

Yovka Tisheva

On Right Dislocation and Marginalization in Bulgarian

0. Introduction

Bulgarian belongs to the group of the so-called discourse-prominent (discourse-configurational) languages, which have developed a subset of syntactic means to encode discourse functions such as topic and focus. Different types of information in Bulgarian could be marked not only prosodically, but rather through specialized syntactic constructions. Although Bulgarian is analyzed as SVO language, the surface word order seems to be relatively free, especially in colloquial (spoken) language and dialects. Word order is, in fact, subject to some constraints, both syntactic and discourse. Discourse (semantic) functions as Topic and Focus could be marked in sentence initial and final positions; both positions are strongly related with syntactic encoding of discourse features. In the preverbal field (Left Periphery of the sentence, following RIZZI 1997) the main types of discourse structures – topicalization and focalization – could be observed. The claim that the order of at least first few constituents of a sentence actually depends not on their grammatical role (as subject, object) but rather on their discourse function (RUDIN 1986 for Bulgarian) could be extended to the most of the phrases in the sentence, not only the first one. The sentence final position (Right Periphery) can also be configured by the discourse features. Topic and Focus of the sentence could be found in both sentence-initial and sentence-final positions.

The main goal of this paper is to discuss some features of the arguments placed in or moved to the postverbal field in Bulgarian. The analyses are led by the assumption that there is a similarity between the structures on the left and the right edges of the sentence. Similar mechanisms could be applied to structure both parts – mechanisms of dislocations and doublings.

The paper has the following organization. First, an overview of the structure of Left Periphery in Bulgarian is presented due to the symmetry or contrast expected between the left and right edges of the sentence. The CLLD and Hanging Topic constructions are analysed in particular. In the rest of the paper the Right Periphery is under study. Special attention is paid to the possibilities for the subjects to be postverbal. The word order and prosody of the elements in the right edge of the sentence are analysed.

1. Left Periphery

The order of constituents on the left periphery of the sentence is constrained: interrogative pronouns and phrases; relative pronouns and phrases; exclamative phrases; focalised elements – possibly binding a resumptive clitic or with contrastive intonation.

They can generally appear together. In the CP field (in many languages in complementary distribution) also could be hosted: complementizers: of generic subordination, of *yes/no* interrogatives, of infinitival clause, etc.; inflected verb, which reaches a C head in specific types of sentence (primarily questions), or in all V2 languages. (BENINCA 2001)

Topic structures are seen as involving dislocation of (object) XP to the preverbal position. Topicalization in all Balkan languages is also marked by reduplication of the object by a pronominal clitic. Since the presence of clitic is obligatory this type of dislocation has been labelled as Clitic Left Dislocation (for CLLD in Bulgarian cf. KRAPOVA 2002)

BENINCA (2001) outlines four types of pre-posing, which could be used to create marked Themes or Focuses. CLLD can only move arguments to the Spec of TopicP. A theoretically indefinite number of constituents can be located in the Spec of TopicP, with apparently free order. SpecFocus also can host more than one constituent, but only one of them can receive contrastive intona-

tion. What appears on the left periphery and has contrastive intonation is not necessarily located in Spec of FocusP, since it could be located in the special projection – DiscourseP.

In Bulgarian two main types of topicalization structures in the Left Periphery are very well presented (cf. KRAPOVA 2004). Since the main task is to outline the properties of the Right Periphery of Bulgarian the detailed analysis of topicalization in the preverbal field is beyond the scope of this paper. The analyses of the preverbal field are included in order to prove the symmetry expected between the Left and Right Periphery or to motivate any possible contrasts.

When topic structures involve dislocation to the preverbal field, we are dealing with *Left Dislocation*. The entire argument (direct or indirect objects) appears on the left of the verb including any prepositions like in (2). A resumptive pronoun is obligatory; the clitic agrees with the Topic in gender, number and case:

- (1) Nego/IvanT vsički go haresvat.
HeAcc/Ivan everybody heAcc like3Pl
Everybody likes him/Ivan.
- (2) Na nego/na IvanT vsičko mu haresva.
to heAcc/to Ivan everything heDat pleases3Sg
Everything pleases him/Ivan.

Since the presence of the clitic in (1) and (2) is obligatory, they should be labelled more correctly as *Clitic Left Dislocation* structures.

A specific type of *Left Dislocation* is present when on the left is just a DP in any cases, without any preposition. These cases are known as *Hanging Topic Left Dislocations*. The resumptive clitic expressing the type of argument is obligatory. It only agrees with HT in number and gender, not in case. If the pre-posed argument is a direct object or a subject, HT and LD become indistinguishable.

- (3) Maria # az (neja) ja bjah pokanil (neja).
Maria INom sheAcc ClAcc was invited sheAcc
As for Maria, I had invited her.

When describing the structure of Left Periphery, a phenomenon well established in the spoken variety of Bulgarian should be also mentioned. If the indirect object expressed by PP is moved to the left (topicalized), in some cases the preposition *na* can be omitted. *Na* is concerned as a tool to distinguish the accusative and dative strong (tonic) personal pronouns. As shown in (4a), the first phrase is analysed as accusative form, because the preposition is not used in front of it. The correct form is reconstructed in (4b).

- (4) a. Men ezicite mi xaresvat.
IAcc languagesDef meDat like3Pl
I like the languages.
b. Na men ezicite mi xaresvat.
I like the languages.

Na-drop is possible not only with pronouns, but also when the indirect object is a PP (with the preposition *na* as it is shown by the correct form in (5b):

- (5) a. Žoro mu e neudobno.
Žoro heDat is uncomfortable
Žoro felt awkward.
b. Na Žoro mu e neudobno.
Žoro felt awkward.

Na-drop does not lead up to ungrammaticality. The result is lack of agreement in cases between the double and the clitic. The constructions in (4a) and (5a) seems to be similar to these with Hanging Topics, but still they have to be analysed as Clitic Left Dislocations, because of their prosodic and discourse features.

Within the framework of RIZZI's (1997; 2001) analyses of the CP field, KRAPOVA (2002) argues that in Bulgarian the Left Periphery can be divided basically into two fields – a higher Topic field and a lower Focus field. Special type of Focus labelled as Contrastive or Identificational Focus is related with the Left Periphery of the sentence. This type of focus is not associated with new information about the proposition, but with some contextually determined set of alternatives for which the predicate holds potentially, by pointing out one element of that set for which the predicate actually holds (cf. ZUBIZARRETA 1998). Part of the sentence which carries Contrastive Focus is pronounced with strong emphasis (stress)

Interestingly, Focus can also be said to involve dislocation, but without a resumptive clitic:

[Topic XP]_i CL_i V t_i
[Focus XP]_j V t_i (from KRAPOVA 2004)

It could be said that the elements on the Left Periphery have ordering constraints. Left Dislocations normally precede the focalized elements; Hanging Topics are found at the first position of the sentence, preceding Left Dislocated arguments.

2. Right Dislocation

Elements of the sentence, which have particular discourse interpretation, could be also found in the post-verbal field called by analogy Right Periphery of the sentence. Rudin offered first description of Right Dislocated NPs in Bulgarian as “generated separately from the sentence proper, but linked to it through coreference to a pronoun in S” (RUDIN 1986: 14). Both the subject like in (6)-(7) and the object like in (8) can be right dislocated:

- (6) E, tuj sa te, momičetata.
well thus are they girls-the
Well, that's what girls are like.
- (7) Toj šte dojde bašta j.
he will come father her
He'll come, her father.
- (8) Znam ja az neja, Neša.
Know1Sg her I her Nesha
I know her, Nesha.

In (6) and (8) the right dislocated NP and the coreferential pronoun are both placed at the right periphery of the sentence (being even in contact), while in (7) the nominative pronoun takes the first position of the sentence and the NP – the final one. Interestingly, Penchev paid special attention to the relative order of the XP and the doubling pronoun and stated that in cases like (6)-(8) two different structures must be distinguished (cf. GSBKE 1998: 565).

There are many ambiguous cases and it is not always clear whether a final subject is a right dislocated phrase or not. Since nominative pronouns in Bulgarian can always be null, sentences like these could be with “doubling/resumptive” pronoun like in examples (6) and (7) or without pronoun like in (9) and (10):

- (9) Zaspalo beše deteto.
Fallen-asleep was child-the
The child had fallen asleep.

- (10) Šte mi gi vārne tja.
Will to-me them return she.
She will return them to me. (examples (6)-(10) are from RUDIN 1986: 37-8)

Rudin's claim that Right Dislocated phrases share all of the characteristics of Left Dislocations could be a good point to start the description of the post-verbal constituents in Bulgarian.

2.1. Right Dislocated Objects

Bulgarian is considered to be SVO language, thus, the canonical position of the objects is the postverbal. Examples like (12) and (13) illustrate exactly that: direct objects take the very last position of the sentence; in (11) an adverbial phrase follows the direct object:

- (11) Nie go bjaxme rešili pātuvaneto ošte otdavna.
We himAcc were decidedPl tripDef more ago

We have decided to travel long time ago.

- (12) Njama da gi vmem tezi obici.
Won't da themAcc take1Pl these earrings
We won't take these earrings.

- (13) Az vāobšte ne gi znaex teja // pārvite.
I not at all not themAcc knew these fistPlDef
I didn't know at all these, first (questions).

Examples like (13) and (14) seem to have the same structure, but looked more carefully at them, an important difference should be mentioned. The direct object in (14) is expressed by a phrase containing demonstrative pronoun and a DP; in (13) the same elements are presented, but they do not form a phrase, because of the pause between them.

- (14) Ne moga da gi razbera tezi ludite
Not can da themAcc understand1Sg these crazyPlDef
I am not able to understand these crazy people.

At first the constructions in (11)-(14) look like good examples for clitic doubling, since they represent the specific features of clitic doubling structures. A pronominal clitic co-occur in the sentence with an associate noun/NP. The two elements of the construction are coreferential. The clitic and the double element agree in number, in (11) also in gender. The NPs are always [+definite] – in (11) by using definite form of the noun, in (12) a demonstrative pronoun is used, while (13) and (14) show so-called “doubled” definiteness because the phrase coreferential with the accusative clitic contains both definite article and demonstrative.

The presence of resumptive clitic though is not obligatory in the examples under study. The result of omission of the accusative clitic is grammatical sentence, as (15) shows:

- (15) Njama da vmem tezi obici.
Won't da take1Pl these earrings
We won't take these earrings.

Tests with omission of the resumptive clitics show that examples like (11)-(14) are not cases of real clitic doubling. They should be analyzed as Clitic Right Dislocations. The most important reason for that is the fact that CIRD is independent from clitic doubling – CIRD can appear in languages without clitic doubling, like Standard Italian (cf. KRAPOVA 2005).

Examples like (16) show that CIRD construction could be associated with HTLD: the proper name, the short accusative pronoun and the demonstrative are coreferential. The proper name is

separated by the rest of the sentence prosodically; semantically it gives only a very general information about the topic of the sentence:

- (16) Milena // az dori ne sām ja viždal taja.
Milena I even not am herAcc seen thatFSg
As for Milena, I haven't even seen that girl.

The examples with indirect objects share all the properties of the Right Dislocated direct objects mentioned above. In (17) and (18) the indirect object expressed by PP (only with the preposition *na*) is resumed by a dative clitic. The two elements agree in number and gender. The preposition *na* could be taken as a marker for agreement also in case:

- (17) Prosto ne mu vārvi na Ronaldo vāv dnešnija mač.
Just not himDat goes to Ronaldo in today's match
It is just not Ronaldo's day today.

- (18) Prosto ne mu vārvi vāv dnešnija mač na Ronaldo.
Just not himDat goes in today's match to Ronaldo
It is just not Ronaldo's day today.

It is important to say that unlike in (4a) and (5a) with Left Dislocations omission of the preposition (*na*-drop) is impossible with Right Dislocation. Examples like (19a,b) show that the attempt to omit *na* lead up to ungrammaticality:

- (19) a. *Prosto ne mu vārvi Ronaldo vāv dnešnija mač.
b. *Prosto ne mu vārvi vāv dnešnija mač Ronaldo.

Na-drop probably could be used as a test to check whether the right periphery is the mirror image of the left periphery. The examples show that omission of the preposition *na* can take place only on the left edge of the sentence. The results of *na*-drop should be analyzed as closely related to HTLDS. So far on parallels to these constructions are shown in the right periphery

2.2. Right Dislocated Subjects

In (spoken) Bulgarian not only the objects could be expressed by set of coreferential elements. There is a possibility also for the subject to be represented by a personal pronoun and a DP. As illustrated in (20) and (21) the nominative pronouns precede the verb, while the coreferential DPs are postverbal. In addition, as shown in (20) the CIRD indirect object does not affect the distribution of the elements expressing the subject – the dative clitic should be presented, but not the PP:

- (20) Tja mi objasnjavaše (na mene) ženata (na mene).
She meDat explain 2SgImperf to me womanDef to me
She was explaining this to me.

- (21) A te kåde živejat indiancite?
but they where live indiansDef
But where do they live, the Indians?

Besides being coreferential, personal pronoun in front of the verb and right dislocated DP agree in number and gender. Although the constructions seem to follow the model of clitic doubling, this is not the case, because the nominative forms of personal pronouns are not clitics. It is possible to analyze such examples as instances of Right Dislocation (or re-ordering of elements at the right periphery of the sentence).

The examples with postverbal subjects show that either the presence of the pronoun or of the DP could be optional. When presented, except for being placed in front of the verb, personal pronoun

could be moved to the right (postverbal) part of the sentence like in (22) and (23). The coreferential DP is not included:

- (22) A na men tolkova mi beše interesna tja.
And to me so much me was interesting she
She was so interesting to me.
- (23) Vsičko priznavam, no tova ne sâm go pravil az.
Everything confess but this not am itAcc done I
I admit everything, but I have not done this.

A different pattern is shown in (24) and (25). The subject is expressed by DP, placed at the right of the verb (last element of the sentence). In (25) even the direct object is in front of the subject. The Dips are the only way to present the subject; no coreferential personal (nominative) pronoun precedes or follows the DP.

- (24) Ami dosta e složna pesenta.
Well very is complex songDef
Well, the song is pretty hard.
- (25) Započvat da presirat svoite protivnici germancite.
Start3Pl da press theirRefl opponents Germans
The Germans started to press the other team.

Since Bulgarian is a pro-drop language, it is possible to analyze examples like (24) and (25) as result of such change exercised in basic (SVO) structures. In (26a) the phrases expressing the subject are in its canonical preverbal position:

- (26) a. Te// germancite započvat da presirat svoite protivnici.
They/Germans start3Pl da press theirRefl opponents

The personal pronoun and the DP are split by moving the IP to the left (following the mechanism of Left Dislocation for instance). The construction in (26a) was already presented in examples like (20) and (21):

- (26) b. Te započvat da presirat svoite protivnici germancite.
They start3Pl da press theirRefl opponents Germans

The last step to get to the model shown in (24) and (25) is to drop the nominative pronoun in front of the verb:

- (26) c. pro započvat da presirat svoite protivnici germancite.
start3Pl da press theirRefl opponents Germans

It is possible to conclude that with Right Dislocated subject two representations could be found – with *pro* being overt or silent. While Right Dislocation of the objects is connected with clitic doubling (the clitic is obligatory with certain types of predicates, but optional in other cases, cf. examples in (12) and (15)), with Right Dislocated subjects it is the status of *pro* that influences the structural representations.

3. Right Dislocation vs. Marginalization

When discussing the properties of postverbal field and Right Periphery of the sentence we have to pay attention to the fact that the structures presented above can get more precise interpretation within the approach proposed by ANTINUCCI & CINQUE (1977) for Italian. As Right Dislocation can be labelled cases like (27a) – when the resumptive clitic is present:

- (27) a. L'ho già comprato, il giornale.

[I] it have already bought, the newspaper.

When the clitic is absent, the structure is an instance of Marginalization (*Emarginazione*):

- (27) b. Ho già comprato, il giornale.
[I] have already bought, the newspaper.

The two sentence types differ syntactically, semantically and prosodically. It is very important to underline the fact that in both cases the sentence-final DP is separated by an intonational break by the rest of the sentence. Such condition does not apply in Bulgarian data. On the other hand, contrary to the expectation for free distribution of the resumptive clitic (or *pro* in cases with subject dislocations), it turns out that pronouns are neither optional nor null (see CARDINALETTI 2002 for discussion).

Apart from presence of the anticipatory clitic pronoun several other differences between Right Dislocation and Marginalization can be listed (for Italian cf. BELLETTI 1988; CARDINALETTI 2001; CECCHETTO 1999; for Spanish cf. ZUBIZARRETA 1998). The distribution of accusative *a* (Case-marking *a*) in Italian only with Right Dislocated [+human] objects; Right Dislocated objects co-occurring with complement clauses; the distribution of left peripheral verbal constituents (left peripheral past participles); extraction possibilities, binding phenomena and position of quantified expressions and sentence adverbs were among the tests applied when distinguishing the cases of Right Dislocation from Marginalization. Only two of the features of structures under study in Italian could be used to test the properties of the elements of Right Periphery in Bulgarian: order of (postverbal) arguments and prosody.

It was stated for Italian, that the order of Right Dislocated arguments is free, while in cases of Marginalization only the unmarked order of arguments (objects following the subject) is possible.

In (28a) and (28b) more than one XP were right dislocated. The direct object expressed by the demonstrative and indirect objects expressed by PP are placed after the verb; both are anticipated by clitics:

- (28) a. I kak da mu go kažeš sega tova na premiera?
And how da him Dat itAcc say2Sg now this to premierDef
And how could you say this to the premier?
- (28) b. I kak da mu go kažeš sega na premiera tova?
And how da him Dat itAcc say2Sg now to premierDef this
And how could you say this to the premier?

The relative ordering of object DP and PP is free, hence they could be analyzed as an instance of Right Dislocation. The order of resumptive (verbal) clitics is fixed. The dative clitic must precede the accusative one; the reverse order is not possible as shown in (28c):

- (28) c. *I kak da go mu kažeš sega tova na premiera
And how da itAcc him Dat say2Sg now this to premierDef

If the subject is in the postverbal field, more patterns could be demonstrated. The object DP and PP are not resumptive by clitics, thus they should be Marginalized but not Right Dislocated. Contrary to expectations for fixed (unmarked) order of postverbal arguments shown in (29a), it is also possible to have the subject between the direct and indirect objects like in (29b) or after the object phrases like in (29c):

- (29) a. Ne e podaril IvanF cvetja na Maria (a Boris).
neg is gavePPart IvanF flowers to Maria but Boris
It was not Ivan who gave flowers to Maria (but Boris).
- (29) b. Ne e podaril cvetjaF Ivan na Maria (a kniga).

- neg is gavePPart flowersF Ivan to Maria but book
 It was not flowers what Ivan gave to Maria (but a book).
 (29) c. Ne e podaril cvetja na Maria IvanF (a Boris).
 neg is gavePPart flowers to Maria IvanF
 It was not Ivan who gave flowers to Maria (but Boris).

The relative order of postverbal objects and subject is obviously related to their discourse features and the way they are marked prosodically. The element that precedes a marginalized constituent must be necessarily an instance of Contrastive Focus. Prosodic properties of marginalized subjects mirror those of marginalized objects. The phrase preceding a Marginalized subject is necessarily an instance of Contrastive Focus. Under this condition it is not possible to get structure like in (29a) and (29c) where the subject – the argument which seems to be Marginalized – is contrastively focused (gets the emphatic stress).

The same result of prosodic test is observed if Right Dislocated object is included in the sentence. The PP is resumed by the dative clitic (which precedes the PP). If the subject in (30b) is Marginalized, the contrastive stress should go to the PP, but as the example shows it stays on the nominative pronoun.

- (30) a. Pomognah mu AZ F (a ne ti) na Ivan (a ne ti).
 Helped1Sg heDat I but not you to Ivan
 I was the one who helped Ivan, not you.
 (30) b. Pomognah mu na Ivan AZ F (a ne ti).
 Helped1Sg heDat to Ivan I but not you
 I was the one who helped Ivan, not you.

The examples like (29a-c) and (30a,b) show that the elements in the postverbal field in Bulgarian do not share completely the (whole) subset of features of Right Dislocated and Marginalized arguments concerning the word order and focalization. For Italian and Spanish, the prosodic difference could be explained by locating the marginalized constituent in clause-internal position and right-dislocated constituent in clause-external position. Therefore, only Right Dislocation uses an intonational phrase on its own. It seems that such assumption is not valid for Bulgarian because in both cases intonational separation is not necessary or required.

4. Conclusions

Based on evidences from Bulgarian, a structural asymmetry between the Left and Right Periphery of the sentence was shown. Although dislocation is a mechanism applied on both pre- and postverbal fields, the results are not identical. Na-drop could take place on the left of verb only, if the PP is moved to the sentence initial field. Separation of elements on the right edge by pause by the rest of the sentence is not required as it is the case with Hanging Topic constructions in the preverbal field. The relative order of the elements of the Left Periphery is constrained, while the Right Dislocation allows variations. Topics and Clitic Dislocations are normally found on both edges. The same could be said also for one type of Focus – apparent cases of contrastively focused arguments on the Right Periphery confirmed that claim.

References

- ANTINICCI, F. & G. CINQUE (1977) Sull'ordine delle parole in italiano: l'emarginazione. *Studi di grammatica italiana* 6: 121-146.
 BELLETTI, A. (1988) The Case of Unaccusatives. *Linguistic Inquiry* 19.1: 1-34
 BENINCA, P. (2000) The position of Topic and Focus in the Left Periphery. In: CINQUE, G. & G. SALVE (eds.) *Current Studies in Italian Syntax*. Essays offered to Lorenzo Renzi, 39-64. Amsterdam: Elsevier.

- CARDINALETTI, A. (2001) A second thought on *Emarginazione*: Destressing vs. "Right Dislocation". In: CINQUE, G. & G. SALVI (eds.) *Current Studies in Italian Syntax: Essays Offered to Lorenzo Renzi*, 117-135. Amsterdam: Elsevier.
 CARDINALETTI, A. (2002) Against optional and null clitics. Right Dislocation vs. Marginalization. *Studia Linguistica* 56(1), 2002: 29-57.
 CECCHETTO, C. (1999) A comparative analysis of Left and Right Dislocation in Romance. *Studia Linguistica* 53 (1): 40-67.
 BOJADZIEV, T., I. KUCAROV & J. PENCHEV (1998) *Gramatika na suvremennija bulgarski knizoven ezik*. Sofia.
 KRAPOVA, I. (2002) On the Left Periphery of the Bulgarian sentence. *University of Venice Working Papers in Linguistics*, vol. 12: 107-128.
 KRAPOVA, I. (2004) Word order in Topic-Focus structures in the Balkan languages. *L'Europa d'oltremare*. Contributi italiani al IX congresso Internazionale dell' Association Internationale d'Etudes du Sud-Est Europeen, Tirana, 30 agosto – 3 settembre 2004. Romania Orientale 7, XVII, Bagatto Libri, Roma (a cura di Alberto Basciani e Angela Tarantino), 2004, 139-161.
 KRAPOVA, I. (2005) Clitic Doubling in Bulgarian with Reference to Balkan Languages and Dialects. Ms.
 RIZZI, L. (1997) The Fine Structure of the Left Periphery. In: HAEGEMAN, L. (ed.) *Elements of grammar*, 281-339. Kluwer: Dordrecht.
 RIZZI, L. (2001) On the position Interrogative in the Left Periphery of the Clause. In: CINQUE, G. & G. SALVI (eds.) *Current Studies in Italian Syntax: Essays offered to Lorenzo Renzi*. Amsterdam: Elsevier
 RUDIN, C. (1986) *Aspects of Bulgarian Syntax: Complementizers and Wh Constructions*. Columbus: Slavica
 ZUBIZARRETA, M. (1998) *Prosody, Focus and Word Order*. Cambridge: MIT Press. Cambridge, Mass.

Yovka Tisheva
 Department of Bulgarian Language
 Faculty of Slavic Studies
 Sofia University St. Kliment Ohridski
 1504 Sofia
 Bulgaria
 e-mail: yovka@slav.uni-sofia.bg