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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.1

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.2 For most speakers na-drop is

---

1 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.

2 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
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. See (1)-(3):

(1) (Na) men sa mi kazali, če djado Assen e (to) me_{dat} are_{3pl} me_{dat,CL} said_{3pl} that grandpa Assen is rabotil na tri mesta, da može da gi gleda (CLLD) worked in three places to be-able_{acc,CL} take-care_{3sg} ‘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_{1sg} even to him_{dat,CL} help_{1sg} (to) man-{DEF} ‘I can’t even help the man.’

(3) Tozi film mi xaresva samo *(na) mene. (CD) this film me_{dat,CL} appeal_{3sg} only (to) me_{dat} ‘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).
(4) a. Edin moj prijatel go vidjaxa da izliza ot xotela.  
    one my friend himACC.CL saw3PL to walk-out3SG from hotelDEF  
    ‘They saw a friend of mine leaving the hotel.’  
    (Arnaudova 2003,168)

b. *Vidjaxa go <edin moj prijatel> da izliza  
   saw himACC.CL one my friend to walk-out3SG  
   ot xotela <edin moj prijatel>.  
   from hotelDEF 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 kâšno (CLLD)  
    one woman will herself herACC.CL find3SG he, sooner or later  
    ‘He will find one woman or other for himself, sooner or later’

b. *Rano ili kâšno šte si ja nameri toj (CLRD)  
    sooner or later will himself herACC.CL find3SG he  
    edna žena.  
    one woman  
    ‘He will find for himself one woman or other, sooner or later’

(i) a. ?*ton sinandisa ena simfititi mu pighenondas sto periptero  
     himACC met3SG a fellow studentACC my going to-the kiosk  
     ‘I met a fellow student of mine on the way to the kiosk.’  

b. ena simfititi mu ton sinandisa pigenondas sto periptero  
     a fellow studentACC my himACC met3SG going to-the kiosk  
     ‘I met a fellow student of mine on the way to the kiosk.’

5 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.
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(6) a. Ženata taka i ne ja nameri toj. (CLLD)
    woman\text{def} so and not her\text{acc.CL} found\text{3sg he}
    ‘The woman, he did not find after all’

b. Taka i ne ja nameri toj ženata (CLRD)
    so and not her\text{acc.CL} found\text{3sg he} woman\text{def}
    ‘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):  

6 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)).
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.
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