In my PhD project, I investigate the function of clitic doubling in Bulgarian in contrast to Spanish clitic doubling and German scrambling and its neurophysiological correlates in the processing of these structures. In the masterclass, I want to discuss my underlying theoretical hypotheses with Artemis Alexiadou. Most accounts of clitic doubling in Bulgarian describe this syntactic construction as an optional topic-marking strategy that is not subject to Kayne’s generalization (arguably achieved by movement of the object into a higher projection and leaving an overt trace in form of a clitic). In contrast, in other languages it is obligatory in certain contexts. Sportiche’s (1996) account is an elegant attempt to both overcome the base-generation vs. movement debate and to account for different clitic constructions as well as scrambling in a unitary way. Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou 1997 extended this approach and tested it on Greek and German. In my theoretical part, I will replicate their analysis on Bulgarian material. Bulgarian clitic doubling with its acclaimed optionality and topic-marking function is a good candidate for additionally testing the correspondence hypothesis in order to examine if this holds true also here. In the past, it was also claimed for scrambling in German to be a topic-marking strategy. However, recent accounts contradict this classical claim (e.g., Struckmeier 2017). Here, scrambling rather appears as being driven by prominence phenomena. Taking the detour via the discussion of German scrambling, it opens the debate of clitic doubling as topic-marker from a new perspective. Very often, clitic left dislocation and instances of doubled object-first operations were also classified in Bulgarian as clitic doubling. However, I believe that it is necessary to at least subclassify the construction type into three only formally similar constructions: clitic left dislocation (example 1), clitic topicalization (object first; example 2) and clitic doubling proper (example 3). I claim that there is functional difference between clitic left dislocation and clitic topicalization on the one side and clitic doubling proper on the other. I want to show that only instances of clitic left dislocation and clitic topicalization are true topic-marking constructions. In contrast, clitic doubling proper is a phenomenon of core syntax and mainly influenced by prominence features (and therefore also functionally similar to scrambling). To date, I am not fully sure how to model that diagnosis in line with the aforementioned model. Cartographic approaches could provide some insights, but it is necessary to develop a more elegant solution. I would like to discuss these theoretical issues with Prof Alexiadou. In my empirical part, I want to investigate if the correspondence hypothesis does hold also in the processing patterns of the constructions in Bulgarian and German, following a neurotypological framework. Bringing together theoretical models of syntax and processing models is also an issue in my research.

Examples from my project outline:

(1) **Na Marija, ti s ništo ne si i pomognal.** (Bulgarian: Clitic left dislocation)
    to Marija you with nothing NEG be.PRS.2.SG her.DAT.SG.F help.PFV-PTCP.SG.M
    ‘Marija, you didn’t help her at all.’

(2) **Knigata Ivan ja pročete.** (Bulgarian: topicalization, obligatory clitic)
    book.SG.F-ART.DEF-SG.F Ivan her.ACC.SG.F read.PFV-PRS.3SG
    ‘The book, Ivan finished reading it.’

(3) **Decata (gi) bojadisaha stenite.** (Bulgarian: Clitic doubling proper, facultative)
    child.PL.N them.ACC.PL.F paint.PFV-PRF.3PL wall.PL.F-ART.DEF.PL.F
    ‘The children painted the wall.’
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