Yovka Tisheva

Bulgarian Yes-No Questions with Particles *nali* and *nima*

0. Introduction

Much resent work focuses on the interaction of Interrogativity and the Information structure of the sentence because many lexical items can indicate interrogativity as well as focusation.

In this paper I investigate Bulgarian yes-no questions formed with particles *nali* and *nima*. While other lexical items used to form questions (e.g., *li*) have been analyzed within different theoretical frameworks, *nali* and *nima* haven't been mentioned as part of CP field in Bulgarian. *Nali* and *nima* display interesting similarities and differences. They should be well distinguished from the clitic *li* and the complementizer *dali*, although all of them have the same feature – [interrogative]. Irrespective of which particle is used, the surface form of Bulgarian yes-no questions seems to be quite similar. When examine closely yes-no questions with *nali* and *nima* the syntactic (formal) and pragmatic differences are displayed.

The paper has the following organization: after a brief description of syntactic properties of the interrogative enclitic *li* and the complementizer *dali* in Bulgarian (Section 1), the distribution of *nali* and *nima* is presented (Section 2). Then in Section 3 the information structure of yes-no questions is discussed with respect to the problem whether *nali* and *nima* take part in identifying Focus of the sentence. The theoretical implication of this investigation follows Rizzi's (1997, 2001) analysis of the CP domain.

1. Alternative (yes-no) questions in Bulgarian

Bulgarian has a large number of lexical items that indicate yes-no questions: *li*, *dali*, *nali*, *nima*, *migar*, *zer*, *da*, *da ne bi da*, *a*, *e*. We can classify these lexems by giving an account of different features: frequency, modality, expectations of certain answer etc. Some of these particles are more typical for colloquial (spoken) Bulgarian – *migar*, *zer*, *a*, *e*. *Nima*, *nali* are used when the speaker expects to get certain kind of answer. The answer is not specified when using *li* or *dali*.

Before my analyses of *nali* and *nima* I will start by reviewing the properties of Bulgarian question particle *li*. By origin *dali* and *nali* are closely related with *li* (*da+li*, *na+li* or *ne e+li*) and one can expect some similarities concerning the main features and distribution of *nali* and *nima* which were "inherited" from *li*. The differences will reflect the fact that *li* is an enclitic and its placement depends on prosodic factors. More important here is that placement of *li* depends of syntactic factors, too.

The question marker *li* in Bulgarian is analyzed as complementizer (cf. Rivero 1993; Rudin 1997). Since *li* is a clitic, it needs a host to form a prosodic word together with it. Not only an XP as in (1a,b), but also V can host *li* as in (1c):

(1)

a. KNIGATA li šte vzeme Ivan?
   BOOKdef Q will takes Ivan
   'Is it the book that Ivan will take?'

b. Tvojat kolega IVAN li šte vzeme knigata?
   yourDef colleague IVAN Q will takes bookDef
   'Is your colleague Ivan the person who will take the book?'

c. ŠTE VZEME li Ivan knigata?
   will TAKES Q Ivan bookDef
   'Will Ivan take the book?'

If the complementizer *li* is in C, the verb should move to the position in front of it in order to form a question as in (1c). Such position is SpecCP, but the verb cannot move there; it can be only in C, not in its Spec. An XP can move to SpecCP where it hosts the clitic *li*. In neutral yes-no questions the finite verb moves to C° where it hosts the clitic. *Li* is a clitic complementizer (more precisely an enclitic to constituents in SpecCP or C) which also assigns a focus feature (cf. KING 1997, FRANKS & KING 2000). If a maximal projection moves to SpecCP, it hosts the clitic *li* and it is a focus of the question. If no maximal projection moves to SpecCP, then the verb moves to C in order to host *li*.

In yes-no questions with *li* the focus position is stable; "bound morpheme" *li* is a morphological marker for Focus (see MOTAPANYANE 1997). In all configurations the [focus] features associate with C and this follows from the lexical properties of the clitic complementizer. In this article I will try to distinguish yes-no questions with *nali* and *nima* from these with *li*. In this respect it is important to point out that *li* is specified for both interrogative and focus features and attracts these features to C for checking purposes.

Although Penčev (1998) claims that *li* and *dali* are synonyms there are some differences concerning their distribution and syntactic properties. The question particle *dali* could be characterized as "non-clitic yes-no interrogative complementizer" (RUDIN et. al. 1999). This particle is situated in C and examples as in (2a) show its canonical position. *Dali* necessarily takes the entire proposition in its scope (see also KRAPOVA & KARASTANEVA 2000):

(2)

a. Dali Ivan veče e kupil tazi kniga?
   Q Ivan already is bought thisF book
   'Has Ivan already bought this book?'
   [Dali [Ivan veče e kupil tazi kniga]]

Dali occupies the head C; as complementizer it cannot be moved out of this position. Parts of the sentence, irrespectively of their grammatical function – subjects or objects, which precede *dali* as in (2b,c) are moved and presumable adjoined to CP:

(2)

b. Ivan dali veče e kupil tazi kniga?
   IvanF Q already is bought thisF book
   'As for Ivan, has he already bought this book?'

c. Tazi kniga Ivan dali veče ja e kupil?
   thisF book Ivan Q already sheAcc is bought
   'As for this book, has Ivan already bought it (or not)?'

While *li* always follows a focus phrase in SpecCP, the position of complementizer *dali* "interacts" not only with Focus of the sentence, but with both parts of information structure. *Dali* is situated in C, focused phrases are in its Spec, so it is clear that the preposed elements as in (2b,c) should be in a Topic position. In (2e) the fronted constituent *tazi kniga* 'this book' is clitic resumed. Clitic resumption is not an optional process in Bulgarian, but sign for CLLD topic (see for more details KRAPOVA 2001). Topics (including CLLD Topics) appear to precede *dali*; the following structure could be established:

Topic > *dali*

Dali is also associated with the FocusP. Bulgarian allows for a FocusP to precede the complementizer as in (2d) or to be after *dali* as in (2e).

(2)

d. Čudja se KNIGITE dali Ivan šte vzeme.
   (I) wonder BOOKS Q Ivan will takes
   'I wonder whether Ivan will take the books.' (from KRAPOVA 2001)

e. Čudja se dali KNIGITE šte vzeme Ivan.
   (I) wonder Q BOOKS will takes Ivan
   'I wonder whether Ivan will take the books.' (from KRAPOVA 2001)

When analyzing examples as in (2d,e) at first glance it seems that there are two Focus positions – one in front and the other after the complementizer. For such examples I will use the explanation proposed by Krapova (2001). FocusP in Bulgarian is only one; the double position of Focus phrase is an illusion, created by the optional raising of *dali* around this single Focus projection. We find more support for raising analysis of examples as in (2d,e) from the use of other complementizer *če* in Bulgarian which has the possibility also to raise, but around the highest CLLD topic.

(3)

a. Vidjah če Ivan go bijat.
   saw če Ivan himAcc beat3Pl
   'I saw that they were beating Ivan.'

b. Vidjah Ivan če go bijat.
   saw Ivan če himAcc beat3Pl
   'I saw that they were beating Ivan.'

To summarize this section, the clitic complementizer *li* may be specified for both [interrogative] and [focus] features. The first one is intrinsic to *li* and, thus, always presented when this particle is used. *Li* cannot be used as marker for Focus feature only. In yes-no questions with *li* [focus] feature always forms a set with [interrogative] feature. When the complementizer *dali* is used to form yes-no questions the raising analysis should be applied to specify the placement of Focus. Constituents with Topic reading may precede the CP with *li* or *dali* situated there.

2. *Yes-no questions with 'nali' and 'nima'*

Before discussing the syntactic and some of semantic properties of these questions, I would like to provide a background on their use. It is necessary to include this data because other Slavic languages lack such particles corresponding to Bulgarian *nali* and *nima*.

2.1. Background

In general, yes-no question can be felicitous only if neither an affirmative nor a negative answer would clash with its proposition. The speaker believes that the hearer knowing more about certain events is able to specify the conditions of the truth of the proposition in question. From the subset of those conditions (as part of the pragmatic universe of discourse) the hearer has to recognize the one corresponding to the part of the proposition in question. This could be illustrated by the examples in (3a,b). *Li*-questions are chosen not only because their structure has been already analyzed in details in Section 1, but also because they are neutral – the answer of such question is not specified by the speaker's presuppositions.

(3) a.   Dojde li Ivan?
          came Q Ivan
          'Did Ivan come?'

     b.   Ivan li dojde?
          Ivan Q came
          'Was Ivan that person who came?'

The question in (3a) presupposes nothing; it is a neutral question. The speaker wants to know whether there is a connection between the agent (subject of the sentence) and the activity (the verb). The question in (3b) bears the presupposition that something has happened (someone did come), thus the speaker is inquiring whether the one who did it was the person called Ivan or not.

When using the particle *nali* to form a question the pragmatic structure is more complicated than the structure represented in (3a,b). These questions express not only the statement, made by the speaker, but also his expectation this statement to be truth. The hearer is expected to confirm the truth-value of the statement. The speaker presupposes that the hearer shares the same presuppositions, while with *li* no such presupposition is involved.

(4) a.   Nali Ivan dojde?
          Q   Ivan came
          'Ivan came, didn't he?'

     b.   Ivan nali dojde?
          Ivan Q came
          'Ivan came, didn't he?'

The speaker and the hearer know that something has happened and this background/knowledge guaranties the felicitous use of these questions. With questions as in (4a) the speaker shows his presupposition that somebody was expected to do

something; and in (4b) – that the person who was expected to do something has done it. The speaker expects to get an affirmative answer; it will confirm his own presuppositions. Hence his question is about the truth-value of the whole proposition plus the truth-value of speaker's presupposition. The hearer is expected to confirm that speaker's expectations. The questions in (4a,b) both will get affirmative answers, but concerning different parts of the proposition of the question:

(5) a.   – Nali Ivan dojde?
          – Da, toj dojde.
          'Yes, he did.'

     b.   – Ivan nali dojde?
          – Da, dojde veče.
          'Yes, he already did.'

The most striking difference between *nali* and *nima* concerns the expected answer – *nali* is a sign that affirmative answer is expected by the speaker, *nima* implies the opposite expectation. The question with *nima* is about the truth-value of the presupposition; the speaker expects to get a negative answer.

(6) a.   – Nima Ivan veče   dojde?
          Q   Ivan already came
          'Is it really the truth that Ivan has already come?'

     b.   – Ne, ne e došãl ošte.
          'No, he hasn't come yet.'

When the speaker does not want to believe (or cannot) that the presupposition of the question is truth, the question with *nima* could be used. Such questions carry wide range of "special effects" – someone's surprise, wonder that something really has happened (so it is truth) or doubts, uncertainty that something really has happened. From this point the question in (6a) could be interpreted as: 'Is this really the truth/fact that Ivan has already come? I wonder if this could be possible. I can't believe that he was able to come and is already here.'

In addition to these pragmatic conditions motivating the use of *nali* and *nima*, other factors also seem to play a certain role in the process in question. The contexts where these particles usually function should be mentioned in order to differentiate between *nali* and *nima*. Yes-no questions with *nima* are typical for the literary (written) language. They are not regular or habitual part of spoken (colloquial) Bulgarian. The questions with *nali* are contextually neutral and should not be attributed to any specific language formation or standard. The questions with *nima* have very low frequency of use due to the factors mentioned above.

So far only these semantic and pragmatic features of *nali* and *nima* have been analyzed in Bulgarian grammars. Usage differences concerning the expected or desired answer have been quantified by several studies. They could be a basis for characterizing *nali* as marker for confirmative questions and *nima* as marker for rejective questions, while *li* and *dali* form neutral informative questions.

More interesting are the formal features of these particles. If *nali*, *nima* and *dali* are synonyms, as Penčev (1998) argued, do they share same syntactic features? Both *nali*

and *dali* originate from *li*, but do they form a group and thus differ significantly from *nima* when it comes to their syntactic features? These questions are just the starting point of my investigations. In order to answer them I will take a close look at the language facts and analyze them in the manner that was already applied for *dali*.

2.2. *Yes-no questions with 'nali'*

The particle *nali* was already characterized as a marker for confirmative questions with broad range of uses. It is very important to pay attention to the fact that *nali* could be used as a marker of interrogativity only in direct alternative questions as in (4a,b) and (5a,b) or in matrix clauses as in (7).

(7)
Nali ti mi kaza, če Ivan dojde?
Q   you meDAT told that Ivan came
'Didn't you tell me that Ivan came?'

When *nali* is in the matrix clause it takes the scope over the whole sentence. The attempt to transform the direct questions from (4a,b) and use them as indirect questions will be completely unacceptable. The result of such transformation as shown in (8) is completely ungrammatical. From such examples we can conclude that *nali* cannot be used in embedded clauses. This contrasts with the possibilities of *dali* and *li* which freely could be used in indirect questions as in (9a,b).

(8)
*Toj ne mi kaza nali Ivan dojde
he neg meDAT told Q Ivan came

(9) a.
Toj ne mi kaza dali Ivan dojde.
he neg meDat told whether Ivan came
'He didn't tell me whether Ivan came or not.'

b.
Toj ne mi kaza Ivan dojde li veče.
he neg meDat told Ivan came Q already
'He didn't tell me if Ivan has already come.'

The examples in (7)-(8) illustrate the fact that *nali* functions only as a marker of interrogativity, but not as subordinator. That is one of main differences between *li*, *dali* and *nali*.

In Bulgarian the enclitic *li* is a morphological marker for interrogative features and could be used together with wh-words (*k*-words in Bulgarian). Although such option to form questions occurs only for special effects (when the speaker does not expect any answer), examples as in (10) are completely acceptable and of great use. Each of the interrogativity markers has fixed position in the structure. Wh-word occupies SpecCP and *li* is attached to it.

(10)   Kăde li zaminava Ivan?
where Q leaves   Ivan
'I really wonder where Ivan is going.'

This kind of "overlapping" when marking the interrogativity is possible only for the enclitic *li*. The use of *nali* in direct questions together with wh-words is not allowed, as it is visible from the example in (11a,b).

(11) a.   *kăde nali zaminava Ivan
where Q   leaves   Ivan

b.   *nali kăde zaminava Ivan
Q   where leaves   Ivan

It seems very tempting to generalize that the use of *nali* in wh-questions always yields unacceptability. The following example shows that the combination is possible, but the question particle and wh-words have to follow certain order. *Nali* marks the interrogativity in the matrix clause and wh-word is in the embedded clause.

(11) c.   Nali ti mi   kaza kăde zaminava Ivan?
Q   you meDat told where leaves   Ivan
'Weren't you the one who told me where Ivan would go?'

Examples as in (11c) show that *nali* and wh-words could be used together but only if they follow a strict order. They have to be in different parts of the complex sentence. The position of *nali* must be higher than the position of wh-word. On the other hand, *nali* cannot be added to a sentence if *li* or *dali* are already used in it to mark the interrogativity.

(12) a.   *nali Ivan li zaminava
Q   Ivan Q leaves

b.   *nali Ivan dali zaminava
Q   Ivan dali zaminava

The model from examples like (11c) distributes *nali* and wh-words in different parts of the complex sentence. However, it is not applicable if we try to combine *nali* with *dali* or *li*.

(13) a.   *nali ti mi   kaza dali Ivan zaminava
Q   you meDat told Q   Ivan leaves

b.   *nali ti mi   kaza Ivan li zaminava
Q   you meDat told Ivan Q leaves

From the test of "double specification" of interrogativity shown in examples (12a,b) and (13a,b) it is reasonable to suppose that all question particles have the same target. Only one question particle could be used in the structure, thus the position they compete for is not a multiple position, it is not a Spec position. *Li* is inserted in C, *dali* is situated in C, so it seems this is also the position for other interrogative particles in Bulgarian.

More evidence for this assumption we get when analyzing the possibilities for fronting of elements in *nali*-questions. The example in (14) shows the possibilities for distribution of constituents. The interrogativity marker *nali* is first; it occupies the C position and takes the scope over the whole sentence. The elements after *nali* follow the same order as in a declarative clause. In this case the entire clause is questioned.

(14)   Nali Ivan zaminava za Sofia utre?
Q   Ivan leaves   to Sofia tomorrow
'Ivan is leaving for Sofia tomorrow, isn't he?'

Any XP can precede the particle *nali* as illustrated with examples in (15)-(16). The question particle *nali* takes the scope over the constituents on its right. That part of the sentence also contains the focus of the question.

(15) Ivan nali zaminava za Sofia utre?
Ivan Q leaves to Sofia tomorrow
'Is it truth that Ivan is leaving for Sofia tomorrow?'

(16) Za Sofia utre nali Ivan zaminava?
to Sofia tomorrow Q Ivan leaves
'Is it true that Ivan is leaving tomorrow for Sofia?'

The only restriction of fronting concerns the verb, no matter if only the verb is moved or other constituents had been already moved in front of *nali* and the verb goes second. The question particle *nali* is in C, the verb moves in front of *nali* and should go to its Spec. This is not possible and yields the ungrammaticality of examples as in (17a-c).

(17) a. *zaminava nali Ivan za Sofia utre
leaves Q Ivan for Sofia tomorrow

b. *Ivan zaminala nali za Sofia utre
Ivan leaves Q to Sofia tomorrow

c. *za Sofia utre zaminava nali Ivan
to Sofia tomorrow leaves Q Ivan

The last examples give more evidence which confirms the assumption that question particle *nali* has fixed position in the structure. It is head position, not multiple one (Spec). *Nali* has to take the highest position (higher than V and than wh-words), thus this question particle has to be in C. Any XP could be moved in front of *nali*, after the movement this phrase gets focus reading.

However, two very interesting facts about *nali* have to be added to the analysis here. The first one concerns the possibility to have the verb in front of the particle, but not as a result of any verbal movement. *Nali* could be placed after the V, but we will have a different structure to analyze. The question particle is at the end of the sentence, characteristically set off from the rest of the elements by long "comma" pause. Raising intonation is obligatory.

(18) a. Zaminavaš, nali?
leave2Sg # Q
'You are leaving, aren't you?'

This way of using *nali* is not connected only with the distribution of the particle and the verb. It is generalized and *nali* could be at the right of the sentence. The particle again takes the scope over the whole sentence, but now the scope is on its left. This model of forming questions corresponds to English question-tags. "Question tags" impose affirmation, agreement, thus in examples as in (18a,b) Bulgarian and English show quite similar models to form affirmative questions.

(18) b. Utre Ivan zaminava za Sofija, nali?
tomorrow Ivan leaves for Sofia # Q
'Tomorrow Ivan is leaving for Sofia, isn't he?'

In this article I investigate Bulgarian question particle *nali* and I will restrict my attention to the data from this language. However, after introducing the model of "question-tag" in Bulgarian it is interesting to be mentioned that other Slavic languages also dispose the same model. The difference between them and Bulgarian concerns the lexical elements in "tag" position. In Bulgarian the particle *nali* is used, while other Slavic languages have other lexical items (adverbs, nouns, complementizers) or li-phrases, as shown in examples (20a-d).

(19) Ivan se obadi na Petăr, nali?
Ivan Refl called to Petăr Q
'Ivan called Petăr, didn't he?'

(20) a. Ivan pozvonil Petru, pravda? Rus
b. Iwan zadzwonił do Piotra, prawda? Pol
c. Ivan Petrovi zavolal, že? Cz
d. Ivan se javio Petru, je l'da? SC

The second surprising detail concerning the use of *nali* is that this question particle can have non-interrogative reading. Often the sentences with *nali* loose their interrogative status. This happens when they are about facts of common sense (common knowledge) or at least the speaker and the hearer know them, because they share the same experience, etc. The usage of *nali* is a sign of their cooperation as in examples (21a,b).

(21) a. Sled tolkova eksperimenti nali nie veče znaehme kak da izpolzvame aparata...
(After so many attempts finally we learned how to use the device...)

b. I tja nali ne može da mălči, vednaga mu otgovri, če može da go čaka...
(You know her; she can't keep her mouth shut that's why she reacted immediately and told him that she couldn't wait for him any more...)

The use of *nali* in examples like (21a,b) could be analyzed as a signal of interpersonal relations, or an instructions to the hearer to use his/her background knowledge in a certain way. *Nali* is not used to mark interrogativity any more; it is only a "reminder" that refers to background assumptions. The particle *nali* is not part of the formal structure of the sentences in (21a,b). Hence, these examples show that *nali* is a possible candidate for the group of pragmatic particles in Bulgarian.

2.3. Yes-no questions with 'nima'

Most of the syntactic features that the question particle *nima* display had been already mentioned when *nali* was analyzed. I will not repeat all the details about these features; they will be just illustrated in order to show the similarities and point out the differences. Like *nali* the particle *nima* can be used as marker of interrogativity only in direct alternative questions or in matrix sentences. It does not function as subordinator, as the ungrammaticality of (22) indicates.

(22) *Toj mi kaza nima veče zamina.
he meDat told Q already left

The distribution of *dali* and *nali* supports the idea that C is the place where the question particles are inserted. *Nima* acts as other interrogative markers *nali* and *dali*. It tends to occupy the first position as in (23a) and thus takes the scope over the whole sentence. The question is about the truth-value of the whole proposition.

(23) a.   Nima Ivan veče   zamina?
         Q   Ivan already left
         'Is it truth that Ivan has already left?'

Different constituents could be moved in front of *nima* in order that they be will be topicalized, as illustrated in (23b,c).

(23) b.   Ivan nima zaminava za Sofija?
         Ivan Q   leaves   for Sofia
         'Is Ivan really leaving for Sofia?'

     c.   Za Sofija s   Marija nima Ivan zaminava?
         for Sofia with Marija Q   Ivan leaves
         'Is it truth that Ivan is the one who is leaving for Sofia with Marija?'

The verb always has to be after the particle *nima*. Examples in (17a-c) with *nali* and (24a,b) with *nima* show the same restriction for movement. The "free" position in front of these question particles is a Spec position, but the verb cannot go there.

(24) a.   *Ivan zaminala nima za Sofija?
         Ivan leaves   Q   to Sofia tomorrow

     b.   *za Sofia utre   zaminava nima Ivan
         to Sofia tomorrow leaves   Q   Ivan

The test with "double specification" of interrogativity by using more than one question particle in the sentence shows more similarities between *nali* and *nima*. It is not possible to combine *nima* with *nali*, *dali* or *li* in one sentence. Examples as in (25a-c), just like those in (12a,b) with *nali* show the restriction on the number of question particles used in the sentence.

(25) a.   *Nima (toj) dali toj zamina
         Q   he   Q   he left

     b.   *Nima (toj) nali toj zamina
         Q   he   Q   he left

     c.   *Nima (toj) li toj zamina
         Q   he   Q he left

Question particle *nima* in (25a-c) takes the first position; it marks the illocutionary force of the sentence and it is specified as interrogative. Therefore no more lexical markers of introgativity are needed in the sentence. There is only one head position in the structure for this type of force markers. All question particles carry the same [interrogative] features, but only one can be inserted in C. Two constituents carry the same [interrogative] features, which can't be checked twice in the sentence.

Nima does not compete with wh-words for the same position in the structure, but still they can't be used together as illustrated in (26a,b). The particle and wh-word carry the same [interrogative] features, which can't be checked twice in the sentence.

---

(26) a.   *Nima koga zaminava
         Q   when leaves

     b.   *Koga nima zaminava
         when Q   leaves

The examples in (27a,b) show the distribution of *nima* in complex sentences with indirect wh-questions. The restriction to use *nima* as subordinator is the reason for the ungrammaticality of the example in (27b). In (27a) the question particle is in the matrix clause, whereas wh-word is after (lower) than *nima*.

(27) a.   Nima toj ti   kaza koga zaminava?
         Q   he youDat told when leaves
         'Is it really truth that he told you when he was going to leave?'

     b.   *Koga ti   kaza nima zaminava
         when youDat told Q   leaves

All examples with *nima* presented here show many similarities between *nima* and *nali* concerning their distribution and syntactic features. The only difference in them is that *nima* cannot be used at the end of the sentence to form a question tag, as shown in (28a,b).

(28) a.   *Zaminavaš, nima
         leave2Sg   # Q

     b.   *Utre   Ivan zaminava za Sofija, nima?
         tomorrow Ivan leaves   for Sofia # Q

To sum up Section 2, *nali* and *nima* are markers for interrogativity and occur in direct questions or in main clauses. They do not occur in embedded (indirect) questions. *Nali* and *nima* cannot be used together with other markers of interrogativity – *li* or *dali*. Only one question particle could be presented in the structure. There are certain restrictions of using *nali* or *nima* together with wh-words.

Nali has larger range of use than *nima*. *Nali* is the lexical tool to form question tags. Only this question particle could loose its [interrogative] features and function as a pragmatic marker, thus it is not part of the formal structure of the sentence.

3.   Topic and Focus in questions with 'nali' and 'nima'

The question particle *li* is underspecified for set of [interrogative] and [focus] features. *Li* cannot occur as a marker only for [focus], this is always presented in interrogative sentences. Hence, [interrogative] feature is intrinsic to *li*, whereas the [focus] feature is optional. The distribution of *dali* shows similarity between *dali* and *li* in their [interrogative] features. It is important to remind that the distribution of *dali* is connected with the process of focus marking. For *dali* Krapova (2001) concludes that it raises around the Focus phrase (see (2d,e) as well)).

(29)   ⟶
     Foc   dali
           ⟶   ↓

From the analysis of *nali* and *nima* proposed here it seems reasonable to suppose that these question particles will also play certain role in the information structure of the

sentence. The question arising is whether [interrogative] features of these particles are necessarily related to other features, especially to [focus] features.

Topic and Focus of the sentence could be defined as pragmatic categories (cf. JACOBS 2001; KISS 1998; LAMBRECHT 1994; see also NICOLOVA 2000, 2001 for Bulgarian). The analysis of Rizzi (1997, 2001) provides the theoretical tools for the present investigation. In this framework, the CP domain has a finer structure and should be split into several CP projections.

(30)   V$_{matrix}$ [ForceP Force [TopP Topic [FocP Focus [TopP Topic [FinP Finiteness [IP ...]]]]]]

Force phrase carries information about the illocutionary force of the sentence. Topic and Focus phrases are lower than Force. It is important to be mentioned that according to Rizzi there is a projection higher than Force. He calls it Subordinator phrase.

Krapova and Karastaneva (2000) have arrived at similar ideas about ordering CP elements in Bulgarian, as illustrated in (31).

(31)   SubordinatorP [TopicP   [TopicP   [ForceP   [FocusP   [FinitenessP   [IP....]]]]]]
            če   wh-words/dali/li   da

(KRAPOVA & KARASTANEVA 2000)

Wh-words, *dali* and *li* are in Force phrase, which is lower than the subordinator *če*. Focus phrase is after the Force phrase.

Following Rizzi (2001), Krapova suggests that "it is worth subdividing ForceP (which was meant to convey information about clause type or illocutionary force) into two different heads – a declarative and an interrogative head. Like English, Bulgarian possesses a single lexical item for declaratives, the complementizer *če* 'that', which appears only in subordinate clauses. Bulgarian also disposes of an interrogative complementizer, *dali* 'whether', which unlike *če*, can appear both in embedded yes-no questions and in main yes-no questions" (KRAPOVA 2001:2). The analysis of *nali* and *nima* led to the conclusion that *dali*, *nali* and *nima* behave alike with respect to their syntactic distribution and main features. I will not discuss here whether *nali* and *nima* could be part of complementizer system in Bulgarian, since they cannot appear in embedded questions. For my analysis it is more important that all these particles are markers for interrogativity. If *dali* is situated in Interrogative head, presumably this will be the position of *nali* and *nima* in the structure. If this is truth, TopicP must precede *nali* and *nima*, but FocusP will be after them.

The examples in (32a) and (33a) show that it is normal Focus phrases to follow the interrogativity markers. The attempt to have Focus in front of *nali* and *nima* leads to ungrammaticality, as in (32b) and (33b).

(32)   a.   Nali IVAN zaminava za Sofia? (a ne Petar)
            Q   IVAN leaves   for Sofia (not Petar)
            'Is IVAN the person who leaves for Sofia?'
       b.   *IVAN nali zaminava za Sofia
            IVAN Q   leaves   for Sofia

(33)   a.   Nima IVAN zaminava za Sofia?
            Q   IVAN leaves   for Sofia
            'Is it truth that Ivan is the one who leaves for Sofia?'
       b.   *IVAN nima zaminava za Sofia?
            IVAN Q   leaves   for Sofia

Dali can raise around the Focus phrase, as shown in examples in (2d,e), but obviously this is not the same with *nali* and *nima*. It is not possible to have FocusP preceding *nali* or *nima*. This suggests the following relative order of elements in Interrogativity and Focus illustrated in (34).

(34)   nali > Focus
       nima > Focus

From the hierarchy, illustrated by the schedule in (31) Topic phrases should precede interrogativity markers. The examples in (15), (16) for *nali* and (23b), (23c) for *nima* confirm that prediction. Any XP moved in front of the particles gets topic reading. It is interesting that CLLD Topics can also precede *nali* or *nima*.

(35)   a.   Knigata   nali IVAN ja vze?
            bookDef Q IVAN Cl took
            'It was Ivan who took the book, wasn't he?'
       b.   Knigata   nima IVAN ja vze?
            bookDef Q IVAN Cl took
            'It is truth that Ivan was the one who took the book?'

The examples in (36a,b) show that even more than one CLLD Topics can precede the interrogativity markers *nali* and *nima*. It is possible to have two Topic phrases in front of *nali* or *nima*, but only one of them to be resumed by a clitic.

(36)   a.   Na Ivan knigata   nali PETAR (mu)   ja   dade?
            to Ivan bookDef Q PETAR heDat sheAcc gave
            'It was Petar who gave the book to Ivan, right?'
       b.   Na Ivan knigata   nima PETAR (mu)   ja   dade?
            to Ivan bookDef Q PETAR heDat sheAcc gave
            'Is it really the truth that Petar gave the book to Ivan?'

The examples presented here confirm the suggestions done by Krapova (2001) that Interrogative head is higher than Focus, but lower than Topic in the structure. However, the examples in (37a,b) show one very interesting fact. Clitic doubling constructions (cf. AVGUSTINOVA 1998; SCHICK 2000; TOMIĆ 1996 for more details) can be after *nali* or *nima*. These constructions get Topic reading:

(37)   a.   Nali knigata   IVAN ja vze?
            Q   bookDef IVAN Cl took
            'It was Ivan who took the book, wasn't he?'
       b.   Nima knigata   IVAN ja vze?
            Q   bookDef IVAN Cl took
            'Is it true that Ivan was the one who took the book?'

The fact that clitic doubling constructions functioning as regular Topics or CLLD Topics could be found to the left or to the right of *nali* or *nima* could be generalized as

(38) CLLD Topic > nali > Topic
                   nima

Focus could be an XP after *nali, nima*. Focus phrase is below Interrogativity head. Topics (more that one), CLLD Topics can occur in front of *nali, nima* or after them. To explain the positions of elements presented in (34) and (37) I will adopt the idea proposed by Rizzi (1997). "The global articulation of the topic-focus field in Italian involves a FocP surrounded by recursive TopP's, this configuration being in turn sandwiched in between the Force-Finiteness system. The non-recursiveness of FocP may be a consequence of its own interpretative characteristics" (RIZZI 1997:287). The examples from Bulgarian yes-no questions with *nali* and *nima* show that topic phrases can undergo free recursion.

Such relations between the preverbal elements and their mutual ordering follow Rizzi's conclusion for the fine structure of the C system:

(60) Force Top* Int   Top* Focus Mod* Top* Fin   IP

                                                (from Rizzi 2001:21)

To sum up, it is reasonable to suggest that Bulgarian interrogative particles *dali, nali* and *nima* interact with both Force marking and Topic-Focus distribution. While [interrogative] features of *dali* are related especially to [focus] features, *nali* and *nima* are connected with Topic phrases. *Dali* has the possibility of raising around a single Focus projection, while *nali* and *nima* are connected with Topic recursion.

References

AVGUSTINOVA, TANIA (1998) *Word Order and Clitics in Bulgarian* (= *Saarbrücken Dissertations in Computational Linguistics and Language Technology*, 5). Saarbrücken.

FRANKS, STEVEN & TRACY HOLLOWAY KING (2000) *A Handbook of Slavic Clitics*. New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

JACOBS, JOACHIM (2001) The Dimensions of Topic-Comment. In: *Linguistics* 39(4):641-681.

KING, TRACY HOLLOWAY (1997) Some Consequences of a Prosodic Inversion Account of Slavic Clitic Clusters. In: *Formale Slavistik* (= *Leipziger Schriften zur Kultur-, Literatur-, Sprach- und Übersetzungswissenschaft*, 7:75-86). Frankfurt am Main: Vervuert Verlag.

KISS, KATALIN (1998) Identificational Focus versus Information Focus. In: *Language* 2:245-272.

KRAPOVA, ILIYANA (2001) On the Left Periphery of the Bulgarian Sentence. Ms.

KRAPOVA, ILIYANA & TSENA KARASTANEVA (2000). Complementizer Positions in Bulgarian. In: *Bălgaristikata v zorata na XXI vek - Bălgaro-amerikanskata perspektiva za naučni izsledvanija*, 93-104. Sofia.

LAMBRECHT, KNUD (1994) *Information Structure and Sentence Form*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

MOTAPANYANE, VIRGINIA (1997) Preverbal Foci in Bulgarian. In: *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 5(2):265-299.

NICOLOVA, RUSELNA (2000) Kontrastfocusierung mit Partikeln im Bulgarischen. In: *Linguistische Arbeitsberichte* 75, 103-115.

NICOLOVA, RUSELNA (2001) Za kontrastnija fokus s chastici v bulgarskija ezik. In: *Săvremenni sintaktični teorii*: Vol. 1, 76-85. Plovdiv: Plovdiv University Press.

PENČEV, JORDAN (1998) *Săvremenen bălgarski ezik. Sintaxis*. Plovdiv: Plovdiv University Press.

RIVERO, MARIA-LUISA (1993) Bulgarian and Serbo-Croatian Yes-No Questions: V-Raising to –Li versus –Li Hoping. In: *Linguistic Inquiry* 24:567-575.

RIZZI, LUIGI (1997) The Fine Structure of the Left Periphery. In: HAEGEMAN, LILIANE (ed.) *Elements of Grammar*, 281-339. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

RIZZI, LUIGI (2001) Locality and Left Periphery. Ms.

RUDIN, CATHERINE (1997) Kakvo li e li: Interrogation and Focusing in Bulgarian. In: *Balkanistika* 10:335-346.

RUDIN, CATHERINE, CHRISTINA KRAMER, LOREN BILLINGS & MATTHEW BAERMAN (1999) Macedonian and Bulgarian li Questions: Beyond Syntax. In: *Natural Languages and Linguistic Theory* 17(3):499-540.

SCHICK, IVANKA (2000) Dative Clitics and the Information Structure of Balkan-Slavic Languages. In: *Linguistische Arbeitsberichte* 75:149-165.

TOMIĆ, OLGA (1996) Focus on Focus. *University of Trondheim*. In: *Working Papers in Linguistics* 28:309-317.

Yovka Tisheva
Department of Bulgarian
Faculty of Slavic Studies
University of Sofia
15 Tzar Osvoboditel
1504 Sofia, Bulgaria
e-mail: yovka@slav.uni-sofia.bg