Ilijana Krapova, Jovka Tiševa
Univerza v Plovdivu, Univerza v Sofiji

CLITIC REDUPLICATION STRUCTURES
IN THE BULGARIAN DIALECTS

Članek predstavlja vprašanje podvajanja naslonk v bolgarskem jezikovnem prostoru, ki, tako je dokazano, ni bilo splošno razširjeno, obstaja pa več različic glede na ustrezno pogostost in skladenjsko rabo. Prostor, v katerem je podvajanje naslonk (močno) omejeno ali jih celo ni, pripada bolgarskemu jezikovnemu obrobju – predstavil ga je Stojko Stojkov v delu o glavnih izoglosah, ki določajo temeljno dvodelno razdelitev bolgarskega jezikovnega prostora.

The paper discusses the phenomenon of clitic reduplication as it is represented across the Bulgarian linguistic territory. It is argued that clitic reduplication does not have a uniform distribution, and there is a considerable variation with respect to relative frequency and syntactic type. The area where clitic reduplication is (highly) restricted or absent belongs to the peripheral zone as outlined in St. Stojkov's work on the chief isoglosses which outline the fundamental bi-partitioning of the Bulgarian linguistic territory.

Introduction

The phenomenon of clitic reduplication of the object which refers to the co-existence of a short (clitic) pronoun and an associated non-clitic personal pronoun or an object noun phrase is a discourse-syntactic mechanism found in all varieties of Bulgarian: apart from the literary language where it appears in some particular syntactic environments, it is frequent in the colloquial style, as well as in many dialects. Both the direct and the indirect object can be reduplicated.

(1) Eastern (Moesian) dialects: As vi rekuu prasitu n'amă dă gu zakolim. 'I told you that we wouldn't kill the pig' (Straxilovo I 3).[1]
(2) Eastern (Balkan) dialects: Mlogu ja igraxme neja igrè. 'We played this game a lot' (Golica I 22).

---

[1] The capital letter refers to the reader, the number – to the text, from which the example is taken: I – Ivanov (1978), S – Stojkov (1950), MlR – Mladenov, Radeva (1995).

(3) Western (Northwestern) dialects: Grojză ga berămo u štajg'e 'The grapes we collect in crates' (Novo selo I 120).

Clitic reduplication is a widespread and typically dialectal phenomenon, which has most probably evolved in a Balkan context for the purpose of distinguishing the subject from the object, following the decline of the nominal Case system/declension. It has received a considerable attention in the literature as regards its chronological development, as well as its status and frequency in the contemporary language. (Cf. MIRČEV 1978, POPOV 1962, ASSENOVA 2002, a.o.)

Reduplication is currently spread out across the entire Bulgarian linguistic territory and therefore, it belongs to the inventory of common syntactic dialectisms (cf. STOJKOV 1962). However, no in-depth study of the phenomenon exists in the dialectological literature, apart from the data collected in the course of the fieldwork on specific dialects or dialect groups. The present paper is thus an attempt to offer some preliminary observations as regards the regional distribution and the most salient syntactic properties of object reduplication in contemporary Bulgarian dialects. Our observations are based on the existing sources such as the dialectological studies of the various dialect groups (cf. IVANOV 1978, MLADENOV, RADEVA 1995, STOJKOV 1962, BOJADŽIEV 1991, MLADENOV 1965, 1977, UMLENSKI 1965, VIDENOV 1978, a.o.).

Reprisa vs. anticipatio. Reduplication of pragmatic type

Clitic reduplication is not a unitary phenomenon neither in syntactic, nor in pragmatic terms. From a distributional point of view, the delineation of a large dialectal area where reduplication is (relatively) frequent, and a smaller area where it is (highly) restricted, if not absent at all, suggests that the isogloss of reduplication divides the Bulgarian linguistic territory into a central and a peripheral zone.

Following previous work on Bulgarian and other (Balkan) languages (cf. LOPAŠOV 1978, MINČEVA 1969, ASSENOVA 2002), we distinguish two structural types of reduplication, illustrated in (4) and (5). In the former case, labeled reprisa (or resumption proper), the object is preposed with respect to the verb; the cltic appears to its right. In the latter case, labeled anticipatio, the object is postposed; the clitic appears to its left

(4) Pogačata če ja tărkolime na čandijata. 'We will slide the bread into the tray' (Dragalevci I 130).

(5) Drugi gi upapae parite. 'Others got the money' (Sekirovo I 49).

Our observations show that the first asymmetry between reprisa and anticipatio, as they are represented across the Bulgarian dialectal territory, has to do with their relative frequency. The former appears to be much more widespread than the latter. This finds its logical explanation in the very pragmatic nature of resumption, that is a discourse mechanism that brings forward the Topic/theme of the sentence (the constituent which expresses what the sentence is about). As in other Topic-prominent varieties cross-linguistically, clitic resumed Topics in the dialects under study typically occupy the sentence-initial position – the position employed to introduce a new Topic or to express continuity of a Topic already introduced. Since there can be different types of Topics, reprisa is open to all kinds of phrases: definite or specific object arguments, including phrases with edin, indefinite quantifiers, universal or distributive quantifiers:

(6) Edin'a go ubia vo vojnata. 'They killed one during the war' (Makocevo I132a); Edin ot t'ax mu vikat Juda 'They call one Juda' (Trănčovica I 54); Site gi naplašixme 'We scared them all' (Dragalevsi I 135).

The pragmatic function of anticipatio is to express co-reference or to resume the current Topic, rather than to introduce a new Topic. This explains not only the lesser frequency of anticipatio, but also the positional characteristics of the clitic doubled object: typically, it appears in the right periphery of the sentence, in a position more detached from the rest of the sentence, presumably following an intonational break/pause.

(7) Otesame go sas motika # burena. 'We cut the weed with a mattock' (Strelča I 20).

Anticipatio »prefers« full noun phrases and is much less common with pronouns. It is completely absent with quantifiers of various types, given their inadequacy for Topic continuity in discourse.[2]

Grammaticalized reduplication

The second criterion that can be applied to the description of clitic reduplication in the Bulgarian dialects has to do with the status of the doubling clitic.

---

[2] The cross-dialectal difference in frequency between reprisa and anticipatio finds also a historical explanation (cf. MINČEVA 1969, ILIEVSKI 1988).

There exists in all varieties of Bulgarian a class of constructions, in which the presence of a clitic is required. Such constructions feature predicates of the following type: predicates for psychological or physical states with an experiencer Dat or Acc argument; modal predicates; predicates for presence or absence. These predicates united under the label 'category-of-state' should be strictly distinguished from the cases reviewed in section 2., since here the function of the clitic is no longer that of resuming a Topicalized argument. As illustrated in (8), the clitic is an obligatory part of the argument structure of the predicate, thus, it will be more appropriate to say that the clitic is doubled by the Dat or Acc argument rather than vice versa. We are dealing therefore with a special instance of reduplication which can be labeled grammaticalized reduplication. As with reduplication of the pragmatic type grammaticalized reduplication is much more frequent in reprisa than in anticipatio:

(8) Nă men mi j măčno. 'I feel sad' (Enina 112).

I mu beše mnogo čudno Hrist'umu.'And Hrsito was very susrprised' (Arda S37); I naze ni bolat kraka, race. 'Our legs, arms are aching' (Pravec I123); Mene mă njamăše 'I was not there'; Negu gu beše jat 'He got angry' (Babaeski region BOJADŽIEV 1991: 183).

Area restrictions on clitic reduplication

Given that grammaticalized reduplication is also present in the standard language, as well as across the other Balkan languages, it comes as a surprise that there exists a group of Bulgarian dialects exhibiting a missing clitic in constructions analogous to (8). Absence of a clitic points to an absence of clitic reduplication. This phenomenon has been observed for the southwestern dialects of Kjustendil ((K) in the examples given) (UMLENSKI 1965) and Ixtiman (Ix) (MLADENOV 1965, 1966), as well as the area of Gjumjurdžina (Gij) to the Eastern Thrace, cf. BOJADŽIEV (1964, 1972, 1991), the (north-western) dialect of the Godeč area (G) (VIDENOV 1978). In Rhodope dialects, Sokolovci (S) reduplication is not completely absent, but is either considerably restricted or used as an alternative strategy.

(9) Nas e stràx, lèp ako ne dadàt. 'We are afraid if they don't give bread' (Ix); I men nemaše u spisaka. 'I was also missing from the list' (Ix); A koga mene potrebe, druk vojnik šte go dokara 'And when I need it, another soldier will bring it' (Ix); Mene ju xubavu 'I feel good' (Gju); N'oj se čini šàla taja ràbota. 'To her this thing seems stupid' (G); Vas e lèsno 'It is easy for you' (K); Starêm stana dragu, pak i menê si b dragu. 'The old man was happy, and I was happy too (S).

It should be noted that in these dialects absence of clitic reduplication is found not just with Dat or Acc arguments, but also with regular predicates taking a direct or an indirect object, like kill and give, e.g. Negu traktor ubi lit. 'Him killed a tractor' (Gju); Nas malko dadoa lit. 'To us they gave little' (K).

Given that the non-reduplicated objects are most frequently represented by pronouns, rather than full noun phrases, it can be suggested that the common denominator behind for all the cases with no clitic reduplication is the preservation of Case distinctions (Acc-Dat) in the pronominal system where, differently from the situation in the standard language, Case morphology persists, albeit sometimes in a relict form. This is especially true for 3p pronouns, which are most resistant to Case unification/merger, thus providing a morphological means for disambiguation between direct and indirect objects in the absence of a clitic. To the extent that doubling is found in these dialects, it is extremely restricted and is predominantly used in the following types of syntactic contexts:

– Acc and Dat forms in the pronominal system coincide, also as a consequence of dropping of preposition na which marks analytically indirect object

(10) Nas tova ni se ne dàva. (G) lit. 'This is not given us'; Mène tăka mi se ni kè. lit. 'Me do not want like that.' (Dervent, East Thracia)

– The experiencer argument in constructions with psych-predicates, modal predicates, and predicates of presence/absence is expressed by a Nominative pronoun[3]

(11) Ja (Nom) ide mi se 'I feel like coming' (Ix) Ja (Nom) me beše stràx. 'I was scared' (Ix) (Mladenov 1965: 213); Toj (Nom) go nema tuk. 'He is not here' (Ix); Nožat (Nom) go nema na màsutu. 'The knife is not on the table' (G).

Taking into consideration also data from several »transitional« areas w.r.t. reduplication – the Northwestern dialects of Pravec, Trudovec Makocevo, i.e. dialect areas whether one finds occasional cases of missing reduplication with experiencer and modal predicates, it could be tentatively hypothesized that the entire area with restricted or missing clitic reduplication comprises (parts of) the Northwestern, Southwestern, Rhodope and Thracian dialects.

The four dialect regions outlined above as an area of restricted or absent clitic reduplication have a number of shared phonetic, morphological and

---

[3] According to STOJKOV (1962: 260), BOJADŽIEV (1991: 101), Nominative experiencers are more typical for eastern dialects, but we found out that they have a much wider distribution.

lexical features (MLADENOV 1966: 178). They constitute a subpart of what STOJKOV (1963a,b) refers to as »the periphery zone of the Bulgarian linguistic territory«, the zone which includes »bigger of smaller parts of the northwestern, southwestern, and southeastern Bulgaria« and which contains a number of archaic properties. It could tentatively be hypothesized that the isogloss which distinguishes presence vs. lack of clitic reduplication runs parallel to other isoglosses dividing the central from the peripherical zone in Stojkov's (1963a,b) terms, and has a direction north–south–southeast. The key areas are the regions of Ixtiman, Kjustendil and Godeč; western boundary coincides with the dialects in the area of Gjumjurdžina, and eastern boundary extends towards the Rhodope dialects. In view of the complexity of the data, it will be premature at this early point of the investigation to make any definite claims about the territorial extent of the phenomenon.

The dialectal landscape of the phenomenon is much more complex: contrary to expectations reduplication exists even in dialects from the same peripheral area which have preserved pronominal Case distinctions. In the Thracian dialects of the Odrin/Adrianopolis region Acc and Dat are distinguished for all persons, but the presence of the clitic in the grammaticalized type of reduplication is nevertheless mandatory:

(11) Meni mă buli răkată 'My hand aches'; Negă gu e strax 'He is scared' (BOJA-DŽIEV 1991: 101, 147).

In the same vein, the rare cases of reduplication in the Ixtiman dialect, as reported by MLADENOV (1965, 1966), occur only with 3p pronouns, which show the Case distinctions: nim (Dat) – nix (Acc)

(12) Nim kakvo im tekne tova pravjat. 'They do whatever occurs to them' (MLA-DENOV 1965: 73).

Bibliography

PETYA ASSENOVA, 2002: *Balkansko ezikoznanie.* Plovdiv.

TODOR BOJADŽIEV, 1964: Njakoi sintaktični osobenosti na govora na s. Săčanli, Gjumjurdžinsko. *Ezik i literatura.* 86–90.

– –, 1972: *Govorăt na s. Săčanli, Gjumjurdžinsko.* Sofia.

– –, 1991: *Bălgarskite govori v Zapadna (Belomorska) i Iztočna (Odrinksa) Trakija.* Sofia.

PETAR HR. ILIEVSKI, 1988: Prinos kon xronologiata na eden balkanizam vo makedonskiot jazik. *Balkanološki ligvistički studii.* Skopje.

JURI LOPAŠOV, 1978: *Mestimennye povtory dopolnenija v balkanskix jazykax.* Leningrad.

ANGELINA MINČEVA, 1969: Opit za interpretacija na modela na udvoenite dopălnenija v bălgarskija ezik. *IIBE.* 3–50.

KIRIL MIRČEV, 1978: *Istoričeska gramatika na bălgarskija ezik.* Sofia.

MAKSIM MLADENOV, 1965: Beležki vyrhu sintaksisa na Ihtimanskija govor. *Bălgarski ezik.* 208–224.

– –, 1966: *Ihtimanskija govor.* Sofia.

– –, 1977: Beležki po govora na s. Kufalovo, Solunsko. *Bălgarski ezik.* 471–485.

KONSTANTIN POPOV, 1962: Stilno-gramatična upotreba na udvoenoto dopălnenie v bălgarskija knižoven ezik. *IIBE.* 459–470.

STOJKO STOJKOV, 1962: *Bălgarska dialektologija.* Sofia.

– –, 1963a: Osnovnoto dialektno delenie na bălgarskija ezik. *Slavjanska filologija.* Sofia, 105–114.

– –, 1963b: Tri mestoimenni izoglosi v bălgarskija ezik. *Slavistični studii.* Sofia, 149–163.

IVAN UMLENSKI, 1965: *Kjustendilskijat govor.* Sofia.

MIHAIL VIDENOV, 1978: *Godečkijat govor.* Sofia.

Readers

(I) – JORDAN IVANOV (săst.), 1978: *Bălgarska dialektologija. Hristomatija.* Plovdiv.

(MIR) – MAKSIM MLADENOV, VASILKA RADEVA (săst.), 1995: *Sbornik s teksove i zadači po dialektologija na bălgarskija ezik za studenti ot bălgarska filologija.* Sofia.

(S) – STOJKO STOJKOV (săst.), 1950: *Hristomatija po bălgarska dialektologija.* Sofia.

Povzetek

Članek poskuša ponuditi nekaj osnovnih pogledov na regionalno razširjenost in posebnosti glede vprašanja podvajanja naslonk v bolgarskih narečjih. Izoglosa, ki loči prisotnost oz. odsotnost podvajanja naslonk, je domnevno vzporedna z ostalimi izoglosami, ki delijo bolgarski osrednji jezikovni prostor od obrobnega (glede na terminologijo Stojka Stojkova), in poteka v smeri sever–jug–jugovzhod.