

BALKANISTICA 11

Table of Contents

<i>Contents:</i>	<i>Page</i>
Table of Contents	iii
Editor's Foreword	vii
Notes and Acknowledgments	viii
<i>ARTICLES</i>	
Determinedness and Replication Potential of Nominal Material in Bulgarian <i>Tania Avgustinova</i>	1
Bibliography of Sources on the Language of Bosnia and Hercegovina <i>Ahmet Kasumović</i> (with an Introduction by <i>Wayles Browne</i>)	19
On the Boundary of Morphology and Phonology: Accentual Alternations in the Čakavian Nominal Inflection <i>Keith Langston</i>	31
The Eastern Question and the Voices of Reason: Panslav Aspirations in Russia and in the Balkans, 1875-1878 <i>Jelena Milojković-Djurić</i>	55
Engineering Hatred: The Roots of Contemporary Serbian Nationalism <i>Cristina Posa</i>	69
On the Characteristics of Political Language in the Bulgarian Post-Totalitarian Period: The Language of the Press <i>Tatjana Šamraj</i>	79
Adaptations and Borrowings in the Balkan Sephardic Repertoire <i>Susana Weich-Shahak</i>	87
Economic Reform and Crisis in Bulgaria, 1989-1992 <i>Jonathan B. Wight</i> and <i>M. Louise Fox</i>	127

Determinedness and Replication Potential of Nominal Material in Bulgarian

Tania Avgustinova

Department of Computational Linguistics
University of Saarland

1. Introduction

Clitic replication of nominal material (referred to also as “clitic doubling,” “pronominal reprise,” “reduplication,” etc.) has received extensive attention mainly from the point of view of its origin, *i.e.*, whether it is a “balkanism”¹ or a phenomenon intrinsic to the language system of modern Bulgarian — *cf.*, *e.g.*, Miletič 1937, Sławski 1946, Rusek 1963, Mirčev 1966, Cyxun 1968, Mladenov 1968, Kănčev 1972, Orzechowska 1976, Lopašov 1978, Asenova 1989, among others. An attempt to analyze the nature of “pronominal reprise” and to interpret the model of “doubled objects” in Bulgarian in the context of the overall analytic development of this language is made in Minčeva 1968, 1969; the stylistic aspect of the problem has also been addressed by, for example, Popov 1962. A notable direction of research is pursued in Guentchéva 1994, where this phenomenon is investigated in the context of “thématisation de l’objet” (‘object thematization’), but already in Georgieva 1974 it is argued that “complement reduplication” is used in certain alignments in order to include the object into the theme, and should therefore be considered a “necessary structural element in building up the functional sentence perspective of the utterance.” There is an important line of research viewing the phenomenon of replication as grammaticalized means of syntactic function identification in a language that has lost case-marking morphology in the nominal system. For example, in Rudin 1986, “clitic reduplication” is regarded as a way of disambiguating case roles in potentially ambiguous sentences. Obviously, this is in accord with Ivančev 1978, who argues that without such a means of object-identification in Bulgarian, stronger (or even full) grammaticalization of the word order would be unavoidable in this Slavic language.

This article systematically approaches the problem of which nominal material has the potential to be replicated in Bulgarian. Some of the terms I use — *e.g.*, *replication of nominal material*, *replication potential*, *replication causing factors* — are from Dyer 1988.² The relevant linguistic concept behind them is the process of manifesting as a clitic pronoun the **index** (*i.e.*, the person, gender

and number information) and the case of a direct or an indirect object NP in a Bulgarian sentence.³

Replication phenomena are intrinsically related to the problems of nominal determinedness. In fact, **determinedness as a broader concept** is the main prerequisite for replication of nominal material. Therefore, it is of primary interest for us to clarify what such a concept would subsume.

2. Approaching the Problem

There seems to be an emerging consensus among the authors treating Bulgarian nominal determinedness in one way or another that this is a fairly broad notion that should be understood as being, at least formally, manifested in a number of different ways.⁴

As a first approximation, let us consider a cross-classification of Bulgarian NPs by two features:

- a. presence vs. absence of an article, and
- b. definiteness vs. indefiniteness.

	def +	def -
art +	NPs with an overt definite article	NPs with an overt indefinite article
art -	lexically definite NPs with no overt article	lexically indefinite NPs with no overt article

With non-determined NPs, both features would be negatively specified: [art -, def -]. These are lexically indefinite NPs with no overt article — *e.g.*, *geroj* ‘a hero,’ *dokumenti* ‘papers.’ A tentative interpretation would be that the object to which the NP is referring is “totally non-determined” in the sense that either it is unknown to both the speaker and the hearer or, for some (semantic, communicative, etc.) reasons, the speaker considers it so. With determined NPs, at least one of the two features would be positively specified. On the one hand, NPs with an overt indefinite article⁵ would have the specification [art +, def -] — *e.g.*, *edni dokumenti* ‘certain papers’ — and would be tentatively interpreted in the following way: the object to which the NP is referring is “partially determined” in the sense that either it is known to the speaker but (assumed by the speaker to be) unknown to the hearer, or the speaker considers the hearer’s awareness of the object the NP is referring to to be irrelevant for the particular communicative purposes. On the other hand, lexically definite NPs with no overt article would be specified [art -, def +] — *e.g.*, *Ivan* ‘John,’ *toj* ‘he,’ *lelja* ‘aunt’ — implying the tentative interpretation that the object to which the NP is referring is “fully determined” in the sense of being known to the speaker and known or unknown but evident (clearly feasible) to the hearer. Finally, NPs with

an overt definite article would have both features positively specified [art +, def +] — e.g., *gerojat* 'the hero'; again, the tentative interpretation would be that the object to which the NP is referring is "fully determined" in the sense of being known or evident to both the speaker and the hearer.

In such a simplified classification, however, certain important semantic and communicative factors governing the use or non-use of the definite-article morpheme — extensively discussed in Šamraj 1989 — have not been taken into consideration. Šamraj's analysis makes the original assumption that definite articles must be viewed as signals and instructions rather than markers of (e.g., old/new) information inasmuch as both articulated and non-articled forms of NPs and PPs can denote (i.e., refer to) objects that may be known or unknown to the speaker and the hearer, real or imaginary, of definite or indefinite quantity. The idea is that by using the definite article, the speaker (i) **indicates** that the object is (available as) known, and (ii) **instructs** the hearer to look for it within some perimeter of presupposed common knowledge. Such an instruction has various motivations — from direct mentioning of the object in the preceding text, to the speaker's hypothesis concerning, for example, hearer's world knowledge, or hearer's familiarity with the particular communicative situation. Šamraj also observes that the requirements posed on the conditions of use of demonstrative pronouns (in combination with non-articled NPs/PPs) are much stricter than those concerned with the use of the definite article: it is only in the former case that the respective object has to be either mentioned before or visually perceptible. On the other hand, the speaker gives no instructions of the abovementioned type when using non-articled NPs/PPs, which, however, does not mean that the respective object is unknown or non-evident to the hearer. It is rather the case that according to the particular communicative intentions of the speaker any special indication of the object as being known (or unknown) to the hearer is not considered relevant.

Šamraj further distinguishes the deictic nature of the definite article from a meaning appropriate to all articles, which she calls "limitedness" or "lack of limitedness" (in my notation below [lim +] and [lim -], respectively).

Značenijata limitiranost / otsaštvie na limitiranost ne otrazjavat prjako priznacie na obektite ot vāšnija svjat, a različnite načini, po koito nie mislim za tjah v zavisimost ot komunikativnite si celi. Šamraj (1989:51) 'The meaning of limitedness, or lack thereof, does not reflect directly the features of the objects in the external world, but rather it reflects the different ways we think about them in accordance with our communicative goals.'

Using a particular noun, the speaker — on the one hand — categorizes or generalizes, and — on the other hand — identifies or particularizes the object

which is referred to by this noun. The feature [lim +] would indicate then that the identifying, *i.e.*, the particularizing, aspect of the respective noun has been activated, while the feature [lim -] would mean that only the categorizing, *i.e.*, the generalizing, aspect of the noun is relevant for the communication. On such a basis, Šamraj assumes that the definite article and the “zero” article are morphemes, with the former setting the value of the feature limitedness positive, and the latter — negative. In order to cover also the Bulgarian indefinite article, let us develop the idea further: one could certainly regard also *edin* as a means of expressing the meaning of limitedness but in the sense of *indefinite* particularization, in opposition to *definite* (unique) particularization as realized by the definite article.

In her analysis, Šamraj divides the sentence into a *characterized* part containing the object(s) of characterization and a *characterizing* part containing certain aspect(s) of this characterization. From such a perspective, articed NPs/PPs can occur in **both** parts, and in all these cases, the speaker consciously provides certain information about the designated objects, since any use of an article — according to Šamraj — generally indicates the speaker’s intentions to say something about the respective object, while non-articed NPs/PPs (which are also lexically indefinite) occur **always** in the characterizing part. In the latter case, the speaker expresses no special intentions to provide any particular information about the designated objects; rather, the lack of an article indicates that the respective object is considered only to an extent that will allow for supplying certain information about another object. Thus, the use of articed or non-articed NPs/PPs can be considered “free” in Bulgarian, in the sense that speakers — according to their intentions and goals — are free to express different attitudes toward the situation described in the sentence, to treat it in a different way preferring one or another articulation into a “characterized” and a “characterizing” part.

An attempt to directly integrate a feature “limited vs. non-limited” into the classification of Bulgarian NPs, as illustrated in the following table, clearly shows that the **generic** uses of both the definite and the indefinite articles⁶ are incompatible with the assumption that any presence of an article activates the identifying (particularizing) aspect of the respective noun.

lim +	def +	art +	<i>definite-article morpheme</i>
		art -	<i>inherent definiteness</i>
		art none	<i>demonstrative pronominals</i>
lim -	def -	art +	<i>indefinite article</i>
		art -	<i>“zero” article</i>
		art none	<i>indefinite pronominals</i>

		art +	<i>indefinite article</i> (intended meaning "proper," "authentic," "real," "in general")
	def +	art +	<i>definite-article morpheme</i> (intended meaning "in general," "all," "as such," or uniqueness)

Therefore, let us re-consider how exactly concepts like "limitedness," "specificity" and "generity" can be related to each other.

3. Towards a Typology of Non-Articled and Articled NPs in Bulgarian

In agreement with Šamraj, let us assume that there are two basic semantic aspects behind any nominal use which can be highlighted in accordance with the communicative intentions of the speaker. My tentative terms are *categorizing* potential, which corresponds to (the semantics of) "non-limitedness" of nominal material, and *identifying* potential, which corresponds to (the semantics of) "limitedness" of nominal material. I further assume that, from the perspective of the categorizing potential, one could speak of *non-generic* and *generic* descriptions of objects, while, from the perspective of the identifying potential, it is possible to distinguish *specific* and *non-specific* descriptions of objects:

categorizing (lim -)	non-generic
	generic
identifying (lim +)	specific
	non-specific

Thus, the dichotomy *generic* vs. *non-generic* appears to be relevant only when the categorizing potential of certain nominal material is activated, and the dichotomy *specific* vs. *non-specific* makes sense only with activated identifying potential of some nominal material. How nominal material will be used in each particular case of language communication is totally speaker-oriented and depends on what "world" or "perspective" the speaker chooses to present to the hearer.

Most generally, **non-articled NPs** in Bulgarian can be viewed now as having three main uses: the prototypical categorizing non-generic use, the identifying specific use bound to the so-called "inherent definiteness" of, e.g., proper names, kinship terms, etc., and the categorizing generic use which is revealed in restricting environments, e.g., of type "definition."

Bulgarian NPs with definite article — parallel to what can be observed synchronically in many languages — have two main uses: the identifying specific

use and the categorizing generic use. I assume that both of them are prototypical, agreeing with Mayer (1988: 25) who considers the latter one:

... a secondary, conventionalized usage where there is no reference to a specifically identifiable object (or set of objects). Rather, a general statement is made to refer to a whole class.

Finally, I view Bulgarian NPs with **indefinite article** as having three uses: the prototypical identifying specific use — in a clear opposition to the same use of NPs with definite article, the identifying non-specific use, and the categorizing generic use — generic descriptions as statements which impart qualities or characteristics to all members of a group are not necessarily expressed by the definite article in Bulgarian.

I follow Mayer 1988 in assuming that a definite description is one in which an object (person, thing, situation, etc.) or set of objects is presented by the speaker as being identifiable in a specific context, regardless of whether or not the object is in fact pragmatically identifiable. For this reason, the feature *definiteness* — understood as “unique identifiability” — is inappropriate (*i.e.*, set to ‘none’) for nominal material with activated categorizing potential. On the contrary, this feature is appropriate for nominal material with activated identifying potential (and therefore, set positively or negatively for the respective cases).

All these assumptions result in a classification of Bulgarian articulated and non-articled NPs, which is summarized in the following table.

categorizing (lim -)	non-generic	def none	no art	prototypical use	<p>Tuk kupavam knigi. 'I buy books here.'</p> <p>Pie mi se voda. 'I want to drink water.'</p> <p>Vleze grupa studenti. 'A group of students came in.'</p> <p>Ne biva da jam meso. 'I must not eat meat.'</p> <p>Taršja prijateli. 'I am looking for friends.'</p>
	generic	def none	def. art	prototypical use	<p>Kučeto e prijatel na čoveka. 'Dog is man's friend.'</p> <p>Horata sa smārtni. 'Humans are mortal.'</p> <p>Toj običa vinoto i ženite. 'He loves wine and women.'</p> <p>Običaj bližnija si. 'Love your fellow-man.'</p> <p>Gotov e vsičko da razdava na horata. 'He would give everything to the people.'</p> <p>Prozorecāt na staja trjabva da bāde svetāl i širok. 'A window of a room should be bright and wide.' (in restricted context)</p> <p>Fizikata e edna ot naj-starite nauki za prirodata. 'Physics is one of the most ancient sciences of nature.' (uniqueness)</p>

indef. art	<p>"properness"</p> <p>"authenticity"</p> <p>(highlighting basic features)</p>	<p>Edna majka vinagi šte poznae deteto si. 'A mother would always recognize her child.'</p> <p>Podobno nešto ne može da se sluči na edin specialist. 'Nothing like that could happen to an expert.'</p> <p>Edin faringolog lekuvu i ušni bolesti. 'A throat specialist also treats diseases of the ear.'</p> <p>Edin vālk nikoga ne se rešava da umre ot glad pred edno stado ovci. 'A wolf never decides to die of hunger in front of a flock of sheep.' (E. Pelin)</p> <p>Ne vi li e sram, kakvo iscate ot edni ženi. 'Aren't you ashamed — what do you want with women?' (J. Jovkov)</p> <p>Edno okončanie, obšto vzeto, ne izčezva, dokato e funkcionalno neobhodimo. 'An ending, generally speaking, does not disappear as long as it is still necessary from a functional standpoint.' (Minkov)</p>
no art	<p>"definitions"</p> <p>(prototypical use in predicatives)</p>	<p>Stepen s osnova otricatelno čislo i četen pokazatel e položitelno čislo. 'A power with a negative base and an even exponent is a positive number.'</p> <p>Za proizvodstvo na hartija se izpolzva dārvesina. 'Wood is used for paper production.'</p> <p>Zaek, kojto e ranen, e lesna pljačka za kučetata. 'A rabbit which has been wounded is an easy target for dogs.'</p> <p>Tova životno e vālk. 'This animal is a wolf.'</p> <p>Nikoga ne e bil student. 'He has never been a student.'</p>

identifying (lim +)	specific	def +	def. art	prototypical use	Vidjajte li knjige / dvete knigi / mnogoto knigi / vsičkite knigi / njakolkoto knigi? 'Did you see the books / the two books / the many books / all the books / the several books?'
			no art	demonstratives	Tezi knigi / onezi knigi mi trjabvat. 'I need these books / those books.'
			no art (def. art with preposed adj. mod.)	"inherence"	<p>full personal non-reflexive pronouns: toj 'he,' nego 'him' (cf. gorkijat toj 'poor he')</p> <p>proper names: Ivan, Stara Planina (cf. glupavijat Ivan 'the stupid John')</p> <p>kinship terms: majka 'mother,' tatko 'daddy,' baba 'granny,' lelja 'aunt' (cf. starata mi baba 'my old granny')</p> <p>others: months, days of week, points of compass (cf. minalija januari 'the last January')</p>
	def -	indef. art	prototypical use	<p>Edni knigi gi njama ošte ot včera. 'Some books are missing since yesterday.'</p> <p>Dojdoha s edna (hubava) kola. 'They arrived with a nice car.'</p> <p>Tja počuka na edna vrata. 'She knocked on the (literally, 'a') door.' (E. Stanev)</p> <p>Trjabvat mi edni dokumenti. 'I need some papers.'</p> <p>Edna studentka donese cvetja. 'A student brought flowers.'</p> <p>Da ti dam edin balsam da si usladiš sârceto. 'Let me give you a balm to soothe your heart.' (Georgiev)</p> <p>Po livadata tiča boso edno dete. 'A child is running barefoot through the meadow.' (S. Ivančev)</p>	

non-specific	def -	indef. art	"some/any"	<p>Molja dajte mi edin moliv. 'Please, give me a pencil.'</p> <p>Potärsi mi edni po-iziskani drevi za ure. 'For tomorrow, look for some more representative clothes for me.'</p> <p>Mislehme, že ima talanta na edin Dostojevski. 'We thought that he had a Dostoyevskian talent.'</p> <p>Toj beše nadaren i s glasa na edin Stentor. 'He was also endowed with a Stentorian voice.' (Maslov)</p>
		no art	lexical means (inherent indefiniteness or quantification)	<p>njakakvi knigi, njakoi knigi, edi-koi si knigi, koi da e knigi, koito i da bilo knigi; vsjaka kniga 'some / certain / any books; every book'</p> <p>pet knigi, mnogo knigi, njakolko knigi, vsički knigi 'five / many / several / all books'</p>

Demonstrative pronouns, while sharing some of the semantic properties of the definite article, always imply deixis and are limited to anaphoric uses; therefore, they are not normally used in generic descriptions.

Proper nouns tend not to be articulated because they are inherently definite (inherently identifiable) and are usually used with unique reference; their definiteness is revealed when they are preceded by adjectival modifiers by articling the adjective. NPs headed by kinship terms are not articulated when used as names (except if containing preposed adjectival modifiers) but can be normally articulated when used as descriptive common nouns; for this reason, all kinship terms are articulated when used in the plural.⁷

It is important to distinguish between *edin* used as a cardinal numeral or an indefinite pronoun and *edin* used as an indefinite article. Prosodically, as observed in, for example, Scatton (1984:316), this element has a primary stress (´) in the former case (1a), but carries only a secondary stress (˘) in the latter, *i.e.*, as an indefinite article (1b).

- (1) a. Dajte mi edná kniga. 'Give me one book.'
 b. Dajte mi edná kniga. 'Give me a book.'

Morphologically, as a cardinal numeral or an indefinite pronoun *edin* can take the definite article: *ednoto dete* ('the one child') or *ednite deca* ('some (of the) children'), while this is absolutely impossible when *edin* functions as an indefinite article.

4. Replication Potential

On the basis of my typology of articulated and non-articled NPs presented in the previous section, it is possible now to formulate constraints concerning the replicability of Bulgarian NPs. Thus I argue that what can be replicated by a clitic pronoun — under the appropriate verb-lexeme specific, syntactic or communicative conditions — is the nominal material that is used as **identifying specific** description of a given object. This is illustrated in (2) to (6), where the replicated material — both in Bulgarian examples and in their English translations — is underlined, while the respective replicating clitics are double-underlined. On the other hand, non-articled NPs which are categorizing or non-specific descriptions, as well as articulated NPs which are generic or non-specific descriptions completely lack replication potential.

- (2) Deteto go dovede Elena.
'Helen brought the child.'
- (3) Tezi knigi gi kupih za teb.
'I bought these books for you.'
- (4) Nego go poznavam ot universiteta.
'I know him from the university.'
- (5) a. Na Ivan mu izpratihme nova pokana.
'We sent a new invitation to John.'
- b. Baba ja risuva brat mi.
'My brother sketches Granny.'
- c. ? Juli go prekarahme na moreto.
'We spent July at the seaside.' (colloquial)
- (6) Edni studenti gi oćakvame dnes.
'We expect certain students today.'

Finally, I shall briefly elaborate also on the abovementioned appropriate conditions for replication. The verb-lexeme specific conditions are found with verbs like *trese me* 'to shiver,' *domāćnjava mi* 'to get nostalgic,' etc., where the obligatory pronominal clitic functions as a lexical formant indicating the experiencer.⁸ Even though the result is formally equivalent to clitic replication, especially with respect to the constraints imposed on the nominal material that is

coreferent with the pronominal clitic — *cf.* (7a) and (8a) — here we are faced with a principally different situation. The clitic is an indispensable part of the compound verbal lexeme, while the full NP indicating the experiencer is optional in such constructions — *cf.* (7b) and (8b) *vs.* the ungrammatical (7c) and (8c). As argued in Avgustinova 1996, this phenomenon is more naturally interpreted as a specific type of analytic object-verb agreement, rather than clitic replication.

- (7) a. Mene ot sutrinta me trese.
me-EXP-OBJ from morning-def.art ACC-1sg shiver-impers
'I shiver from the very morning.'
- b. Ot sutrinta me trese.
from morning-def.art ACC-1sg shiver-impers
- c. *Mene ot sutrinta trese.
me-EXP-OBJ from morning-def.art shiver-impers
- (8) a. Na decata mnogo skoro im domáčnja za moreto.
to children-def.art-EXP-OBJ very soon DAT-3pl got-nostalgic-impers about sea-def.art
'Very soon the children felt nostalgic about the sea.'
- b. Mnogo skoro im domáčnja za moreto.
very soon DAT-3pl got-nostalgic-impers about sea-def.art
- c.* Na decata mnogo skoro domáčnja za moreto.
to children-def.art-EXP-OBJ very soon got-nostalgic-impers about sea-def.art

As to the relevant syntactic and communicative conditions, these basically amount to the two major replication-causing factors in Bulgarian: surface alignment and object thematization. In my opinion, clitic replication as such has two interrelated functions. One is to identify the syntactic category of nominal material occurring in the "prototypical" subject position in the surface ordering (*i.e.*, clause-initially, possibly immediately preceding the verb) but functioning as direct object — *e.g.*, (2). Such a need results from the lack of morphological case marking which would unambiguously distinguish syntactic nominative from syntactic accusative in Bulgarian non-prepositional nominal constituents, even though the opposition full *vs.* short definite article in the standard language⁹ basically solves this problem in the relevant cases.¹⁰ The other — fairly dominating — function of clitic replication is communicative in nature: the clitic replicant indicates that the replicated nominal material belongs to a thematic (ground, topic) segment in the informational structuring of the respective utterance. As can be expected, the two functions interact to a different degree in each particular case.

5. *Some Related Cliticizing Effects*

With direct-object NP and indirect-object *na*-NP complements of a verb certain interesting regularities with respect to (the possibilities of) cliticizing can be observed. Let us consider for the sake of illustration the shortest reply, for example, in the context: 'They ask me if you have seen NP.' — 'I have.'

- (9) Pitat me dali si vidjal ...
- a. ... hora ('people'). — Vidjah.
 - b. ... novi hora ('new people'). — Vidjah.
 - c. ... vseki gost ('every guest'). — Vidjah.
 - d. ... nejni gosti ('her guests'). — Vidjah.
 - e. ... pet knigi ('five books'). — Vidjah.
 - f. ... knigi, koito/deto ti trjabvat ('books which you need'). — Vidjah.
 - g. ... edni hora ('certain people'). — Vidjah (gi).
 - h. ... nejnite gosti ('her-def.art guests'). — Vidjah gi.
 - i. ... gostite 1 ('guests-def.art her-POSS-CL'). — Vidjah gi.
 - j. ... horata ('people-def.art'). — Vidjah gi.
 - k. ... tezi hora ('these people'). — Vidjah gi.
 - l. ... pette knigi ('five-def.art books'). — Vidjah gi.
 - m. ... Ivan ('John'). — Vidjah go.
 - n. ... majka ('mother'). — Vidjah ja.

It can be observed that whenever an identifying specific definite NP is involved, there occurs an obligatory (9h-n) clitic in the reply. If the NP is an identifying specific indefinite one, the clitic in the reply is optional (9g). In all other cases, no clitic in the reply is possible.

All this suggests that such a query-reply test can be useful as a diagnostic tool for defining nominal determinedness in general,¹¹ as well as clitic replicability of nominal material in particular.

6. *Summary and Conclusions*

Determining which nominal material has the potential to be replicated by a clitic pronoun in a Bulgarian sentence is a complex task involving criteria such as the following.

- Which semantic aspect has been activated in the particular nominal use — the categorizing or the identifying potential of the nominal material?
- Does the activation of the categorizing potential result in a generic or a non-generic use of article NPs?
- Does the activation of the identifying aspect result in a specific or non-specific use of the article NPs, and are the objects referred to by the respective nominal material regarded as uniquely identifiable (*i.e.*, definite) or not?

The first criterion is based on Šamraj 1989, whose proposal has been developed further in the above analysis in order to accommodate the commonly made distinction between generic- and specific-NP use taking into consideration not only article NPs but also unarticle NPs in a systematic way. While Šamraj's study focuses on the distribution of the definite article and demonstrative pronouns, Mayer 1988 is primarily concerned with the definite article, arguing that it has two "widely disparate meanings" — (a) the specifically identifiable and (b) the generic — and that the dichotomy specific *vs.* generic refers to "totally different functions rather than aspects of the same meaning." In the classification proposed here, the observed difference is structured in a more general way by viewing the specific use of article NPs as resulting from activation of the identifying potential of nominal material, and the generic use of article NPs as resulting from activation of the categorizing potential of nominal material. Definiteness in the sense of *unique* identifiability of the respective object is then viewed just as a special case of specific identifiability — a broader concept covering also the identifying specific use of the indefinite article. The current proposal accommodates the different uses of NPs with indefinite article in Bulgarian as categorizing generic descriptions, as identifying specific descriptions, and as identifying non-specific descriptions.

The main advantage of the proposed NP typology is that it allows for stating a general non-replicability constraint. Namely, if certain nominal material functioning as a direct or an indirect object is used as a categorizing or as an identifying non-specific description, it can never be replicated. Only nominal material which is used as identifying specific description of the respective object is replicable, *i.e.*, has replication potential in Bulgarian.

It is a further interesting outcome of the approach herein that Ivančev's distinguishing of degrees of definiteness — *i.e.*, "close definiteness" (which is defined by anaphoric reference) and "distant definiteness" (which is defined by general context or situation) — also can now be rendered precise as being relevant

only for NPs that are used as identifying specific definite descriptions of the respective objects.

Notes

1. There are striking typological parallels to this phenomenon in the Balkan languages (*e.g.*, in Greek, Romanian, Albanian, Macedonian, partly in Serbian and Croatian dialects), while in the other modern Slavic languages which have short pronominal forms it is not attested.

2. While borrowing certain terminology, I nevertheless disagree with the interpretation of the data given in this paper. For completeness sake, it should be pointed out that this material has a working paper status. In a personal remark (1994) the author himself expressed certain doubts about the adequacy of the analysis he had presented there. Still, it should be acknowledged that some of Dyer's ideas — *e.g.*, on the possibility of gauging nominal material with respect to replication potential which, in turn, may be equated with "degree of determinedness" — have been quite insightful for my analysis.

3. It is important to distinguish clitic replication from pronominal resumption, which may but need not be realized by a clitic pronoun, as the following examples illustrate. In (i) the resumptive element is a clitic, while in (ii) and (iii) it is a full pronoun.

- (i) Kolkoto do **Ivan**, ne sām go kanila.
as for **John**, NEG be-1sg ACC-CL invited
'As for John, I have not invited him.'
- (ii) Kolkoto do **Ivan**, **nego** ne sām kanila.
as for **John**, **him** NEG be-1sg invited
- (iii) Kolkoto do **Ivan**, nego ne sām go kanila.
as for **John**, **him** NEG be-1sg ACC-CL invited

Both the NP and the pronoun resuming it are given in **bold**. Replication can be observed only in (iii), where the replicated nominal material and the coreferent clitic replicant are underlined.

4. *Cf.*, *e.g.*, Naylor 1983, Dyer 1988, Guentchéva 1994, Mayer 1988.

5. The existence of an indefinite article in Bulgarian, addressed, for example, in Friedman 1976, is still a controversial issue and a matter of on-going linguistic discussion. In my opinion, there is strong evidence in favor of the assumption that *edin/edna/edno/edni* functions as an indefinite article in certain cases. This is taken into consideration in the proposed classification of articulated and non-articled NPs.

6. In the following table, the generic use of the definite-article morpheme is indicated as [lim -, def +, art +], while the generic use of the indefinite *edin* as [lim -, def -, art +].

7. Note, however, that nicknames (*e.g.*, *Borimečkata vlezje zasmjan*. 'B. came in smiling.') and diminutive proper nouns (*e.g.*, *Kateto i Vankata bjaha mnogo iznenadani*. 'Kate and Jonny were quite surprised.') are, as a rule, articulated when used not as vocatives. Note that it is the

unarticled form that serves as vocative with such nouns (e.g., *Borimečka, ela pri nas!* 'B., come and join us!' *Kate, Vanka, tuka li ste?* 'Kate, Johnny, are you here?').

8. The fact that the object clitic is an obligatory structural element in this type of construction, inasmuch as it plays the "semantic role experiencer," is mentioned in, e.g., Cyxun 1968, Nicolova 1986, Popov 1962.

9. The full definite article is appropriate for syntactically nominative masculine NPs while the short definite article for syntactically accusative/oblique masculine NPs.

10. In certain Bulgarian dialects, as well as in the closely related standardized Macedonian, the object-identifying function of clitic replication is grammaticalized to the extent that the replication of the direct object is obligatory regardless of sentence position.

11. For example, also for languages having no morphologically established category of "definiteness" but a well developed clitic system (e.g., Czech, Polish, etc.).

References

- Asenova, P. 1989. *Balkansko ezikoznanie. Osnovni problemi na Balkanskija ezikov sąjuz*. Sofia: Nauka i izkustvo.
- Avgustinova, T. 1996. *Between Lexicon and Syntax Proper*. CLAUS-Report 80. September 1996. University of Saarland.
- Cyxun, G. 1968. *Sintaksis mestoimennyx klitik v južnoslavjanskix jazykax (Balkansko-slavjanskaja model')*. Minsk: Nauka i tehnika.
- Dyer, D.L. 1988. "Intensifying RP and the Effect of Grammatical Categories on Replicated NM in Bulgarian." *University of Chicago Working Papers in Linguistics* 4, pp. 1-24.
- Friedman, V. 1976. "The Question of the Bulgarian Indefinite Article." *Bulgaria. Past and Present*, Butler, T. (ed.). Columbus, Ohio: AAASS, pp. 334-40.
- Georgieva, E. 1974. *Slovoed na prostoto izrečenie v bälgarskija knižoven ezik*. Sofia: Bälgarska akademija na naukite.
- Guentchéva, Z. 1994. "Thématisation de l'objet en bulgare." *Sciences pour la communication* 39. Bern; Berlin; Frankfurt/M.; Paris; Wien: Peter Lang.
- Ivančev, S. 1978. *Prinosi v bälgarskoto i slavjanskoto ezikoznanie*. Sofia: Nauka i izkustvo.
- Känčev, Iv. 1972. "Njakoi nabljudenija vărhu upotrebata na udvoenoto dopälнение v ispanskija i bälgarskija ezik." *Ezik i literatura* 1, pp. 52-58.
- Lopašov, J.A. 1978. *Mestoimennye povtory dopolnenija v balkanskix jazykax*. Leningrad: Nauka.

- Mayer, G.L. 1988. "The Definite Article in Contemporary Standard Bulgarian." *Balkanologische Veröffentlichungen* 14, Reiter, N. (ed.), Berlin: Otto Harrassowitz — Wiesbaden.
- Miletič, L. 1937. "Udvojavaneto na obekta v bälgarskija ezik ne e 'balkanizäm.'" *Spisane na BAN* 56(28), pp. 1-21.
- Minčeva, A. 1968. "Za njakoi aspekti na reprizata na ličnite mestoimenija v bälgarskija ezik." *Izvestija na instituta za bälgarski ezik* XVII, pp. 371-79.
- _____. 1969. "Opit za interpretacija na modela na udvoenite dopälnenija v bälgarskija ezik." *Izvestija na instituta za bälgarski ezik* XVII, pp. 3-50.
- Mirčev, A. 1966. "Za hronologijata na osnovnite balkanizmi v bälgarskija ezik." *Bälgarski ezik* 4, pp. 284-86.
- Mladenov, C. 1968. "Balkanizäm li e udvojavaneto na obekta v bälgarski?" *Izvestija na instituta za bälgarski ezik* XVI, pp. 151-56.
- Naylor, K. 1983. "On Expressing 'Definiteness' in the Slavic Languages and English." *American Contributions to the Ninth International Congress of Slavists I — Linguistics*, Flier, M.S. (ed.). Columbus, Ohio: Slavica Publishers, Inc., pp. 202-20.
- Nicolova, R. 1986. *Bälgarskite mestoimenija*. Sofia: Nauka i izkustvo.
- Orzechowska, H. 1976. *Procesy bałkanizacji i sławizacji bułgarskiego języka literackiego XVII-XIX w. w świecie użycia klitycznych form zaimków*. Warszawa.
- Popov, K. 1962. "Stilno-gramatična upotreba na udvoenoto dopälnenie v bälgarskija knižoven ezik." *Izvestija na instituta za bälgarski ezik* VIII, pp. 459-70.
- Rudin, C. 1986. *Aspects of Bulgarian Syntax: Complementizers and WH Constructions*. Columbus, Ohio: Slavica Publishers, Inc.
- Rusek, J. 1963. Po väprosa za hronologijata na udvojavane na dopälnenjata v bälgarskija ezik. *Bälgarski ezik* XIII(2), pp. 141-48.
- Scatton, E.A. 1984. *A Reference Grammar of Modern Bulgarian*. Columbus, Ohio: Slavica Publishers, Inc.
- Šamraj, T. 1989. *Členuvani i nečlenuvani imena v bälgarskija ezik*. Sofia: Narodna prosveta.
- Sławski, F. 1946. *Miejsce enklityki odmiennej w dzieinach języka bułgarskiego*. Kraków.