

Introduction

We know Catherine Rudin as a linguist who specializes in the syntax of Bulgarian, both in the context of grammatical theory and in comparison with other languages of the Balkan region, especially Macedonian. But she is a person of many lives, with diverse interests and seemingly boundless energy. Catherine rarely misses “our” conferences—such as the Slavic Linguistics Society (SLS), Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics (FASL), the American Association of Teachers of Slavic and East European Languages (AATSEEL), or the Biennial Conference on Balkan and South Slavic Linguistics, Literature and Folklore—but she also takes part in meetings of many other kinds. These include not just familiar national linguistic gatherings such as the Linguistic Society of America, and sundry meetings of specialists in Native American languages (where she has an entire other life!), but also gatherings of dancers, singers, and folklore enthusiasts of various ilks. (“Dance and music” constitutes an impressive category on her CV.)

To us, her friends and colleagues, Catherine has been a constant presence in the field, writing and presenting, organizing meetings, and working tirelessly to advance the Slavic Linguistics Society: as Treasurer, Chair of the Board, and long-time Associate Editor for the *Journal of Slavic Linguistics (JSL)*. Thankfully, even after official “retirement,” she shows every sign of remaining so. She continues to be a popular invited speaker and her recent CV lists no fewer than six publications in press, in preparation, or to appear. And of course she continues to serve SLS and *JSL*. It is thus with great pleasure, pride, and esteem that we present this volume to Catherine in honor of her intellectual work, her professional engagement, and her unstinting friendship. We hope that this homage will inspire and delight.

Although we aimed to limit their content to Bulgarian morphosyntax, the papers included in these pages ended up reflecting the diversity of Catherine’s interests and, more importantly, the diversity of her friendships, even within our small field. What follows are short summaries of each of these contributions.

Olga Arnaudova’s paper gives an overview of clitic doubling in Bulgarian and argues that this phenomenon corresponds to two types of constructions in view of properties like degree of obligatoriness, distinctive features, and distribution. The author proposes assimilating each of them to a different applicative structure: a low applicative with an Experiencer argument projected in a clause-internal position and a high applicative base-generated above the

clause. Clitic Left Dislocation and Clitic Doubling structures are compared to structures involving focus-topic chains, where typically no doubling occurs.

Loren Billings explores the topic of multiple *wh*-questions and in particular sheds light on the ordering of *wh*-phrases in ternary *wh*-questions. He concludes that the ordering we find results not from inherent argument ordering preferences or arboreal asymmetry but rather from restrictions based on animacy and consecutive homophony.

The paper by **Željko Bošković** differs somewhat in orientation from the other contributions, in that rather than concentrating on Bulgarian (or even South Slavic), it uses well-motivated analyses of other, superficially very different languages as a foil to show that an otherwise credible account of article placement in Bulgarian would not in fact be typologically consistent. As such, the paper serves a useful methodological point, one that Catherine's more recent work also reflects: syntax is moving away from simple investigations of individual languages to comparisons of unrelated languages (as has indeed long been the norm for typology). This paper reveals how one can tease apart different analyses of Bulgarian by looking at Bantu, thereby illustrating a very promising (if surprising) research strategy.

In his paper **Wayles Browne** carefully examines Bulgarian personal and *wh*-pronouns. He shows that Bulgarian pronouns are not sensitive to certain contrasts, and therefore, obscure distinctions that would be clear in other related languages. For example, in Bosnian, Croatian, or Serbian, he observes, a personal pronoun can have a DP antecedent but not a clausal CP antecedent, whereas in Bulgarian, a pronoun can take either a DP or a CP as its antecedent. The paper considers five different ways in which Bulgarian pronouns can be ambiguous.

Vrinda Chidambaram addresses in her paper an intriguing topic that not only adds to our descriptive knowledge of Bulgarian and Macedonian but also has consequences of a theoretical nature. She deals with clitic doubling, focusing her attention on "what happens when the clitic-double corresponds to an object consisting of conjoined DPs differing in definiteness". The two languages differ in their treatment of such sentences, making for an important descriptive contribution within her comparative syntax approach. Moreover, this allows for a contribution to the theory of First Conjunct Agreement, insofar as that is the basis for the divergence between the two languages.

Building on Rudin's work and adopting her conclusion that multiple *wh*-relatives in Bulgarian are different from correlatives, **Elena Dimova** and **Christine Tellier** argue that the first *wh*-phrase in multiple *wh*-relatives is not in Spec, CP. The authors argue that it occupies a Topic projection, given that it has the properties of a topicalized constituent, while the second *wh*-phrase is a free relative selected by both the main and the embedded verb. The proposed analysis offers a derivation of multiple relatives in terms of labeling, which

also explains the transparency of Topics for the purpose of selection in such contexts.

The paper by **Steven Franks** addresses the question of whether Bulgarian instantiates a QP category analogous to that of other Slavic languages in spite of its morphological impoverishment. To establish the depth of nominal structure, the author discusses the so-called *brojna forma* as a possible (surface) instantiation of Q, and on this bases his conclusion that this may indeed be the case for combinations of the *brojna forma* with numerals, classifiers, and quantifiers. In order to show that projecting a QP counts for the purposes of binding and c-command, the author examines Condition B and Condition C effects in nominal phrases. While the absence of the former is expected by the DP-analysis of Bulgarian, new data reported in the paper give a clue that it is precisely Q that is responsible for suppressing expected Condition C effects.

Victor Friedman engages in a comparative study of the functioning of the pluperfect tense in Bulgarian and in Macedonian. Working with translations of Aleko Konstantinov's 1895 novel *Bai Ganyo* (an appropriate corpus because Catherine Rudin worked with Friedman on an annotated English translation) and a present-day Macedonian corpus of wiretapped material, the *Bombi*, Friedman argues that the pluperfect is becoming obsolete in Macedonian while it remains alive and functional in Bulgarian. This then represents another way in which the two languages are diverging.

Iliyana Krapova and **Guglielmo Cinque** examine two puzzles in Bulgarian syntax and argue that these can be understood in terms of how DP-internal arguments receive abstract Case. The first concerns the differential ability of lexical and pronominal arguments (in event/process nominal DPs) to act as DP-internal subjects; the second concerns clitic doubling in ordinary object nominals. Their case-conflict account supports the universalist idea that all languages have the same abstract Cases but differ in terms of the morphological cases which ultimately spell them out.

John Leafgren tackles a long-standing issue in Bulgarian morphosyntax, namely, the ways in which the distinction between long and short forms of the definite articles is manifested in masculine singular nouns. He approaches the topic through a corpus-based study of contemporary formal and informal oral and written texts. He finds that a variety of factors, ranging from phonological to syntactic to discourse-controlled, plays a role in the distribution of these variants

Petya Osenova considers the concept of syntactic head from various perspectives. She describes how different theoretical models approach the concept of head, asking, in particular, how heads relate to the phrases that contain them and how they relate to external phrases (in generative terms, complement and specifier phrases).

Roumyana Pancheva's contribution explores reasons behind the choice between count (*brojna forma*) and regular plural marking in Bulgarian, in par-

ticular from the perspective of why the former fails to be used with the “cardinality” exclamative *wh*-expressions *kolkova*, *tolkova*, even though these same lexical items take count forms otherwise. She also treats differences between normative and colloquial variants. The account relies on the unusual assumption that count NPs are semantically singular, as well as on the proposal that the resistance of exclamatives to count-marked NPs follows from the idea that these are formed using a cardinality measure based on estimation (rather than counting *per se*).

Teodora Radeva-Bork’s paper is a study of children’s acquisition of clitics. She looks specifically at the acquisition of direct object clitics and clitic doubling. She outlines three experimental studies and their results, which show that direct object clitics emerge early and are used appropriately (i.e., used in place of full DPs, occur in the correct syntactic position, etc.) from an early age ($\approx 2;3$), while CD emerges much later and with far less consistency with adult usage. The paper then turns to the theoretical implications of these results.

Lilia Schürcks, in her paper, reassesses the mechanisms governing the distribution in Bulgarian of the [+refl, $-\phi$] forms *sebe si*, *svoj*, *si*, *se vis-à-vis* the [+refl, $+\phi$] forms *nego si*, *negov si*. She specifically examines c-command and the locality requirement within Binding Theory and the Minimalist Program, with the goal of reformulating her previously enunciated Degree of Markedness Spell-Out Principle.

In her paper, **Vesela Simeonova** considers the semantics of the complementizers *deto* and *če*, which largely occur in complementary distribution. She explores the contexts in which these complementizers are used and concludes that each one serves a distinct semantic function: while *deto* introduces content, *če* is an exemplifying complementizer.

Finally, **Mila Tasseva-Kurktchieva** and **Stanley Dubinsky** argue that even though Bulgarian may in some nominal contexts project a DP structure, this language is a weak DP language in that DP is not always required to project. To support their view, the authors discuss Neg raising and subject expletives and argue that these phenomena, in Bošković’s (2012) typology, characterize Bulgarian as an NP-language, while clitic doubling and obligatory number morphology characterize it as a DP-language. The proposal that Bulgarian is a weak DP-language brings out the possibility of reconsidering the NP/DP dichotomy into a tripartite typology: strong DP languages (English), weak DP-languages (Bulgarian) and strong NP-languages (Chinese).

In the remainder of this brief introduction, each of us offers a few personal comments and/or reflections on Catherine, thinking about first meetings, time spent together, Catherine’s contributions, and the like.

Steven Franks cannot recall when he first met Catherine, although it was surely at an LSA meeting in the early 1980s (probably at the 1981 meeting in New York, where she talked on “Bulgarian Free Relatives and the Matching Effect,” or the 1982 meeting in San Diego, where she talked on “Movement,

Binding, and Island Conditions in Bulgarian Relative Clauses.” Despite a paucity of records from that period, in one of his recent office moves he came across a postcard from Catherine from April 1983 confirming his AATSEEL presentation and—in perfect Catherine form—asking about some Macedonian data in light of Bulgarian. Since that time their paths have crossed regularly; they coauthored a number of papers, and he even flew out to Nebraska to work with her on one of them. Catherine came to Bloomington many times, for conferences and workshops (where she was invariably a featured speaker), and she taught Bulgarian at the IU Summer Language Workshop (then SWSEEL) in 1993 and 1994. From those summers, Steven has fond memories of hikes with Catherine and her family at places like McCormick’s Creek State Park. She and her husband Ali Eminov both received their PhDs from IU–Bloomington and always enjoyed return visits. Indeed, she is one of their most prominent Linguistics PhDs, and was honored with the department’s Distinguished Alumni Award in October 2018, joining the ranks of such notables as Ken Hale, Dell Hymes, and George Lakoff.

Steven emphasizes that Catherine has been instrumental from the start in making the Slavic Linguistics Society such a well-functioning and successful organization. Her constant dedication, discernment, and concern have long played an essential role in virtually all decision processes. Nothing is done without including Catherine, who sometimes points out potential difficulties and invariably adds vital feedback. She remembers everything we said at every meeting, recalls everything we promised in every e-mail, and follows through on everything quickly and conscientiously. She is, in a word, the driving force behind SLS. She has also been the longest serving Associate Editor for *JSL*, and even agreed to continue after Steven stepped down as Editor-in-Chief at the beginning of the year. In short, they have been a team, and he has relied on her insights over many, many years. (He says his name appears 13 times on her CV, so when repeatedly asked whether there was going to be a *Festschrift* for Catherine, he finally realized he needed to make it happen.) Steven also recalls how their joint research typically began: by being “stuck” together after a conference. Their work on Bulgarian clitics came from waiting for hours in the airport in Ottawa after the 2003 FASL meeting, and their work on universal concessive constructions came from hanging around at the end of the 2011 SLS meeting in Aix-en-Provence (which no one was in a rush to leave). But they also had a lot of fun together, touring ruined castles in the countryside near Heidelberg (SLS in 2015), or just walking until exhausted (Steven, not Catherine) around places like Szczecin (SLS in 2013) and Ljubljana (SLS in 2017).

Although **Vrinda Chidambaram** never took a class with Catherine, she can speak a bit about her tremendous patience as a teacher. One thing that Catherine does not always reveal about herself is that she is a phenomenal singer and a seasoned performer of Bulgarian folk song and dance. And

Vrinda, as an enthusiastic student of folk songs, was eager to learn from her. At the meeting of the Slavic Linguistics Society in Szczecin, Vrinda recalls how she and Catherine sneaked away from an afternoon session to sit on the steps of a neighboring building and sing. Vrinda had expressed nervousness about her upcoming talk, and Catherine suggested there was nothing better to strengthen her constitution than to take a break and sing. So they retreated to a quiet corner, and Catherine taught her to sing the melodies and harmonies of several Bulgarian folksongs. Among these was the popular “Katerino Mome,” inspiring Vrinda to choose it as part of the title for the present volume. Vrinda recalls that Catherine patiently repeated each phrase as many times as it took to sink in, until they could sing several songs in rich harmony at the final banquet of SLS. This became a new tradition: Vrinda sang with Catherine again at SLS in Ljubljana and she is looking forward to doing it in Eugene after this volume has been officially presented. Catherine is a person who communicates her love for and knowledge of Bulgarian language, music, and dance in a way that few others can. She is an expert who refuses to intimidate but rather insists on encouraging all those around her. This, just as much as genius in the study of language, is her gift.

Brian Joseph recalls first meeting Catherine in the early 1980s, during a summer when she was working in the Ohio State University Department of Slavic and East European Languages and Literatures (as it was then known) on a project to develop pedagogical materials for Bulgarian. (This project resulted in her co-authored 1984 book *Manual for Individualized Studies: Bulgarian Intermediate 2*.) He remarks what a pleasure it was to get to know her—a kindred spirit interested in Balkan syntax—and he notes how that pleasure has continued cyclically over the years at numerous Balkan, South Slavic, and Linguistics conferences in various venues. For him, she was then, just as she remains still, a refreshing voice examining aspects of Bulgarian and Balkan syntax from a formal perspective but always in a way that was suitably rigorous, empirically sound, yet theoretically non-doctrinaire. These are the traits which have given the scholarly community great confidence in her work and which have helped to give the work the visibility it so richly deserves.

But although she is best known for her early—and continuing—work on Bulgarian syntax, Brian recognizes that Catherine is so much more than that. As a linguist, her interests range over diverse languages such as Omaha-Ponca (Siouan) as well as various Balkan languages, including Turkish and diverse fields, especially the sociology of language with regard to the status of Turkish in Bulgaria and language documentation with regard to Omaha-Ponca. But as a person, she really shines, as she is an exceptionally talented singer and dancer who has thrilled those in attendance at conferences with her sometimes impromptu performances. Moreover, on a personal level, she is friendly and open and—as Brian can confirm from personal experience—a fine house guest. He is particularly pleased to be able to contribute to this recognition of

all that she has accomplished and the gracious—and graceful—way in which she has accomplished it.

Iliyana Krapova recalls meeting Catherine in the fall of 1995 when she invited her to speak at the First Conference of Balkan and South Slavic languages, held in Iliyana's home town of Plovdiv. This was an emblematic conference since it took place just a few years after the democratic changes of 1989, and the organizers wanted to celebrate the new era of opening up to the Western world. Catherine was also interviewed by the local radio station, and Iliyana remembers being struck by her revelation that her love for Bulgarian syntax was a follow-up on her passion for Bulgarian folk dancing. Later on, she had several occasions to see and talk to Catherine at conferences in Bulgaria and the U.S. With the years, she came to realize that Catherine is a very gentle, earnest, and down-to-earth person, a person of peace in heart and mind. These human qualities complement her work and are a source of inspiration for many.

Those who have followed in her footsteps (as well as those who have not) recognize Catherine Rudin as a pioneer of Bulgarian formal linguistics and one of the founding scholars of the study of Bulgarian syntax. Iliyana explains that, until the 1980s, syntax used to be a marginal theoretical subject for Bulgarian academics compared to traditional areas like phonology and morphology, so Catherine's contributions helped a lot in modernizing the field and changing fundamental aspects of the way younger generations now think about the importance of doing syntax. The periods of research Catherine spent in Bulgaria in the early 1980s, in particular at the Institute for Bulgarian Language, as well as her discussions with the late Jordan Penchev, led to interesting discoveries. Unexpected facts and properties of the language (especially with respect to *wh*-words, focus, topic, and complementizers) were brought to light and received their transformational-generative labels as well as a thorough analysis in her 1982 Indiana University dissertation, published by Slavica in 1986 as *Aspects of Bulgarian Syntax*. As happens with ground-breaking work in general, this book has not lost its value over time. (Slavica released a second revised edition in 2013.) Many researchers still refer to it not only for its analyses, but also for Catherine's solid descriptions of the many phenomena relevant to the organization of the left periphery and the discourse properties of Bulgarian syntax. Catherine has a keen eye for data, which is why her formal descriptions have long constituted a suitable basis for further work. Her contributions on issues as diverse as clitics and clitic doubling, multiple *wh*-fronting in questions and relatives, *da*-clauses, and *li*-questions are all well known to the international community of Slavic and general linguists. Special mention should be made of her 1988 *NLLT* paper "On Multiple Questions and Multiple *Wh*-Fronting," which opened up an extremely productive line of research into many issues of syntactic variation in Slavic and beyond.

Besides the four of us, many other people worked hard to make this volume possible. The editors wish to thank Slavica Publishers for seeing this project through, Catherine's sons Deniz and Adem and her husband Ali for their assistance in various matters, and also Dean Yasuko Taoka (Wayne State College, School of Arts and Humanities) for securing financial support. Finally, we acknowledge the help of the following additional individuals for providing valuable feedback on one or more of the papers in this volume:

Loren Billings
 Barbara Citko
 Miloje Despić
 Mila Dimitrova-Vulchanova
 Elena Dimova
 Lydia Grebenyova
 Boris Harizanov
 Christina Kramer

John Leafgren
 Olga Mladenova
 Roumyana Pancheva
 Asya Pereltsvaig
 Vesela Simeonova
 Anastasia Smirnova
 Mila Tasseva-Kurktchieva
 Francis Tyers

Steven L. Franks
 Bloomington, Indiana

Vrinda Chidambaram
 Riverside, California

Brian D. Joseph
 Columbus, Ohio

Iliyana Krapova
 Venice, Italy

July 2018