Predicate clefts in Bulgarian[*]

Elena Karagjosova   *Katja Jasinskaja*
Stuttgart University   *Cologne University*

1 Introduction

Predicate cleft constructions (PCCs) have been observed in a number of languages, including Slavic languages (cf. e.g. Abels 2001, Aboh and Dyakonova 2009 on Russian; Bondaruk 2009 on Polish). According to Abels (2001), whose terminology we adopt here, a PCC consists of a HEAD and a BODY. The HEAD is a phrase, usually infinitival. The BODY is a finite clause whose main verb repeats the main verb of the HEAD. In languages where this construction results from VP or V movement, one refers to it as *predicate fronting with doubling*, where the HEAD contains the fronted copy of the verb, and the BODY the lower copy. An example of a Russian PCC is given in (1), where the first clause is the predicate cleft, and the second is a typical adversative context in which PCCs occur.

(1)   *[Rabotat' (to)]*HEAD *[on rabotaet]*BODY, *no ničego ne zarabatyvaet.*
         work.inf   prt   he work.3sg   but nothing not earns
         'As for working, he does work, but he doesn't earn anything.'

The goal of this paper is to describe predicate clefts in a language that lacks infinitives – Bulgarian. What does a predicate cleft look like if fronting an infinitival phrase is not an option? We provide an account of previously undescribed Bulgarian PCCs that are unique in their range of options for the morphosyntactic realization of HEADs. More specifically, we argue that Bulgarian has three different ways of structuring the HEAD of a predicate cleft: *za*-PCCs, *če*-PCCs, and *da*-PCCs. The three constructions exhibit subtle differences in their pragmatic function and have different restrictions on use. We show how to derive those differences from the differences in the structure of the HEAD. We argue, moreover, that at least in the case of *če*-and *da*-PCCs, the construction is not derived by movement, unlike Russian and Polish PCCs. Finally, we raise the questions: Which parts of the HEAD are doubled, and which are not doubled in the BODY, and why? Previous answers to these questions given for other languages are based on the nature of movement, and therefore are not applicable to the base-generated

PCCs in Bulgarian. We observe a common structural pattern in the BODY of Bulgarian PCCs on the one hand and in denials on the other and argue that in both cases the material that is doubled is the material that cannot be omitted for information-structural reasons and due to constraints on VP-ellipsis.

We first introduce the 3 types of Bulgarian PCC (section 2). Then we discuss the pragmatic function and the semantic properties of the HEADS of *če*-and *da*-PCCs (section 3). Finally, in section 4 we address the structure of Bulgarian *če*-and *da*-PCCs and present our explanation of the doubling pattern.

2 Predicate clefts in Bulgarian

The first type is the **za-PCC**, exemplified in (2), where the first sentence represents the context for the PCC:

(2)   *A kak sa dečizata s govoreneto, momičeta?*   (Internet)
      'And how are the kids doing with talking, girls?'
      [Za govorene]ₕₑₐD -[govori]ᵦₒDY, no mnogo nepravilno.
      as for talking   talk.3sg   but very   incorrectly
      'As for talking - (s)he talks, but very incorrectly.'

The HEAD of a *za*-PCC consists of a PP headed by the preposition *za* ('as for') and a verbal noun which may be either definite or indefinite. The BODY contains the tensed copy of the verb from which the verbal noun is derived. The PCC is followed by an adversative clause as is typical for PCCs in other languages (cf. Abels 2001). The arguments and adjuncts can in general be realized in the BODY or in the HEAD of the *za*-PCC.

The second type is the **če-PCC**, cf. (3):

(3)   *Vsičko e mnogo obârkano.*   (BulNC[1])
      'This is a complete mess.'
      [Če e   obârkano]ₕₑₐD, [obârkano e]ᵦₒDY Ne   tova e važnoto.
      that is.3sg confused   confused is   Not this is important.def
      'A mess it is. This is not what matters most.'

The HEAD of a *če*-PCC consists of a full CP headed by the complementizer *če* ('that') and a VP (here consisting of the verb 'to be' plus an adjectival predicate). The entire VP is copied in the BODY. Again, the PCC is followed by a contrasting utterance. In contrast to *za*-PCCs, arguments and adjuncts are normally realized in the HEAD.

The third type is the **da-PCC**, as in (4):

---

[1]   Bulgarian National Corpus, URL: http://dcl.bas.bg/bulnc/home/?lang=en

(4)   *Zašto Toromanova si šie takiva prosti rokli?*   (BulNC)
      Why does Toromanova have sewn such simple dresses?'
      [Da e   ot skromnost]$_{HEAD}$ *[ne e]*$_{BODY}$. *A   može bi   veče ne*
      to   is   of modesty   not is   and maybe   yet not
      im   stigat parite?
      them suffice money.def
      'Out of modesty - no. Maybe they are getting short of money?'

The HEAD of a *da*-PCC is a full CP[2] headed by complementizer *da* ('(in or-
der) to') and the finite verb is copied in the BODY. Again, a contrasting utterance
follows. As with *če*-PCCs, all arguments and adjuncts are normally realized in
the HEAD, whereas the BODY only contains a copy of the lexical verb and/or the
auxiliary and sometimes the pronominal clitics.
      In the rest of the paper we concentrate on *če*-and *da*-PCCs.

3 Contrastive topic and the structure of the HEAD

In general, the function of a PCC is to mark the VP as either a focus or a con-
trastive topic. When it marks focus, as in some West-African languages, the
PCC can be roughly paraphrased as an *it*-cleft, e.g. *It is [working]*F *that he does.*
(cf. Lefebre 1992). In Russian and Polish (and many other languages, e.g. Span-
ish, Hebrew, and Korean), the PCC is assumed to mark contrastive topic (hence-
forth CT, cf. Abels 2001): the HEAD contains a CT-exponent, while the BODY con-
tains a focus exponent: *[As for working]*CT *[he works]*F. CT on the PCC-HEAD is
interpreted semantically in terms of a set of alternative questions called its *topic
semantic value* (Büring 1995), e.g. the topic semantic value for (1) is the set of
questions {Does he work?, Does he earn money?, ...?}. The question set indi-
cates at the same time a discourse strategy, i.e. a hierarchy of questions and an-
swers to them along which the discourse is structured (Büring 2003).
      The focus in the BODY of a PCC is interpreted in terms of a set of alternative
answers to one of the topic questions (*focus semantic value*, Rooth 1992). In
general, the focus exponent in the BODY of a PCC tends to be polarity focus (e.g.
in Russian, Abels 2001) or verum focus[3] (e.g. Brazilian Portugese, Hungarian,
Mandarin Chinese, Spanish, cf. Vicente 2009), but in some languages constitu-
ent focus is also possible (e.g. Hungarian, Vicente 2007). These types of focus

---

[2]   The status of complements containing *da*-forms is a subject of ongoing debate: the
      traditional view of *da* as complementizer is challenged by the view that it belongs to the
      verbal morphology, cf. e.g. Smirnova (2011, 185). For our purposes, however, the
      precise status of *da* is not of crucial importance.
[3]   Focus on the truth (or falsity) of a proposition, cf. Höhle (1992).

differ with respect to the type of alternatives they evoke and are related to different types of topic questions (polar, verum-[4], or constituent questions):

(5)   *{he works, he doesn't work}*   polarity focus
     he works$_{SF}$:   *{it's true that he works, it isn't true that he works}*   verum focus
             {he works, he sleeps, he watches TV, ...}   constituent focus

The CT-analysis applies in general to all three Bulgarian PCCs. We argue, however, that the constructions differ in terms of the type of questions and answers they involve. While the nominalized verbs in the HEAD of *za*-PCCs are comparable to Russian infinitives, *da*- and *če*-clauses exhibit semantic properties that influence the interpretation of the CT and lead to different restrictions on the polarity of the HEAD and the BODY, as detailed in the following sections.

3.1 *če*-PCCs

We start with the observation that *če*-PCCs obey particular restrictions with respect to the polarity of the two parts of the construction: they require the same polarity in the HEAD and the BODY. Thus whereas the sentences in (6a, b) are well-formed, the cross-over combinations (6c, d) are unacceptable:[5]

(6)   a. *Če čete, čete.*   b. *Če ne čete, ne čete.*
       that read.3sg read.3sg   that not read.3sg not read.3sg
       'As for reading, he does read.'   'As for reading, he does not read.'

       c. **Če čete, ne čete.*   d. **Če ne čete, čete.*
       that read.3sg not read.3sg   that not read.3sg read.3sg

This restriction cannot be attributed to the interpretation of CT: in principle, both positive and negative topic questions are possible; moreover, the polarity of the answer is independent from the polarity of the question. On the other hand, the semantics of the *če*-HEAD offers a natural explanation for this restriction.

It has been observed that the complementizer *če* expresses factivity, whereas *da* expresses non-factivity (cf. e.g. Pitsch 2010, 316-318 and the literature mentioned there). Pitsch notes that this property of *če* is related to a general difference between factive (transparent) and non-factive (opaque, intensional) complement sentences (observed in e.g. Kiparski and Kiparski 1970; Maienborn

---

[4]   I.e. questions asking whether a proposition is true and should be added to the Common Ground or not, cf. Romero and Han (2004) on *yn*-interrogatives with preposed negation.

[5]   For comparison, the polarity of the *za*- HEAD is always positive, which may be related to the fact that negating verbal nouns in Bulgarian with the negation prefix *ne*- does not always yield acceptable results, cf. *nepušene* ('non-smoking') vs. ??*neudrjane* ('non-hitting'). Note that a negative *za*- HEAD is only possible with negative polarity of the BODY.

2003), where only the former yield a reality reading of the proposition. A more cautious view advocated in Smirnova (2011) is that the difference between *če* and *da* should be analysed in terms of the indicative-subjunctive opposition. In any case, there seems to be a clear preference for *če* to combine with predicates expressing factivity (factive or semi-factive predicates, cf. Karttunen 1971), whereas predicates expressing non-factivity tend to combine with *da*.[6] For instance, whereas *znaja* ('know') and *viždam* ('see') combine with *če*, *iskam* ('want') and *želaja* ('wish') do not. On the other hand, while some non-factive predicates like *mislja* ('believe'), *kazvam* ('say'), or *ne e vjarno* ('is not true') also combine with *če*, as in (7a), this is not possible if the *če*-clause is fronted, whereas fronting with a factive predicate is perfectly acceptable (7b):

(7)   a. *Mislja/ Kazvam/Ne e vjarno, če čete.*
          think.1sg/ say.1sg/   not is true   that read.3sg
          'I think/I say/It is not true that he reads. '

       b. *Če čete,   *milsja/ *kaz vam/*ne e vjarno/znam/   viždam/e vjarno.*
          that read.3sg think.1sg/say.1sg/   not is true / know.1sg/see.1sg/ is true
          'That he reads, I think/I say/it is not true/I know/I see/it is true.'

This observation suggests that *če*'s general preference towards factive predicates becomes even stronger when the *če*-clause is fronted. The association of *če* with factive predicates in fronted clauses leads to a factive interpretation of the *če*-complement. This is also what seems to happen with the HEAD of the *če*-PCC, in spite of the fact that the clause representing the HEAD of a *če*-PCC is obviously unembedded. A possible explanation for this is offered by the observation that *če*-PCCs seem semantically and pragmatically equivalent to fronted *če*-clauses embedded under the predicate *it is true*: both receive a CT-interpretation (8a); in addition, the BODY of the PCC and the embedding predicate offer equivalent answers to a question about the truth value of a proposition (8b):

(8)   a. *[Če čete]$_{CT}$, čete$_F$/e vjarno$_F$, no ništo   ne razbira.*
          that reads   reads/is true   but nothing not understands
          'That he reads, he reads/is true, but he doesn't understand anything.'

       b. A: *Vjarno li e, če čete?*   B: *Čete./Vjarno e.*
          true   prt is that read   read/ true   is
          'Is it true that he reads?'   'He reads./It is true.'

The factivity reading[7] of the *če*-HEAD explains why the BODY needs to have the same polarity: if not, the two parts of the PCC convey contradicting information,

---

6   Cf. also Krapova (2001) where *da* is claimed to be the subjunctive marker in Bulgarian.
7   We leave here the question of its precise semantic status open.

and the utterance becomes inconsistent. It also has an effect on the interpretation of the CT on the HEAD of the construction: CT on the factive HEAD of the *če*-PCC leads to evoking verum-questions, i.e. questions of the type 'Is the proposition (really) true?', rather than of the type 'Is the proposition true or false?'. Thus in (3), CT on the *če*-clause raises the set of verum-questions {Is it true that it is a mess?, Is it true that this is what matters most?,...?}. A verum-question may be given either a verum-answer, i.e. a sentence containing verum focus or an epistemic adverb like *really* (cf. Romero and Han 2004)[8], or a non-verum answer:[9] thus, a question like *Is it true that Peter reads the book?* seems equally appropriately answered by *(Yes,) He* READS *it.*; *He* DOES *read it.*; or *He* REALLY *reads it.* We argue nevertheless that the focus in the BODY of *če*-PCCs is verum focus. Like plain polarity focus, verum focus surfaces usually as an accent on polarity elements, negation or auxiliary, but may be also on the main verb. This is also the case in Bulgarian, where verum focus is not always formally distinguishable from plain polarity focus. A reliable test is therefore the insertion of focused *naistina* ('really'), which in the case of *če*-PCCs yields a perfectly acceptable utterance,[10] cf. *Če govori –* NAISTINA *govori.* ('As for talking – he REALLY talks.'). The difference between plain polarity focus and verum focus is functional:[11] while both give rise to a set of polarly opposed focus alternatives, plain polarity focus fixes the truth value of a proposition, whereas verum focus targets an already established truth value for the proposition in the given discourse. The BODY of a *če*-PCC seems therefore a natural environment for verum focus: while the HEAD suggests that the proposition is true, CT on the HEAD raises the question whether the proposition is really true. I.e., the truth value of a proposition that is already proposed in the discourse is being questioned.[12] The clause contrastively attached to a *če*-PCC may but need not involve verum-interpretation, since verum-questions allow non-verum answers, as argued above.[13]

---

[8]   Romero and Han (2004, 122) argue that epistemic *really*, verum focus and *yn*-interrogatives with preposed negation introduce the conversational epistemic operator VERUM whose role is to assert that the speaker is certain that p should be added to the common ground.

[9]   And vice versa, a verum-answer may be given to a non-verum polar question, e.g. *Does Peter read the book? - Če čete, čete, no ništo ne razbira.* ('He DOES read it, but.... ')

[10]   For comparison, focused *naistina* is not appropriate in *da-* or *za*-PCCs, cf. #*Za govorene* - NAISTINA *govori*, #*Da govori -*NAISTINA *ne govori*.

[11]   Cf. also Romero and Han (2004) who point out that polarilty focus may have different functions in declaratives, such as contrastive focus or verum focus.

[12]   That the *če*-BODY involves verum is also suggested by the observation that it can be paraphrased as "is true", cf. (8a). This paraphrase does not apply for the other two PCCs.

[13]   Cf. *Če e obârkano, obârkano e. No sâšto taka e vjarno, če ne tova e važnoto.* ('A mess it is. But what is also true is that this is not what matters most.') Such verum-continuations

3.2 Da-PCCs

Da-PCCs exhibit a different set of restrictions with respect to the polarity of the two parts of the construction: the HEAD must have positive polarity, and the BODY a negative one. Thus only (9a) is well-formed, the rest is unacceptable:

(9)   a. *Da čete, ne čete.*   b. **Da čete, čete.*   c. **Da ne čete, (ne) čete.*
          to read not read   to read read   to not read (not) read
       'As for reading, he doesn't read.'

As in *če*-PCCs, this restriction does not follow from the semantics of CT and should be attributed to the semantics of the *da*-HEAD. The *da*-HEAD is best analysed in terms of a positive polar *da*-question[14] expressing a negative speaker-bias towards the underlying proposition, e.g. *Da ste zabeljazali nešto neobičajno?* ('Noticed something unusual?') suggests "I know there's little chance that the answer will be 'yes' but I thought I'd ask anyway". If the *da*- HEAD expresses negative bias towards the underlying proposition, this explains why the BODY needs to have negative polarity: if not, the BODY contradicts the bias expressed by the HEAD, and the utterance becomes inconsistent. In addition, the polarity of the *da*-HEAD is fixed by the positive form of the *da*-question involved in *da*-PCCs; negation turns the *da*-clause into a different type of unembedded *da*-question (which also carries a different, positive bias instead). The nature of the *da*-HEAD has further the effect that the topic questions evoked by the *da*-HEAD are plain polarity questions, rather than verum-questions. Thus, CT in (4) raises the polar topic questions {Is it out of modesty?, Is it out of poverty?, ...?} and focus evokes the set {it is out of modesty, it is not out of modesty}.

4 Doubling

This section characterises and explains the doubling pattern in Bulgarian PCCs – which parts of the VP are doubled and which are not. Existing theories of predicate doubling developed for other languages are mostly based on restrictions on the realisation of multiple copies in a chain on the assumption that predicate clefts are derived by movement (Aboh and Dyakonova 2009; Bondaruk 2009).

---

     are inappropriate with the other PCCs (or generally with sentences lacking a verum element).
[14] Based on BulNC-data, we identified different types of unembedded *da*-clauses – declarative, exclamative, counterfactual wish, imperative – and several subtypes of interrogative unembedded *da*-clauses. Various structural and semantic properties make the other types of unembedded *da*-clauses unlikely candidates as HEADS of *da*-PCCs.

Section 4.1 argues that Bulgarian *če*-and *da*-PCCs are base-generated. If this is so, movement-based explanations of doubling cannot apply to Bulgarian. Section 4.2 proposes a different kind of analysis: the deletion of material in the BODY is the result of VP ellipsis, for which the HEAD serves as the licensing context.

4.1 Movement vs. base generation

Abels (2001) argued using a number of tests that Russian PCCs are derived by movement (in particular, remnant VP movement). Applying the same tests to Bulgarian suggests that this is not the case at least for *če* and *da*-PCCs. First, unlike Russian PCCs, *če* and *da* PCCs resemble hanging topics (cf. Krapova and Cinque 2008, on Bulgarian hanging topics) in that they are a root phenomenon, and, second, in that they do not show locality effects. The first point is illustrated in (10): whereas Russian PCCs can be embedded in a complement clause (10a), this is not possible for *če*-and *da*-PCCs, cf. (10b) and (10c).

(10) a. *Petja skazal čto pročitat' - to on eë pročital.*   (Ru)
         Peter said   that read   prt he it   read
         'Peter said that as for reading he read it.'

     b. **Petar kaza, če [če ja e   pročel], pročel ja e.*   (Bg)
          Peter said   that that it aux read   read   it aux
         'Peter said that as for reading he read it.'

     c. **Petar kaza, če [da ja e   pročel], ne e.*   (Bg)
          Peter said   that to it aux read   not aux
         'Peter said that as for reading he didn't read it.'

The second point is shown in (11)–(13). According to the judgements reported by Abels (2001), Russian sentences like (11), where the predicate moves out of a complement clause, are ungrammatical, i.e. Russian predicate clefts show locality effects.[15] This does not apply to Bulgarian *če/da*-PCCs:

(11) **Pročitat'-to Petja skazal čto on eë pročital.*   (Ru)
        read   prt Peter said   that he it   read
        'As for reading, Peter said that he read it.'

(12) *[Če čete], vsički   znajat, če   čete.*   (Bg)
        that reads everyone know.pl that reads
        'As for reading, everyone knows that he reads.'

(13) *[Da e bedna], ti   kaza, če ne e   bedna.*   (Bg)

---

[15]   There seems to be considerable inter-speaker variation in the acceptance of predicate clefts with non-local predicate movement in Russian.

to   is   poor   you   said   that   not   is   poor
'As for being poor, you said that she is not poor.'

Moreover, Bulgarian PCCs do not obey island constraints. In (14), the HEAD doubles the predicate of the relative clause, but the sentence is grammatical.

(14) *Da pečeli, toj e čovek, kojto nikoga ne pečeli.*   (Bg)
  to   wins   he is person who   never   not wins
  'As for winning, he is someone who never wins.'

The third difference is in the connectivity effects. Whereas a tense/aspect/mood mismatch between the fronted and the lower copy of the verb is not allowed in Russian (Abels 2001; Aboh and Dyakonova 2009), in Bulgarian this is possible (in *da*-PCCs):

(15) a. * *Čitat'- to on eë pročital.*   (Ru)
      read.iprf prt he it read.prf
      'As for reading, he has finished it.'

  b. *[Da čete],   ne e   pročel nito   edna kniga.*   (Bg)
      to   read.iprf.prs not aux read.prf neither one   book
      'As for reading, he has not finished a single book.'

Finally, in Russian the arguments and adjuncts of the doubled predicate can be realised in the HEAD or (more often) in the BODY, but not in both, cf. pronoun *eë* 'it' in (16) adapted from Abels (2001). In Bulgarian they can be realised in both, as will be illustrated by multiple examples in the next section.

(16) *[Čitat' (-to) eë (- to)]_HEAD [Ivan   eë   čitaet]_BODY.*   (Ru)
    read   prt it   prt   Ivan   it   reads
    'As for reading it, Ivan does read it.'

These observations suggest that the syntactic relationship between the HEAD and the BODY of Bulgarian PCCs is relatively loose. The most straightforward explanation would be to assume that *če*-and *da*-HEADS are base-generated high in the clause structure. At the same time, there exist clear-cut constraints on what can be deleted in the BODY and which parts must be realised. In the next section those constraints are analysed in terms of VP ellipsis.

4.2 Predicate doubling and VP ellipsis

As was shown in section 3, the HEADS of *če*-and *da*-PCCs are basically *yes/no*-questions. *Yes/no*-questions require polarity (plain polarity or verum) focus in the answer. In this section we show that the material obligatorily doubled in the BODY is the polarity focus exponent. The rest of the BODY (normally) undergoes

ellipsis modulo a number of syntactic restrictions. The kind of ellipsis that we observe in the BODY of predicate clefts is the same as the one we find in denials, which is another typical context for polarity and verum focus, and for VP ellipsis. Predicate clefts and denials behave in a strikingly parallel fashion with respect to their deletion pattern, which supports a uniform treatment.

In languages that mark focus by accentuation, polarity focus is usually realised as accent on the finite verb, whether it is a main verb or an auxiliary (Höhle 1992). Examples (17) and (18) show that the finite lexical verb bears the polarity focus accent both in denials and in predicate clefts in Bulgarian. This is the only part that may not be deleted in the BODY. The rest (cf. *ja*, *knigata*) can be and usually is deleted. If it is not, the utterance sounds redundant, but is not ungrammatical. Presumably, the finite verb moves out of the VP to mark polarity focus, while the rest of the VP (optionally) undergoes VP ellipsis.

(17) A: *Včera toj ošte ne četeše knigata.*   B: *ČETEŠE (ja)   (knigata).*
        yesterday he yet not read.ipf book.def   read.ipf sg.f.acc book.def
        'Yesterday he wasn't reading that book yet.'   'He WAS (reading it / that book)!'

(18*) [Če včera   četeše knigata],* ČETEŠE *(ja)   (knigata).*
        that yesterday read.ipf book.def   read.ipf   sg.f.acc book.def
        'As for reading this book yesterday, he WAS doing it.'

In analytic forms where the finite auxiliary is not a clitic, polarity focus is realised on the auxiliary. Examples (19) and (20) show this for Bulgarian past perfect, which is formed by the past imperfect auxiliary *beše* (non-clitic) plus the *l*-participle of the main verb. Since the auxiliary bears focus accent, it can be deleted neither in the denial (19), nor in the predicate cleft (20).

(19) A: *Toj ne beše   čel knigata.* B: a. *BEŠE (ja   cel)!* b. **BEŠE ja!*
        he   not aux.ipf read book.def   aux.ipf cl.acc read   aux.ipf cl.acc
        'He hadn't read that book.'   'He had!'

(20) *[Če beše čel knigata], ...*   a. *BEŠE (ja   čel).*   b. **BEŠE ja.*
        that aux.ipf read book.def   aux.ipf cl.acc read   aux.ipf cl.acc
        'As for having read that book, he had indeed.'

As in (17)/(18) the VP may also *not* be deleted. However, one cannot delete the main verb, but keep the pronominal clitic *ja* as in (19Bb) and (20b). Again, it is equally ungrammatical both in denials and in the BODY of PCCs.

In positive clauses, a clitic auxiliary cannot realise polarity focus and cannot stand on its own in denials and predicate clefts.[16] Both the finite clitic auxiliary and the lexical non-finite verb are doubled:

---

16   For some speakers, (21Bc) is marginally acceptable.

(21) A: *Toj ne e   spal.* B: a. *SPAL e!*   b. **SPAL!*   c. **E!*
        he   not cl.aux slept   slept cl.aux   slept   cl.aux
        'He hasn't slept.'   'He has!'

(22) *[Če e   spal], ...*   a. *SPAL   e.*   b. **SPAL.*   c. **E.*
        that cl.aux slept   slept   cl.aux   slept   cl.aux
        'Sleep he did indeed.'

This is different in sentences with negation. It is well known that in Bulgarian, negation precedes the clitic cluster and assigns stress to the element that immediately follows it (Franks and King 2000). In a way, the first clitic following the negation turns into a non-clitic. If it is an auxiliary clitic, it can realise polarity focus and the rest of the clause can be deleted, both in denials and in PCCs:

(23) a. A: *Te   sa   spali.* B:*Ne SA   (spali)!* b. *[Da sa   spali], ne SA(spali).*
        they cl.aux slept   not cl.aux slept   to cl.aux slept not cl.aux slept
        They have slept.'   'They haven't!   'As for sleeping, they haven't slept.'

Pronominal clitics can also bear the polarity focus accent after negation, but only if ellipsis does not apply (24Ba). Some speakers accept denials like *ne GO e!*, where the clitic cluster as a whole is stranded, while the lexical verb and the rest of the VP are deleted. Finally there is a possibility to delete everything but the finite clitic auxiliary, in which case it gets stressed (24Bb).[17] Once again, the same acceptability judgements apply to predicate clefts, cf. (25).

(24) A:*Kupila go   e.*   B: a. *Ne   GO   *(e   kupila)!*   b. *Ne   E!*
        bought cl.acc cl.aux   not   cl.acc cl.aux bought   not   cl.aux
        'She has bought it.'   'She hasn't! '

(25) *[Da go   e   kupila], ...*   a. *ne   GO   *(e   kupila)*   b. *ne   E.*
        to cl.acc cl.aux bought   not cl.acc cl.aux bought   not   cl.aux
        'As for bying it, she didn't (buy it).'

It is beyond the scope of the present paper to provide a detailed analysis of VP ellipsis in Bulgarian (see e.g. Lambova 2004 on this issue). What is crucial is that the accentuation and deletion pattern in the BODY of predicate clefts is the same as in other contexts with polarity and verum focus, in particular in denials. The polarity focus exponent bears a focus accent and cannot be deleted. The rest can, in principle, modulo constraints on the deletion of clitics. As was argued in

---

[17]   Alternatively, the negation particle gets the stress, in which case the unaccented clitic auxilicary may (marginally) be deleted in denials and *da*-PCCs, but not in *če*-PCCs, probably due to the fact that a negative answer to a question like *Is it true that he hasn't read?* can be ambiguous, i.e. *No, it is not true that he hasn't read.* vs. *No, he hasn't read.*

section 3, the HEAD has the pragmatic effect of a polar question and therefore provides a suitable context for polarity focus and VP ellipsis, and the BODY contains just those elements that are not deleted by ellipsis. Since ellipsis is in general syntactically optional, both denials and predicate clefts are also acceptable without ellipsis, although the result sounds redundant and not very natural.

5 Concluding remarks

To conclude, we have described in some detail two of the three kinds of predicate clefts in Bulgarian, which are interesting from the typological point of view because their HEADS are not infinitival. We have derived the semantic and pragmatic differences between these kinds from the semantic and pragmatic properties of the complementizers *če* and *da* and the notion of contrastive topic. We have argued that *če*- and *da*-PCCs are *not* derived by movement and have provided a new kind of explanation for the doubling pattern, which is not based on movement, but on the mechanisms of polarity focus and ellipsis.

Bibliography

Abels, K. (2001). The predicate cleft construction in Russian. In Franks et al. (eds.) *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics*, 1–18, Ann Arbor.

Aboh, E. O. and Dyakonova, M. (2009). Predicate doubling and parallel chains. *Lingua*, 119(7):1035–1065.

Bondaruk, A. (2009). Constraints on predicate clefting in Polish. In Zybatow et al. (eds.) *Proceedings of FDSL 7, Leipzig 2007*, 65–78. Peter Lang.

Büring, D. (1995). *The 59th-Street Bridge Accent*. PhD thesis, University of Tübingen.

Büring, D. (2003). On D-trees, beans, and B-accents. *Linguistics and Philosophy*, 26(5):511–545.

Franks, S. and King, T. H. (2000). *A Handbook of Slavic Clitics*. Oxford University Press.

Höhle, T. (1992). Über Verum-Fokus im Deutschen. In Jacobs, J. (ed.) *Informationsstruktur und Grammatik*, 112–142. Westdeutscher Verlag.

Karttunen, L. (1971). Some observations on factivity. *Papers in Linguistics*, (4):55–69.

Kiparski, P. and Kiparski, C. (1970). Fact. In Bierwisch, M. and Heidolph, K. E. (eds.) *Progress in Linguistics. A Collection of Papers*, 143–173. The Hague, Paris.

Krapova, I. (2001). Subjunctives in Bulgarian and modern Greek. In Rivero, M. L. and Ralli, A. (eds.) *Comparative Syntax of Balkan Languages*, 105–126. Oxford.

Krapova, I. and Cinque, G. (2008). Clitic reduplication constructions in Bulgarian. In Kallulli, D. (ed.) *Clitic Doubling in the Balkan Languages*, 257–286. John Benjamins.

Lambova, M. D. (2004). *On Information Structure and Clausal Architecture: Evidence from Bulgarian*. PhD thesis, University of Connecticut.

Lefebre, C. (1992). Towards a typology of predicate cleft languages. *Journal of West African Languages*, 22(1):53–61.

Maienborn, C. (2003). *Die logische Form von Kopula-Sätzen*. Number 56 in Studia Grammatica. Berlin.

Pitsch, H. (2010). Complex verbs between syntax and morphology in Bulgarian. *Russian Linguistics*, (34):307–329.

Romero, M. and Han, C. (2004). On negative yes/no questions. *Linguistics and Philosophy*, (27):609–658.

Rooth, M. (1992). A theory of focus interpretation. *Natural Language Semantics*, 1(1):75–116.

Smirnova, A. (2011). *Evidentiality and Mood*. PhD thesis, Ohio State University.

Vicente, L. (2007). *The Syntax of Heads and Phrases*. PhD thesis, Leiden University.

Vicente, L. (2009). An alternative to remnant movement for partial predicate fronting. *Syntax*, 12(2):158–191.