Hall 322
1021 East Third Street
Bloomington, IN 47405-7005

e-mail address: franks@indiana.edu