

Adverb Interpolation in the Bulgarian Clitic Cluster*

Steven Franks

Indiana University

0. Introduction. The present paper is intended to honor Charles Gribble by offering a small contribution to our understanding of the syntax of modern spoken Bulgarian (Bg). While the clitics in this language are often described as necessarily adjacent to the verb and impenetrable by extraneous material, it has been occasionally noted that this generalization is not empirically correct. For many speakers, certain adverbial expressions can be felicitously interpolated into the clitic-verb cluster. Two simple examples are provided in (1); throughout this paper the errant adverbial is underlined and the clitics are in boldface:

(1) a. Ivan **ne mu go e** (vse) ošte vârnal.

‘Ivan still has not returned it to him.’

b. Do utre **šte sâm gi** veče pratila.

‘By tomorrow I will have already sent them.’

In the following study I examine the status of adverb interpolation in some detail, attempting first to describe this construction and second to offer a formal analysis that might be able to accommodate the observed phenomena appropriately.

1. A popular analysis faces some problematic core data. The possibility of adverb interpolation is not even mentioned in as detailed a study of Bulgarian grammar as Hauge (1999). And in the context of the comprehensive survey of Slavic clitics in Franks and King (2000), we chose to relegate the existence of adverb interpolation to two obscure footnotes, citing an even more obscure (and still unpublished) conference presentation.¹ Judgments are, to be sure, subtle, with speakers exhibiting some variation and/or uncertainty. Yet, I subsequently

began to encounter this possibility with a frequency which dissuaded me from continuing to sweep it under the rug, despite my commitment to the (fairly popular) idea that the Bg clitic cluster should, together with the verb, be treated as a single, large amalgamation of syntactic heads. That is, the bracketed groups in (2), consisting of the clitics plus their verbal host, are readily analyzed as complex heads, created in the syntax by successive adjunctions, either of the verb to the clitics (as argued *inter alia* in Franks and King 2000) or of the clitics to the verb (as proposed in Bošković 2002):

(2) a. [Dala **sâm mu gi**] včera.

‘I gave them to him yesterday.’

b. Včera [**sâm mu gi** dala].

‘Yesterday I gave them to him.’

Under standard assumptions about head movement, the existence of (1) poses a serious problem: if the clitics plus their verbal host form a syntactic cluster, then a phrase—the presumed status of the interpolated adverbials—should not be able to intervene within the pieces of that cluster.

Yet the evidence that clitics can sometimes be split off from the verb in Bg is incontrovertible, and its vitality is such that, by the time I presented an overview of fundamental “issues and puzzles” facing any even observationally adequate account of Slavic clitics (at a workshop on clitics in February 2001), the existence of adverb interpolation in Bg occupied a prominent position in my catalog of puzzles.² At that point, adverb interpolation seemed like a relatively minor inconvenience for syntactical clustering accounts, so that the tendency of syntacticians when faced with it was to brush it aside as too peripheral to warrant a complete revamping of an otherwise very elegant approach to Bg clitic cluster formation. Bošković (2001: 181, fn. 1), for example, proposes to “assume that the intervening adverbs are incorporated into

the verb, sort of clitics and therefore part of the clitic+verb cluster.” However, to implement this he also has to rely on the false claim that “the adverbs in question are unstressed when intervening between a clitic and the verb.”³ It is important to note here that the reason adverb interpolation is so problematic for Bošković is that, in his system, the clitics and the verb form a complex syntactic head in Bg, which means the only way to accommodate the offending adverbs is to treat them as adjoined to the verb. For Bošković, this in effect means that they need to behave exactly like canonical clitics; i.e., they can move as heads and they lack stress.⁴ Syntactic clustering in Bg is crucial for Bošković because he needs to differentiate Bg from Serbian/Croatian (SC), in which, according to the analysis in Bošković(2001), the clitics form a prosodic unit but not a syntactic one.⁵

It now seems to me that the weight of the evidence has become such that we can no longer perpetuate the single complex-head type of analysis for the Bg clitic cluster. Instead, my intention in this paper is to use adverb interpolation as a finely grained probe into what the clitic group really looks like. What will emerge from this probing is that, whereas the pronominal group is indeed an impenetrable cluster, the verbal auxiliary, on the one hand, and the verbal participle, on the other, stand slightly apart: the auxiliary occupies the next head position up and the participle occupies the next head position down. This conclusion comports well with the general observation that auxiliaries are peripheral in the clitic group, being either initial or final, and has implications for what the ultimate syntactic sources of the various clitics might be.

2. What can adverbs split off from what? In constructions where adverb interpolation is permissible, placing the adverb between the entire set of clitics and a following verbal participle, as in the examples in (1), is always the most natural option. In this section we explore the range of possibilities, in the hope of extracting some generalizations which any adequate analysis

should be able to characterize. On the basis of the conclusions reached here, a tentative account is offered in Section 3. There, I will make specific suggestions about where the interpolated adverbs are introduced in the structure, what heads the various clitics occupy, and how they come to be ordered as they are.

According to Billings (2002), who offers the only substantial discussion of adverb interpolation I know of, one encounters examples of the phenomenon such as the following:⁶

(3) a. **Ne sme im go vse ošte** pokazali.

‘We still have not shown it to them.’

b. Nie **sme im go veče** kazali.

‘We have already said it to them.’

c. Ivana **e verojatno veče** raskazala tova na vsički.

‘Ivana has probably already told everybody about this.’

These examples all show the clitic group, which includes a verbal auxiliary clitic, with the adverb—or, in the case of (3c), *adverbs*—separating the clitics from an *l*-participle. In discussing which adverbs participate in interpolation, Billings (2002: 85) notes that “the list of adverbs is highly constrained; i.e., all are aspectual.”

Billings goes on to note that when there is *no* verbal auxiliary clitic, then adverb interpolation is degraded. This is demonstrated by the following near minimal pair, which he cites from Bošković (2001: 181, fn.1):⁷

(4) a. Ivana **e veče** pročela knjigata.

‘Ivana has already read the book.’

b. ??Ivana **mi veče** dade knjigata.

‘Ivan already gave me the book.’

The account of this offered by Billings (2002: 89) is that clitics are heads which have a “morphological subcategorization ... that requires adjacency with the inflected verbal stem.” Thus, if we let verbal auxiliary clitics count to satisfy this stipulation about adjacency, then (3a-c) and (4a), but not (4b), meet the requirement, given that in the former, but not the latter, there is an auxiliary clitic. While this seems to be an empirically valid generalization, it would be desirable to derive it from structural properties of clitic placement.⁸

Consider the following paradigm, expanded from Franks and Rudin (in press):

(5)a. Ti **ne si mu go** vse ošte dal.

‘You still have not returned it to him.’

b. ?Ti **ne si** vse ošte **mu go** dal.

c. *Ti **ne si mu** vse ošte **go** dal

d. Toj **ne mu go e** vse ošte dal.

‘He still has not returned it to him.’

e. *Toj **ne mu go** vse ošte **e** dal.

The examples in (5) reveal two important facts. First, the ungrammaticality of (5c) shows that splitting of the pronominals is never possible, whereas putting *vse ošte* after *mu go*, as in (5a), or before, as in slightly odd (5b), is grammatical.⁹ I tentatively conclude from this that the pronominal clitics seem to form a cluster among themselves, although there could surely be some other reason why splitting the pronominals is bad.

Note, however, that if all the pronominal clitics cared about was finding an adjacent verb, then the contrast in (5) should not obtain. While the ungrammaticality of (5c) and (5e) seems to imply that the *l*-participle *dal* is not a valid host, and that only an *agreeing* (i.e., fully inflected for person, regardless of whether it is a finite verb or an auxiliary clitic) verb form is, this cannot

be the full story since examples such as (5b) are possible. More generally, a subcategorization approach runs up against the obvious problem that, if there is no finite verb, then the pronominal clitics *can and do* appear adjacent not only to nonfinite verb forms, such as gerunds, participles, and imperatives, but also with hosts of other categories, such as the dative in definite noun phrases; e.g., *vecčno mladata ni stolica* ‘our perpetually young capital’. The second important fact is that not all auxiliaries are alike, in that separating third person *e* off from the pronominals in (5e) has a much different effect than separating off second person *si* in (5b). And while (5e) indeed leaves the pronominals not adjacent to a verb form, the result is worse than (5b), indicating that we should seek a structural account of why *vse ošte* cannot precede *e* here.

An additional and very powerful generalization about adverb interpolation is that adverbs can never intervene when the clitics *follow* the verb.¹⁰ This situation arises when the verb is a nonfinite imperative or gerund, and also when the finite verb would otherwise be initial. Here is a realistic context to consider, again, one 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 (6):

(6) Az **sâm** veče **ti ja** dala?!

‘I already gave it to you?!’

But, if I chose to leave out the subject pronoun *az*, I could never say (7), only (8):

(7) *Dala **sâm** veče **ti ja**?!

(8) Dala **sâm** **ti ja** veče?!

Any adequate account of adverb interpolation must address the clear contrast between (6) and (7). In Section 3, I offer some speculations about such an account.

A final relevant observation concerns how the positioning of the interrogative particle *li* interacts with these facts; see Franks and King (2000: 349–57) or Bošković (2001: 197–253) for critical discussion of *li*. This element differs from the paradigmatic clitics considered thus far in that it is obligatorily enclitic and does not seem to move in the syntax. A striking property of *li* is that it can split clitic sequences which we have already shown do not tolerate an intervening adverb:

(9) a. **Ne ti li go** dade Ana?

‘Didn’t Ana give it to you?’

b. **Dade li ti go** Ana?

‘Did Ana give it to you?’

These are neutral Yes/No questions. In (9a), *li* splits the two pronominal clitics, whereas in (9b) *li* separates off the verb from the clitics which follow it. As noted by Bošković (2001: 222), adverb interpolation is not viable in these same sentences:¹¹

(10) a. ***Ne ti (li) veće go** dade Ana?

b. ***Dade (li) veće ti go** Ana?

The debate about *li* centers on the issue of whether its placement is prosodically or syntactically determined. Although the issues are too complex to be examined here, I regard the striking contrast between adverb interpolation and *li* intervention here as evidence in favor of a prosodic approach, as proposed in Rudin et al (1999), Franks (2000), and many others but contra Bošković (2001). Thus, if one makes the standard assumption that *li* is merged in C°, for the sentences in (9) the output of the syntax would be as in (11), irrelevant structural details omitted:

(11) a. [_{CP} li [ne ti go dade Ana]]

b. [_{CP} li [ti go dade Ana]]

Imposing a prosodic phrasing on this (intermediate) syntactic structure might produce (12), where “ω” indicates a prosodic word:

- (12) a. \underline{li} [_ω ne ti] [_ω go dade] [_ω Ana]
b. \underline{li} [_ω ti go dade] [_ω Ana]

The particle *li* is necessarily prosodically dependent: it adjoins to the first prosodic word; since it is enclitic, it is realized at the *right* edge of that word:

- (13) a. [_ω [_ω ne ti] + \underline{li}] [_ω go dade] [_ω Ana]
b. [_ω [_ω ti go dade] + \underline{li}] [_ω Ana]

Interpolated adverbs, on the other hand, are *not* prosodically dependent; they are just pronounced in the positions in which they merge into the structure. This is the fundamental difference between how *li* is able to penetrate the clitics-verb group and adverbs do: whereas its prosodic requirements can force *li* to be ordered after something syntactically lower than itself, as shown in (13), there is simply no way to get *veče* in the offending positions in (10) in the first place.

Note that while (13a) reflects the final linearization of this sequence, a further restructuring must take place to render (13b) viable, since the clitics *ti go* cannot remain initial in Bg; cf. also fn. 16. This restructuring and relinearization process can be sketched in terms of the following stages:

- (14) [[ti go dade] + \underline{li}] → [[ti go] [dade \underline{li}]] → [[dade \underline{li}] [ti go]]

The intuition is that, subsequent to the linearization in (13b), *ti go* must relinearize, to end up pronounced at the right edge of *dade li*. Note that, since the prohibition against initial clitics is specific to Bg but does not pertain to Macedonian, in that language (13b) is already well-formed and no additional process is invoked.

3. Sketch of an analysis. In order to formalize the insight that adverb interpolation is the result of pronouncing adverbs which simply happen to be merged between constituents that would

normally be part of a single clitic cluster, I will need to adopt some specific assumptions about clause structure. Without further discussion, I will assume that the relevant parts of the Bg clause look roughly as in (15):¹²

(15) [_{CP} C° [_{AgrSP} AgrS° [_{TP} T° [_{AspP} Asp° [SUBJECT _{vP} v ... [... [_{VP} V ...]]]]]]]

The ellipsis between vP, which introduces the external argument, and VP, which introduces the remaining arguments, is intended to avoid the (far from insignificant) question of how direct and indirect object clitics get case in Bg. I adopt a version of the system in Bošković (2002), in which the pronominal clitics raise, as heads, ultimately to appear to the left of their host. However, as discussed in Franks and Rudin (2005), I differ from him in how the verbal clitics are treated. Briefly, his system of clitic placement requires analyzing even verbal clitics as non-branching phrases (introduced in some specifier position), whereas I follow the more traditional approach that they are heads. The idea is that the subject auxiliary clitics, since they contain tense and agreement information, are realized in AgrS (probably with T° raising to AgrS as well).

However, since third singular *e* follows the pronominals, as shown in (16), I place it in the next head position down (i.e., T) and assume that it has morphologically default person (third) and number (singular) agreement features.

(16) a. Ti **si go** vidjal.

‘You have seen him/it.’

b. Toj **go e** vidjal.

‘He has seen him/it.’

To obtain (16), Bošković needs to invoke a scattered deletion account, as shown in (17), based on Bošković(2001: 193–195); underlined items are pronounced, unpronounced lower copies stricken through, and node labels are suppressed:

(17) a. Ti si [go + vidjal + si [go + vidjal + si [go + vidjal go]]]

b. Toj e [go + vidjal + e [go + vidjal + e [go + vidjal go]]]

Which copy is pronounced is the consequence of PF stipulations about the various clitics. To my mind, this obscures the regularity of the special behavior of the third person singular auxiliary clitic, in that it comes last in all the South Slavic languages (with the exception of some Croatian dialects). The other auxiliaries once also came last, the future clitic series comes last in Slovenian, and the third person auxiliary is null in West Slavic (and Macedonian). I will therefore suggest a syntactic rather than PF oriented account, in which the hierarchical structure can be more easily read off the word order.

I take the contrast in (16) to imply that *si* and *e* are realized in different head positions, call them AgrS° and T°, respectively.¹³ For *e* to follow the pronouns, the pronouns must raise to adjoin to T° (in keeping with Bošković's adopting of Kayne's 1994 system, which forces all adjunction to be to the left).¹⁴ And for *si* to precede the pronouns, it must be in the next head up, namely AgrS°. This is schematized in (18):

(18) a. [_{AgrP} Ti si [_{TP} [_{T°} mu go + T°]]] [_{AspP} mu go + dal [_{VP} [_{v°} mu go + dal [_{VP}]]]

b. [_{AgrP} Toj Agr° [_{TP} [_{T°} mu go + e]]] [_{AspP} mu go + dal [_{VP} [_{v°} mu go + dal [_{VP}]]]

One feature of this account requires comment. In (18) I have left *dal* behind in Asp, with the pronominal clitics excorporating. The viability of this move depends on how excorporation is approached. There are two conflicting ideas in the theoretical syntax literature. Roberts (1991) argues that only the element which has features to check moves, which means that excorporation is not only allowed, but forced. If so, excorporation should apply in (18), provided we can identify the motivation for the clitics to move to T in the first place. Bošković (2001), alternatively, adopts the idea that prosodically deficient elements must be carried along. If so,

excorporation is blocked in (17), and it is the verb which must have some motivation to raise, necessarily pied-piping the clitics. It seems to me, however, that we do not want to let a *prosodic* dependency be relevant for *syntactic* movement, which is what this idea entails. Finally, if one really wanted to avoid excorporation in (18)—and to let the verb be the moving force—then minimal use of scattered deletion might be appropriate, as in (19):¹⁵

- (19) a. [_{AgrP} Ti si [_{TP} [_{T°} mu go + dal + T°]] [_{AspP} ~~mu go~~ + dal [_{VP} [_{V°} ~~mu go~~ + dal [_{VP}
 b. [_{AgrP} Toj Agr° [_{TP} [_{T°} mu go + ~~dal~~ + e]] [_{AspP} ~~mu go~~ + dal [_{VP} [_{V°} ~~mu go~~ + dal [_{VP}]

Regardless of which scenario turns out to be correct, the question of how adverb interpolation arises needs to be addressed. If adverbs adjoin to (or are in the specifier of) XPs, as is standardly assumed, then they might adjoin to (or be in the specifier of) AspP, thereby splitting the entire cluster off from the verb, as in (1). This is indeed what we have found to be the most typical case of adverb interpolation, as a survey of the examples offered will confirm. It also seems that adjunction of aspectual adverbs to TP is to some also extent possible, and speakers who admit this option will then tolerate splitting of first and second person auxiliary off from the pronominals as well, as in (5b). What is impossible is separating the pronominal clitics from *e*, as in (5e) **Toj ne mu go vse ošte e dal*, since these are adjoined to *e* in Asp°, or splitting the two pronominals, as in (5c) **Ti ne si mu vse ošte go dal*.

The very marginal status of examples like (4b) repeated as (20), with no auxiliary, could be handled in various ways. Possibly, they are generated by the syntax but marked as divergent in the interface with PF, along the lines of Billings’s generalization. Alternatively, (20) could be ruled out by raising finite verbs to T; the aorist *dade* would then be inseparable from *mi*.

(20) ??Ivana **mi** veče *dade* knigata.

‘Ivana already gave me the book.’

An additional place where clitics cannot be separated from the verb is in the renarrated mood, which employs the *l*-participle but differs from the perfect tense in that third person auxiliaries are omitted:¹⁶

(21) ?*Ivana **ja** veče pročel.

‘(They say) Ivan already read it.’

Since the status of (21) is comparable to that encountered with a finite verb, a possible account would be to claim that, in the renarrated mood, the participle also raises to T. This might explain its incompatibility with *e*, although leaves open the question of why plural *sa* is also silent.

It is likely that the “filtering” effect is what gives rise to the uncertainty and variation in judgments about adverb interpolation in general. I conceive of prosodic structuring (like syllabification and even linearization) as applying cyclically, as the derivation proceeds. When the grammar finally produces a linearized sequence, the question of whether it can be properly parsed prosodically must be raised. And this is where the complexities arise. The extent to which a speaker accepts adverb interpolation depends on the extent to which that speaker can imagine an appropriate context to apply the necessary prosodic structure. For example, recall the following items:

(22) a. [_ω do utre] [_ω **šte sâm gi** veče] [_ω pratila] [= (1b)]

b. [_ω Ivana **e**] [_ω verojatno] [_ω veče] [_ω raskazala] [_ω tova] [_ω na vsički] [= (3c)]

c. [_ω Ivana **mi**] [_ω veče] [_ω dade] [_ω knjigata] [= (4b)]

These are acceptable to the extent that speakers feel these prosodic groupings can be imposed.

On the other hand, cases like (5c) or (5e) are never acceptable, since the syntax could never place the adverb in these positions in the first place. This is an important point, because there is nothing about the prosody that would make hypothetical structures in (23) unavailable:

(23) a. [_ω ti] [_ω **ne si mu**] [_ω vse ošte] [_ω **go dal**] [= (5c)]

b. [_ω toj] [_ω **ne mu go**] [_ω vse ošte] [_ω **e dal**] [= (5e)]

The reason (23) is impossible is simply that the grammar does not generate these word orders, since it would require the adverb to merge inside of a complex head. Hence the input to PF that would lead to adverb interpolation of this sort does not exist, and the structures in (23) are never even considered.

Let us return to the fact that adverb interpolation never obtains when the clitics follow the verb, as demonstrated by the contrast in (6–8), repeated as (24a–c):

(24) a. Az **sâm** veče **ti ja** dala?!

‘I already gave it to you?!’

b. *Dala **sâm** veče **ti ja**?!

c. Dala **sâm** **ti ja** veče?!

My account of the splitting in (24a) was to merge the aspectual adverb *veče* adjoined to TP, with the result that it separates *sâm* from *ti ja*. In this light, recall the claim illustrated in (14) that, if there is nothing in front, the structure is later resubjected to linearization principles, causing the clitic group to be realized to the right of the verb:¹⁷

(25) ∅ [sâm ti ja] + dala → ∅ [dala + [sâm ti ja]]

The ungrammaticality of (24b) must therefore follow from the impossibility of treating *sâm veče ti ja* as a unit to be linearized as in (25). The interpolated adverb leads instead to an eventual structure, as in (26):

(26) [_ω Az **sâm**] [_ω veče] [_ω **ti ja** dala]

Crucially, the adverb cannot be included in the sequence here, so it cannot be part of what appears to “wrap” to the right of the verb. This implies that the sequence is defined as a prosodic

word. Its integrity is always preserved, and whatever ordering principles determine what the clitic cluster looks like when situated before the verb are simply carried over, seamlessly.

I turn finally to an interesting problem highlighted in Franks and Bošković (2001). As noted (in fns. 9 and 17), even the conjunction *i* is sufficient to allow the clitics in Bg not to count as initial:

(27) I **mu go** dade.

‘And s/he gave it to him.’

Also as noted, *li* immediately follows an initial verb:

(28) Dade **li mu go**?

‘Did s/he give it to him?’

However, when these two possibilities are combined, it is the word order in (28) rather than (29) that surfaces:

(29) I dade **li mu go**?

‘And did s/he give it to him?’

The order in (29) reveals that, in the mapping to PF, a determination of the relative order of *mu go* and *dade li* must be made before *i* is merged into the structure. The prohibition against leaving the paradigmatic pronominal and auxiliary clitics in initial position is necessarily resolved before the system has access to the information that *i*, which has the potential to obviate its effect, will subsequently be introduced. This fact suggests what the true nature of this prohibition really is: as mentioned in fn. 17, in Chomsky’s (2001) system, the mapping from syntax to PF that he refers to as “Spell-Out” is cyclic and takes place at the end of specific domains, known as “phases.” Crucially, CP is a phase but lower functional projections of the clause are not. Since *li* is the head of CP, we can conclude that the conjunction *i* is merged below

CP in (27) but above it in (29). Hence, if relevant domain for the non-initial constraint has nothing to do with prosody but rather is the syntactic phase, then the paradigm in (27)–(29) follows straightforwardly.

The account developed in this paper relies on the claim that Bg clitic clustering is *not* syntactic, contrary to the accounts in Franks and King (2000) or Bošković (2002), but rather takes place postsyntactically, on the PF side of the grammar, instead. The possibility of adverb interpolation then depends on the possibility of prosodically realizing (some or all of) the clitics, when left by the syntax in positions which are adjacent to the verb. The PF attempt to support the clitics then has a “filtering” effect, in the sense, curiously enough, argued by Franks (2000) and Bošković (2001) for SC. Finally, I also speculated that word order is determined cyclically, in the mapping from syntax to PF, with some surprising consequences.

Literature

Avgustinova, Tania and Karel Oliva. 1991. “The structure of the Bulgarian verb complex.”

Computerlinguistik an der Universität des Saarlandes, *Technical report 4*. Saarbrücken, Germany: Universität des Saarlandes, Computerlinguistik.

Billings, Loren. 2002. “Why clitics cluster together in Balkan Slavic: non-templatic morphology.” In *Annual workshop on formal approaches to Slavic linguistics: the second Ann Arbor meeting, 2001*, edited by Jindřich Toman, 75–96. Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publications.

Billings, Loren and Abigail Konopasky. 2002. “Morphogy’s role in ordering verb-adjacent clitics”. In *Proceedings of the 21st West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, edited by Line Mikkelsen and Christopher Potts, 29-42. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.

Bošković, Željko. 2001. *On the nature of the syntax-phonology interface*. Amsterdam: Elsevier.

_____. 2002. "Clitics as nonbranching elements and the linear correspondence axiom."

Linguistic inquiry 33(2): 329–40.

Chomsky, Noam. 2001. "Derivation by phase." In *Ken Hale: A life in language*, edited by

Michael Kenstowicz, 1–52. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Franks, Steven. 2000. "Clitics at the interface." In *Clitic phenomena in European languages*,

edited by Frits Beukema and Marcel den Dikken, 1–46. Amsterdam: J. Benjamins.

Franks, Steven. 2005. Two ways of penetrating the clitic cluster. Paper presented at Midwest

Slavic Conference, March 2005, Columbus, OH.

Franks, Steven and Željko Bošković. 2001. "An argument for Multiple Spell-Out."

Linguistic inquiry 32(1): 174–183.

Franks, Steven and Tracy King. 2000. *A handbook of Slavic clitics*. New York: Oxford

University Press.

Franks, Steven and Catherine Rudin. 2005. "Bulgarian clitics as K° heads." In *Annual workshop*

on formal approaches to Slavic linguistics: the South Carolina meeting, 2005, edited by

Steven Franks, Frank Gladney and Mila Tasseva-Kurktchieva, 106–118. Ann Arbor:

Michigan Slavic Publications.

Hauge, Kjetil Rå. 1999. *A short grammar of contemporary Bulgarian*. Bloomington, IN:

Slavica.

Kayne, Richard. 1994. *The antisymmetry of syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Krapova, Iliyana. 1999. "The system of auxiliaries in Bulgarian." In *Topics in South Slavic*

syntax and semantics, edited by Mila Dimitrova-Vulchanova and Lars Hellan, 59–89.

Amsterdam: J. Benjamins.

- Oliva, Karel. 1998. Just Czech clitics data or a closer look on the position paper: ‘Clitics in Slavic’. Paper presented at *Workshop on comparative Slavic morphosyntax*, June 1998, Spencer, IN.
- Roberts, Ian. 1991. “Excorporation and minimality.” *Linguistic inquiry* 22(1): 209–218.
- Rudin, Catherine, Christina Kramer, Loren Billings, and Matthew Baerman. 1999. “Macedonian and Bulgarian *li* questions: beyond syntax.” *Natural language and linguistic theory* 17(3): 541–586.
- Tomić, Olga Mišeska. 2001. “The Macedonian negation operator and cliticization”. *Natural language and linguistic theory* 19(3): 647–682.

Notes

* I am grateful to Leonard Babby, Loren Billings, Robert Rothstein and Ernest Scatton for helpful comments on the manuscript. I also wish to thank the following Bulgarian speaking linguists for their judgments: Olga Arnaudova, Iliyana Krapova, Vesselina Laskova, Natalya Nikolova, Roumyana Pancheva, Roumyana Slabakova, Mila Tasseva-Kurktchieva, Ivelina Tchizmarova, and Yovka Tisheva. A version of this paper was presented as Franks (2005).

¹ Our mention of the phenomenon did not go beyond noting that Oliva (1998) “points out that certain adverbials can separate the clitics from the verb in Bg” (Franks and King 2000: 237, fn. 9). We do star the example in (i), with no special comment:

(i) (*)Vasko **ì** go veče kaza.

‘Vasko already said it to her.’

This is really not all that different from (1b). One speaker subsequently consulted stated that (i) is acceptable if *veče* is emphatic, but others felt it to be much less acceptable than (1b). The ameliorating factor in (1b) seems to be the verbal auxiliary preceding the pronominal clitics, which is consistent with the observations in Billings (2002), discussed immediately below. Further investigation of these subtleties is clearly needed.

² The workshop in question took place at the Zentrum für Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft, Typologie und Universalienforschung in Berlin. The proceedings are published as *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 12 (2004).

³ Billings (2002: 83) takes Bošković to task, commenting that “every speaker ... consulted reports that these adverbs are indeed stressed.” My inquiries confirm this, although some degree of destressing is often possible.

⁴ See Bošković 2002 for a concise presentation of the relevant mechanics. Briefly, in his system the verb as host moves past each clitic, which then adjoins, as a head, to its left. The cluster in (1b), for example, would have to have the following general structure:

(i) [šte [sâm [gi [veče [pratila]]]]]]

This structure would be built up by successive movements of the host to a head position higher than the clitic followed by immediate adjunctions of the clitic, as a head, to the left of the moved complex head, roughly as in (ii), assuming a minimalist style bottom-up derivation;

unpronounced lower copies are struck through:

- (ii) a. *veče* [pratila] (merger of *veče*)
b. *pratila* [~~veče~~ [*pratila*]] (head movement)
c. [*veče* *pratila*] [~~veče~~ [*pratila*]] (adjunction)
d. *gi* [[*veče* *pratila*] [~~veče~~ [*pratila*]]] (merger of *gi*)

-
- e. veče pratila [gi [[veče-pratila] [veče [pratila]]]] (head movement)
- f. gi veče pratila [gi [[veče-pratila] [veče [pratila]]]] (adjunction)
- g. sâm [gi veče pratila [gi [[veče-pratila] [veče [pratila]]]]] (merger of *sâm*)
- h. gi veče pratila [sâm [gi veče pratila [gi [[veče-pratila] [veče [pratila]]]]]] (head movement)
- i. sâm gi veče pratila [sâm [gi veče pratila [gi [[veče-pratila] [veče [pratila]]]]]] (adjunction)
- j. šte [sâm gi veče pratila [sâm [gi veče pratila [gi [[veče-pratila] [veče [pratila]]]]]]] (merger of *šte*)
- k. sâm gi veče pratila [šte [sâm-gi veče pratila [sâm [gi veče pratila [gi [[veče-pratila] [veče [pratila]]]]]]]] (head movement)
- l. šte sâm gi veče pratila [šte [sâm-gi veče pratila [sâm [gi veče pratila [gi [[veče-pratila] [veče [pratila]]]]]]]] (adjunction)

The resulting highest copy thus has the structure in (i), with *veče* ‘already’ intervening like a clitic.

⁵ While comparison of the two clitic systems is beyond the scope of this paper, it is worth observing a curious inconsistency here, since, unlike in Bg, in SC adverb interpolation does *not* obtain. If anything, this phenomenon should be expected in SC and not in Bg, since according to Bošković, all that matters in SC for cluster formation is that the relevant elements be syntactically adjacent and prosodically deficient. Indeed, in Czech—which otherwise more resembles SC as a “second position clitic” language than Bg as a “verb adjacent clitic” one—it is precisely the set of prosodically light adverbial “particles” which can “float” within the clitic cluster; see the discussion in Franks and King (2000: 103–104) and Billings (2002: 82, fn. 9), and references therein. The kinds of temporal/event related adverbs that can be interpolated in

Bg do not intervene in Czech (or in SC), presumably because, as in Bg, these have lexical prosodic structure, hence cannot be destressed. So the explanation for adverb interpolation in Bg cannot be a prosodic one, and in Section 3 of the text I develop a purely structural account.

⁶ (3a) is cited from Avgustinova and Oliva (1991: 26) and (3c) is drawn from Krapova (1999: 65). Tomić (2001: 657) cites similar examples from Northwestern Macedonian:

(i) **Ne mu go nikogaš dale.**

‘They have never given it to him.’

(ii) **Ne sme mu go voopšto videle.**

‘We have not seen him at all.’

Thanks to Krzysztof Migdalski (p.c.) for drawing my attention to these data.

⁷ Billings notes that *napôlno* ‘completely’ is also acceptable for some speakers, but provides no example. Another adverb some speakers consulted used in examples offered is *vednaga* ‘immediately’; e.g., *ti si mu go vednaga dal* ‘you gave it to him immediately’.

⁸ Of course, the generalization only holds of pronominal clitics, since stranded *e*, as in (3c) and (4a), is fine. Moreover, it is a property of the pronominal clitic *cluster*, not the individual items that constitute this cluster; otherwise (3a, b) would be ill-formed, since *go* is not adjacent to *sme*. (Loren Billings (p.c.), however, points out that adjacency could be defined in a way that avoids this problem, as for example in Billings and Konopasky (2002).) Billings’s generalization also leaves unexplained the marginal/disputed status of (4b) and the one in fn. 1, treating them similarly to the hopelessly ungrammatical examples discussed below in this section.

⁹ Here is a realistic dialog in which the pronominal clitics appear naturally after the adverb, where they are then adjacent to the *l*-participle:

A: Xodix da kupja podarâk za Ivan.

‘I went to buy a present for Ivan.’

B: Može li da go vidja?

‘Can I see it?’

A: Za sâžalenie, ne. Mnogo bârzax i **sâm veče mu go** dala.

‘Unfortunately not. I was in a big rush and I already gave it to him.’

¹⁰ Billings (2002: 84) also notes this; his explanation may work for Macedonian, where clitics never follow finite verb forms, but will not extend to finite constructions in Bg. In Macedonian, the relevant “structures never include a morphologically verbal clitic,” so that an auxiliary to serve as host is lacking.

¹¹ Bošković suggests an account in terms of head movement, but I do not understand how he can exclude *veče* and still maintain, as discussed in Section 1, that it behaves as a clitic.

¹² The analysis could be recast without AgrS, so long as there are (at least) three functional projections above vP. I use AgrSP in addition to TP simply because the facts of Bg verbal morphology seem to warrant agreement as a distinct projection.

¹³ Note that the tonic clitics in SC seem to involve movement of T to Agrs, left-adjoining *je: je + sam, je + si*, etc.

¹⁴ Although, to be sure, for me this is a matter of linearization, and not a property of the syntax per se, but rather a (violable) desideratum of the interface with morphology. See also Billings and Konopasky (2002) for a similar idea.

¹⁵ Although whether the copy of *dal* pronounced is the one in Asp or *v* would require further investigation.

¹⁶ I am grateful to James Lavine (p.c.) for raising this issue.

¹⁷ I have been intentionally vague about labeling brackets or defining “ \emptyset ” here. This does not seem to be prosodically motivated in that relinearization only takes place if there is nothing preceding the clitics in CP (suggesting that this linearization applies at the end of each “phase,” in the sense of Chomsky 2001), regardless of the possibility of prosodic support. Thus, not only does proclitic material, such as *ne* or *šte*, as in the examples in (1), or the conjunction *i*, as in the example in fn. 9, suffice to render the clitics noninitial, but they also remain in front of the verb, even if preceded by an intonational boundary:

(i) Petko, edin moj prijatelj, **mi go** dade.

‘Petko, a friend of mine, gave it to me.’

(ii) Ivan, spored Marija, **go** viždam vsemi den.

‘(Talking about) Ivan, according to Maria, I see him every day.’