Multiple Topicalization and Wh-fronting in Bulgarian and the Fine Structure of the Left Periphery

In this paper I argue that topicalization and focus fronting in Bulgarian (BG) are licensed in the same projection. Their interaction provides evidence for Uriagereka's (1988, 1995) point-of-view functional projection. I correlate two seemingly unrelated properties, the order of the fronted topics and foci and the requirement for subject verb inversion with focused phrases by positing a null fo-cus affix. As a result I conclude that the order of movement with multiple feature checking is free.

Topics appear at the beginning of a sentence (1), and they can co-occur with a fronted focused phrase (2a), which must follow it (2b). Rudin (1986) argues that topics are CP adjoined but I provide counterevidence from multiple wh-fronting (MWF). Topics also precede the fronted wh-phrases (3). Now note that lexical material can split the wh-cluster in the absence of a topic (4a) but
not in the presence of one (4b). If topics were indeed adjoined to CP, this fact remains a mystery.

Bo kovi 's (1997) argues that MWF is an epiphenomenon decomposable into the more familiar wh-movement for one wh-phrase and an independently motivated focus movement for all wh-phrases. He assumes, following Rudin (1988), that BG wh-phrases form a constituent and suggests that C is the focus licensor. Based on the data in (4a) I propose a minor modification of his Economy/Focus Movement account, namely that focus is checked below C. The contrast in (4) can be explained on Franks' (1998) hypothesis that lower copies of movement can be pronounced to save a derivation from a phonological violation. In related work I suggest that topics are checked in the projection C takes as a complement, DP. The wh-phrases also move all to SpecDP. Then only the highest one goes to SpecCP which is shown to follow from the Principle of Economy. Lexical material can interevene between the two maximal projections (5). Assuming the copy theo-ry of movement, the phrase in SpecCP has left a copy in the lower projection. If the wh-cluster is pronounced below the topic the impossibility of splitting the wh-cluster follows since lexical mate-rial cannot appear within SpecDP (6). I claim this is the case and the responsible factor is intona-tion. Topics require a sharp fall followed by a rise-fall (7a).Wh-phrases require a high tone but the fall is gradual spreading over the whole sentence (7b). Intonational requirements clash when a to-pic follows immediately a wh-phrase. There is a remedy, though: pronouncing the copy of the wh-phrase in SpecCP on the the marked contour (7c). Multiple topics are allowed in BG, and they will be shown to follow the same pattern (8).

Note my claim that apparently contradictory movements (topics is old and focus is new information) are licensed in the same clausal projection. The motivation is entirely empirical. The con-ceptual oddness disappears if these are viewed as discourse-related. Uriagereka's (1995) starting assumption is that discourse affects configurations. His is a minimalist solution: a single syntactic category encodes information theoretic matters which do not carry enough conceptual weight to de-fine a separate level. Topic, focus, emphasis, contrast, etc. all have an aspect of common: they en-code the *point of view* of the speaker or some other subject. The projection in question is deemed universal, and suggestive evidence comes from languages with overt focalization strategies. The facts discussed above provide support for his hypothesis.

If topic and focus target the same projection the order of the fronted phrases needs to be explained, see (2). I assume a multiple specifiers structure. The null hypothesis is that the order of movement is free, and some other factor is responsible for the observed orders. Following Bo - kovi (forthcoming) I propose that a null focus marker is attached to the focused phrase. This mar-ker is a verbal affix, i.e. requires adjacency to the verb. In principle, either the topic or the fo-cused phrase can surface first. The derivation on which the focus phrase moves to the higher specifier crashes at PF since the phonological requirements of the affix cannot be met. The deriva-tion that satisfies the null affix requirements for (2a) is given in (9). Crucial will be a parallel bet-ween fronted multiple topics and foci with respect to ordering. This analysis extends to the requirement for subject verb inversion as in (10) and (11). Topicalization does not require inver-sion (12). The phonological requirement of the null affix to be adjacent to the verb is satisfied by pronouncing a lower copy of the subject (13). The adjacency does not have to result from Spec-Head agreement via the verb raising to D^o. I claim it remains in I^o. In summary,

having shown that multiple topicalization and focalization target the same projection, I have attributed the order of the fronted phrases to a non-syntactic factor.
Note: Topicalized phrases appear in **bold**face and focused phrases are given in CAPITALS.

(1) **Filma** Ivan e gledal.
movie-the (top) Ivan AUX.PRES.3P.SG seen
"The movie, Ivan has seen it."

(2) a. **Filma** IVAN e gledal.
movie-the (top) Ivan (foc) AUX.PRES.3P.SG seen
b. *IVAN **filma** e gledal.
"The movie, IVAN has seen it."

(3) **Filma** koj koga e gledal?
movie-the (top) who when AUX.PRES.3P.SG seen
"The movie, who has seen it when?"

(4) a. Koj, kazva , koga e gledal filma?
who you-are-saying when AUX.PRES.3P.SG seen movie-the
"Who are you saying has seen it when?"
b. ***Filma** koj, kazva , koga e gledal?
movie-the (top) who you-are-saying when AUX.PRES.3P.SG seen
"The movie, who are you saying has seen it when?"

(5) [$_{CP}$ Koj C ... [$_{DP}$ ~~koj~~ koga e gledal filma]]

(6) [$_{CP}$ ~~koj~~ C ... [$_{DP}$ filma D [$_{DP}$ koj koga e gledal ~~filma~~]]]

(7) a. utp (marked contour) c. utp
top comment topic wh_1 wh_2
b. p (neutral contour)
wh_1 wh_2

(8) a. Decata $_i$ [na cirk] $_k$ koj_1 $koga_2$ te vodi t_{wh-1} t_i t_k t_{wh-2} ?
kids-the (top) to-circus (top) who when will take
"The kids to the circus, who will take when?"

(9) [$_{SpecDP}$ filma $_{[+Top]\ i}$ [$_{SpecDP}$ IVAN $_j$ + ø$_{[+Foc]}$ D [$_{IP}$ ~~IVAN $_j$ + ø$_{[+Foc]}$~~ e gledal [$_{vP}$ ~~IVAN $_j$ + ø$_{[+Foc]}$~~ ~~e gledal~~ ~~filma $_{[+Top]\ i}$~~]]]]

(10) a. NA CIRK te vodi mama decata.
to-the-circus (foc) will take mom kids-the
b. *NA CIRK mama te vodi decata.
"Mom will take the kids TO THE CIRCUS."

(11) a. Kâde te vodi mama decata?
where will take mom kids-the
b. *Kâde mama te vodi mama decata?
"Where will mom take the kids?"

(12) a. **Filma** Ivan e gledal.
movie-the (top) Ivan AUX.PRES.3P.SG seen
b. ***Filma** e gledal Ivan.
"The movie, Ivan has seen it."

(13) a. [$_{SpecCP}$ Kâde [$_{SpecDP}$ ~~kâde + ø$_{[+Foc]}$~~ D [$_{IP}$ ~~mama~~ te vodi
[$_{vP}$ mama ~~te vodi~~ ~~decata~~ ~~kâde + ø$_{[+Foc]}$~~]]]] =(10a)

b. [$_{SpecDP}$ Decata $_i$ [$_{SpecDP}$ NA CIRK + ø$_{[+Foc]}$ D [$_{IP}$ ~~mama~~ te vodi
[$_{vP}$ mama ~~te vodi~~ ~~decata~~ $_i$ ~~NA CIRK + ø$_{[+Foc]}$~~]]]] =(11a)

Selected Refrences

Bo kovi , º. 1997. Multiple wh-fronting and Economy of derivation.*WCCFL*, 16: 49-65.

Bo kovi , º. (forthcoming). On the syntax-phonology interface: a view from syntax. Ms. University of Connecticut.

Franks, S. 1998. Clitics in Slavic. Position paper, *Workshop on Comparative Slavic Morphosyntax* 5-7 June 1998, Indiana University. (http://www.indiana.edu/~slavconf/linguistics/index.html).

Rudin, C. 1986. *Aspects of Bulgarian Syntax: Complementizers and Wh-Constructions* . Columbus, OH: Slavica.

Rudin, C. 1988. On multiple questions and multiple wh-fronting. *NLLT*, 6: 445-501.

Uriagereka, J. 1995. An F-position in Western Romance. In K. Kiss (ed.) *Discourse-Configurational Languges* . Oxford, UK: OUP.