

In H.Broekhuis, N.Corver, R.Huybregts, U.Kleinhenz, J.Koster (eds.)  
*Organizing Grammar. Linguistic Studies in Honor of Henk van Riemsdijk*. Berlin, Mouton de Gruyter, (2005), pp.359-364

## **Two asymmetries between Clitic Left and Clitic Right Dislocation in Bulgarian**

**Iliyana Krapova and Guglielmo Cinque**

Università di Venezia

krapova@unive.it, cinque@unive.it

### **1 Introduction**

Despite the substantial identity in syntactic properties between Clitic Left Dislocation (CLLD) and Clitic Right Dislocation (CLRD), and the prospect of deriving the latter from the former (Kayne 1995, Samek-Lodovici 2005), a prospect which we also find attractive, we point out here two types of contexts from colloquial Bulgarian where the two constructions diverge.<sup>1</sup>

### **2 Prepositionless datives ( *na-drop* )**

The first asymmetry between CLLD and CLRD in colloquial Bulgarian involves the so-called *na-drop* phenomenon (Vakareliyska 1994), which consists in omitting the preposition *na* 'to' in front of indirect object DPs resumed by a clitic in the same sentence.<sup>2</sup> For most speakers *na-drop* is

---

<sup>1</sup> Kayne's (1995) and Samek-Lodovici's (2005) analyses of CLRD involve leftward movement of the dislocated item (as in CLLD) followed by leftward raising of the remnant IP. Cecchetto's (1999) putative asymmetries between the two constructions, which he takes to argue against Kayne's analysis, do not seem to us to be cogent. Also see Samek-Lodovici's (2005) criticism. If the two differences that we discuss here could be attributed to the extra step in the derivation of CLRD and to the different pragmatic conditions associated with it, then the derivational relation between the two constructions could still be maintained.

<sup>2</sup> With psychological and physical perception predicates the omission of *na* is not sensitive to person distinctions, while with all other predicates taking indirect objects it is restricted to first and second persons. This, and other complexities of

## 2 Die Zauberflöte

possible if the object appears to the left of the verb, typically in sentence-initial position, which can be identified with one of the available CLLD positions in this language. According to the results of the test carried out and discussed in Vakareliyska (1994), speakers reject the possibility of *na*-drop if the indirect object appears postverbally, i.e. in CLRD or clitic doubling (CD) contexts.<sup>3</sup> See (1)-(3):

- (1) (Na) men sa mi kazali, če djado Assen e  
(to) me<sub>dat</sub> are<sub>3pl</sub> me<sub>dat.CL</sub> said<sub>3pl</sub> that grandpa Assen is  
rabotil na tri mesta, da može da gi gleda (CLLD)  
worked in three places to be-able to them<sub>acc.CL</sub> take-care<sub>3sg</sub>  
'They told me that grandpa Assen worked in three places in order  
to be able to take care of them.'
- (2) Ne moga dori da mu pomogna \*(na) čoveka... (CLRD)  
not be-able<sub>1sg</sub> even to him<sub>dat.CL</sub> help<sub>1sg</sub> (to) man-DEF  
'I can't even help the man.'
- (3) Tozi film mi xaresva samo \*(na) mene. (CD)  
this film me<sub>dat.CL</sub> appeal<sub>3sg</sub> only (to) me<sub>dat</sub>  
'Only I like this film.'

### 3 Indefinite specific DPs

The second asymmetry concerns the possibility of clitic left dislocating, and the impossibility of clitic right dislocating (pace Ivančev 1978, 164), indefinite *specific* DPs (i.e., indefinites which presuppose the existence of a referent for the DP):<sup>4</sup>

---

the phenomenon, discussed in Vakareliyska (1994), are however orthogonal to our point.

<sup>3</sup> "The highest over-all tolerance was for sentence-initial *na*-drop (e.g. [...] *\_ mene ne mi xaresva tozi film* 'I don't like that film'), while, as expected from the results of the earlier test, sentence-final *na*-drop was found unacceptable by most speakers (e.g. [...] *Tozi film ne mi xaresva \_ mene*).'' (Vakareliyska 1994, 137).

<sup>4</sup> To judge from Philippaki-Warburton et al. (2004,982), the same left-right asymmetry with indefinite specific DPs is also found in Greek. See their example (29), reproduced here in (i), as well as their discussion following the example:

- (4) a. Edin moj prijatelj go vidjaja da izliza ot xotela.  
 one my friend him<sub>acc.CL</sub> saw<sub>3pl</sub> to walk-out<sub>3sg</sub> from hotel<sub>def</sub>  
 ‘They saw a friend of mine leaving the hotel.’  
 (Arnaudova 2003,168)
- b. \*Vidjaja go <edin moj prijatelj> da izliza  
 saw him<sub>acc.CL</sub> one my friend to walk-out<sub>3sg</sub>  
 ot xotela <edin moj prijatelj>.  
 from hotel<sub>def</sub> one my friend  
 ‘They saw a friend of mine leaving the hotel.’

Indefinite specific DPs in Bulgarian differ from both *non-specific* DPs, as well as from definite *specific* DPs, which do not show any such asymmetry: the former can never be dislocated, as illustrated in (5), while the latter freely enter both the CLLD and the CLRD constructions without any limitations ((6)) (cf. Ivančev 1978, Guéntcheva 1994, Assenova 2002, Arnaudova 2002, 2003):

- (5) a. \*Edna žena šte si ja nameri toj, rano ili kásno (CLLD)  
 one woman will himself her<sub>acc.CL</sub> find<sub>3sg</sub> he, sooner or later  
 ‘He will find one woman or other for himself, sooner or later’
- b. \*Rano ili kásno šte si ja nameri toj (CLRD)  
 sooner or later will himself her<sub>acc.CL</sub> find<sub>3sg</sub> he  
 edna žena.<sup>5</sup>  
 one woman  
 ‘He will find for himself one woman or other, sooner or later’

- 
- (i) a. <sup>?</sup>\*ton sinandisa ena simfititi mu pighenondas sto periptero  
 him<sub>acc</sub> met<sub>3sg</sub> a fellow student<sub>acc</sub> my going to-the kiosk  
 b. ena simfititi mu ton sinandisa pighenondas sto periptero  
 a fellow student<sub>acc</sub> my him<sub>acc</sub> met<sub>3sg</sub> going to-the kiosk  
 ‘I met a fellow student of mine on the way to the kiosk.’

<sup>5</sup> Bulgarian CLLD in this respect differs from Italian CLLD, where even indefinite non-specific DPs can be clitic left (and clitic right) dislocated, as indicated by the grammaticality of the equivalent of (5):

- (i) a. Una donna, prima o poi la troverà  
 b. Prima o poi la troverà, una donna.

- (6) a. Ženata taka i ne ja nameri toj. (CLLD)  
woman<sub>def</sub> so and not her<sub>acc.CL</sub> found<sub>3sg</sub> he  
‘The woman, he did not find after all’
- b. Taka i ne ja nameri toj ženata (CLRD)  
so and not her<sub>acc.CL</sub> found<sub>3sg</sub> he woman<sub>def</sub>  
‘He did not find the woman after all’

#### 4 Are the asymmetries real?

In addition to CLLD, the Bulgarian left periphery is known to host more structural positions than the right periphery, each associated with a different construction: Focus movement, Hanging Topic Left Dislocation (HTLD), and the *kolkoto do* ‘as for’ construction (Arnaudova 2002, 2003, Krapova 2002, Krapova and Karastaneva 2000,2002, Krapova and Cinque 2005). So, if it could be shown that the options on the left side which are unavailable on the right side (i.e. (1) and (4)a) are not instances of CLLD but rather of one of the other left peripheral constructions, the syntactic identity between CLLD and CLRD could still be maintained. This however cannot be right, for several reasons. First, the fact that *na*-less datives and indefinite specific DPs cannot bear contrastive focus rules out the focus movement analysis ((7a-b)). Secondly, the fact that the same left-right asymmetries appear in an embedded context, renders a HTLD account not viable ((8a-b)) in view of the root-only character of this construction. Thirdly, the fact that *na*-less datives and indefinite specific DPs count as first position occupants w.r.t. Tobler-Mussafia effects (see (1) and (4)a above), rules out the possibility that they be (reduced) *kolkoto do* ‘as for’ phrases, given that, as noted in Krapova and Cinque (2005), the latter never count as first position occupants. See the contrast between (9a) and (9b):<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> By Tobler-Mussafia effects we mean the fact that Bulgarian clitics cannot be in first position of the clause but must be preceded by either the verb (in which case they are enclitic to it; see (9b)) or by some other constituent (in which case they are proclitic to the verb; see (9a)).

- (7) a. \*MEN sa mi kazali, če djado Assen e rabotil  
 me<sub>focus</sub> are<sub>3pl</sub> me<sub>dat.CL</sub> said<sub>3pl</sub> that grandpa Assen is worked  
 na tri mesta.  
 in three places  
 ‘To me they said that grandpa Assen worked in three places.’
- b. \*EDIN MOJ PRIJATEL go vidjaja da izliza  
 one my friend<sub>focus</sub> him<sub>acc.CL</sub> saw<sub>3pl</sub> to walk-out<sub>3sg</sub>  
 ot xotela.  
 from hotel<sub>def</sub>  
 ‘They saw a friend of mine leaving the hotel.’
- (8) a. Kazax ti, če men ne mi e studeno.  
 said<sub>1sg</sub> you<sub>dat.CL</sub> that me<sub>dat</sub> not me<sub>dat.CL</sub> is cold  
 ‘I told you I am not cold’
- b. Razbrax, če i edin tvoj prijatel sa go  
 understood<sub>1sg</sub> that also one your friend are him<sub>acc.CL</sub>  
 pokanili na sreštata.  
 invited to meeting<sub>def</sub>  
 ‘I understood that they have invited also a friend of yours to the  
 meeting.’
- (9) a. \*Kolkoto do mene# me pokanixa na sreštata  
 as for me me<sub>acc.CL</sub> invited<sub>3pl</sub> to meeting<sub>def</sub>  
 ošte včera.  
 already yesterday
- b. Kolkoto do mene# pokanixa me na sreštata  
 as for me, invited<sub>3pl</sub> me<sub>acc.CL</sub> to meeting<sub>def</sub>  
 ošte včera.  
 already yesterday  
 ‘As for me, they invited me to the meeting yesterday already’

Having thus excluded all possible alternatives, we are left with the conclusion that the *na*-drop case ((1)) and the dislocation of the indefinite *specific* DP ((4)a) are true instances of CLLD, unavailable in CLRD.

## References

- Arnaudova, Olga. 2002. Clitic Left Dislocation and Argument Structure in Bulgarian, in Proceedings of FASL 10, University of Michigan, 23-46

6 Die Zauberflöte

- Arnaudova, Olga. 2003. *Focus and Bulgarian Clause Structure*. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Ottawa
- Assenova, Petya. 2002. *Balkansko ezikoznanie*. Veliko Turnovo: Faber
- Cecchetto, Carlo. 1999. A comparative analysis of left and right dislocation in Romance. *Studia Linguistica* 53.40-67
- Guéntcheva, Zlatka. 1994. *Thématisation de l'objet en bulgare*. Bern: Peter Lang
- Ivančev, Svetomir. 1978. Nabljudenija vǎrxu upotrebata na člena v bǎlgarskija ezik in: *Prinosi v bǎlgarskoto i slavjansko ezikoznanie*, Sofia: Nauka i Izkustvo, 128-152.
- Kayne, Richard 1995. Class lectures at Harvard.
- Krapova, Iliyana. 2002. On the Left Periphery of the Bulgarian sentence *University of Venice Working Papers in Linguistics* 12.107-128.
- Krapova, Iliyana and Guglielmo Cinque. 2005. Clitic Doubling in Bulgarian (with reference to other Balkan languages and dialects), ms., Università di Venezia
- Krapova, Iliyana and Tsena Karastaneva. 2000. Complementizer positions in Bulgarian, in *Bulgarian Studies at the Dawn of the 21<sup>st</sup> Century: A Bulgarian-American Perspective*. Sofia: Gutenberg, 93-104
- Krapova, Iliyana and Tsena Karastaneva. 2002. On the Structure of the CP field in Bulgarian. *Balkanistica* 15.293-321
- Philippaki-Warbuton, I., S. Varlokosta, M. Georgiafenius, G. Kotzoglou. 2004. Moving from theta-positions: pronominal clitic doubling in Greek. *Lingua* 114.963-989.
- Samek-Lodovici, Vieri. 2005. When Right Dislocation Meets the Left-Periphery. A Unified Analysis of Italian Non-final Focus, ms., UCL, London.
- Vakareliyska, Cynthia. 1994. Na-drop in Bulgarian. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 2 (1).121-150.