BULGARIAN NEGO SI IS A BALKAN ANAPHOR

1. Introduction: Bulgarian nego si

The point of departure for this paper is the colloquial Bulgarian anaphor nego si ‘himself’ (similarly, neja si ‘herself’ and tjax si ‘themselves’), as described in a series of works by Schürcks (2003, 2006, 2008). Nego si is a non-standard form, and there is considerable disagreement among speakers about judgments and interpretation. In this paper, I rely completely on Schürcks’s examples and discussion, without entering into more general (and important) debates about felicity or regional dialects. Some simpler examples are given in (1):

(1) a. Ivan govori na nego si.

   ‘Ivan talks to himself.’

b. Marija vinagi misli za neja si.

   ‘Maria always thinks about herself.’

c. Momčetata razčitat na tjax si.

   ‘The boys rely on themselves.’

It will be noted that, superficially, these forms parallel English reflexives in their morphology: both seem to consist of a person–number–gender piece—the so-called “phi”-features – and a reflexive piece.

There are, however, some striking structural differences. First of all, the reflexive piece is nominal and shows number in English, whereas in Bulgarian it is an etymologically dative reflexive clitic. Second, the head of the phrase is the second self/selves piece in English, with the phi-feature part a possessive-like modifier, while the head in Bulgarian is the first pronominal nego/neja/tjax ‘him/her/them’ piece, with the clitic formally comparable to an adnominal dative-like possessive marker, e.g., mi in knigata mi ‘my book’ or even knigata si ‘self’s book’.
Alongside these structural differences come remarkable interpretative differences. English reflexives respect Chomsky’s classic 1981 Binding Theory (BT) – a fact which is hardly surprising, given that the BT was devised specifically to accommodate English\(^3\). S. Č. H. r. c. k. s. (2003: 77-79 and ff.) however offers some very surprising examples, of which (2) and (3) are representative:

(2) a. [Ivanovijat bašta] kritikuva nego si.
   ‘Ivan’s father criticizes him SI.’ [= Ivan or bašta]

b. [Sinűt na [Ivanovija brat]] kritikuva nego si. [= sinűt or Ivan or brat]
   ‘The son of Ivan’s brother criticizes him SI’.

c. [Da razkažes šegi za nego si] ne učudva Javor.
   ‘That you tell stories about him SI does not surprise Javor.’ [= Javor]

(3) a. Ivan kazva, če doktorût mrazi nego si.
   ‘Ivan says that the doctor hates him SI.’ [= Ivan or doktorût]

b. Marija kaza, če kralicata pokani Ivan i neja si na partito.
   ‘Marija said that the queen invited Ivan and her SI to the party.’ [= Marija or kralicata]

c. Ivan se poxvali, če statijata e napisana ot Marija i nego si.
   ‘Ivan boasted that the paper was written by Marija and him SI.’ [= Ivan]

The remarkable thing about these sentences is that neither c-command nor locality requirements seem to hold; nego si, in short, appears to be “exempt” from the traditional BT\(^4\). Schürcks proposes instead that the nego si forms impose a speaker-oriented “point of view,” an idea which I will adopt in the present paper.

In what follows, three general issues are addressed:

1. Is nego si a “Balkanism”?\(^5\) Is there anything comparable in the region?
2. Are there other typologically related properties of Bulgarian?
3. How can nego si (and its comparables) be analyzed in a way that respects the traditional BT?

I will demonstrate that non-standard Bulgarian nego si is not an isolated occurrence, and that other Balkan languages also make use of BT-exempt anaphors.

2. Exempt Anaphors in Other Balkan Languages

In this section I cite data from Turkish, Greek, and Albanian to show that these languages also have anaphors with unusual properties that are similar to those of Bulgarian nego si. It thus seems that the existence of BT-exempt anaphors may be a hitherto unrecognized Balkanism (modiolo endnote 5). I also briefly consider Macedonian, which turns out not to fit the more general Balkan pattern.
2.1. Turkish *kendisi*

A quick look at Turkish reflexives reveals them to display some curiously similar properties. Here I report the data and analysis laid out in Kornfilt (2001). Turkish has both an uninflected reflexive, *kendi* ‘self’, and an inflected form which includes person agreement, e.g., *kendisi* ‘self-3.sg’. The former behaves like a canonical reflexive. As (4) – (6) show, the latter does not:


Ali-Nom Ayşe-Gen self-3.sg-Dat be-angry-Dat was-surprised

‘Ali was surprised that Ayşe was angry at him(self)/(her)self.’ [= Ali or Ayşe or someone else]

(5) Speaker A:

Ali hakkında Ahmet ne düşün-üyor?
Ali about Ahmet what think-Progr

‘What does Ahmet think of Ali?’

Speaker B:

Ahmet kendisi-i çok beğen-iyor-muş.
Ahmet self-Acc very admire-Progr-Rep.Past

‘(They say that) Ahmet admires him (i.e., Ali) very much.’

(6) a. [Oya -nun kendisi -sin -i beğen -me -si] Ahmed-in
hoş -un -a git-ti.
liking -3.sg -Dat go-Past
‘Oya’s admiring him was to Ahmet’s liking.’ [= Ahmet]

Oya -Gen self -3.sg -Acc admire -Ger -3.sg Ahmet-by
bil -in -iyor -du.
know -Pass -Progr -Past
‘Oya’s admiring him was known to Ahmet.’ [= Ahmet]

c. Alii Ahmed -ej [Selim -in k kendisi -sin -i ijk çok
Ali Ahmet -Dat Selim -Gen self -3.sg -Acc very
admire -Ger -3.sg -Acc say -Past
‘Ali told Ahmet that Selim admires him(self) very much.’ [= Ali or Ahmet or Selim]
d. Ali Oya-ya [Ankara-ya kendi -lerin -in
Ali Oya-Dat Ankara-Dat self -3.pl -Gen
send -Pass -Fut -3.sg -Acc tell -Past

‘Ali told Oya that they would get sent to Ankara.’ [= Ali and Oya]

The example in (4) resembles those with Bulgarian nego si, in that the antecedent can be of unlimited distance from the anaphor. The exchange in (5) is even more telling, because here the antecedent is in a separate sentence. This indicates that reference for kendisi is set up in the discourse, and that the choices in (4) are not a matter of long-distance (LD) binding per se. Variation for LD reflexives, as described in the classic BT literature (cf. e.g. Wexler, Manzini: 1987), is simply a matter of manipulating binding domains, so that for example Russian sebja is bound (coreferential with a c-commanding subject) in its smallest finite clause, Icelandic sig is bound in the smallest indicative clause, and Chinese ziji is bound over unlimited distance (i.e., in the entire sentence). As pointed out by Kornfilt (2001: 204), (6) provides proof that Turkish inflected reflexives are not typical LD anaphors because they neither care about c-command (6a, b) nor subject orientation (6c). Finally Turkish (6d), with split antecedency, further proves the point that kendisi is simply not behaving like a reflexive.

Example (6c) is the crucial one in proving that kendisi cannot be analyzed as some kind of LD anaphor. The reason is because LD non-subject binding does not exist: in no language can non-subjects ever antecede reflexives, except in very local contexts. That is, even LD anaphors that have an alternate, local life – as evidenced by their ability to be bound by a local non-subject – never allow for LD binding out of a subjunctive clause by anything but a subject. Relevant Icelandic examples from Hyams, Sigurjónsdóttir (1990: 64) are given in (7); while some speakers accept binding by the local object in (7a), none ever allow the attempted LD object binding in (7b):

(7) a. Ég sendi Haraldi føt á sig.

‘I sent Harald clothes for himself.’

b. *Ég sagði Jóni að María hefði boðið sér.

‘I told Jon that Maria had-Subj invited himself.’

True LD thus implies subject-orientation. Hence, Turkish kendisi cannot be regarded as just a LD anaphor. It is, instead, in some sense exempt from the familiar Binding Theory.

The question, of course, is “If not a LD anaphor, what is it then?” Kornfilt’s solution, summarized in (8), is straightforward:

(8) Turkish inflected reflexives are phrasal. There is a pro subject in SpecAgrP, with which kendi agrees in person and number, e.g., for (4a), [proi kend-sin-ei].
This *pro* refers back to some discourse prominent antecedent, exactly as any other pronoun does, and it itself – rather than the antecedent – locally binds the reflexive.

It is easy to see how Kornfilt’s solution accommodates the Turkish facts in a simple and direct fashion – the standard BT is respected *internal to* the nominal projection containing the reflexive – although whether the account in (8) is appropriate for Bulgarian remains to be seen. Before returning to Bulgarian, however, let us first consider two other Balkan languages that also seem to have BT-exempt anaphors.

### 2.2. Greek *o idhios*.

Modern Greek exhibits some tantalizingly similar properties to Turkish. Iatridou (1986) discusses the anaphor *o idhios* “the self” in Modern Greek. She describes this anaphor as an obligatorily LD reflexive, modifying the classic BT accordingly to admit this kind of entity as a possible anaphor type. But in truth it does not behave like a LD reflexive at all. Consider the following examples from Iatridou’s paper. First of all, *o idhios* resists local binding, so that the alternative, “well-behaved” reflexive *ton eafton tou* ‘himself’ must instead be used in local contexts:

(9) O Yanis aghapa ton eafton tou/*ton idhio.

‘Yanis loves himself.’

On the other hand, *o idhios* must have a LD antecedent. The examples in (10) are unambiguous:

(10) a. O Yanis theli o Costas na voithisi *ton eafton tou*.

‘Yanis wants Costas to help himself.’ [= Costas]

b. O Yanis theli o Costas na voithisi *ton idhio*.

‘Yanis wants Costas to help himself.’ [= Yanis]

Iatridou proposes that *o idhios* is a new type of anaphor with the property “bound in the whole sentence but free in the governing category.” Note that, since there is a nominative form (the citation form *o idhios*), it can even appear as a subject:

(11) O Yanis pistevi [oti *o idhios* tha kerdhisi].

‘Yanis believes that himself will win.’

Like Turkish *kendisi*, however, *o idhios* cannot be analyzed as a true LD anaphor since, as Iatridou (1986: 769-770) shows, it accepts non-subject antecedents:

(12) a. O Yanis ipe stin Katerina [oti o Costas aghapa *tin idhia*].

‘Yanis told Katerina that Costas loves herself.’ [= Katerina]

b. O Yanis ipe ston Costa [oti i Maria aghapa *ton idhio*].

‘Yanis told Costa that Maria loves himself.’ [= Yanis or Costa]
Varlokosta, Hornstein (1993: 179) revisit Iatridou’s paper, adding examples with *ton idhio* inside adjuncts and embedded noun complement constructions:

(13) a. O Yanisi arnithike [to gegonos [oti i Maria aghapai *ton idhio]*].
   ‘Yanis denied the fact that Maria loves him.’ [= Yanis]

b. O Yanis kharike [otan i Maria filise *ton idhio*].
   ‘Yanis was pleased when Maria kissed him.’ [= Yanis]

c. O Yanis kharike [epidhi i Maria voithise *ton idhio*].
   ‘Yanis was pleased because Maria helped him.’ [= Yanis]

They go on to propose that *o idhios* is a “bound pronoun,” specifically, an element that has a logophoric function and is coreferential with an operator in SpecCP (an A-bar position). They also distinguish emphatic *o IDHIOS*, which they argue is the one in subject position (11) and is much freer in distribution. Varlokosta, Hornstein (1993) also show that *o idhios* must be locally A-bar free – it cannot appear in relative clauses or embedded questions.

Here are some additional Greek examples:

(14) a. O Yanis milise ston Costa ya *ton idhio*.
   ‘Yanis told Costa about himself.’ [= Costa, BUT NOT Yanis]

b. O pateras tu Costa aghapa *ton idhio*.
   ‘Costa’s father loves him.’ [= Costa, BUT NOT pateras]

c. O pateras tu Costa ipe oti Maria aghapa *ton idhio*.
   ‘Costa’s father said that Maria loves him.’ [= Costa OR pateras]

Note that the judgments in (14) suggest that *o idhios* must also be locally A-free, that is, it cannot be coreferential with a local c-commanding DP. In this regard it must somehow be distinguished from its Turkish neighbor.

This raises the question of how the Greek facts can be reconciled with the Turkish paradigm and, in particular, with Kornfilt’s analysis as described in (8). First, as in Turkish, we can posit a *pro* subject within the nominal projection, in SpecDP. Iatridou (1986: 770) herself suggests something very close in her analysis of (15a) as having a *pro* subject; compare (15b, c):

(15) a. *pro o idhios* pighe sto scholio.
   ‘He himself went to the school.’

b. O Yanos *o idhios* pighe sto scholio.
‘Yanos went to the school himself.’

c. Aftos o idhios pighe sto scholio.

‘He went to the school himself.’

The primary difference between o idhios and kendisi seems to be that local binding is blocked in Greek but not in Turkish. Why should this be? An answer can be easily formulated within traditional BT if we posit the right kind of nominal structure, as follows:

(16) The extra AgrP layer in the Turkish extended nominal projection is absent in Greek.

The combination of DP and AgrP thus “protects” the pro subject from local Condition B effects, rendering it free to refer back to any appropriate antecedent. Since the AgrP layer is lacking in Greek, pro, as a pronoun, must be locally free. This structural difference is sketched in (17).

(17) a. Turkish: \[ DP [AgrP pro kend-i-sin-e] \]

b. Greek: \[ DP pro ton idhio \]

This accounts for the fact that Greek ton idhio can refer to a local object antecedent, as in (14a), or to a local antecedent contained within the subject DP, as in (14b), or to a LD subject, as in (14c), but – unlike its Turkish counterpart – never to a local subject.

2.2. Albanian atë vetë

Superficial consideration of Albanian suggests some similar “exempt” properties. Albanian has a simple reflexive, either vetë/vetja or vetvete/vetvetja ‘self’, which declines like any other feminine noun and shows the same definite/indefinite morphological behavior as normal nouns (definite is used for argument positions, indefinite is triggered by accusative-taking prepositions unless there is a modifier attached to the reflexive noun). I take this to be comparable to sebe (si) in South Slavic. Interestingly, vetë can also occur with a pronoun, which strikes me as comparable to Bulgarian nego si.

In (18) we see a simple minimal pair; note that both orders him + self or self + him are used interchangeably:

(18) a. Vëllai i Jovanit kritikon vetveten.

‘Jovan’s brother criticizes self.’ [= vëllai ‘brother’]

b. Vëllai i Jovanit kritikon atë vetë/vetë atë.

‘Jovan’s brother criticizes himself.’ [= Jovani or someone else]

As with Greek o idhios, the antecedent of atë vetë in (18b) cannot be the local subject (vëllai ‘brother’). According to Mimoza Rista-Dema (p.c.), atë vetë adds emphasis or a “point of view” meaning, just as Schürcks proposes for colloquial Bulgarian nego si.
Once again, then, we see standard Condition B effects, with the pronoun \textit{atë} ‘him/her’ disjoint from any locally c-commanding expression. In (19a) \textit{atë vetë} can refer back to any antecedent except for \textit{djali} ‘son’, whereas the simple reflexive \textit{veten/vetveten} in (19b) must, as expected, be locally A-bound:

(19) a. Djali i vëllait tê Ivanit e kritikon \textit{atë vetë/vetë atë}.
   ‘The son of Ivan’s brother criticizes himself.’ [= vëllai ‘brother’ or Ivan or discourse antecedent]

b. Djali i vëllait tê Ivanit kritikon \textit{veten/vetveten}.
   ‘The son of Ivan’s brother criticizes self.’ [= djali ‘son’] And again as expected, the simple reflexive is subject-oriented, as shown in (20a).

Complex \textit{atë vetë} on the other hand is ambiguous, as shown in (20b):

(20) a. Jani i tregoi doktorit një ngjarje rreth \textit{vetes/vetvetes}.
   ‘Jani told the doctor a story about self.’ [= Jani]

b. Jani i tregoi doktorit një ngjarje rreth \textit{atij vetë}.
   ‘Jani told the doctor a story about himself.’ [= Jani OR doktori]

Finally, Rista-Dema reports (20b) as contrasting with the impossible (21):

(21) *Jani kritikon \textit{atë vetë}.
   ‘Jani criticizes himself.’ [INTENDED MEANING]

Apparently, the relevant domain for Condition B applying to the ablative pronoun \textit{atij} in (20b) is the containing DP \textit{një ngjarje rreth atij vetë} ‘a story about himself’. Because the clausal subject \textit{Jani} is outside that domain, it is a valid antecedent.

When we look at LD environments in Albanian, we find that any antecedent is potentially acceptable if made discourse appropriate. As before, the two forms are in complementary distribution:

(22) a. Jani tha se doktori e urren \textit{veten/vetveten}.
   ‘Jani says that the doctor hates himself.’ [= doktori]

b. Jani tha se doktori e urren \textit{atë vetë/vetë atë}.
   ‘Jani says that the doctor hates himself.’ [= Jani]

There is no obviation effect and, as in the other languages, LD object antecedents are equally possible for the exempt anaphor \textit{atë vetë}:

(23) Jani i tha Petros se Maria e admiron \textit{atë vetë}.
   John said to Peter that Maria admires himself. [= Jani OR Petros]

Similarly, just as for Bulgarian \textit{nego si}, c-command is not relevant, so that (24) is technically ambiguous:

(24) *Vëllai i Jovanit tha se Maria e admiron \textit{atë vetë/vetë atë}.
'Jovan’s brother said that Maria admires him self.’ [ = vëllai ‘brother’ OR Jovani]

Crucially, however, choice of antecedent depends on the discourse context. Ristadema points out that in order for atë vetë in (24) actually to refer to Jovani, he would have to be a previously mentioned discourse topic. In other words, Jovani would have to constitute an established “point of view” in order for the exempt anaphor to identify him as its antecedent. We consequently expect that, in the right context, atë vetë/vetë atë should be able to refer beyond its containing sentence. This prediction is indeed borne out. For example, if speaker A asks: “What did the teacher say about Ben?”, Speaker B could utter not just (25b) but also (25c) with the intent of referring to Ben, as discourse topic:

(25) a. Speaker A: What did the teacher say about Ben?
   b. Speaker B: Shoku i Benit tha se mësuesi e lavdëroi atë vetë/vetë atë.
      ‘Ben’s friend said that the teacher praised him.’
   c. Speaker B: Mësuesi e lavdëroi atë vetë/vetë atë.
      ‘The teacher praised him.’

In sum, Albanian atë vetë behaves similarly to Greek o idhios rather than to Turkish kendisi: the one clear restriction is that is must be locally A-free. The reason is presumably similar: Albanian atë vetë contains a pronoun, in this case atë, and, as a pronoun, atë must respect Condition B in that it cannot be bound by a locally c-commanding expression.

(26) Albanian: [DP atë vetë]

2.4. Macedonian

Macedonian is usually considered the Balkan language par excellence, so it is all the more curious that this language has no element comparable to Bulgarian nego si. It does, however, make optional use of the possessive clitic si, both with the reflexive pronoun sebe and the reflexive possessive svoj. Recall that si is obligatory with sebe in Bulgarian; there is no bare sebe. Although the fact that optional use of si is symmetrical in the Macedonian system is suggestive of more evolved grammaticalization of the point of view contrast, I know of no literature addressing the optionality of the si clitic after sebe/svoj in Macedonian.

Tomić (2012: 171) briefly mentions the reflexive pronoun sebe in her grammar of Macedonian. She states that addition of si is generally optional, as in (27), but obligatory “when functioning as an indirect object,” as in (28):

(27) a. Prvo se izmiv sebe(s), a potoa i deteto.
   ‘First I washed myself and then the child, too.’
   b. Go zede so sebe(s).
   ‘(S)he took it with herself/himself.’
(28) Si go dade sebe*(si).

‘(S)he gave it to herself/himself.’

The examples in (27) involve objective case, either after a verb or a preposition. It thus seems to me the impossibility of bare sebe in (28) is unremarkable: it can be taken to mean nothing more than that sebesi is the dative form of the pronominal reflexive.16

In any event, my suspicion is that if indeed si plays some kind of discourse role, such as marking point of view, then speakers ought to be able to sense a pragmatic contrast. While this proposal requires more careful investigation, according to Ognen Vangelov (p.c.) there is a subtle contrast. He comments that he would rather use sebesi when focused, as in (29a), although sebe on its own, as in (29b), is also perfectly grammatical:

(29) a. Sebesi Ivan se razbira.

‘Ivan understands himself.’

b. Sebe Ivan se razbira.

Apparently the addition of si has a focusing effect, which supports the fronting of the direct object sebe(si) in (29).

A final suggestive fact that this use of si is more advanced in terms of grammaticalization in Macedonian is orthographic: in this language, unlike Bulgarian, it is written together with its host, e.g., sebesi and svojasi, as if it were inflectional (or at least intrinsic to its reflexive host; cf. endnote 14). On the other hand, si as a possessive clitic is written separately from its host in Macedonian (as it is in Bulgarian).

This concludes my quick survey of exempt anaphors in select Balkan languages. The data indicate a typological pattern, the existence of which is a (so far as I know) hitherto unnoticed potential Balkanism. We now turn to the next question identified in the introduction, namely: “Are there other typologically related properties of Bulgarian?” In what follows, I will suggest an affirmative answer to this question.

3. Back to Bulgarian

In this section I return to Bulgarian in light of what has been observed for other Balkan languages. First, additional data from Bulgarian are presented. I then turn to the proposal in Schürcks (2003, 2006, 2008) that the usage of Bulgarian anaphors reflects “point of view,” adapting her account but also identifying some problems with her implementation. Finally, I suggest that Bulgarian grammaticalizes other relevant properties that, broadly understood, can be taken as typologically related aspects of some kind of formal expression of point of view.
3.1. More Bulgarian data

Recall that Bulgarian *nego si* respects neither c-command nor locality requirements. Some examples repeated throughout Schürcks’s work are provided in (30):

(30) a. [Ivanovijat bašta] kritikuva nego si.
   ‘Ivan’s father criticizes him SI.’ [= bašta or Ivan]
b. [Sinůt na [Ivanovija brat]] kritikuva nego si. [= sinůt or Ivan or brat]
   ‘The son of Ivan’s brother criticizes him SI’.
c. Ivan pročete [Petrovata statija za nego si].
   ‘Ivan read Petůr’s article about him SI.’ [= Ivan or Petůr]
d. Ivan popita bašta si za [Petrovata statija za nego si].
   ‘Ivan asked his father about [Petůr’s article about him SI].’
   [= Ivan or Petůr or bašta]
e. Ivan kazva, če doktorůt mrazi nego si.
   ‘Ivan says that the doctor hates him SI.’ [= Ivan or doktorůt]
f. Ivan popita Petůr za nego si.
   ‘Ivan asked Petůr about him SI.’ [= Ivan or Petůr]
g. Ivan razkazva na doktora [istorii za nego si].
   ‘Ivan tells the doctor stories about him SI.’ [= Ivan or doktora]

In this regard, *nego si* behaves very differently from the canonical reflexive *sebe si*, which, for all intents and purposes, functions like an ordinary LD reflexive. Schürcks (2003: 77 and ff.) offers the following examples, which contrast markedly with those in (30):

(31) a. [Ivanovijat bašta] kritikuva sebe si.
   ‘Ivan’s father criticizes self SI.’ [= bašta, NOT Ivan]
b. [Sinůt na [Ivanovija brat]] kritikuva sebe si.
   [= sinůt, NEITHER Ivan nor brat]
   ‘The son of Ivan’s brother criticizes self SI.’
c. Ivan pročete [Petrovata statija za sebe si].
   ‘Ivan read Petůr’s article about self SI.’ [= Ivan or Petůr]
d. Ivan popita bašta si za [Petrovata statija za sebe si].
   ‘Ivan asked his father about [Petůr’s article about self SI].’
   [= Ivan or Petůr, NOT bašta]
e. Ivan kazva [če doktorút mrazi sebe si].
   ‘Ivan says that the doctor hates self SI.’ [= ONLY doktorút, NOT Ivan]

f. Ivan popita Petûr za sebe si.
   ‘Ivan asked Petûr about self SI. [= ONLY Ivan, NOT Petûr]

g. Ivan razkazva na doktora [istorii za sebe si].
   ‘Ivan tells the doctor stories about self SI.’ [= ONLY Ivan, NOT doktora]

Examples (31a, b) show that sebe si obeys the standard c-command requirement; (31c, d) reveal that sebe si is LD in that it can be bound over the subject of a DP; (31e) demonstrates that sebe si cannot be bound outside of its finite clause; (31f, g) show it to be subject-oriented. These properties (modulo lack of LD-binding data out of infinitives, which Bulgarian lacks) prove ostensibly complex sebe si to pattern just like morphologically simplex anaphors such as Russian sebja17.

As a comparison of the sets of examples in (30) and (31) clearly shows, Bulgarian colloquial nego si is very different. Recall also (3b, c), repeated in (32):

(32) a. Marija kaza, če kralicata pokani Ivan i neja si na partito.
   ‘Marija said that the queen invited Ivan and her SI to the party.’
   [= Marija or kralicata]

b. Ivan se poxvali, če statijata e napisana ot Marija i nego si.
   ‘Ivan boasted that the paper was written by Marija and him SI.’ [= Ivan]

As we have already seen for other Balkan anaphors, nego si can in principle refer back to any discourse-salient masculine singular antecedent.

Finally, and again like the Turkish, Greek, and Albanian exempt anaphors, Bulgarian nego si can also pick out a discourse-determined antecedent. As always, of course, the context needs to be set up properly. Consider, for example, the exchange in (33), provided by Schürcks (p.c.):

(33) a. Kakvo kazva Vera na Petûr?
   ‘What does Vera say to Petûr?’

b. Vera kazva če strašno obožava nego si.
   ‘Vera says that she admires him SI terribly.’ [= Petûr]

In sum, nego si (and its other Balkan cousins) clearly flout standard structural requirements on reflexives, which restrict the set of antecedents to sufficiently local c-commanding expressions. These forms are thus not reflexive in the standard sense (cf. Reuland, Reinhart 1993) of marking a predicate as reflexive. They are not comparable to English complex reflexives of the himself type, but rather behave as if completely exempt from the standard Binding Theory.
3.2. On Schürcks’s analysis

Schürcks argues that Bulgarian anaphors are organized along “point of view” (henceforth, PoV) lines, in the sense of Kuno (1987) and, for Slavic, Yokoyama (1986). Specifically, she claims that what makes nego si special is that it forces an interpretation taken from the speaker’s PoV. In her system, both nego si and sebe si have “marked PoV,” but the former is [–subject, +speaker] whereas the latter is [+subject, –speaker]. More generally, Schürcks posits the following binary oppositions: [±R(eferential)], [±refl(exive)], [±phi], [±subject], and [±speaker]. While descriptively on the right track, I will argue in this section that this account suffers from several conceptual problems. Fortunately, these problems are easily remedied and do not detract from her fundamental insight.

Most obvious is the question of why one needs to posit a pair of binary features ([±subject] and [±speaker]) in order to obtain just two classes of items (sebe si and nego si), rather than the conceivable four. Moreover, [+speaker] and [+subject] would seem in principle to be mutually exclusive (except presumably in the first person singular, where the speaker is the subject). It is also far from clear that [±subject] and [±speaker] are really the best choices. Each issue raises its own set of questions about the analysis, which I consider in turn.

First of all, while subject-orientation is certainly a salient property of anaphors, as a feature [±subject] is not needed. The reason is that this behavior is very likely derivable from the anaphor’s morphological properties, so that it does not need to be stipulated with a lexical feature. The correlation between morphological simplicity and subject-orientation, as noted in endnote 17, is a robust one, and several credible formal implementations have been developed over the years. Morphological simplicity is generally taken to mean head (versus phrasal) status. So the anaphor has a morphological structure, morphology is a property worn on its sleeve (in Logical Form, following endnote 17), and this determines whether or not the anaphor is subject-oriented. There is no need for any independent [±subject] feature.

The flip side of morphological simplicity is that a complex or phrasal anaphor needs to be able to express phi-features in addition to those pertaining to its status as an anaphor per se. Phi-features too thus reduce to morphology, and this morphological factor correlates with subject-orientation. In particular, the lack of phi-features causes anaphors to be subject-oriented (or their presence prevents them from being so), as stated by the biconditionals in (34):

\[(34) \begin{align*}
(34)_a & \quad [+\text{phi}] \leftrightarrow [–\text{subject}] \\
(34)_b & \quad [–\text{phi}] \leftrightarrow [+\text{subject}]
\end{align*}\]

This correlation is then another reason to be suspicious of the need to adopt a privative [±subject] feature: it is predictable from another of Schürcks’s features, namely, [±phi]. Moreover, there is no conceptual need to posit a literal feature [±phi], since the fact that a vocabulary item embodies phi-features should be evident from its morphology. That is, if for example the him part of English himself consists of the phi-features [–1st, –2nd, –fem, –pl], then we already know that it expresses phi-
features and we certainly do not also need to say that it has in addition the property of being [+phi]. Schürcks’s typology thus has considerable redundancy that can be cleaned up.

In sum, Schürcks would be better off in her model simply discarding the [±subject] feature. It is unnecessary because, as just noted, simple anaphors are subject-oriented, obviating in general any need for independent indication of [±subject]. Hence the subject-orientation behavior of Bulgarian sebe si seen in (31) is as expected, since this anaphor lacks phi-features (and is simplex at LF). Rejection of [±subject] more generally strikes me as good move, because I cannot see that subject has anything really to do with PoV anyway. What is really relevant to setting up a discourse PoV, which following Schürcks’s insight is what makes nego si seek an antecedent the way that it does, is a matter of establishing a topic from those “file cards” of old, shared information available to the interlocutors. “Subject” is special only accidentally, not intrinsically, to the extent that the subject is frequently also the topic of the sentence.

Turning now to Schürcks’s feature [±speaker], it seems to me that that this, too, is not really the right way to capture the idea that PoV is relevant to the interpretation of nego si. Who the speaker is has nothing to do with who the topic of the discourse is. So, as a binding feature, [±speaker] too should be rejected. In fact, nego si never refers back to the actual speaker, as even a cursory examination of the data in (30) will reveal. Rather it clearly refers to some discourse-salient topic. And we have seen that it is not some special feature of the anaphor that makes it discourse bound, but rather its internal structure that contains a pronominal element. PoV thus needs to be incorporated into the sentence structure in some other way.

Having said this, one still wonders why Bulgarian should require the si marking, rather than getting by with bare sebe as other Slavic languages do. That is, what strikes me as usual about the Bulgarian reflexive system is the addition of si in general, as it appears with both BT-exempt nego si, which the data show to be essentially pronominal, and also with well-behaved sebe si, which is a true reflexive. Perhaps, then, the “anaphor extending” possessive clitic si is imparting some meaning as well. When added to a pronoun, as in nego si, something about si indeed enforces the imposition of the speaker’s perspective, in that the antecedent is the topic of the sentence. This suggests to me that perhaps addition of si to the reflexive sebe has a similar effect, it is just that sebe constrains the antecedent to be a c-commanding and sufficiently local phrase.

3.3. Why Bulgarian does this

If the above speculation is on the right track, then the obligatory addition of si to sebe in Bulgarian might somehow reflect more general properties of the language. Specifically, I contend that marking PoV on anaphora, including both the reflexive sebe and, colloquially, the pronoun nego, is connected to other typological hallmarks. These all indicate that Bulgarian is a topic-prominent language. In a variety of ways, Bulgarian formally encodes discourse information in its grammar. These include such phenomena as grammaticalization of a “reported/renarrated”
versus “witnessed” distinction as in (35a), the prominence of preverbal topics as (35b), and clitic doubling, with its implication not only of overt topics (35c), but also wholesale silent ones (35d):

(35) a. Ivan (e) nameril knigata.

‘(I attest that) Ivan found the book.’

b. Ivan nameri li knigata?21

‘As for Ivan, did he find the book?’

c. Knigata ja nameri Ivan.

‘As for the book, Ivan found it.’

d. pro Nameri ja Ivan.

‘It was found by Ivan.’

Inclusion of the auxiliary e in (35a) implies that the speaker can attest to the veracity of the statement. This information constitutes a kind of illocutionary force, which could be treated as a high functional category in the actual structure of the sentence, above the usual CP (which houses for example interrogative information). Similarly, since the Yes/No marker li in (35b) is in the head of CP and follows its host nameri ‘found’, we know that Ivan in this sentence must be higher, outside CP; see Franks (2006) for discussion and analysis of li constructions. Clitics require topics, which the clitic doubles – clearly so when the topic is overt, as in (35c), but presumably also when the topic is silent, as in (35d). These associated topics are similarly situated outside the core structure of the sentence.

My proposal is thus that the Bulgarian sentence is embedded in what may be called a “PoVP,” in the spirit of the ΔP proposed by Lambova (2004). She follows Uriagereka (1995), who “suggested that all information-theoretic matters are mediated by the point of view of the speaker which is syntactically encoded in a single (universal) functional projection.” This can be represented roughly as follows:

(36)  \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{PoVP} \\
[CP] \\
[TP] \\
\end{array}]
\]

It is the content of PoVP which encodes the kinds of discourse information needed not only to enable the kinds of construction in (35), but which also provides a syntactic location (in its specifier position SpecPoVP) for the antecedent of the exempt anaphors described in this paper. In sum, the idea of a high syntactic position for a discourse prominent element may provide a path to formalizing anaphoric PoV and unification of these seemingly disparate typological phenomena. Some possible specifics are considered in the final section.

4. Back to the Balkans

In light of the postulation of a high PoV phrase, this section asks how we can understand the non-canonical properties of the colloquial Bulgarian anaphor nego si ‘himself’, and related items in the other Balkan languages, in traditional binding
theoretic and larger typological terms. Our goal is an analysis which does not postulate any special features to render these elements “exempt” from the traditional BT, but rather derives their unusual behavior from their internal nominal structure, embedded in a larger clausal structure which incorporates expression of PoV. We have already discovered that Turkish, Greek, and Albanian exempt anaphors have a complex internal structure with, in particular, a pronominal element that interacts with Condition B rather than Condition A, hence are not expected to behave as normal reflexive items. To complete the picture, we need only to posit the existence of a PoV antecedent to which that pronominal element can refer. Typically, then, we expect these other Balkan languages to be discourse-oriented in ways comparable to Bulgarian.

4.1. Turkish

I turn first to Turkish. This is similarly a heavily discourse-oriented language. It has the renarrated versus witnessed distinction and uses word order to reflect functional sentence perspective, as expected for a language which grammaticalizes information structure enough to formally represent a PoV element in its syntactic structure.

Recall the dialog in (5), repeated as (37):

(37) Speaker A: Ali hakkında Ahmet ne düşün-üyor?
   Ali about Ahmet what think-Progr
   ‘What does Ahmet think of Ali?’

Speaker B: Ahmet kendisin-i çok beğen-iyor-muş.
   Ahmet self-Acc very admire-Progr-Rep.Past
   ‘(They say that) Ahmet admires him (i.e., Ali) very much.’

Here we see fronting of the topic Ali hakkında ‘about Ali’, which enables the inflected reflexive kendisini to refer back to Ali as topic. Formally, this is done through a topical pro element in SpecPoVP in the reply in B. Since we adopted Kornfilt’s structure for the inflected reflexive, this means there is a silent pronominal subject of kendisini. I placed this in SpecAgrP and indicated it as pro_y, Pro_y binds the reflexive kendi and is itself understood as referring back to the PoV element at the top of the sentence. This PoV element, indicated as pro_x, is in turn identified through the discourse as Ali. The overall structure of (37B) is sketched out in (38):

(38) [poVP pro_x=Ali [CP [TP Ahmet [VP [DP [AgrP pro_y=pro_x kendi-sin-i]] çok beğen-iyor-muş]]]]

Crucially, the BT is respected: pro_y as a pronominal, is appropriately free in its governing category, since its antecedent, the PoV topic pro_x, is not sufficiently local to cause a Condition B violation.

There is surely much more structure to be fleshed out, especially in light of endnote 5. Moreover, because the case ending -i is in K⁰ and the possessive suffix -si-
is in Agr\textsuperscript{0} (or, possibly, Poss\textsuperscript{0} if more detail were provided), some kind of movement (perhaps “rolling-up” in the spirit of Cinque 2005) will need to be invoked. Be that as it may, the point is that the pronominal element \textit{pro}_{y}, which controls the agreement and binds the reflexive in accordance with Condition A, is sufficiently structurally embedded to be itself protected from Condition B effects. This frees it up to refer back to the topic available in SpecPoV. The result is that inflected \textit{kendi} appears to be behaving like an anaphor completely exempt from Condition A.

4.2. Greek

On the other hand, Greek, while still a discourse-oriented language, lacks the kind of witnessed/renarrated contrast grammaticalized in Macedonian, Bulgarian, Turkish, and Albanian\textsuperscript{22}. Classical Greek, however, may have had this. If so, as in the other languages\textsuperscript{23}, this contrast involved the synthetic perfect; see Sicking, Stork (1996) for details. Modern Greek, with its flexible word order, still employs many of the tropes of a language with a formal topic-comment structure, including clitic doubling to mark topics, and it can place topics in a position before fronted \textit{wh}-phrases, as in (39), from Baltazani (2003: 17):

(39)  \textit{Kai ta maroulia poios ta efage?}

and the lettuces-acc who them ate-3s

‘And who ate the lettuce?’

We saw, however, that although \textit{o idhios} is LD BT-exempt, it shows local Condition B effects. A typical example is repeated in (40):

(40)  \textit{O Yanis ipe ston Costa [oti o Vasilis aghapa \textbf{ton idhio}].}

‘Yanis told Costa that Vasilis loves himself.’

[= Yanis OR Costa, BUT NOT Vasilis]

To handle this I suggested that Greek has a similar structure to Turkish, except that the nominal phrase lacks the AgrP layer, as in (41). This means \textit{pro} can refer back to any PoV topic except if that coreference would cause a Condition B violation.

(41)  \[ DP pro ton idhio \]

In (40), since \textit{pro} in DP is locally c-commanded by \textit{o Vasilis}, it must be disjoint from this potential local antecedent. Once again, the intuitive idea is that there is a functional projection at the top of the clause which houses a silent topical element—the PoV imposed by the speaker. Embedding (41) into the same functional structure, we could represent the relevant portion of (40) as in (42).

(42)  \[ \text{PoVP} pro_{x} = \text{Yanis OR Costa} \ [CP oti [TP [o Vasilis] [VP aghapa [DP pro_{y} = pro_{x}]

\text{ton idhio]]]]]]

\textit{Ton idhio} thus refers, through \textit{pro}_{y} to the PoV topic \textit{pro}_{x}, the only restriction being that it must be free from locally-commanding \textit{o Vasilis}.
One might at this point question the need for a silent pro in DP, since ton
‘him’ can, as a pronoun, provide the exact same result. That is, for Greek it might be
simpler to replace (41) with the smaller structure in (43):

(43) \[ DP \text{ ton idhio} \]

While, following Kornfilt (2001), Turkish needs the pro to control agreement
within the DP, for Greek ton alone might be adequate. Since it is in the highest
specifier of the Greek structure, ton is still distinguished from the pro of Turkish,
hence is not protected from local Condition B effects.24

4.3. Albanian

Whatever is concluded about Greek, it seems to me that Albanian atë vetë
should be analyzed in exactly the same way since it appears to behave identically to
its Greek counterpart. Recall, for example, (19a), repeated as (44):

(44) Djali i vëllait të Ivanit e kritikon atë vetë/vetë atë.

‘The son of Ivan’s brother criticizes himself.’

[= vëllai ‘brother’ or Ivan or discourse antecedent]

Here, atë vetë/vetë atë consists of two pieces, a pronoun and a reflexive. The
pronominal piece atë must be locally free, hence it can be vëllai ‘brother’, Ivan,
or some discourse antecedent, but never djali ‘son’. This range of interpretations
follows straightforwardly, again assuming a PoV type position:

(45) \[ \text{PoVP } pro [CP \ldots [TP \ldots [DP \text{ atë vetë/vetë atë}]]] \]

Although it remains to spell out the details, Albanian of course displays all the
discourse-oriented properties that, I have suggested, optimally cooccur with the
exempt anaphor phenomenon: it marks evidentiality, doubles clitics, and has word
order structured in terms of topic-comment.

5. Some final speculations

Returning to Bulgarian nego si in light of this comparison with other Balkan
languages, we are left with the question of why there are no local Condition B effects
in that language. Superficially, the nego si type of anaphor in Bulgarian appears to
resemble its morphological brothers in Greek and Albanian. Yet the data indicate
that it behaves much more like its Turkish cousin. In particular, Schürcks’s examples
consistently allow local c-commanding antecedents. Recall (3a), from Schürcks
(2006: 390), repeated as (46):

(46) Ivan kazva, če doktorût mrazi nego si.

‘Ivan says that the doctor hates him SI.’ [= Ivan or doktorût]

Here we see that nego si seems to be protected from Condition B effects,
just like its Turkish counterpart and in striking contrast to the otherwise comparable
exempt anaphors of Greek and Albanian.

For Turkish, the absence of local Condition B effects was due to an extra
AgrP projection. This projection renders the domain containing the DP-internal pro
opaque so that Condition B is trivially satisfied. Any solution to Bulgarian *nego si* should presumably be comparable. That is, just as the additional AgrP projection protects the silent *pro* from Condition B effects in Turkish, overt *nego* in Bulgarian must also be protected by an extra projection. I therefore postulate (47):

(47) The extended nominal projection in Bulgarian contains more than just DP. In Greek and Albanian, on the other hand, the absence of this extra projection gives rise to Condition B effects for overt *ton* and *atē*.

What then might be comparable in Bulgarian to the additional nominal structure posited for Turkish? Whereas for Turkish there is strong morphological evidence that DP dominates an AgrP, Bulgarian nominal projections seem very different and, in particular, there may well be no reason to posit an agreement projection within DP for Bulgarian. If so, the explanation lies elsewhere.

Here I suggest that what is special about Bulgarian nominal structure is that this language countenances two kinds of larger functional projections above NP. Bulgarian is, first of all, a DP-language in that it expresses postpositive articles, as described for example in Franks (2001) and many other places. These are inflectional and appear once per DP, on the highest head, as in (48):

(48) a. kniga-*ta* ‘the book’
   b. interesna-*ta* kniga ‘the interesting book’
   c. [dosta glupava]-*ta* zabeležka ‘the quite stupid remark’
   d. [polučena-*ta* sūs mūka] stipendija ‘the received with pain scholarship’

In addition, however, Bulgarian has a KP projection, as I have argued in e.g. Franks, Rudin (2005) or Franks (2013a). K₀ is the locus of pronominal clitics, just as D₀ is for Romance languages where the pronominal clitics are determiner-like elements. In the kind of structure posited in Franks, Rudin (2005), KP is the projection which contains case information and DP is the projection which contains specificity information. In Bulgarian, then, these are split into two distinct projections, with KP dominating DP (which in turn dominates NP). A primary hallmark of this split structure is the appearance of clitics which can double both full phrases and tonic pronouns. This allows both the clitics and their associates to be expressed independently, as in (35c), repeated below:

(49) Knigata *ja* nameri Ivan.
   ‘As for the book, Ivan found it.’

In Franks, Rudin (2005), we proposed that clitic-doubling requires a KP – over – DP structure, with doubling a consequence of the DP associate vacating its containing KP, which then becomes non-branching.

More recently, in Franks (2013a), I revise this account to accommodate the problem raised by antilocality, a condition that would essentially prohibit the movement of the DP complement of K through SpecKP. Instead, although it is still the additional structure that allows for clitic doubling, it is the NP that vacates
and the extra layer enables the NP complement of D to escape without violating antilocality. In that paper, I also articulate the structure a bit more, so as to allow for Topics within the extended nominal projection. This is represented in (50)28:

(50) Top^{(max)} [Bulgarian]

Unfortunately, this introduces a new problem: the exact same case might be made for the extended nominal projection in Albanian. If so, however, we would lose the contrast in Condition B effects between Bulgarian and Albanian for the exempt anaphor, since, as observed above, the pronominal portion of Albanian atë vetë must be locally A-free29. In order to reconcile these facts, it is perhaps worth noting that clitic doubling in Albanian (and Greek) is grammaticalized much more than in Bulgarian. As described by Kallulli (2000), these languages behave virtually the same as Macedonian does with respect to clitic doubling, hence very differently from Bulgarian. In Franks (2009), I compare pronominal clitics in Macedonian with their Bulgarian counterparts, identify a host of differences, and argue that object clitics in Macedonian have actually become agreement markers. While this is not what Kallulli concludes, if correct, it means a structure that splits KP and DP may not be necessitated for Albanian and, consequently, the pronominal piece of the Balkan BT-exempt anaphors in Albanian (and Greek) will display local Condition B effects.

In this paper I have explored the possibility of a previously unidentified Balkanism, the existence of a BT-exempt reflexive anaphor. In all the languages which have such an element the account involves postulation of a pronominal within DP, and it is this pronominal which, trivially, binds the reflexive portion. Moreover, the pronominal itself receives its reference from a high, topical element which can in these languages express PoV in keeping with the information structure of the discourse. The specifics for each language however differ, since the extended nominal projections are not identical in the various languages, hence the position of the pronominal seems to vary. There is obviously much work to be done in fleshing out the proposals sketched above. It is my hope, however, that by identifying the phenomenon of an anaphor which appears to defy the predictions of the standard Binding Theory, this paper has made a contribution to our understanding of the
workings of Balkan languages and will stimulate further research into the poorly understood topic of BT-exempt anaphors.

NOTES

1 I thank Lilia (Grozeva) Schürcks for sharing her materials and providing me with additional native speaker judgments and intuitions. An earlier version of this paper was presented in August 2012 at the University of Kansas at the seventh annual meeting of the Slavic Linguistics Society. Thanks are owed to that audience, and especially to Brian Joseph, for helpful comments. I also appreciate the feedback collected by Don Dyer. Other individuals who have provided helpful data and/or discussion include Öner Özçelik (Turkish), Mimoza Rista-Dema (Albanian), Lilia Schürcks (Bulgarian), Vassiliki Tsitsopoulou (Greek), and Ognen Vangelov (Macedonian).

2 Schürcks also lists: *mene si ‘me SI’, tebe si ‘you(sg) SI’, nas si ‘us SI’, vas si ‘you(pl) SI’. Possessives in Bulgarian raise similar issues, but I exclude them from this paper to facilitate the presentation. As described by Schürcks, *nego si ‘his SI’, etc., behave exactly the same as *nego si ‘him SI’, etc.

3 Relevant to the discussion in this paper are Conditions A and B of Chomsky’s classic Binding Theory. Condition A requires anaphors to be coreferential with a sufficiently local (within the same “governing category”) antecedent. Condition B precludes pronouns from entering into such a local coreference relationship.

4 I borrow this term from Pollard, Sag (1992), although I intend it in a completely descriptive sense.

5 An anonymous reviewer objects that just identifying similarities among the Balkan languages does not in and of itself constitute discovery of a “Balkanism.” The reviewer rightly points out that “even the traditional view of a Balkanism recognizes the role of language contact, and that has always been front and center in any discussion of the Balkans.” Since it makes no attempt to take into the account the role of language contact and thus makes no claims about the formation of the Sprachbund, the present paper should be viewed rather as a typological study in the comparative syntax of the Balkan languages.

6 Thanks also to Öner Özçelik (p.c.) for general helpful discussion of the Turkish examples. Özçelik points out that the choice of -n- to precede a case suffix in, e.g., *kendi-si-n-e reflects the fact that si is possessive agreement, since otherwise the general epenthetic –y- would have been inserted. It is however surprising that even when the stem *kendi is directly followed by a case suffix, –n- must still be inserted, e.g., *kendi-n-e, *kendi-n-de, etc. This suggests that the last vowel in *kendi might itself be yet another possessive agreement, and thus, that the stem is, in fact, *kend-, and not *kendi-, as usually assumed. (All this is possible because third person possessive agreement in Turkish is –i when it follows consonant-final nouns and –si when it follows vowel-final nouns.) For our purposes, this means that the Turkish nominal phrase might have an even more complex structure than what is proposed in (17a) below.
A likely account treats sig (dative sér) as a head which, for some Icelandic speakers, can receive an alternative phrasal analysis (cf. e.g. Progovac: 1992).

To my knowledge, this correlation was first noted in Yang (1983). My point here is merely that the correlation exists and that exempt anaphors flout it; consideration of reasons why LD might force subject-orientation goes beyond the scope of this paper. See however the discussion in Pica (1987), Wexler, Manzini (1987), Cole, Hermon, Sung (1990), or Progovac (1992), among others.

Note that the embedded syntax in Greek (10) is finite, comparable to Bulgarian da pomogne, so this is clearly a local/LD contrast.

Thanks to Frank Hess and Vassiliki Tsitsopoulou (p.c.) for help with these Greek data.

Note that these are instances of Varlokosta and Hornstein’s emphatic O IDHIOS. Öner Özelçil (p.c.) informs me that Turkish also has this use of kendisi/kendi, the latter being emphatic:

(i) O kendi geldi. ‘He came by himself.’ or ‘He himself came.’
(ii) O kendisi geldi. ‘He came by himself.’ or ‘He himself came.’
(iii) Kendi geldi. ONLY ‘He came by himself.’

The Albanian data were provided by Mimoza Rista-Dema (p.c.); thanks also to Eric Prendergast (p.c.) for discussion. Hubbard (1983, 1985) showed that Albanian vete- ‘self’ can be bound by lower antecedents. Such facts have also been examined by Williams (1988), Massey (1991), and Postal, Ross (2009). They all characterize “inverse” reflexives as actually c-commanded (or lower on a relational hierarchy) in some relevant derivational (or representational) sense. As far as I can tell, however, no one treats the emphatic “exempt” forms that are the topic of the present paper.

One should of course wonder how Albanian atë vete (and Bulgarian nego si) differ then from English himself, which exhibits no such exempt behavior. Clearly, the pronominal portion of English himself is irrelevant to the BT, merely providing phi-features to the reflexive portion, whereas in the other languages the pronoun is fundamental to interpretation. In English, the pronominal piece restricts the reflexive (hence it has semi-possessive status, as seen in all other standard forms, e.g. myself, yourself, etc.), whereas in the other languages the reflexive piece restricts the pronoun, producing the appearance of a reflexive which flouts the BT.

One possibility is that the availability of the nego si structure is parasitic on the generalization of the dative clitic in DPs, since these are highly restricted in Macedonian (essentially limited to family relations), whereas in Bulgarian such clitics not only can be used for possession but can even serve as arguments within nominalizations. (See Franks (2001) for discussion of the DP-internal clitic in Bulgarian.) Possessive si would have to be treated as a pure instantiation of reflexive features which, in sebe(si), are fissioned off from sebe in the morphology; cf also endnote 17. This option is clearly unavailable for nego, which lacks reflexive features. In Macedonian this renders hypothetical nego si underivable, but in Bulgarian si can be introduced after nego the same way that it can after any noun.
Although I do not examine possessive reflexives here, it is worth noting that the Bulgarian possessive svoj only optionally occurs with clitic si (which is obligatory with sebe). In this respect, Bulgarian svoj resembles both sebe and svoj reflexives in Macedonian.

Possibly relevant to the direct versus indirect object contrast in (27) versus (28) is the fact that clitic doubling is obligatory in Macedonian with all indirect objects, whereas for direct objects doubling is sensitive to specificity.

As discussed in Franks (2013b), Logical Form (LF) rather than Phonetic Form (PF) morphological structure is relevant for binding. The argument developed there is that, since binding is an interpretative matter, the oft-remarked observation that LD binding and subject-orientation correlate with morphological simplicity (see endnote 6) cannot be expressed in terms of overt morphology. Rather, the restriction that phrasal anaphors are local – which also enables them to be bound by non-subjects – must derive from their complex LF structure. The claim is then made that, in LF, Bulgarian sebe si is a simple anaphor (like Russian sebja), despite its PF bipartite form. Note that, as suggested in endnote 14, non-standard nerno si cannot be derived in this manner, hence necessarily behaves as a complex anaphor. The flip side of sebe si is that when overtly monomorphemic anaphors occur with reciprocal semantics, as is possible for Polish siebie or Czech sebe, they are actually phrasal in LF, again despite their simplex PF form. It is thus the LF structure of anaphors that determines their interpretative properties.

For Schürcks, nerno has an unmarked point of view.

There is of course a good reason for this, in that subjects, as canonical specifiers, tend to be pre-verbal hence old information, and thus constitute likely topics.

One could of course understand this topic as the speaker’s PoV, but only in the sense that the topic is a matter of the speaker’s perspective and assumptions about shared information in the discourse. Perhaps this is what Schürcks had in mind in naming her PoV feature [+speaker]. In any event, the terminology is obscure and misleading at best.

If Ivan were in SpecCP, the output would be Ivan li namerì knigata? ‘Was it Ivan who found the book?’.

In the modern language, the only piece of evidentiality that I have found is the discourse particle lei.

Indeed, Proto-Indo-European may even have been similar, if Joseph (2003) is correct.

Possibly the fact that masculine ton marks gender is sufficient here.

Not that AgrP has never been claimed in the literature. Dimitrova-Vulchanova, Giusti (1998) for example assume an AgrP in their representation of Bulgarian, although for completely different reasons than to accommodate the referential behavior of the colloquial exempt anaphor. They also argue for a TopP, just as in my (50), similarly to accommodate doubling of DP-internal topicalized constituents.
On the other hand, the contrast between Macedonian and Bulgarian with respect to the viability of nego si, as discussed in endnote 14, may reduce to the absence of Agr (as a source of si) in the former language versus its availability in the latter.

The idea behind antilocality is that, since a complement YP to a head X is already as close as it can be to X, YP cannot move to SpecXP, since that would put YP in exactly the same (most local) relationship with X as it was in before the movement.

The TopP is not crucial for the discussion at hand.

Alternatively, pursuing the suggestion in endnote 26 that what is relevant in Bulgarian – but not Macedonian – actually is an AgrP within DP, the fact that Schürcks’s judgments for Bulgarian nego si parallel Turkish kendisi is expected.
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