

Clitic doubling in Bulgarian

Ivanka P. Schick and Frits Beukema

Berlin / University of Leiden/HIL

1. Clitic doubling in Bulgarian

At the outset we want to make it clear that we are aware that the most profitable way to study clitic behaviour is to choose a comparative perspective. In particular, the area of clitic doubling in Bulgarian is closely related to, but also shows noticeable differences from, the same area in Macedonian (Schick 1997; 2000a,b). However, for lack of space, we will have to confine ourselves to what goes on in Bulgarian, and even here we will be concerned mainly with the Dative clitic. We intend to show that the analysis of Bulgarian cliticisation facts supports the view that clitic doubling is to be characterised as a discourse-related phenomenon.

Let us first see where a doubling dative clitic can be found. There are basically three configurations involving doubling Dative clitics.

1.1 Clausal object clitics

In Bulgarian sentences (CPs), topical arguments with specific reference can be doubled or substituted by Accusative or Dative clitic forms of personal pronouns. In (1a) below, the clausal Dative clitic *mu* doubles the internal argument of the verb ‘help’, a strategy that is well-known cross-linguistically (cf. a Spanish sentence like *Lo vimos a Juan* ‘We saw Juan’). In Bulgarian, the clitic pronouns and their corresponding doubled nominal phrases (DPs) will be taken to be topics. Here we follow Krifka (1991/92) and Jäger’s (1995) analysis of the interrelatedness of scrambling, topicality and presupposition of definite and certain indefinite DPs, according to which topics are those entities which are presupposed as given in the relevant discourse. On this view, the pronominal clitics belong to the background part of the information structure. The two dichotomies, topic/comment and focus/background, constitute two crucial dimensions of the discourse-related information structure, according to which the elements in the sentence attain a particular level

of communicative importance. The pragmatically determined focus function, which conveys that constituents are carriers of important information in a given context, is signalled by focus accent and is located in a particular focus domain that comprises the new information. Focus is paired with background, where the background part of the sentence contains already known information outside the focus domain (cf. Rooth 1992). Thus, the example in (1b) shows that a non-contrastively focused object DP, cf. *na Ivan/na nego*,¹ cannot be doubled.² If, however, focus is contrastively signalled by the object DP, clitic doubling is allowed but only if the DP is overtly moved to the left periphery of CP, as shown by (1c) and (1d):

- (1) a. *Rada mu pomaga (na Ivan/ na*
Rada CL-DAT-3SG-M is helping PREP Ivan PREP
nego). / *Rada (mu) pomaga na Ivan.*
 he-ACC-3SG-M
 ‘Rada is helping Ivan/him.’
 b. *Rada *mu pomaga na IVAN /NEGO.*
 c. *Na IVAN_i Rada (mu) pomaga t_i*
 ‘Rada is helping IVAN/to HIM.’
 d. *Na IVAN_i li (mu) pomaga Rada t_i?*
 ‘Is it IVAN whom Rada is helping?’

1.2 Adnominal (possessive) dative clitics

In Bulgarian DPs we also find clitic doubling, but here it is restricted to the Dative clitic, which co-occurs with a possessor *na*-phrase, as shown in (2). In the DP containing the definite head noun *konja* (the possessum) and the dative clitic, *mu* acts as a link between the head noun and the postnominal restrictive modifier *na Ivan* (the possessor).

- (2) *konja (mu) na Ivan/na Ivan_i konja (mu) t_i*
 horse-the CL-DAT-3SG-M PREP Ivan
 ‘Ivan’s horse’

Possessive clitics like *mu* (cl-dat-3sg-m) or *mi* (cl-dat-1sg) are related to full, inflected forms of possessive pronouns like *moja(t)*, cf. (3a). There is no co-occurrence of the full form of the possessive pronoun with a doubling possessive clitic (or possessor *na*-phrase for that matter), as shown in (3b):

- (3) a. *mojat kon* vs. *konjat mi*
 my-the horse horse-the CL-DAT-1SG
 ‘my horse’

- b. *mojat *mi kon/ mojat kon *na mene*
 my-the CL-DAT-1SG horse my-the horse PREP I-ACC-1SG

1.3 Clausal non-argument dative clitics

In addition to object clitics, Bulgarian CPs display Dative clitic pronouns in the well-known free Dative or so-called External Possession construction. The Dative clitic *mu* in (4), which has been underlined to show that it is a free Dative, as opposed to (5) which contains the regular possessive clitic *mu*, is not an argument (object) clitic nor is it a possessive clitic, as brought out by the translation. The non-equivalent interpretations of the sentences in (4) and (5) are determined by the different configurations in which the Dative clitic appears: the possessive clitic in (5) needs a definite host to its left, whereas in (4) there is material between *mu* and the coreferential *na*-phrase:

- (4) a. *Včera mu umrja konjat (na Ivan).*
 Yesterday CL-DAT-3SG-M died horse-the PREP Ivan
 ‘Yesterday Ivan’s horse gave up on Ivan.’
- (5) *Včera umrja konjat mu (na Ivan).*
 yesterday died horse-the CL-DAT-3SG-M PREP Ivan
 ‘Yesterday Ivan’s horse died.’

2. Basic assumptions

We assume that when pronominal clitics are used, general principles apply with regard to the saturation of the argument structure of lexical heads, binding of referential arguments, merging of modifiers and heads and accessing information structure from the standpoint of the grammatical system. We accept that in clausal syntax under X-bar theory, nominal and verbal projections should be parallel to a maximum extent. We regard predication as a vital concept.

We understand information structure to be the situational and textual positioning of utterances in coherent utterance sequences, where information structure is determined by the interplay of discourse-related aspects of utterances with the sentence representations on different grammatical levels.

The parallelism of CPs to DPs containing pronominal clitics is instrumental in determining the lexical properties of clitic pronouns. We assume that Dative clitics, irrespective of whether they occur in CPs or DPs, are invariant in their contribution to the meaning of the utterance: in keeping with the guideline *one form — one*

meaning there is a single lexical entry for the anaphoric Dative clitic *mu* (3rd person singular, m(asculine) or n(euter)), as suggested in (6):

- (6) /*mu*/, [[]_p -]_p v [-]_p]_p
 [+D-V+N] [+specific] [+topical] [+hr, +lr] [+max]
 x with $x \in 1$

In addition to the P(honological) F(orm) of this item, the first line provides the prosodic context in which the clitic needs to find a host.³ The data in the second line refers to the clitic's categorial and grammatical properties. Pronominal clitics are D(eterminer)-heads of DPs: as such, they represent a particular instance of referentially specific anaphoric entities indicating topicality.⁴ They are morphologically non-compositional, as indicated by the [+max] feature, and they bear the structural case features [+h(igher) r(ole)], [+l(ower) r(ole)], which determine the assignment of structural and morphological case in Wunderlich's (1997) linking procedure (cf. also Schick 2000a). The meaning representation in the third line states that anaphoric pronominal clitics are interpreted as individual variables, and hence may saturate argument positions.

3. Where are pronominal clitics generated?

3.1 Clausal object clitics

CPs and DPs are extended functional projections of the lexical projections of verbs and nouns. In (7) we provide our general schema for the placement of clitic pronouns: anaphoric clitic pronouns are non-projecting adjuncts to functional heads (F), i.e. the clitic pronouns are situated over the lexical projections (LP) of verbs and nouns:

- (7) [... [_{FP} (XP) [_{F'} [_F F cl] ... [_{LP} ... L ...] ...]] ...]

Bulgarian pronominal clitics are usually enclitic: the XP in the Spec(ifier) of FP represents the topical DP doubled by the clitic. The configuration in (7) arises in LF at the latest.

A pronominal clitic in DP relates to the D-head in that the clitic indicates the D-head's referential features as these are determined by the discourse. If we follow this line of reasoning, we see that the anaphoric clitic pronoun in CP is related to the head that ultimately binds the reference-situational variable of the verb. We take the category in which the binding of the referential variable of the verb takes place to be the multi event-related Mod(ality) P(hrase) (cf. Schick 1997, 2000a,b). The clausal clitics are generated in ModP as right-peripheral adjuncts, as shown in (8):

- (8) [_{CP} *če ne* [_{ModP} *šte* *ti* *go* ... [_{VP} *dam*
 that not FUTURE-PART CL-DAT-2SG CL-ACC-3SG-1 give
pismo (na tebe)]]]
 letter-the PREP you-ACC
 ‘that I will not give it (= the letter) to you.’

Generating clausal pronominal clitics in ModP makes it possible to link the discourse context to the syntactic representation in two ways:

1. ModP is the place where linguistic information is stored regarding the incremental nature of the aspectuality of the sentence. As Higginbotham (1985) and Bierwisch (1990), among many others, have shown, linking the syntactic expression to a discourse referent is mediated by the binding of the referential theta-role projected on the event argument of the verb.

2. Clausal pronominal clitics participate in characterising the reference situation (which in its turn is determined by the linguistic context). They indicate that their doubling DP is [+topical], this feature requiring a link to a referent already established in the discourse, so that the clitics essentially function as mediators in the interaction of the grammar with information structure: the semantic and aspectual properties of the VP and the referential properties, i.e. the D-characteristics, of the DP-complement affect the characterisation of the reference situation variable. As indicated above, the clitic pronouns together with their doubling DPs are taken as ‘given’ in terms of the rest of the information structure, and in this way they clarify how the informational load is distributed over the clause structure in Bulgarian. Even if the clitic is not phonetically realised, it consistently acts as a type of licenser of its doubling DP: each DP that is pragmatically interpreted as [+topical] can insightfully be said to be linked to a silent pronominal clitic.

3.2 The possessive Dative clitic in Bulgarian DPs

The analysis of clitic doubling in DPs is based on the empirical observation that the structure of DPs is determined by the structure of the NP complement as well as by the characteristics of the D-head. In the same vein as with CPs, we assume that in DPs the Dative clitic is base-generated as an adjunct on the right-hand edge of the functional head D, and requires adjacency with a definite Determiner, as is borne out by the representation in (9):

- (9) [_{DP} D (XP) [_{D'} [_{D°} D° (cl)] [_{NP} [_{N'} ... N ...] ([_{DP} *na* DP])]]]

Furthermore, the clitic, which together with the *na*-DP marks the possessor, is structurally parallel to the *na*-DP in that both are ‘enclitic’: the clitic to the (definite) D-head and the *na*-DP to the (definite) head noun. The close relationship

between the clitic and the *na*-DP can in a specific sense also be taken as a formal licensing relationship: the clitic has D-status and bears the morphological case of the doubled possessor *na*-phrase.⁵

Let us now discuss the examples in (10)–(16). First note that the possessor phrase [*na*+DP] is a sister of N(oun)', and as such functions basically as a restrictive relational modifier to the head of the N(oun) P(hrase), the possessum. This relationship might be viewed as a prototypical small clause construction à la Kayne (1994) or den Dikken (1995), with the possessor as the prominent constituent in a subject-predicate relationship holding between the possessum and the possessor, but this aspect of the construction need not concern us any further here. For our purposes now it is more important to note that the anaphoric dative clitic pronoun *mu* acts as a link between the NP head and its *na*-modifier, indicating in this way that the doubled possessor *na*-DP is [+ topical] and refers to an existentially presupposed unique individual.

There are two noticeable differences between the possessor *na*-phrase and other (possible) postnominal argumental and adjunct phrases: 1. there is a word order restriction in that the possessor phrase must precede other complements and adjuncts, as shown in (10b) and (12b); being the prominent argument in a relational possessive expression, the possessor *na*-DP shows its postnominal adjacency to the containing DP obligatorily. 2. the possessor *na*-phrase may also be overtly raised to SpecDP, as shown in (10c), the second expression in (11), and in (12c), in which the *na*-DP appears with its postnominal modifier in SpecDP. Non-possessor postnominal phrases may not raise to SpecDP, as shown by the ungrammaticality of the second expression in (10c) and by (12b):

- (10) a. *knigata (mu) na Ivan na/pod/... masata*
 book-the CL-DAT-3SG-M PREP Ivan on/under/... table-the
 'Ivan's book on/under/... the table'
 b. **knigata (mu) na/pod/... masata na Ivan*
 c. *na Ivan_i knigata (mu) t_i na masata/*na masata_i knigata (mu) (na Ivan) t_i*
- (11) *cveta (mu) na cveteto/na cveteto cveta (mu)*
 petal-the CL-DAT-3SG-N PREP flower
 'the petal of the flower'
- (12) a. *cveta (mu) na cveteto do prozoreca*
 petal-the CL-DAT-3SG-N PREP flower by window-the
 'the petal of the flower by the window'
 b. **cveta (mu) do prozoreca_i na cveteto t_i*
 c. [*na cveteto do prozoreca*]_i *cveta (mu) t_i*

We have noted above that the possessive clitic pronoun is enclitic with respect to the D-head of DPs. Non-clitic possessive pronouns, however, appear in front of the noun head, a position typically occupied by adjectives. In (13a) below, the non-clitic possessive pronoun *negov(-)* ‘his’ precedes the head noun *kola* ‘car’ or *deteto* ‘child’, as does the adjective *bjal(-)* ‘white’ in (13b). Non-possessive clitic pronouns inflect as adjectives, as the comparison of (13a) with (13b) shows. In (14a) we see that the definiteness marker *-t* belongs to the morphological structure of the lexical head *kolata* ‘the car’ in NP, thus suggesting incorporation of the head of NP into D, with the enclitic *mu* as an adjunct to the complex D-head [*kola-ta*]. The cliticisation of the pronominal enclitic to the definite determiner immediately captures the adjacency requirement. From the point of view of semantics, definiteness is achieved in the functional head D only after binding of the referential argument of N(oun) by D: the feature [+definite] is licensed by adjunction of N to D. In Bulgarian, the morphological configuration with the definite article is base generated. The ungrammaticality of (14b) is due to the absence of the definiteness marker *-t* on the head noun, while preposing the possessive clitic to the carrier of definiteness results in ungrammaticality, as in (14c). Moreover, the bracketing provided in (14a) also indicates that the possessive clitic *mu* forms a prosodic group with the definiteness marker:

- (13) a. [[*negov*]_a([*ta*])] [*kola*] [[*negov*]_o([*to*])] [*dete*]]
 his- F-the-F-SG car-F-SG his- N-the-N-SG)child
 ‘his car’ ‘his child’
- b. [[*bjal*]_a([*ta*])] [*kola*]
 white-F-the-F-SG)car-F-SG
 ‘the white car’
- (14) a. [[[*kola*][*ta*] [*mu*]] (*na Ivan*)
 car-the CL-DAT-3SG-M PREP Ivan
 ‘Ivan’s car’
- b. **kola mu (na Ivan)*
 c. **mu kolata na Ivan*

The structure of the DP in (14a) after the licensing of definiteness is sketched in (15a) while (15b) represents its Logical Form:

- (15) a. [_{DP} [_D N_i [_D Ø cl] [_{NP} ... t_i ...]]]
 [_{DP} [_D *kolata_i mu*] [_{NP} t_i [_{DP} *na Ivan*]]]
 kolata mu (na Ivan)
 ‘Ivan’s car’
- b. [_{DP} *na Ivan_j*] [_D *kolata_i mu*] [_{NP} t_i t_j]]

In Bulgarian, unlike other Balkan languages, definiteness is non-tautologically marked on the leftmost (i.e. hierarchically highest) lexical head in the DP. In (16a) and (13) this happens to be an adjectivally inflecting head. (16b) and (16c) characterise the syntactic structure and the LF of (16a), respectively.

- (16) a. [[[*nova*][*ta*] [*mu*]] *kola* (*na Ivo*)
 new-the CL-DAT-3SG-m/n car PREP Ivo
 ‘a new car of Ivo’s’
- b. [_{DP} [_{AP}_i [_D’ [_D Ø] [_D cl] [_{NP} t_i ... N ...]]]]
 [_{DP} [_{AP} *novata*]_i [_D’ [_D Ø *mu*] [_{NP} t_i *kola* [_{DP} *na Ivo*]]]]]
novata mu kola (*na Ivo*)
 ‘his (Ivo’s) new car’
- c. [_{DP} *na Ivo*]_i [_D’ [_D Ø *mu*] [_{NP} *novata kola* t_i]]

Non-clitic possessive pronouns inflect like adjectives, as shown in (13) above. We have already seen in (3b) that the doubling clitic with its possessor *na*-DP does not co-occur with non-clitic possessive pronouns. Recall that possessive clitics are morphologically non-compositional (i.e. non-inflectable) D-entities bearing Dative case. Pronominal clitics always refer to a particular event, i.e. are event-oriented, the event indicating givenness, and relate to the reference situation of the sentence. In line with Kratzer (1994) an event entailment is not yielded by an environment in which non-clitic possessive pronouns are instantiated since the structural case of the possessor *na*-phrase cannot be carried by the full forms of the personal pronouns; this can only be done by the anaphoric clitic pronoun. A further consequence of this distinction is that if the *na*-DP contains a personal pronoun, as in (17), the anaphoric clitic *mu* is obligatory, because the full form of the personal pronoun cannot carry the structural case of the possessor *na*-phrase. Since anaphoric clitics like *mu*, which bear the feature [+topical], belong to the background part of the sentence, and prosodically need a host, they cannot bear focal stress, as shown by the third sentence in (18). However, the adjective-like full forms of the possessive pronoun are not restricted in this way and therefore may be focalised.

- (17) *Viždam* (*ja*) *kolata* *(*mu*) *na*
 see-I CL-ACC-3SG-F car-the CL-DAT-3SG-m/n PREP
*negol** *Viždam* (*ja*) *kolata na nego*.
 him
 ‘I see his car.’
- (18) *Negovata majka*
 his mother

pristigna; *NEGOVATA majka pristigna*/**Majka MU pristigna*.
 arrived
 ‘His mother arrived.’; ‘HIS mother arrived.’

The choice between a possessive pronouns and a possessive clitics under coindexation with a particular antecedent is thus partly motivated by discourse considerations.

4. Can the possessive dative clitic be raised outside the DP hosting it?

In this section we will focus on a number of constructions featuring what have been called ‘free Datives’. A first example of this type of construction was provided in (4) above.⁶ The issue of the free Dative relates to the (clearly discourse-determined) occurrence of clausal Dative clitics in a heterogeneous group of expressions, which, however, are not independent of the lexical properties of the particular verb and the characteristics of its arguments. Given that a number of one-place and two-place predicates are not subcategorised for Dative complements (cf. *die*, *come* and *break*, *eat*, *cook*, *paint*, *see* etc., respectively), we claim that in the example in (4), repeated in (19a), and in the additional examples provided in (20)–(21) below, the underlined Dative clitics are neither object clitics nor possessive clitics.⁷ To the extent that these dative clitics do not belong to the argument frame of the matrix verb, they need to be treated as an additional participant of the clause, the antecedent of which may be expressed as subject, direct object or predicative noun.

There are a number of crucial differences between the cases of free Dative clitics in CPs and the possessive Dative clitics in DPs we have reviewed so far. First of all, as demonstrated in (4) vs. (5) above, dissimilarities in their syntax correspond to the different interpretation of these expressions. Consider the example in (19a):⁸

- (19) a. *Umrja mu (...) // konjat (mu) (na Ivan). /*
 died CL-DAT-3SG-m horse-the CL-DAT-3SG-m PREP Ivan
 (*Na Ivan*) *konjat mu (...) // mu umrja / Konjat (mu) (na Ivan) (...)*
 // (...) *mu umrja. / ...*
 ‘Ivan’s horse gave up on Ivan’
- b. *umrja mu (...) // kon (na Ivan)*
 died CL-DAT-3SG-3 horse PREP Ivan
 ‘A horse gave up on Ivan.’

In (19a), the subject of the one-place predicate *umrja* ‘died’ is *konjat* ‘the horse’ or *konjat mu na Ivan* ‘Ivan’s horse’. The fact that the sentence (19a) shows the co-

occurrence of two instances of the item *mu* is a justification of the analysis of the sentences with free Datives as elliptical since the possessive clitic is omissible. The possessive clitic with its *na*-DP can be left out, still leaving the interpretation of the free Dative as ‘given’ intact, since both types of Dative clitic have a common antecedent with which they co-refer and are interpreted as ‘given’ on their intended readings.⁹ Additional support can be found in the second sentences in (19a) as well as in (20a) below, in which the free Dative clitic appears side by side with the anaphoric possessive clitic.

Although free Datives clitics and argumental possessive Dative clitics are both verb-related, their syntax is clearly different: the former belong to the modifiers of the V(erb) P(hrase), whereas the latter are prototypical possessive clitics within a DP-configuration. Thus, it is not surprising that constructions featuring Dative clitics are different in terms of the interpretation: free Dative clitics are never tautological with anaphoric possessive structures, which implies that the meanings of these two types of construction cannot be equivalent although the differences in meaning are subtle and sometimes difficult to render — cf. *Ivan’s horse died* vs. *The horse gave up on Ivan* (i.e. the predicate in the sentences in (19) does not have the interpretation *gave up the ghost, passed away*, etc.’). More examples containing free Datives are provided in (20) and (21):

- (20) Čux mu go (...) koncerta
 listened to-I CL-DAT-3SG-m CL-ACC-3SG-m concert-the
 (mu) (na Ivan). / (Na Ivo) koncerta (mu) (...) // mu gočux. / ...
 CL-DAT-3SG-m prep Ivan

Not the same meaning as ‘I listened to Ivan’s concert.’

- (21) a. Deteto (mu) (na Ivan) (...) // (...) mu
 child-the CL-DAT-3SG-m PREP Ivan CL-DAT-3SG-m
 go gledax pet godini. / Gledax mu go
 CL-ACC-3SG-n looking after five years
 pet godini deteto (mu) (na Ivan). / ...
 Not the same meaning as ‘I was looking after his child / Ivan’s child for five years.’
- b. Dete mu gledax (na Ivan) pet godini.
 child CL-DAT-3SG-m looking-after PREP Ivan five years
- c. Edno dete mu gledax (na Ivan) pet godini.
 a/one child CL-DAT-3SG-m looking-after PREP Ivan five years
 Not the same meaning as ‘I was looking after a child of Ivan’s for five years.’

The second quite conspicuous difference is that free Dative clitics do not require the head noun functioning as a [+specific] possessum to be definite, as is evident from

the non-obligatoriness of the definite determiner *-t* in (19b) the external possession dative clitic is found with an indefinite head noun. The sentences in (21) illustrate these points once more with a different predicate — compare *konjat* in (19a) with *kon* in (19b) and also *deteto* in (21a) with *dete* or *edno dete* in (21b,c).

A third difference is that the Dative clitic in external possession constructions does not form a prosodic group with the carrier of definiteness of the antecedent *na*-DP, as outlined in Section 3.2.

It is important to stress at this point that it should not be thought that the possessive clitic leaves its containing DP. What, then, is the status of the free dative in the sentence and what is its semantic contribution? In many instances of free dative constructions, we are inclined to believe that syntactically the free Dative instantiates a telic relation in which the intended referent (say *Ivan*) is a beneficiary or experiencer syntactically acting as ‘operator-like adverbial P(repositional P(hrase) modifier’. This function will probably turn out to be a type of frame-setting modifier indicating a pragmatically determined benefactive or malefactive point of view of the speaker: This is why the anaphoric Dative clitics represent discourse-determined referential markers, which again shows that their use has a bearing on the distribution of the informational load in Bulgarian sentences. Anaphoric free Dative clitics are intended to be coreferential with an antecedent expression occurring elsewhere in the sentence.¹⁰ The correspondence of the free Dative clitic and the doubled (*na*)-phrase, however, is a necessary condition for signalling the existence of (a possessive relation as) a reference point for the operator-like benefactive speaker’s statement (cf. Langacker 1993; Partee & Borschev 1999; Schwarzschild 1999). It is the speaker’s intention to direct the hearer’s attention to entities affected by the predication that figure prominently in the speaker’s focus of attention.

5. Conclusions

In our discussion of Bulgarian dative clitics we have argued that the grammar of Bulgarian contains explicit lexical information about the referential status of argument DPs as well as a type of adverbial modifier, which is brought out by means of Dative clitics.

The anaphoric doubling clitics indicate how the informational load is distributed over the clause structure since they are bearers of the information structure feature [+topical].

Pronominal clitics mark the pragmatically determined referential characteristics of the doubled nominal phrases in that they qualify them as existentially and uniquely presupposed individuals. Both the doubling clitic pronoun and the

doubled phrase belong to the Background part of the information structure of the sentence.

Since the anaphoric clitics bear structural and morphological Case-features as well as the features [+specific] and [+topical], they determine the form, meaning and information-structure status of the corresponding DPs.

Notes

1. On the status of Bulgarian formative *na* in object DPs cf. Schick (1997, 2000a).
2. Clitic pronouns are shown in boldface italics and focused elements in capitals.
3. The first line of the lexical entry of *mu* indicates that pronominal clitics can appear as proclitics or as enclitics.
4. In our treatment of pronominal clitics we are concerned with the information-structural feature [+topical] in the sense of *Givenness*, which represents a discourse function referring to less prominent information with respect to the distribution of the informational load over the items in the clause structure of Bulgarian. The feature [+topical] makes the non-focusable clitic pronouns fundamentally distinct from non-clitic anaphoric pronouns and specific DPs: neither the full form of pronominal anaphors nor specific DPs necessarily acquire the status [+topical], whereas clitic pronouns always carry the feature [+topical] (cf. Schick 1997, 2000b and Section 3). Thus, inherent carriers of information-structural properties, e.g. the marker of topicality or focus marking, are represented as features of the lexical item (see also Reis & Rosengren's (1997) study of German *auch*, and data from Chinese, Korean, Japanese, etc. which confirm our assumption).
5. See Schick (1997) on the status of the *na*-formative as a weak morphological (Dative) case marker in Bulgarian.
6. Free Datives are not only found in the Balkan-Slavic languages — compare for example the German sentences in (i) and (ii): While the a-sentences feature inalienable possessive constructions, the predicates of the b-sentences contain an additional Dative-marked participant (Von Polenz 1969):
 - (i) a. Die Hand (des Kindes) blutet.
'The (child's) hand is bleeding.'
 - b. Dem Kind blutet die Hand.
 The-DAT child-DAT bleeds the hand
'The hand of the child is bleeding.'
 - (ii) a. Ich verbinde die Hand des Kindes.
 'I am bandaging the child's hand.'
 - b. Ich verbinde dem Kind die Hand.
 'I am bandaging the hand for the child.'
7. Recall that in this paper free Dative clitics are underlined, to distinguish them from argumental possessive Dative clitics.

8. The sign // marks a prosodic break.
9. Note that we are not claiming that the free Dative has nothing to do with the verb: the fact that the free Dative clitic and the 'regular' possessive clitic share a coreference relation with the referent of the *na*-DP shows their mutual dependence on the verb.
10. Variable binding always takes place when there is a joint antecedent of the homonymous anaphoric Dative clitic. In this way, the free Dative clitic *mu* and the DP-internal possessive *mu* are licensed by the *na*-DP.

References

- Bierwisch, M. (1990) 'Event Nominalization: Proposals and Problems'. *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 40, 19–84.
- Dikken, M. den (1998) 'Predicate Inversion in DP'. In A. Alexiadou and C. Wilder, eds., *Possessors, Predicates and Movement in the Determiner Phrase*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 177–214.
- Higginbotham, J. (1985) 'On Semantics'. *Linguistic Inquiry* 16, 547–593.
- Jäger, G. (1995). *Topics in Dynamic Semantics*. Doctoral dissertation, Humboldt Universität Berlin.
- Kayne, R. (1994) *The Antisymmetry of Syntax*. Cambridge, Mass., MIT Press.
- Kratzer, A. (1994). *The Event Argument and the Semantics of Voice*. Ms, University of Massachusetts.
- Krifka, M. (1991/92) 'A Compositional Semantics for Multiple Focus Constructions'. In J. Jacobs, ed., *Informationsstruktur und Grammatik. Linguistische Berichte, Sonderheft 4*, 17–53.
- Langacker, R. (1993) 'Reference-Point Constructions'. *Cognitive Linguistics* 4, 1–38.
- Partee, B.H. & V. Borschev (1999) *Integrating Lexical and Formal Semantics: Possessives, Relational Nouns, and Type-Shifting*. Handout, ZAS Berlin.
- Reis, M. & I. Rosengren (1997) 'A Modular Approach to the Grammar of Additive Particles: The Case of German AUCH'. *Journal of Semantics* 14: 237–309.
- Rooth, M. (1992) 'A theory of focus interpretation'. *Natural Language Semantics* 1, 75–116.
- Schick, I.P. (1997) 'Clitic-Doubling Constructions in Modern Bulgarian'. In P. Kosta et al. eds., *Proceedings of the Second European Conference on "Formal Description of Slavic Languages" (FDSL 2) Potsdam, November 1997*, Otto Sagner: München, 225–250.
- Schick, I.P. (2000a) 'Clitic-Doubling Constructions in Balkan-Slavic Languages'. In F. Beukema and M. den Dikken eds., *Clitic Phenomena in European Languages*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 259–292.
- Schick, I.P. (2000b) 'Dative Clitics and the Information Structure of the Balkan-Slavic Languages'. In G. Zybatow et al. eds., *3. Europäische Konferenz "Formale Beschreibung Slavischer Sprachen, Leipzig 1999. Linguistische Arbeitsberichte* 75, Leipzig: Institut für Linguistik, 149–165.
- Von Polenz, P. (1969) 'Der Pertinezdativ und seine Satzbaupläne'. In U. Engel et al. eds., *Festschrift für Hugo Moser*. Düsseldorf: Verlag Schwann, 146–171.

- Schwarschild, R. (1999) 'GIVENness, AvoidF and other Constraints on the Placement of Accent'. *Natural Language Semantics* 7. 2, 141–177.
- Wunderlich, D. (1994). 'Towards a Lexicon-based Theory of Agreement'. *Theoretical Linguistics* 20, 1–35.