

Another Look at *li* Placement in Bulgarian*

Abstract. This article explores the properties of interrogative/focus particle *li* in Bulgarian, in the larger context of the clitic system of that language as well as from the perspective of how *li* and other clitics behave in related Slavic languages. A highly derivational model of grammar is assumed, with Minimalist syntax and Distributed Morphology morphology. As an alternative to scattered deletion, prosodically sensitive principles of linearization apply on the post-syntactic side of the grammar. Bulgarian special clitics cannot be Utterance initial, hence, very late in the derivation, undergo (Reordering) Merger to be linearized at the right of the prosodic word to their right. It is argued that interrogative *li*, as an enclitic, linearizes upon vocabulary insertion on the right of the prosodic word to its right. Focus *li*, however, occurs with a focused phrase in its specifier, hence is pronounced to the right of this phrase, with non-focus material elided.

1. Introduction

This article is a contribution to the growing literature on the syntax and semantics of the interrogative/focus particle *li* in Bulgarian (Bg), with particular emphasis on the interaction of *li* with the paradigmatic clitics in that language. Idiosyncracies of the Bg clitic system are exploited in order to probe the workings of the mapping from syntax to phonology. I argue that the nature of grammar is highly derivational, taking literally the minimalist idea that the rules, symbols, and principles of each component are blind to the needs of other components with which they must eventually interface. In particular, not only are questions of morphology and prosody ignored by the syntax, but the syntax proper makes no statements about linear order. Therefore, ordering relations *cannot in principle* be expressed between the constituents of a syntactic representation. Linearization is instead a property imposed on language by virtue of the temporal exigencies of

articulation, part of the process of Spell–out.¹ Similarly, once movement is treated as “Reemerge” of a copy of the constituent being moved, the question of which copy ultimately to pronounce *cannot in principle* be a syntactic one. Instead, copy selection is best regarded be a property imposed by the exigencies of the morphological and phonological components. It is only once such PF–oriented aspects of the representation have been factored out of the syntax that the questions of how, when, and why they are introduced can even be posed. And clitics, whose special properties are revealed at the nexus of syntax, morphology, and phonology, turn out to be the ideal tool with which to attack these issues. I argue that a careful consideration of the ordering and pronunciation of Bg clitics leads to specific proposals about the steps in the derivation which serve to map syntactic structures into those manipulable by the morphology and/or phonology.

The article proceeds as follows. I first offer an overview of the basic Bg facts and next briefly consider the debate over whether clitics are positioned in the syntax or in PF. In the fourth section, I lay out some assumptions about phrase structure and discuss one recent account of how Bg clitic order can be generated. In section 5, I demonstrate how the Bg data follow from a suitably articulated strongly derivational model of the mapping from the syntax into PF. In section 6, I turn to the puzzling behavior of *li* as a focus marker, arguing that it is driven by the PF deletion of non-focus material preceding *li*. The final section offers a short summary.

2. Background

Bg displays the standard Slavic inventory of pronominal and verbal auxiliary clitics; see Franks and King (2000: 48–67) for a comprehensive overview. These elements appear, adjacent to the verb, in the order AUX (except 3rd sg *e*) > DAT > ACC > *e*, as in (1):²

- (1) a. Sled tri godini ti **si** **mu** **gi** pokazvala.
 after three years you aux.2sg him.dat them.acc shown
 ‘After three years, you have shown him them.’
- b. Učitelkata veče **mu** **gi** **e** pokazvala.
 teacher.def already him.dat them.acc aux.3sg shown
 ‘The teacher has already shown them to him.’

These clitics are “special” in the sense of Zwicky (1977) in that they belong to specific grammatical paradigms, have corresponding tonic forms, and display syntactic properties which sharply distinguish them from their tonic counterparts. Although these are serious issues which have engendered considerable discussion, I will only peripherally be concerned in this article with how the special clitics come to be placed in this order and the exact syntactic positions that they occupy. It is however important to note that their canonical position in modern Bg is preverbal, as the above examples show. As a point of departure, I therefore assume that, everything else being equal, they are positioned with respect to the left edge of the finite verb. We will thus need a principle for linearizing the clitics before the verb; this will it turns out result from applying Kayne’s (1994) Linear Correspondence Axiom to linearize adjunction as to the left.

If, however, being syntactically positioned in front of the verb, would leave the clitics in absolute initial position (in a way to be made more precise below), then they must follow the verb instead:

- (2) a. Pokazvala **si** **mu** **gi**.
 shown aux.2sg him.dat them.acc
 ‘You have shown them to him.’
- b. Pokazvala **mu** **gi** **e**.
 shown him.dat them.acc aux.3sg
 ‘She has shown them to him.’
- c. ***Si mu gi** pokazvala.
- d. ***Mu gi e** pokazvala.

We will thus need a principle for adjusting an initial clitic group so that it follows the verb instead; following the tradition of Romance linguistics, I refer to this adjustment as the “Tobler-Mussafia” (TM) effect. As discussed in Franks (2005, 2006), this effect clearly involves some operation over and above the initial linearization, since it targets an uninterrupted clitic sequence and treats that sequence as a seamless whole (thereby preserving clitic order). Significantly, there are no TM effects in very closely related Macedonian, hence no restriction against initial clitics in that language, so that (2a, b) is what emerges in Macedonian (modulo the absence of third singular *e*), without any need for ordering adjustments.

Contrary to popular wisdom, the TM effect is not fundamentally prosodic. A clitic is an element that cannot serve as an independent prosodic word. Since it lacks a prosodic word tree, the clitic must “lean” on adjacent prosodic structure. In this article, I reserve the terms “enclitic” and “proclitic” to mean that an element in need of prosodic support can look to its left or to its right, respectively. The special clitics in Bg are traditionally described as prosodically enclitic, implying that they receive syntactic support and phonological support in opposite directions and in this way distinguishing them from the Macedonian clitics, which are not sensitive to direction. It turns out, however, that in Bg too the clitics can receive prosodic support in either direction and are in fact often proclitic. Thus, although the clitics in (2) are indeed prosodically enclitic on the verb, in (1) they can easily be pronounced as proclitic. Note that no TM effect obtains in Bg if *anything* precedes the clitics, even elements that are themselves prosodically deficient:

- (3) a. I **si** **mu** **gi** pokazvala.
 and aux.2sg him.dat them.acc shown
 ‘And you have shown them to him.’
- b. **Šte** **mu** **gi** pokazvaš.
 will him.dat them.acc shown
 ‘You will show them to him.’

In (3a) the conjunction *i* is sufficient to render *si mu gi* non-initial and in (3b) the future proclitic *šte* is. Even more telling are the examples in (4), where the clitics remain in front of the verb even when preceded by elements which necessarily induce an intonational boundary; cf. Nespor and Vogel (1986):

- (4) a. Petko, edin moj prijatelj, **mi go** dade.
 Peter a my friend me.dat him.acc gave
 ‘Petko, a friend of mine, gave it to me.’
- b. Ako njakoj, kojto e s men, **mi** dade nekolko čipa ...
 if someone who is with me me.dat gives several chips
 ‘If someone, who is with me, gives me some chips ...’
- c. Ivan, spored Marija, **go** viždam vseki den.
 Ivan according Maria him.acc see.1sg every day
 ‘(Talking about) Ivan, according to Maria, I see him every day.’
- d. Sled kato **si** živjal dosta s edna žena, **ja** poznaš dobre.
 after as aux.2sg lived enough with a woman her.acc know.2sg well
 ‘After you have lived with a woman long enough, you know her well.’

The ungrammaticality of (2c, d) must therefore have some source other than the putative requirement that the clitics are exclusively prosodically enclitic. Instead, there is an additional requirement of non-initiality which holds in Bg, but not Macedonian, that gives rise to the TM effect. While the domain at which this “non-initial” restriction on Bg special clitics pertains might be syntactically defined, perhaps as the clausal Spell–out domain, a more fruitful avenue to explore would be to express the relevant notion in prosodic terms here as well. In this article I will assume that Nespor and Vogel’s (1986) “Utterance” may ultimately turn out to be the correct domain, rather than something like Chomsky’s “phase.” If so, the domain for non-initiality for purely prosodic enclitics, such as *li* as described below, would be the Prosodic Word, for Serbian/Croatian second position enclitics, as described in the next section, it would be Nespor and Vogel’s I(ntonational)–phrase, and for the Bg clitics non-initiality would hold at the level of of the Utterance.

The lexical item *li*, on the other hand, is unequivocally enclitic; it is always pronounced at the right edge of a host prosodic word. In neutral Yes/No questions, this will be the verb:

- (5) Dade **li** Ana knjigata na Petko?
 gave Q Ana book.def to Petko
 ‘Did Ana give the book to Petko?’

When the sentence contains special clitics, *li* separates them from the verb:

- (6) Dade **li mu go** Ana?
 gave Q him.dat it.acc Ana
 ‘Did Ana give it to him?’

A striking property of *li* is that it can even split clitic sequences which do not otherwise tolerate any intervening elements. This can be seen with the proclitic negative particle *ne*, which, in addition to voiding TM effects, is post-stressing in Bg:

- (7) **Ne mu li go** dade Ana?
 neg him.dat Q it.acc gave Ana
 ‘Didn’t Ana give it to him?’

Example (7) thus has the prosodic structure in (8), where “ ω ” indicates a prosodic word and stress is indicated with capital letters:

- (8) [[ω ne MU] li] [go [ω daDE]] [ω Ana]

That is, *li* is enclitic on *ne mu* and *go* is proclitic on *dade*. The fact that *li* splits the two pronominal clitics indicates that its placement is purely prosodic.³ Similar effects can be observed in the perfect tense:

- (9) a. Dala **li si mu go**?
 given Q aux.2g him.dat it.acc
 ‘Have you given it to him?’
 b. **Ne si li mu go** dala?
 neg aux.2sg Q him.dat it.acc given
 ‘Haven’t you given it to him?’

The fact that (9a), with the participle preceding *li*, is well-formed will turn out to be significant, given that this word order is impossible in Serbian/Croatian (SC).

3. The clitic placement debate

Despite the recent publication of a number of treatments of *li* in Bulgarian, as well as Russian and Macedonian,⁴ many aspects of the syntax of this item remain underinvestigated. Yet a proper understanding of how *li* is positioned is crucial to the debate over whether the theory of grammar needs to countenance a PF mechanism such as “Prosodic Inversion” (PI). In this section, I present the relevant background to this debate, highlighting some of the basic arguments for each point of view.⁵ While I will argue that some PI effects are real and cannot be captured in syntactic terms, ultimately I eschew the “inversion” metaphor in light of absence of linear order in the syntax *per se*.

3.1. Motivation for Prosodic Inversion

A central dilemma raised by clitics is whether they are positioned syntactically, by the normal methods available to standard models of syntax, or prosodically, by some special PF-side “reordering” mechanism. This dilemma is highlighted by two sets of phenomena that seem to call for reference to prosodic information. The first is the possibility, largely restricted to SC, of the clitics splitting nominal expressions (typically NPs but also PPs where the P is proclitic). Here the force of the arguments is that there is no need for PI. The second is the TM effect discussed in section 2. While there are undoubtedly distinct reasons for both the splitting and TM phenomena, their existence raises the fundamental question of whether syntactic accounts are viable for all cases. Given that syntax is the traditional component where word order is defined, the onus of proof lies on those who would argue that syntax is not enough.

Splitting, as in SC (10) is essentially optional:

(10) a. Zelenu haljinu **mi je** kupila.
 green dress me.dat aux.sg bought
 ‘She bought me a green dress.’

b. Zelenu **mi je** haljinu kupila.

Clitics in SC fall in what is vaguely described as “second position” (2P). Since at least Browne (1974), such pairs have generally been taken to imply that there are two distinct methods of characterizing 2P, a syntactic one relevant for (10a) and a prosodic one relevant for (10b). The variation is then claimed to result from the option of locating the clitic cluster either after the first syntactic phrase or after the first prosodic word.

The syntactic strategy for deriving 2P (10a) is easily understood in X-bar theoretic terms. Some phrase XP must occupy the specifier position of the category ZP at the root of the sentence, which is then itself headed by the clitics, as follows:

(11) [_{ZP} XP [_Z clitics] [...]]

ZP is typically (but, as shown in Franks (1998, 2000), Caink (1999), Progovac (2000, 2005), Bošković (2001), not necessarily) CP, assuming a general clause structure as in (12):

(12) [_{CP} XP [_C clitics] [_{TP/IP} ...]]

Thus, if the clitics in SC all for some reason move to the highest head position, which is preceded by precisely one phrase in its specifier, syntactic 2P then follows.

The debates concern prosodic 2P. While the prosodic criteria are fairly transparent—in SC the clitics appear after the first prosodic word in their intonational phrase—it is not always so straightforward to determine what constitutes a prosodic word or an intonational phrase. Of greater concern is the strategy by which the clitics are able to appear in this (prosodically defined) position. One standard approach makes use of Halpern’s (1992/1995) PI or its less literal descendents. This resolves mismatches between syntactic and surface structure by inverting the clitic with the adjacent prosodic word. The idea is that PI is a last resort operation required to save the structure, and it does so by moving a clitic stranded in initial position to the right edge of the element to its right. Since this element is defined in prosodic terms, that

movement had traditionally been understood as taking place in PF, as in the studies of clitics by Halpern (1992/1995), Percus (1993), and Schütze (1994).

Here I adopt the kind of Morphological Merger view of post-syntactic operations proposed within the Distributed Morphology framework and specifically as developed in Embick and Noyer (2001). This approach is espoused in particular for Bg clitics by Pancheva (2005), who regards PI and its ilk as a kind of post-syntactic linearization process affecting adjacent elements, rather than actual movement. I will call Morphological Merger which results in what looks like local reordering “Reordering Merger” (RM),⁶ although it should be borne in mind that in this model order is not provided by the syntax, but rather is only defined on the PF side of the grammar. As noted in Embick and Noyer (2001: 561, fn. 6), Prosodic Inversion can be seen as a prosodically motivated variety of (Reordering) Merger.

RM is clearly sometimes needed to handle word-level morphology, as when an inflectional suffix precedes its host. Consider, for example, Bobaljik’s (2002) summary of Morphological Merger treatments of *do*-support in English:⁷

- (13) a. Sam *-s* eat ham \Rightarrow Sam eat^{+s} ham.
 b. Sam *-s* **not** eat ham \Rightarrow Sam *does* not eat ham.
 c. Who *-s* eat ham \Rightarrow Who eat^{+s} ham?
 d. When *-s* **Sam** eat ham \Rightarrow When *does* Sam eat ham?

English lacks movement of V to T(ense); instead, stranded inflectional material either undergoes RM as a suffix on adjacent V or, if this is impossible, is supported by inserting the dummy verb *do* into T. Thus, in (13a, c) the suffix *-s* is adjacent to *eat* and so can be realized at its right, whereas in (13b, d) overt elements block Merger, necessitating *do*-support of the stranded affix. An additional need for PI RM, as noted by Pancheva (2005) among others, is based on the fact that there are languages where the clitics appear strictly after the first prosodic word (i.e., only

the equivalent of SC (10b) is possible). Indeed, according to her, Old Bulgarian had a 2P system in which splitting was likely to have been obligatory. I therefore concur with these authors that grammatical theory must embrace special mechanisms which operate, on the PF side of the grammar, to rescue structures in which the syntax happens to have left morphological material stranded: “In the post-syntactic component, proclitics can undergo Merger without reordering, similarly to inflectional prefixes, whereas enclitics need to be reordered with their host, similarly to inflectional suffixes” Pancheva (2005: 129).

3.2. *Arguments from the syntax.*

Even if language has at its disposal something like PI RM, a PF-side mechanism which enables readjustment of the output of the syntax, it remains an empirical matter whether or not any given phenomenon requires resort to it. PI RM has all the hallmarks of a last resort operation and, for SC—despite its superficially appealing aspects—there are good reasons to reject it. There is a large literature debunking PI as the appropriate mechanism to accommodate splitting in SC; here I simply summarize a few main points. The reader is referred to Čavar and Wilder (1994), Franks and Progovac (1994), Progovac (1996), Franks (1998, 2000), Franks and King (2000), and especially to Bošković (2001: 11–36), who offers a comprehensive summary of the reasons against adopting PI for SC.

The essential point made in all relevant discussions is that the possibility of splitting strongly correlates with the ability of other, non-clitic material also to intervene. Thus, the correct analysis should not be to attempt to move the clitics to some position internal to NP, but rather to pull the NP apart by independently available syntactic manipulations. The clitics can then be in their normal, syntactically defined 2P position(s), with one piece of the NP in the specifier to the left of the clitics and the other simply appearing on their right. Thus, Franks and

Progovac (1994) offer SC (14), with apparent splitting, but observe that PI is unnecessary because the adjective and noun can be separated independently of clitic interpolation, as in (15):

(14) a. Anina **mu** drugarica nudi čokoladu.
 Ana's him.dat girlfriend offers chocolate
 'Ana's girlfriend offers him chocolate.'

b. Zanimljivu **sam** knjigu čitao.
 interesting aux.1sg book read
 'I read an interesting book.'

(15) a. Anina dolazi sestra.
 Ana's arriving sister
 'Ana's sister is coming.'

b. Kakvu čitaš knjigu?
 what-kind read.2sg book
 'What kind of book are you reading?'

They argue, along with Čavar and Wilder (1994) and others, that the correct analysis involves remnant topicalization/*wh*-movement.⁸ This shows that PI is not necessary to accommodate splitting.

More problematic is the existence of “fortresses”: this was Halpern's term for constituents that cannot be split by PI, such as a preposition plus its complement, as in (16a). A P in SC can never be cannot separated from its complement (16b),⁹ just as it cannot be separated by non-clitics (16c) or be stranded by *wh*-movement (16d):

(16) a. Prema Mariji **je** Milena trčala.
 towards Maria.dat aux.3sg Milena ran
 'Milena ran towards Maria.'

b. *Prema **je** Mariji Milena trčala.

c. *Prema trči ona Mariji.
 towards runs she Maria.dat
 'She is running towards Maria.'

d. *Kome **je** Milena trčala prema?
 who.dat aux.3sg Milena ran towards
 'Who did Milena run towards?'

Note that *prema* is a tonic preposition, that can even bear contrastive focus under appropriate conditions; for the significance of contrastive focus, see section 6 below. Nonetheless, as noted in the following example from Franks and Progovac (1994), PI is still blocked:

- (17) *PREMA je Milanu Marija koračala, a ne od njega.
 towards aux.3sg Milanu.dat Maria walked and not from him
 ‘Mary walked TOWARDS Milan, not away from him.’

This is clearly a syntactic restriction, yet hypothetical PI is sensitive to it.

Another significant correlation between splitting by clitics and other elements concerns the kind of fortress constituted by a head plus its complement, as in the following, illicit judgments due to Progovac:

- (18) a. *Roditelji su se uspešnih studenata razišli.
 parents aux.3pl refl successful.gen students.gen dispersed
 ‘*The parents dispersed of the successful students.’
 b. *Roditelji dolaze uspešnih studenata.
 parents arrive.3pl successful.gen students.gen
 ‘*The parents are arriving of the successful students.’

What is interesting here is that Bošković (2001: 15–16) finds both sentences marginal but acceptable. To the extent that judgments are parallel across speakers, a syntactic account of fortresses is supported. This correlation also seems to hold across languages, so that splitting by clitics is as degraded as splitting in general in other 2P clitic languages, such as Czech and Slovenian; for Slvn, see Golden and Milojević Sheppard (2000). On the other hand, the claim made about the correlation between clitic splitting and the potential for movement for examples such as those in (18) is not as absolute as proponents of the remnant movement account (including myself in previous work) make it out to be. This is, in fact, one place where Croatian and Serbian seem to differ. An informal poll of roughly 35 Croatian speakers in Zagreb in 2004 revealed that, for them, although (movement) splitting in (18b) is indeed impossible, (clitic)

splitting in (18a) is perfectly acceptable. This suggests instead that PI RM must indeed be an option, and that SC for some reason rarely makes recourse to it.

The second type of putative prosodically conditioned phenomenon falls under the general rubric of Tobler-Mussafia effects, as discussed in the previous section with respect to Bg. Here the evidence for RM in SC is not as compelling. Recall that Bg *li* is preceded not only by finite verbs, but also by participles, as in Bg (9a), repeated as (19):

- (19) Dala **li** **si** **mu** **go?**
 given Q aux.2g him.dat it.acc
 ‘Have you given it to him?’

This is not, however, the case in SC. Bošković (2001) points out that participles in SC never raise to C. Compare (20a) with (20b), which instead of RM surfaces with what may be called “*da*-support,” as in (20c):

- (20) a. Kupuješ **li** novu kuću?
 buy.2sg Q new house
 ‘Are you buying a new house?’
 b. *Kupio **li** **si** novu kuću?
 c. Da **li** **si** kupio novu kuću?
 C Q aux.2sg bought new house
 ‘Did you buy a new house?’

Clearly, the participle never gets high enough to be in the head position which ends up moving to C, only a finite verb does. As Bošković (2001: 44) notes, “this is not surprising, given that crosslinguistically, in languages in which V-to-C movement clearly takes place in finite clauses only finite verbs move to C, which indicates that finiteness motivates the movement.” If, moreover, SC also does not employ PI to handle splitting, but instead analyzes it in terms of remnant movement, we could reconcile SC with Bg by claiming that the participle in both languages stops to the right of *li*, but that in Bg *li* can be linearized after the participle whereas in SC it cannot. This would entail that *li* has a different status in the two languages in a way that

remains to be made explicit. One straightforward possibility is that *li* can undergo Merger with a prosodic word to its right in Bg, but not in SC (hence is forced to be enclitic on whatever is to its left and, if nothing is, then the result is unacceptable at PF).¹⁰ I thus conclude that leaving participles to the right of *li* in both languages resolves an important typological problem. This conclusion will play a key role in my eventual account of *li* placement in Bg.

3.3. *A residue of prosodic effects*

Despite all the reasons to reject PI for SC, there remains a small residue of prosodic effects which seem crucially to depend on the prosodic deficiency of the clitics. Interestingly, these effects only seem to obtain with single clitics.¹¹ Here I mention one, that concerns fortresses, summarizing points made in Franks (2000: section 2.2).

Progovac (1996) provides the following judgments for various types of SC fortresses:

- (21) a. ??Sestra **će** i njen muž doći u utorak.
 sestra.nom fut.3pl and her.nom husband.nom come on Tuesday
 ‘My sister and her husband will come on Tuesday.’
- b. ??Lav **je** Tolstoj veliki ruski pisac.
 Leo.nom aux.3sg Tolstoi.nom great Russian writer
 ‘Leo Tolstoi is a great Russian writer.’
- c. ??Prijatelji **su** moje sestre upravo stigli.
 friends aux.3pl my.gen sister.gen just arrived
 ‘Friends of my sister’s have just arrived.’

The marginality of these constructions is due to the fact that, for Progovac, they are not actually splittable in the syntax. The addition of more clitics renders them completely unacceptable:

- (22) a. *Sestra **će mi ga** i njen muž pokloniti.
 sestra.nom fut.3pl me.dat it.acc and her.nom husband.nom give
 ‘My sister and her husband will give it to me.’
- b. *Lav **mi ga je** Tolstoj poklonio.
 Leo.nom me.dat it.acc aux.3sg Tolstoi.nom gave
 ‘Leo Tolstoi gave it to me.’

- c. *Priatelj*li* **su** **mi** **ga** moje sestre poklonili.
 friends aux.3pl me.dat it.acc my.gen sister.gen gave
 ‘Friends of my sister’s gave it to me.’

Consistently, a single clitic is marginally able to split fortresses which cannot be penetrated by larger amalgamations of clitics. This curious effect suggests a PF account of (21). It reveals an apparent restriction that only a single morpheme, typically monosyllabic, can undergo RM. The idea is that, in (21), a simple enclitic happens to be stranded at the left edge of its potential prosodic host and so is linearized to that host’s right. Recall also in this regard that Croatian speakers do not necessarily adhere to the correlation in (18) which the remnant movement account predicts. It thus seems that PI RM is indeed an option made available by the principles of Distributed Morphology, albeit one which SC rarely, if at all, avails itself of.

3.4. *PF filtering*

In order to understand why this might be, it is necessary to consider yet another PF strategy for saving illicit structures. Following Chomsky (1995) and much subsequent work, syntactic movement can be regarded as copying an element merged lower in the tree and reemerging it at the root, so that a moved phrase is really just a higher occurrence of a previously merged element.¹² Thus, in a sentence like Bg (23), the direct object *kakvo* is associated both with its initial position as object of the verb (which also moves) and SpecCP (where it ends up):

- (23) Kakvo obuslavja [lipsata na vkus ~~obuslavja kakvo~~]?
 what conditions absence.def of taste conditions what
 ‘What does the absence of taste condition?’

In the mapping to PF, the multiple copies are resolved in favor of their highest occurrence and lower copies are deleted (represented as stricken through). If, however, the highest copy cannot for some reason be pronounced, it is the lower copy which surfaces. For example, given the prohibition described in Billings and Rudin (1996) against adjacent homophonous *wh*-elements, in a multiple *wh*-question in Bg, although ordinarily the highest copy is pronounced, when the

two *wh*-words are identical, it is the lower copy of the second one which must be pronounced.

Consider the following minimal pair:¹³

(24) a. *Koj kakvo kupi?*
 ‘Who bought what?’

b. **Koj kupi kakvo?*

(25) a. *Kakvo obuslavja kakvo?*
 ‘What conditions what?’

b. **Kakvo kakvo obuslavja?*

Since pronunciation of the higher copy is blocked, (25) looks roughly like (26) in PF:

(26) *Kakvo kakvo obuslavja [kakvo obuslavja kakvo]?*

This gives the order in (25a) rather than (25b).

Franks (1998, 2000) and Bošković (2001), inter alia, demonstrate how this same kind of interface system, in which “the syntax proposes and the phonology disposes,” is also very well suited to handle the behavior of prosodically dependent elements, such as the SC clitics.

Essentially, if these are left by the syntax at the beginning of their intonational phrase (demarcated with “#”), then the so-called “clitic third” phenomenon arises, whereby clitics appear lower than in second position, since they cannot find prosodic support when preceded by an intonational break. In the following minimal pair, this effect arises when the topicalized constituent *tvome prijatelju* ‘your friend’ is treated as a separate intonational phrase, as in (27a):

(27) a. #*Tvome prijatelju*# #~~su~~ prodali **su** knjigu.#
 your.dat friend.dat aux.3pl gave aux.3pl book.acc
 ‘To your friend, they sold the book.’

b. #*Tvome prijatelju* **su** prodali ~~su~~ knjigu.#

As noted in regard to Bg (4), some elements are necessarily flanked by intonational phrase boundaries. As expected, these induce obligatory pronunciation of lower copies, as in (28), where *tvoja mama* is an appositive:

- (28) #Ja#, #tvoja mama#, #~~sam~~ ti obećala **sam** **ti** igračku#.
 I your mother aux.1sg you.dat promised aux.1sg you.dat toy.acc
 ‘I, your mother, promised you a toy.’

In this way, the syntax provides the correct structure, but the phonology filters out the illicit copies. Prosodic considerations are irrelevant to the syntax, but in the mapping to PF these play a critical role.

Evidence in support of this account is based on closely related Slovenian. In this language, the clitics are not necessarily dependent on a prosodic word to their left to be pronounced; cf. Franks and King (2000: 31–48) or Bošković (2001: 151–168). Hence, in the Slvn translation of (28), cited by Golden and Milojević Sheppard (2000), it is the highest copy of the clitics which is retained:

- (29) Jaz#, #tvoja mama#, **sem** **ti** obljubila ~~sem~~~~ti~~ igračko.

Let us return in this light to the rarity of the PI RM option in SC. Because the clitic elements under consideration move in the syntax, there are going to be copies in prosodically viable positions. If the first stage in mapping from the syntax to the morphology is selection of which copy to retain, then this operation will render RM otiose. It is only when a clitic is introduced in a high position that we would therefore ever expect to encounter the last resort effects of RM. The particle *li* is just such an enclitic: it is prosodically enclitic in all the languages which have it and it is merged very high, in C^0 . The result is that structures with nothing to its left *can* be generated by the syntax, leaving *li* to seek prosodic support to its right. But when the prosodic host of *li* is to its right, then *li*, as an enclitic, must follow that host. Although this situation does not seem to arise in SC, perhaps because of the availability of *da*-support, it does in Bg. In the remainder of this article I subject the behavior of *li* in Bg to closer examination and argue that the data necessitate precisely this kind of analysis.

4. Phrase structure and Bulgarian clitics

In order to understand the placement of *li* with respect to the special clitics, it will be necessary to make certain assumptions about Bg phrase structure and how the clitics come to appear in the orders that they do. In what follows, I adopt aspects of the account in Bošković (2002) but depart from it in one crucial respect: whereas he implements the surface order in terms of a “scattered deletion” mechanism, my goal is to show how the order can be derived more directly.

4.1. *Getting clitics to the left*

I follow Franks and Rudin (2005) in analyzing the Bg nominal domain as a K(ase)P, with the pronominal clitics K^0 heads which take a DP complement; for a very similar approach, with R(eferenz)P instead of their KP, see Werkmann (2003). KPs are merged in argument positions within VP. As cased elements, however, these will have their case features valued (or checked—the exact mechanism is immaterial to the present discussion) in the specifier position(s) of whatever licenses accusative and dative case. For the sake of explicitness, I will assume without further argumentation that these are AgrPs, situated above VP. The auxiliaries, on the other hand, are introduced even higher, presumably in T and/or AgrS, in a system with the following rough clausal architecture:¹⁴

$$(30) \quad [_{CP} C^0 [_{AgrSP} AgrS^0 [_{TP} T^0 [_{AgrIOP} AgrIO^0 [_{AgrOP} AgrO^0 [_{VP} V KP KP \dots]]]]]]]$$

Bošković (2002: 329) addresses clitic ordering in terms of the Bare Phrase Structure model of Chomsky (1995), which treats clitics as ambiguous between X^0 and XP status. Since clitics are non-branching elements, they can be introduced in XP positions (as specifiers or complements) but subsequently move as heads. Bošković further assumes Kayne’s (1994) Linear Correspondence Axiom (LCA), which forces head-adjunction to be always to the left. Thus, to get a clitic on the left of the verb, the clitic has to move to the verb from below it (i.e., from a position to its right). These assumptions let Bošković derive clitic order as follows. Each clitic is,

at an intermediate point in the derivation, analyzed as an XP and located in the specifier of some phrase. The verb then raises, from the head position of that phrase, past the clitic to the next head up, after which the clitic itself finally moves as a head, raising to adjoin to the left of V.

This process is illustrated by the phrase *(ti) si mi go dal* ‘you have given it to me,’ starting from a structure as in (31):

(31) [TP **si** [T' T⁰ [AgrIOP **mi** [AgrIO' AgrIO⁰ [AgrOP **go** [AgrO' AgrO⁰ [VP dal]]]]]]]]

The derivation then proceeds from this configuration, eventually to produce (32), with the following sequence of steps:

- (i) V adjoins to AgrO, creating the complex AgrO head “V+AgrO.”
- (ii) AgrO adjoins to AgrIO, placing *dal* above the specifier containing *go*.
- (iii) Next, *go*, moving as a head, adjoins to AgrIO, which places it to the left of *dal*.
- (iv) AgrIO, now containing *go dal*, moves past *mi*, enabling *mi* to adjoin to *go dal*.
- (v) T, now containing *mi go dal*, moves past *si* to the next functional head up.¹⁵
- (vi) Finally, *si* moves up from SpecTP to adjoin to the left of F.

(32) [FP [F **si** [**mi** [**go dal**]]]]

In this way, Bošković’s system produces the required AUX>DAT>ACC word order, assuming only left-adjunction, in keeping with Kayne’s LCA.

4.2. *The scattered deletion method*

Unfortunately, things are not always this simple. One obvious problem is that the third singular auxiliary comes last, rather than first, even though—as shown by ellipsis, movement, and other tests summarized in Bošković (2001) for SC (they don’t work in Bg)—*e* is merged above the pronominal clitics. A second, smaller problem concerns the marginal possibility of adverbs intervening in the sequence. And the third problem, which is the focus of the present article, involves getting *li* to intervene in the clitic sequence, as described above in section 2. For all

these problems, Bošković offers the same solution: scattered deletion. The idea behind this mechanism is that, if necessitated by PF requirements, it is possible to pronounce pieces of complex heads. Thus, to obtain (33a), some idiosyncratic lexical property of *e* must mandate that only the lowest copy can be pronounced, as in (33b).¹⁶

(33) a. Toj **go** e vidjal.
 he.nom him/it.acc aux.3sg seen
 ‘He has seen him/it.’

b. Toj e [go + vidjal + e [gø + vidjal + e [gø + vidjal gø]]]

While this works (assuming the theory is enriched to countenance scattered deletion of pieces of complex heads, such as F in (32)), it is to my mind unnecessarily stipulative. As discussed below, the account relies on three individually suspect assumptions about PF: (i) the auxiliary and pronominal clitics cannot be initial in their intonational phrases; (ii) *li* must be second in its intonational phrase; and (iii) *e* must be last in the sequence of clitics. The first is how Bošković characterizes prosodic enclitics, although in fact the relevant domain for non-initiality for true enclitics, such as *li*, is the prosodic word (non-initiality in the I-phrase being what produces the 2P effect, but this is property of SC not Bg clitics). The second misrepresents the prosodic properties of the Bg special clitics (the relevant domain for non-initiality being a larger domain, the Utterance, if prosodically defined at all). And the third is not only purely templatic, but also obscures the regularity of the special behavior of the third person singular auxiliary clitic, as discussed in section 5.2.

With respect to adverb interpolation, in examples such as (34), Bošković (2001: 181, fn. 1) is forced to “assume that the intervening adverbs are incorporated into the verb, sort of clitics and therefore a part of the clitic+verb cluster.”

(34) a. Ne sme im go vse ošte pokazali.
 neg aux.1pl them.dat it.acc still shown
 ‘We still have not shown it to them.’

- b. Nie **sme im go** večē kazali.
 we aux.1pl them.dat it.acc already said
 ‘We have already said it to them.’

To implement this he also has to rely on the false claim that “the adverbs in question are unstressed when intervening between a clitic and the verb.”¹⁷ The reason adverb interpolation is so problematic for Bošković is that, in his system, the clitics and the verb form a complex syntactic head in Bg, which means that the only way to accommodate the offending adverbs is to treat them as adjoined to the verb. For Bošković, this means that they need to behave exactly like canonical clitics; i.e., they can move as heads and they lack stress. While (34) does not *per se* require scattered deletion, to the extent that adverbs can intervene between an auxiliary and the pronominal clitics, scattered deletion will also need to be invoked; see Franks (2005, 2006) for details and analysis.

Finally, *li* placement induces even more complex instantiations of scattered deletion, as in (35)–(37):

- (35) a. Pokazvala **li mu gi** e.
 shown Q him.dat them.acc aux.3sg
 ‘Did she show them to him?’
 b. [~~e~~ + [~~mu~~ + [~~gi~~ + **pokazvala**]]] + **li** [~~e mu gi pokazvala~~] ... [~~e mu gi pokazvala~~] ...
- (36) a. Ne **si li mu gi** pokazvala?
 neg aux.2sg Q him.dat them.acc shown
 ‘Didn’t you show them to him?’
 b. [~~ne~~ + [~~si~~ + [~~mu~~ + [~~gi~~ + ~~pokazvala~~]]]] + **li** [~~ne si mu gi pokazvala~~] ...
- (37) a. Ne **mu li gi** e pokazvala?
 neg him.dat Q them.acc aux.3sg shown
 ‘Didn’t she show them to him?’
 b. [~~ne~~ + [~~e~~ + [~~mu~~ + [~~gi~~ + ~~pokazvala~~]]]] + **li** [~~ne e mu gi pokazvala~~] ... [~~ne e mu gi pokazvala~~] ...

These patterns obtain with scattered deletion once it is stipulated, as Bošković does, that *e* can only be pronounced at the end of the clitic sequence and that *li* must be pronounced in the second

position of its intonational phrase, so that it appears after the first prosodic word that can be formed. With these PF assumptions, the only way that (37b) can surface is with the five clitics each belonging to different pieces of the structure.

5. A linearization based approach

In this section, I offer an alternative account to Bošković’s highly modulated scattered deletion system. I reject scattered deletion for subparts of morphological words (although retaining the copy and delete approach for syntactic constituents, as in section 6) and I eschew the complex PF requirements his use of scattered deletion must refer to (although retaining as inescapable the need for everything to be prosodically parseable).

5.1. *Getting li in the right place*

We have seen that *li* poses special problems for syntactic accounts of splitting,¹⁸ since it is able to separate elements which cannot otherwise be separated by demonstrably syntactic processes. I propose to handle this with the following Spell–out steps: (i) the clitics are first linearized in front of the verb, which they c-command (in accordance with the LCA); (ii) *li* is merged above the “clitics + verb” sequence; (iii) as an enclitic, *li* undergoes “Prosodic Inversion” RM (Merger to avoid prosodic word initiality) and is linearized at the right edge of the first prosodic word to its right; and (iv) the clitics, when left in Utterance initial position, undergo “Tobler-Mussafia” RM (Merger to avoid prosodic Utterance initiality) and are linearized to the right of minimal prosodic word to their right. When this is the “verb + *li*” sequence, then the clitics follow *li*, resulting in apparent splitting.

The simplest scenario is schematized in (38), where “v” = Utterance and “CG” = “clitic group”:

(38) a. [_v Ti [_ω [_{CG} **si mu gi**] pokazvala]]] ‘You have shown them to him.’

b. [_v [_ω [_{CG} **si mu gi**] pokazvala]]] ⇒ [_v [_ω pokazvala + [_{CG} **si mu gi**]]]

In (38a), the clitics are first linearized to the left of the verb. At the end of the derivation, the presence of nominative subject *ti* ‘you’ prevents them from being Utterance initial, so nothing happens. In (38b), on the other hand, the clitics are initial and so must undergo Tobler-Mussafia RM to appear at the right of the word to their right. Recall that the absence of TM effects in Macedonian means that the left side of the arrow in (38b), rather than the right side, is well formed in that language. This suggests that what triggers RM is not the rule *per se*, but rather the violation of a prosodic prohibition against initiality. The idea is that any linear order which fails to respect a PF requirement is cancelled and the items are resubmitted to the linearization process. In (38a) *si mu gi* has been linearized to precede *pokazvala* and there is nothing wrong with this, but in (38b) there is (in Bg, but not Macedonian), so the ordering relation is cancelled. The clitic group is then again linearized with respect to verb, which is must follow.

In (39), on the other hand, the clitics do not become Utterance initial until after *li* has been merged and is itself linearized, hence they are positioned to the right of *pokazvala li*, giving rise to the appearance of splitting.

(39) [_ω [_{CG} **si mu gi**] pokazvala] ⇒ **li** [_ω [_{CG} **si mu gi**] pokazvala]] ⇒
 [_ω [[_{CG} **si mu gi**] pokazvala] + **li**] ⇒ [_v [_ω [[_{CG} **si mu gi**] pokazvala] + **li**]] ⇒
 [_v [_ω [pokazvala + **li**] + [_{CG} **si mu gi**]]]

In Macedonian, as expected, since the Utterance initiality of *si mu gi* poses no problem, the final RM step in (39) is absent.

Consider finally what happens when *ne* ‘not’ is involved; recall that in Bg this element is post-stressing. In (40a), then, only *li* encliticizes, targeting, as expected, the adjacent prosodic word *ne si*, again with the appearance of splitting. Unlike in Bošković’s system, nothing special needs to be said about *e* in (40b) since, as argued in the next subsection, this element is simply

merged in T and the pronominal clitics adjoin to it, linearizing to its left (in keeping with the LCA).

(40) a. **li** [_ω **ne SI**] [_ω **mu gi** pokazvala] ⇒ [_ω [_ω **ne SI**] + **li**] [_ω **mu gi** pokazvala]

b. **li** [_ω **ne MU**] [_ω **gi e** pokazvala] ⇒ [_ω [_ω **ne MU**] + **li**] [_ω **gi e** pokazvala]

In order for this system to work, it is important that the various processes be properly defined and that they feed each other, so as to apply cyclically. To recap, the account exploits three distinct linearization mechanisms. The first is that, in keeping with the LCA, c-command and syntactic adjunction (of both heads and phrases, although here only head-adjunction is at issue) is linearized as precedence. This will place the clitics as *(ne) si mu gi pokazvala*, everything else being equal. Here I contend that, in the structure schematized in (41), Spell-out of a complement phrase *ZP* to some head *X* takes place when *XP* is completed (which means whenever a distinct head of some phrase *YP* dominating *XP* is merged, as well as at the end of the entire derivation), although Chomsky's (2001) more standard phase-based system (which targets only phrases of specific types) should also work.¹⁹

(41) [_{YP} *Y* [_{XP} *X* [_{ZP} ... *Z* ...]]]

The second is that the prosodic properties of lexical items are respected upon vocabulary insertion (which in Distributed Morphology takes place only on the PF-side), so that enclitic *li* must undergo Morphological Merger to the right of an adjacent prosodic word, with the result that it exhibits the PI RM effect. This means that the imposition of morphological and prosodic structure needs to apply iteratively, whenever possible. Finally, the requirement that the special clitics not be Utterance initial means that RM will induce TM effects if there is no preceding element in the linearization. Crucially, *li* must be prosodified before the position of the clitics is (re)evaluated. This means that prosodic structure must be also be available—and (re)evaluated—as the derivation to Spell-out proceeds. Although he does not draw attention to it, the same must

be true of Bošković's system, since determination of which copy to pronounce is contingent upon prosodic factors.

5.2. *Advantages of derivational linearization*

In this section, I argue against Bošković's (2002) use of scattered deletion to obtain the *li* facts and then show how the ordering of clitics AUX (except 3rd sg *e*) > DAT > ACC > *e* can be handled in purely syntactic terms.²⁰ I do not see scattered deletion as a particularly elegant or explanatory solution, and here catalog some reservations about invoking this mechanism so cavalierly. First, it is not clear that extending the copy and delete approach to what Embick and Noyer (2001) call "subwords" (submaximal X^0 s) is either desirable or necessary; its application, like that of ellipsis in general, might be restricted to syntactic constituents and limited from looking inside of complex X^0 s. Second, also on the conceptual side, I note that it requires prosodic properties of specific vocabulary items to determine which actual copy to pronounce, both of itself and of other items. Intuitively, this seems incorrect: assuming that the syntax leaves undetermined which copy is to be overt, this should be resolved *before* any actual morphology or phonology can take place. Third, the scattered deletion account ascribes the same sequence of clitics completely different constituencies, depending on whether it appears preverbally or postverbally (as the result of TM RM), although the actual clitic order internal to the clitic group remains immutable. Fourth, Bošković's approach amounts to my mind to a sophisticated variant of templatic solutions to clitic ordering.²¹ Fifth, there is reason even to doubt the empirical correctness of the PF stipulations Bošković needs in order to modulate the deletions, as discussed *inter alia* in section 6.4 below with respect to *li* when used to mark contrastive focus. Sixth, it is only when the clitics are grouped together that they can follow the verb, indicating that Tobler-Mussafia RM targets the clitics as some kind of seamless and impermeable prosodic unit, which I take to be Nespov and Vogel's (1986) "clitic group." That is, as reported in Franks (2005,

2006), aspectual adverbs can (with varying degrees of felicity) intervene at certain points when the clitics precede the verb,²² but this is absolutely impossible when they follow.

This last point deserves some comment. Since splitting by particles such as *už* ‘maybe’ is more natural than splitting by prosodically heavier adverbs, I illustrate the relevant facts with this element.²³

(42) a. Az *sâm* už *ti* *go* *dala*.
 I aux.1sg maybe you.dat it.acc given.fem
 ‘I have maybe already given it to you.’

b. **Dala sâm už ti go*.

c. **Az sâm ti už go dala*.

d. *Az sâm ti go už dala*.

e. **Tja ti už go e dala*.
 She you.dat maybe it.acc aux.3sg given.fem
 ‘She has maybe already given it to you.’

f. **Tja ti go už e dala*.

g. *Tja ti go e už dala*.

The contrast between (42a) and (42b) shows that, when *už* intervenes, *sâm (už) ti go* cannot be analyzed as a clitic group, a prerequisite for RM. TM RM is thus impossible in (42b); it is hard to see how scattered deletion could obtain this result. Also of interest is the question of where the particle can in fact intervene when the clitics precede the verb. I assume that it can only be adjoined to an XP (or, given its headlike status, to a maximal X⁰,²⁴ i.e. to a Morphological Word in the sense of Embick and Noyer (2001)). The ungrammaticality of (42c) and (42e) show us that the pronouns constitute an independent subcluster. The grammaticality of (42d) and (42g) implies that the clitics are actually *not* adjoined to the verbal participle, contra the analysis in Bošković (2002), but rather in the next higher head position up. The most telling contrast, however, is between grammatical (42a) and ungrammatical (42f). From (42a) I conclude that the

auxiliary clitics, other than third singular *e*, are in a higher head position than the pronominal clitics. From (42f), I further conclude that the pronominal clitics must be left-adjoined to *e*, which is therefore also in the next head position down. Specifically, as I argue in Franks (2005, 2006), *e* is not an a person agreement marker, but rather is situated in T^0 . The pronominal clitics adjoin to T, hence are linearized to the left of *e* (when present), in keeping with the LCA: $[_{AgrS} \text{Agr}^0] [_{TP} [_T [ti\ go] + e] \dots]$. The other auxiliary clitics are then in AgrS, hence to the left of the pronominal clitics, and in a separate head: $[_{AgrS} [_{AgrS} \text{s}â\text{m}] [_{TP} [_T [ti\ go] + T^0] \dots]]$. Implications of an analysis in which the Bg clitics do not all occupy the same functional head are explored in Franks (2006).

A last criticism of the scattered deletion approach is that, by simply requiring *e* to appear last, some larger generalizations about its special status are obscured, generalizations which corroborate the finer structure just proposed for where the various clitics in fact go. In following rather than preceding the pronominal subcluster, the third singular auxiliary clitic behaves differently from the other auxiliary clitics in virtually all the South Slavic languages, as well as in West Slavic Upper and Lower Sorbian. This supports the idea that this element, which I generically represent as *(j)e*, actually occupies a different position than the other auxiliary clitics, and that two head positions are involved, one before the pronominal clitics and one after.²⁵ Elsewhere in West Slavic (as well as in South Slavic Macedonian), the third person auxiliary is null, indicating that there is, in fact, no morphological exponent of third person agreement and that, where it appears, it is marking something other than subject agreement. Although the auxiliary clitics are person agreement markers in AgrS, *(j)e* is actually inserted in T, one head down, where it seems to have a more or less expletive status. One reason to implicate tense as the locus of *(j)e* is that, in Slovenian, it is precisely the future tense auxiliary clitic *bom* ‘will.1sg’, etc. which, along with *je*, comes after rather than before the pronouns.²⁶ There is however

variation among the languages in whether the auxiliary clitic appears in AgrS or T. Interestingly, not just *(j)e* but the other clitic auxiliaries also once came last, implying a historical change from the auxiliary clitics surfacing in T to them surfacing in AgrS, as well synchronic T-to-AgrS movement. Morphological evidence from SC lends further support to this approach. In that language that the tonic forms of the auxiliaries consist of the morpheme *je*, which I take to originate in T⁰, plus an AgrS portion identical to the clitic: *jesam* ‘(I) am’ = *je* + *sam* ‘aux.1sg’; *jesi* ‘(you) are’ = *je* + *si* ‘aux.2sg’; *jesmo* ‘(we) are’ = *je* + *smo* ‘aux.1pl’; *jeste* ‘(you) are’ = *je* + *ste* ‘aux.2pl’; *jesu* ‘(they) are’ = *je* + *su* ‘aux.3pl’). These forms can be deriving by raising T to adjoin, in keeping with the LCA, to the left of AgrS. The one morphological exception is in the third singular, which is just a tonic *je*. This follows from the assumption that the AgrS portion is null for the third singular. It thus seems that at one time AgrS lowered to T (as a morphological operation, following Embick and Noyer’s (2001) account of Def(initeness) lowering in the Bg DP), but now T raises to AgrS; this change is apparently complete in some Croatian dialects, where even *je* comes first. None of these facts finds any expression in a scattered deletion account, which treats the fact that *(j)e* is pronounced last as accidental, and are instead indicative of an approach that attempts to read fixed aspects of word order off of hierarchical structure.

6. Additional properties of *li*

This section examines some further ramifications of and problems for the account sketched in section 5.

6.1. Compound Tenses

Since this account relies on *li* targeting the prosodic word to its right, I conclude that the verbal complex does not in fact raise to C (otherwise the entire complex should appear to the left of *li*).²⁷ This is also important in order to get *li* to follow the *l*-participle in Bg. Since the participle

cannot ever raise to C, as it never moves to AgrS (or T, in an Agr-less system), the ability of *li* to follow the participle in Bg but not in SC reflects an important difference between how *li* is positioned in the two languages. Moreover, even in compound tenses with tonic auxiliaries, such as the perfect, *li* follows the first element, splitting the auxiliary off from the verb:²⁸

- (43) Beše **li** kupila kâšta?
 had.2/3sg Q bought house
 ‘Had you/she bought a house?’

While here *beše* and *kupila* do not constitute a complex head, since other material can separate them, as shown below and discussed at length in Franks (2006), the participle can also focus and adjoin to the auxiliary, as in (44):

- (44) Kupila beše kâšta.
 ‘She had BOUGHT a house.’

While the normal effect of participle fronting is contrastive focusing, many speakers report other possibilities, so that (44) could mean ‘She HAD bought a house.’ or ‘She had bought a HOUSE.’

Which element is focused apparently depends on context and intonation, but one (and only one) must be. When this happens, it is only *li* (and other clitics, as discussed in section 6.3) which can ever separate the participle from *beše*. As the following examples reveal, although speakers (to varying degrees and depending on discourse factors) tolerate other material intervening when the auxiliary precedes the participle (45),²⁹ indicating that that they are adjacent heads of distinct projections, this is always absolutely impossible with the other order (47), except for *li* (46):

- (45) a. ?Beše **li** Marija kupila kâšta?
 had.3sg Q Maria bought house
 ‘Had Maria bought a house?’
- b. Beše napâlno/veče zabavila za sreštata.
 had.3sg completely/already forgotten about meeting.def
 ‘She had completely/already forgotten about the meeting.’

- (46) Kupila **li** beše kâšta?
 bought Q had.3sg house
 ‘Had she BOUGHT a house?’

- (47) a. *Zabravila napâlnno/veče beše za sreštata.
 forgotten completely/already had.3sg about meeting.def
- b. *Kupila **li** Marija beše kâšta.
 had.3sg Q Maria bought house

Thus, even though the “participle + auxiliary” constitutes a complex head in (44), it can be split by *li*. The only thing relevant is that *li* is string adjacent to the first prosodic word, which is either *beše* or *došâl*, and then *li*, as an enclitic, linearizes in the only possible way it can with respect to that prosodic word, i.e., at the right edge of its host.

6.2. *Focus and topic*³⁰

We have seen that *li* adjoins to the prosodic word to its right. In neutral questions this is the verb, but in addition there can be a Focus Phrase (FP). In questions, FP is dominated by CP; in statements there is no CP. Focus drives participle fronting, so that when it precedes the auxiliary, the participle raises first to adjoin to the auxiliary and then the “participle + auxiliary” complex head moves to F (hence it immediately follows *li* in C⁰, if present). Thus, in (44), there is an FP and some element contained within it must be focused. As noted, the focus need not be the participle, even though it moves to F. We can see this by using a focus sensitive adverb such as *samo* ‘only’, as noted by Rudin, King and Izvorski (1998):

- (48) Gledali bjaxa (samo) filma.
 saw had.3pl only film.def
 ‘They had seen (only) the FILM.’

The *li* particle also has a focus marking function. This is discussed at length by Rudin, King and Izvorski (1998), whose basic observation about *li* (in Russian as well as Bg) is that it partitions the sentence into focus and presupposition, rendering the question contrastive. A simple example from Rudin, King and Izvorski (1998) follows:³¹

- (49) [_F Na Marija]**li** dadoxte nagradata?
 to Marija Q gave.2pl prize.def
 ‘Was it to Maria that you gave the prize?’

The focus can never follow *li*. Compare (50) with (48):

- (50) [_F Gledali] **li** bjaxa (*samo) filma.
 saw Q had.3pl only film.def
 ‘Had they SEEN (*only) the film?’

The point is that, to the extent that *samo* forces *filma* also to be focused, the sentence is unacceptable (since *li* marks the focus and there cannot be multiple foci). Rudin, King and Izvorski further note that elements which cannot serve as focus, such as left-dislocated phrases and indefinites, cannot immediately precede *li*:

- (51) a. *Ivan **li**, toj **ti** kaza?
 Ivan Q he you.dat told
 ‘*Talking about and was it Ivan who told you?’
 b. *Njakoj **li** dojde na sreštata?
 someone Q came to meeting.def
 ‘*Was it someone who came to the meeting?’

The way to save (51a) is for *toj* to be the focus instead, with *Ivan* the topic:

- (52) Ivan, toj **li** **ti** kaza?
 Ivan he Q you.dat told
 ‘Talking about Ivan, was it him who told you?’

The structure in (52) is in fact extremely common in Bg, which frequently employs and freely iterates topical material at the beginning of the sentence. This material precedes both *wh*-phrases (53a) and the fronted verb in a neutral *li* question (53b):

- (53) a. Decata kakvo gledaxa?
 children.def what watched.3pl
 ‘As for the children, what were they watching?’
 b. Decata gledaxa **li** tozi film?
 children.def watched.3pl Q that film
 ‘As for the children, were they watching that movie?’

I therefore assume that these initial topics are in a projection above the CP phase, hence are not available to support *li* and necessarily precede the focus.

6.3. *Interaction with clitics*

For this reason, such presentential material does not count in the linearization of clitics, which is determined before the topics are merged. This can be confirmed by clitic doubling, since topics are doubled by clitics but the focus never is; cf. Franks and Rudin (2005) for an analysis whereby the clitic arises as a K head merged with its associate and is overt whenever any process moves the associate so that it escapes the KP. Topicalization is one such process. Thus, if the object is topicalized we usually get doubling, as in (54):

- (54) Tozi film decata **go** gledaxa.
 this film children.def it.acc watched.3pl
 ‘As for this film, the children were watching it.’

In (54) there is no TM effect because the subject *decata* precedes. We can show, however, that topics do not count by using the “participle + auxiliary” focus construction. Here, any preceding direct or indirect object must be a topic and, therefore, doubles:

- (55) a. Filma gledali **go** bjaxa decata.
 film watched.3pl it.acc had.3pl children.def
 ‘As for the movie, the children had seen it.’
- b. Na Ivan, knjigata kupila **mu** **ja** beše Marija.
 for Ivan book.def bought him.dat it.acc had.3sg Maria
 ‘As for Ivan and as for the book, Maria had BOUGHT it for him.’
 [OR ‘As for Ivan and as for the book, it was MARIA who had bought it for him.’]
 [OR ‘As for Ivan and as for the book, Maria HAD bought it for him.’]

In (55b), both *na Ivan* and *knjigata* are topics, hence both are doubled, by *mu* and *ja*, respectively.

What is particularly striking here is the fact that the pronominal clitics intervene between the two members of the compound tense.³² This array of data leads to the following conclusions about the application of Tobler-Mussafia Reordering Merger to the clitics: (i) RM follows the prosodically driven merger of *li*; (ii) RM applies before extrasentential topics are merged; and (iii) RM targets the first component of a compound verb.³³ This last property is potentially problematic, given that, in the Distributed Morphology framework articulated by Embick and

Noyer (2001), processes that locally reorder morphological words should not be able to look inside syntactically created heads. Placing the clitics in (55) between the participle and auxiliary should therefore not be possible once the participle has adjoined to the auxiliary. As explored in Franks (2006), this implies (assuming, as always, linearization in keeping with the LCA) either that that participle adjoins to the clitics before that complex itself adjoins to the auxiliary ([[kupila + [**mu ja**]] + [beše]]) or that the clitics are positioned in front of the auxiliary before the participle adjoins to it ([kupila + [**mu ja** + [beše]])).

Although syntactic positions can define discourse functions such as a topic and focus, these also seem to be read off of word order; in this regard, cf. also Arnaudova (2003). Thus, we have already seen that any element within FP can be focused. Similarly, topics do not need to be outside CP. Crucially, in the absence of *li* or focus there is no need to posit a CP projection, even when topics are present. Of interest here is the fact that there is no TM effect after such topics, since these are able to count as preceding the clitics within the phrasal domain:³⁴

- (56) a. Na Ivan, spored mene, **mu go** dadox.
 for Ivan according me him.dat it.acc gave.1sg
 ‘To Ivan, according to me, I gave it.’
- b. Ivan, spored Marija, **go** viždam vseki den.
 Ivan according Maria him.acc see.1sg every day
 ‘(Talking about) Ivan, according to Maria, I see him every day.’ [= (4c)]

However, when *li* is present the TM effect reemerges:

- (57) a. Ivan, spored Marija, vidja **li go** včera vâv centâra?
 Ivan according Maria saw.3sg Q him.acc yesterday in center.def
 ‘Ivan, according to Maria, did she see yesterday in the city center?’
- b. *Ivan, (spored Marija), **go** vidja **li** včera vâv centâra?

This is, as before, because the presence of *li* forces the material at the left edge to be too high to be considered in determining whether or not the clitic *go* is initial. If I am correct that the

relevant domain for non-initiality of Bg clitics is Nespor and Vogel's (1986) Utterance, then this places such topics outside of this prosodic domain (CP presumably forces a new Utterance).

Topics can also occur at the right periphery of the clause. This can be seen in (58), from Rudin et al. (1999: 569), where doubling by *go* indicates that, in addition to *vie* 'you', *tozi film* 'this film' is also understood as a topic:

- (58) *Vie gledali li ste go tozi film?*
 you saw Q aux.2pl it.acc this film
 '(As for) you, have you seen this film?'

According to the analysis in Franks and Rudin (2005), *go* arises by virtue of topicalization of *tozi film*; the clitic is of course not obligatory here, but its absence means *tozi film* has not moved.

Evidence that *tozi film* in (58) actually vacates KP can be seen in (59), also from Rudin et al. (1999), where the clitic is obligatory:

- (59) *Vie ste go gledali li tozi film?*
 you aux.2pl it.acc saw Q this film
 'Have you seen it, this film?'

Contrary to what Rudin et al. (1999) claim, however, *vie* in (59) is not a topic. Instead, *tozi film* moves to outside the entire phrase *vie ste go gledali*, presumably AgrSP, and it is this remnant which raises to SpecCP, where it precedes *li*, but leaving previously extracted *tozi film* behind.

Phrasal fronting is similarly necessary to accommodate the variant in (60):

- (60) *Tozi film vie ste go gledali li?*
 this film you aux.2pl it.acc saw Q
 '(As for this film), have you seen it?'

6.4. Does focus *li* split fortresses?

While I have laid the groundwork in this article for an account of *li* and its interaction with the special clitics in Bg, there is a disturbing residue of puzzling possibilities for the placement of *li* when it marks focus.³⁵ These possibilities suggest that focus *li* must be treated differently than *li* as a simple Yes/No marker.

Li as a focus particle can appear after what looks like a subconstituent of a phrase that is contrastively focused, appearing to split material that is otherwise unsplittable:

- (61) a. Knigata **li** na Ivan Vazov si čel (ili raskaza)?
 book.def Q of Ivan Vazov aux.2sg read or story.def
 ‘Was it the book you read by Ivan Vazov (or the story)?’
 (cf. *Knigata si čel na Ivan Vazov.)
- b. Novata **li** knjiga na Ivan vidja?
 new.def Q book of Ivan saw.2/3sg
 ‘Was it the new book by Ivan that you saw?’
 (cf. *Novata vidja knjiga na Ivan.)
- b. Momičeto **li** ot Sofia se razbolja (ili momčeto)?
 girl.def Q from Sofia refl get-sick or boy.def
 ‘Did the girl from Sofia get sick (or the boy)?’
 (cf. *Momičeto se razbolja ot Sofia.)
- d. Prebrojavaneto **li** na zajcite se pravi naesen (ili čiftosvaneto)?
 counting.def Q of rabbits.def refl make in-fall or mating
 ‘Is it the counting of rabbits that takes place in the fall (or the mating)?’
 (cf. *Prebrojavaneto se pravi na zajcite naesen.)

Even names can be split contrastively, for example, as a response to my ambiguous statement

Vidjax Petrov ‘I saw Petrov’, one could ask:

- (62) a. Žoreto **li** Petrov vidja (ili Koleto)?
 Zhore Q Petrov saw.2/3sg or Kole
 ‘Was it ZHORE Petrov you saw (or Kole)?’
- b. ?Vladi **li** Petrov vidja (ili Ivo)?
 Vladi Q Petrov saw.2/3sg or Ivo
 ‘Was it VLADI Petrov you saw (or Ivo)?’

Note that only diminutive names ending in *-e* are articulated (except in the vocative), and having the article for some reason facilitates focusing; the contrast between (62a) and (62b) deserves more careful analysis. Prepositions as well, to the extent that they are focusable, can be followed by *li*:³⁶

- (63) Protiv **li si** ili za?
 against Q aux.2sg or for
 ‘Are you AGAINST or for?’

As argued by Derzhanski (2002), all adverbs can appear in focus–*li* constructions, except for those, like *veče* ‘already’, which according to him cancel the presupposition part of the focus–presupposition structure associated with such questions. In this vein, *edna* ‘one, a’ is focusable as a numeral, but not as an indefinite quantifier:

- (64) a. Edna **li** knjiga iskaš (ili dve)?
 one Q book want.2sg or two
 ‘Do you want ONE book (or two)?’
 b. *Edna **li** druga knjiga iskaš?
 one Q other book want.2sg
 ‘*Do you want AN other book?’

Similarly, if *starijat prijatel* ‘old friend’ means “a friend who is old,” then *starijat* can be contrastively focused, but when it means “longtime friend,” it cannot:

- (65) a. Starija **li** prijatel pokani (ili mladija)?
 old.def Q friend invited or young.def
 ‘Did you invite your OLD friend (or the young one)?’
 b. *Starija **li** prijatel pokani?
 ‘Did you invite your longtime friend?’
 (cf. Starija prijatel **li** pokani?)

Once again, the placement of *li* reflects this, as does the intonation, in both Bg and English.

Coordination, on the other hand, seems to be one kind of traditional fortress that remains impermeable:

- (66) *Xljaba **li** i sireneto izjade?
 bread.def Q and cheese.def ate
 ‘Was it the BREAD and the cheese that you ate?’ [intended reading]

For some reason, coordination blocks *li*–encliticization to the first conjunct, regardless of which conjunct is in focus. Is PI completely ruled out here? There are ways of improving (66), although it never becomes perfect. It is slightly better if indefinites are used as in (67a), and, if one sets up the contrastive focus properly, (66) becomes even more acceptable, as in (67b, c) :

- (67) a. ?*Xljab **li** i sirene jade?
 bread Q and cheese ate
 ‘Were you eating BREAD and cheese?’
- b. ??Xljaba **li** i sireneto izjade (ili salatata i sireneto)?
 bread.def Q and cheese.def ate or salad.def and cheese.def
 ‘Was it the BREAD and the cheese that you ate (or the salad and the cheese)?’
- c. ??Râžen **li** xljab i sirene jade?
 rye Q bread and cheese ate
 ‘Was it RYE bread and cheese that you were eating?’

Interestingly, as noted by Rudnitskaya (2000), such splitting does obtain in Russian.³⁷

- (68) ?Anna **li** i Petr priezžajut vo vtornik?
 Anna Q and Peter arrive.3pl on Tuesday
 ‘Is it ANNA AND PETER who are coming on Tuesday?’

The position of *li* after the first element is in fact obligatorily for most speakers:

- (69) *Anna i Petr **li** priezžajut vo vtornik?

This speaks in favor of a pure PI approach for Russian, contra Bošković (2001), but suggests the availability of two distinct strategies for Bg.

One can of course restructure (66) and ask, as a neutral Yes/No question:

- (70) Xljaba i sireneto **li** izjade?
 ‘Did you eat the bread and the cheese?’

In fact, *li* is placed after phrasal fortresses in neutral questions; compare (71) with (61d):

- (71) Prebrojavaneto na zajcite **li se** pravi naesen?

‘Does the counting of rabbits take place in the fall?’

In order to accommodate this, we need to allow a questioned phrase to move to SpecCP, where it precedes (and prosodically supports) *li*, in addition to the PI RM mechanism. This gives rise to minimal pairs: in (61d) *prebrojavaneto na zajcite* ‘the counting of rabbits’ is focused and left in SpecFP in the syntax, so that enclitic *li* undergoes PI RM with the prosodic word to its right, but in (71) *prebrojavaneto na zajcite* moves to SpecCP. A similar pair is given in (72):

(72) a. V tozi **li** grad **si** xodil?
 in this Q city aux.2sg went
 ‘Have you been to that city?’

b. V tozi grad **li si** xodil?

If we think about how these options compete, it would seem that placement of *li* after the focus must wait until SpecCP is merged and the CP is completed, otherwise it would never be able to follow an entire phrase. This makes sense if CP, rather than a subphrase consisting of C and its complement, is sent to Spell–Out.

Another argument, due to Bošković (2001), for phrasal movement to the left of *li* concerns Sluicing, as in (73):

(73) Novata kâšta **li**?
 new.def house Q
 ‘Is it a new house?’

Sluicing deletes the complement to *li*, but leaves the rest of the structure intact. There thus must be movement in Bg to the specifier position of the phrase headed by *li*, be it SpecFP or SpecCP.³⁸

To conclude, I draw attention to some problems with this dual approach, which lead me tentatively to adopt a version of the copy and delete system for Bg focus constructions. First, there is the residual coordination fortress noted above, which remains mysterious, given that, other than this, *li* in Bg really seems to be able to follow anything that can be focused.³⁹ This does not really seem to be a matter of the coordination being an island for movement, since it can be improved although unequivocal movement always violates the Coordinate Structure

Constraint:

(74) *Kakvo_i izjade [e_i i sireneto]?
 what ate and cheese.def
 ‘*What did you eat and the cheese?’

Compare also:

(75) a. Sireneto **li** šte jadeš s xljab?
 cheese.def Q will eat.2sg with bread
 ‘Is the cheese that you are going to eat with bread?’

b. ?*Sireneto **li** s xljab šte jadeš?

While comitative *s*-coordination does exist in Bg,⁴⁰ here the difference in definiteness between ostensible conjuncts *sireneto* ‘the cheese’ and *xljab* ‘bread’ implies that what is wrong with (75b) must be something other than coordination. Presumably, this contrast has to do with the restriction against focus following *li* (i.e., against multiple foci), with fronting of *s xljab* ‘with bread’ implying focus. If so, perhaps a focus based account can be extended to the other examples.

Second, the interaction of *wh*-movement and *li* raises complex questions. If *wh*-phrases move to SpecCP, then we would not expect them to be split, as in (76), since the enclitic requirement of *li* should be satisfied by *koja knjiga*.

(76) a. Koj **li** knjiga **šte mi** podariš?!
 which Q book will me.dat give.2sg
 ‘Which(ever) book will you give me?!’

b. *Koja knjiga **li šte mi** podariš?

Here, *li* functions as a kind of emphatic particle focusing the preceding *wh*-material. Bošković (2001: 241–249), in discussing *li* and *wh*-fronting, states that only (77a) is possible.⁴¹

(77) a. Koj **li** kakvo kupuva?
 who Q what buys.3sg
 ‘Who on earth buys what?’

b. (*)Koj kakvo **li** kupuva?⁴²

He proposes that this can be handled under the copy and delete approach, assuming a structure as in (78):

(76) [[CP koj ~~kakvo~~ [C **li** [~~koj~~ kakvo ...

According to him, the PF-deletions in (78) are necessary because *li* is sensitive to second intonational position, rather than simply being enclitic. However, speakers I have consulted find (77b) credible, under the normal pair–list reading. Yovka Tisheva (p.c.) offers the following comparable examples:

- (79) a. Koj kakvo **li mi e** kupil?
 who what Q me.dat aux.3sg bought
 ‘(I wonder) who has bought me what?’
- b. Koga kâde **li šte se** sreštnem?⁴³
 when where Q will refl meet.1pl
 ‘(I wonder) when and where we will meet?’

(79a), for example, might be something to ask oneself right before one’s birthday. Moreover, many other examples, such as (70), (71), or (72b) above, show that *li* happily follows more than one prosodic word. I thus reject Bošković’s conclusion that where *li* appears follows from a stipulation about where it can be pronounced within its intonational phrase.⁴⁴ Clearly, *li* can be preceded by a syntactic phrase and then it is simply pronounced as an enclitic on the last prosodic word in the phrase. And just as clearly—contra Bošković (2001: 242 and p.c.) that they obey different prosodic requirements—Yes/No *li* and focal *li* have the same phonology. It is just that, as proposed in Rudin, King and Izvorski (1998), Bg *li* can bear not just a [+Q] question feature, but also a [+F] focus feature.

Let me try to sketch out a formal account of their differing behavior. Whereas, as we saw in section 5, simple Yes/No *li* is stranded in initial position, hence is linearized after the first prosodic word to its right, in focal questions, including those beginning in a *wh*-phrase, *li* placement is more fluid. If the available mechanisms were just PI, which targets the first prosodic word, and *in situ* pronunciation after a filled specifier, which targets the first syntactic phrase, we would not expect other possibilities (or the variation encountered).

In this regard, consider a third and particularly recalcitrant variant: if the focus is part of a phrase but consists of more than one prosodic word, *li* still follows it.⁴⁵

- (80) Mnogo truden **li** ispit **si** vzel?
 very hard Q exam aux.2sg took
 ‘Did you take a VERY HARD exam?’

Under either PI or syntactic accounts, (80) is a puzzle, since *mnogo* is a separate prosodic word and *mnogo truden ispit*, as noun phrase, should not tolerate extraction, as discussed in Bošković (2003). Note additionally that, to the extent that the adverb can be focused, *li* can also follow this element:⁴⁶

- (81) Mnogo **li** truden ispit **si** vzel (ili malko)?
 very Q hard exam aux.2sg took or little
 ‘Was the exam that you took VERY hard (or only a little)?’

But this splitting cannot be PI, since it is not true that *li* is the only element which can separate the pieces of the AP.⁴⁷

- (82) a. Mnogo **li** beše truden ispitât?
 very Q was difficult exam.def
 ‘Was the test VERY hard?’
 b. Mnogo beše truden ispitât.
 ‘The test was VERY hard.’

In short, focus can determine what part of a phrase is pronounced.

My proposal therefore, much in the spirit of Lambova (2003), is to adopt a variant of the copy and delete approach in (80), but to exploit it specifically for focus *li* and to let focus alone determine what words within a phrase can be pronounced in front of *li*. There are two ways of instantiating this, depending on one’s assumptions about the left-periphery of the Bg sentence. When an element in a phrase bears the [+F] focus feature, that phrase moves to SpecFP. We could then say that, when FP is contained within an interrogative CP, it is headed by *li*, as follows, for (81):⁴⁸

- (83) [[_{FP} mnogo ~~truden ispit~~ [_F **li** [~~mnogo~~ truden ispit ...

The restriction is that, just as a focus cannot follow *li*, non-focus material cannot be pronounced in SpecFP. I imagine prosody to mediate here, in that non-focus material is marked as bearing “flat” intonation and subsequently deleted, resulting in pronunciation of the next highest copy. In this way, splitting between the second and third element can also be obtained:

(84) a. Izvânredno važnija **li** ispit vze?
 exceptionally important.def Q exam took.2/3sg
 ‘Was it the exceptionally important exam that she/he/you took?’

b. [[_{FP} izvânredno važnija ispit [_F **li** [~~izvânredno važnija~~ ispit ...

Alternatively, and I think more simply, *li* could always be situated in C. If so, we would then need the focused constituent to move further, from SpecFP to SpecCP, requiring the following adjustment for (83) and (84):

(85) a. [[_{CP} mnogo truden ispit [_C **li** [_{FP} ~~mного~~ truden ispit ...

b. [[_{CP} izvânredno važnija ispit [_C **li** [_{FP} ~~izvânredno važnija~~ ispit ...

When, in addition to [+Q], Bg *li* has the [+F] feature, it selects FP as a complement. A phrase containing a [+F] element is attracted to the SpecFP and, once *li* is merged, from there to SpecCP as well. This results in two virtually identical copies, as in (85). When, on the other hand, *li* is only [+Q], the result is a simple Yes/No question. It is only in this case that PI applies, since there is nothing to the left of *li* within the SpecCP ph(r)ase that can support it prosodically.

This account may have interesting comparative implications, which space limitations preclude fleshing out. Briefly, the fact from (76) that focal *li* can cooccur with *wh*-questions in Bg shows that it need not be [+Q], since this feature marks Yes/No questions and these are semantically incompatible with [+WH]. In the *wh*-question *li* construction which exists in Bg (and SC), however, *li* just bears the [+F] focus feature. In Russian, on the other hand, *li* can mark focus, but only in addition to [+Q]; cf. e.g King (1994) or Rudin, King and Izvorski (1998).

Thus, nothing comparable to Bg (76) is possible in Russian:

- (86) a. *Kakuju **li** knigu mne podariš'?
 which Q book me.dat give.2sg
 'Whichever book will you give me?' [intended reading]
- b. *Kto **li** kupit takuju knigu?
 who Q buy.3sg such book
 'Who on earth will buy such book?' [intended reading]

This follows if Russian *li* is always [+Q] and can, in addition, be optionally [+F]. In Bg, *li* is just [+F] in Bg emphatic/focal *li* counterparts to (86), which is why these are grammatical. On the other hand, as in Russian, *li* is both [+Q, +F] in focal Yes/No questions but, again like in Russian, is only [+Q] in neutral questions. This suggests that, in Bg, the [+F] feature is introduced in F⁰ and F⁰ raises to C⁰. Here it acquires [+Q] if CP is a Yes/No (as opposed to a [WH] question). Since the lexical item *li* in Bg is featurally either [+Q] or [+F] (or both), it can instantiate either position (or both), but since Russian *li* is always [+Q] and only optionally [+F] (in addition), it can only instantiate C⁰.

This raises the question of whether Bg *li* can really be pronounced in either position (or both, if example (i) of fn. 43 is acceptable). There is some evidence that it can. Lambova (2000) shows that (for certain speakers, at least) various elements can intervene between the first and subsequent *wh*-phrases (translations here and below are Lambova's):

- (87) a. Koj čunkim kakvo **mi** e dal?
 who for God's sake what me.dat aux.3sg gave
 'Who, for God's sake, has given me what for free?'
- b. Koj pāk kakvo **ti** dava na tebe?
 who EMPH what you.dat gives to you
 'Who gives you (of all people) what?'
- c. Koj, spored tebe, kakvo pie?
 who according you what drinks
 'Who, according to you, is drinking what?'
- d. Koj, sās sigurnost, kakvo koga **šte** donese?
 who with certainty what when will brings
 'Who, for sure, will bring what when?'

- e. Koj prâv kogo e udaril?
 who first whom aux.3sg hit
 ‘Who hit whom first?’

Assuming that the intervening material is adjoined to FP, I take the first *wh*-phrase to be in SpecCP and the subsequent one(s) to be in SpecFP. We can then ask what the possibilities for *li* are? It turns out that, according to Yovka Tiševa (p.c.), focal *li* can either follow the first *wh*-phrase or the second one.⁴⁹ This means that *li* in Bg can be realized in either C⁰ or F⁰, as in (88):

- (88) a. Koj **li** prâv kogo e udaril?
 who Q first whom aux.3sg hit
 ‘Who on earth hit who first?’

- b. Koj prâv kogo **li** e udaril?

- c. [CP koj [C **li** [FP prâv [FP ~~koj~~ kogo [F **li** [...

The fact that *kogo* cannot be in SpecCP, since it follows *prâv* ‘first’, means that *li* in (88b) is realized lower than C⁰, i.e., in F⁰. Unfortunately, this account multiplies the possibilities, in that it is not obvious whether just the highest *wh*-phrase moves to SpecCP, as indicated in structure (88c), or they all do but only the highest is pronounced, as in (78). While to address this question properly would take us far afield, some relevant considerations can be briefly examined. Bošković (2001: 104–105), summarizing his previous research on multiple *wh*-movement, points out that Superiority effects in Bg conspire to place first the *wh*-phrase which was highest before *wh*-movement, but that the remaining *wh*-phrases are (more) freely ordered among themselves. This can be accomplished by having all *wh*-phrases target SpecFP, so that they all move there simultaneously, in any order, but have the [+WH] feature of C attract only the highest one, respecting Superiority.⁵⁰ Now, Lambova (2000) states that elements which intervene, as in (87), can only separate the first *wh*-phrase from subsequent ones, but cannot go lower. (89b) is thus not a possible variant of (87d). The structure in (89b) might allow this, but (89c) only derives the order in (87d).

(89) a. *Koj kakvo, sâs sigurnost, koga **šte** donese?

b. [CP koj kakvo ~~koga~~ [C C⁰ [FP sâs sigurnost [FP ~~koj kakvo~~ koga [F F⁰ [...

c. [CP koj [C C⁰ [FP sâs sigurnost [FP ~~koj~~ kakvo (*sâs sigurnost) koga [F F⁰ [...

Lambova (2000: 254) further observes that a preposed topic has the same effect:

(90) a. Koj, navjarno, kâde **šte** porâča tortata?
 who probably where will order cake.def
 ‘Who will perhaps have the cake made where?’

b. Tortata, navjarno, koj kâde **šte** porâča?

c. *Tortata koj, navjarno, kâde **šte** porâča?

This might follow if the topic also occupied SpecCP, so that it competes for this slot with the initial *wh*-phrase.⁵¹ On the other hand, returning to the multiple-*wh* examples in (79), we saw that if both are included within the focus, then both can precede *li*; presumably, the ungrammaticality of (76b) is due to the fact that indefinite *kniga* ‘book’ cannot be part of the focus, and not to a special requirement on the pronunciation of *li*. Their structure is thus as in (91a) if all *wh*-phrases move to SpecCP, but as in (91b) if only the first does.

(91) a. [CP koj kakvo [C **li** [FP ~~koj kakvo~~ [F **li** [...

b. [CP koj [C **li** [FP ~~koj kakvo~~ [F **li** [...

The order *koj li kakvo*, on the other hand, would require pronunciation of the lower copy of *kakvo* in the model in (91a), but of the higher copy of *li* in the model in (91b). Moreover, Lambova (2000: 242) comments that *li* between the second *wh*-phrase and the third one is even possible:⁵²

(92) Koj kakvo **li** koga **šte** **ni** servira?
 who what Q when will us.dat serve
 ‘Who will surprise us with what when, I wonder?’

This can only be obtained if all *wh*-phrases move to SpecCP, since *li* in (92) must be in C in order to precede *koga*:

(93) [_{CP} koj kakvo ~~koga~~ [_C **li** [_{FP} koj kakvo koga [_F **li** [...

The extent to which we need to invoke pronunciation of lower copies in order to handle the *wh* facts thus remains unresolved, with reasons both for moving only one *wh*-phrase to SpecCP and for moving all of them.

For simple focus, however, the need for a PF-deletion mechanism seems clearer. The structure of the split name in (62a), for example, would have to be:

(94) [_{CP} Žoreto ~~Petrov~~ **li** [_{FP} ~~Žoreto~~ Petrov F⁰ [vidja ... (ili Koletu) ...

Consider again, also, the split PP construction in (72). We can understand the two possibilities in terms of whether or not *grad* ‘city’ is included in the focus:

(95) a. [[_{CP} v tozi ~~grad~~ [_C **li** [_{FP} v ~~tozi~~ grad ...

b. [[_{CP} v tozi grad [_C **li** [_{FP} v ~~tozi~~ ~~grad~~ ...

Thus, the fact that *v tozi* ‘to that’ is a prosodic word is incidental to the pronunciation of *li*. PI is simply not the appropriate mechanism. We can see this by considering tonic prepositions, such as *protiv* ‘against’:

(96) a. Protiv vsičkite prijateli **li** **si** govorel?
 against all.def friends Q aux.2sg spoke
 ‘Did you speak AGAINST ALL YOUR FRIENDS?’

b. Protiv vsičkite **li** prijateli **si** govorel?
 ‘Did you speak AGAINST ALL your friends?’

c. *Protiv **li** vsičkite prijateli **si** govorel?
 ‘Did you speak AGAINST all your friends?’

I see nothing semantic or syntactic ruling (96c) out. Instead, I propose that Morphological Rebracketing, as described in Embick and Noyer (2001), applies to restructure PPs so that the preposition becomes a morphological word together with the first element of its complement. This is a common process in Slavic languages, prerequisite to (but not requiring) treating the unit as a single prosodic word. We thus have the following, before deletion:

(97) [[_{CP} [*protiv* vsičkite] [*prijateli*]] [_C **li**] [[_{FP} [*protiv* vsičkite] [*prijateli*]] F⁰ [... **si** govori]

Since deletion does not apply to parts of words, (96c) is not derivable. This follows directly from restricting PF-deletion to constituents at the Morphological Word level and above (i.e., not to subwords, defined as less than maximal X⁰s). This rules out in principle the kind of scattered word internal deletion employed by Bošković, as described in section 4.2 above. To show that, in the absence of restructuring, *protiv* can support *li*, recall (63), repeated below:

(98) *Protiv li si ili za?*
 against Q aux.2sg or for
 ‘Are you AGAINST or for?’

In (98), the complement to *protiv* has been elided, rendering restructuring moot.

I conclude with one last set of examples which corroborates the general approach to focus *li* advocated here and shows that the (word-level) scattered deletion approach rejected by Bošković (2001: 238–239) actually makes the right predictions. His rejected structure for (99a) is reproduced in (99b); my system modifies this as in (99c):

- (99) a. *Novata li kola prodade?*
 new.def Q car sold.2/3sg
 ‘Did she/he/you sell the new car?’
- b. [[_{CP} *Novata kola* [_C **li** *novata kola prodade*]]
- c. [[_{CP} *Novata kola* [_C **li** [_{FP} *novata kola* [F⁰ [_{TP} *prodade ... novata kola* ...

The intermediate movement step is supported by the possibilities in (100):

- (100) a. *Az novata kola si mislja će prodade.*
 I new.def car refl think.1sg that sold.2/3sg
 ‘As for me, I think that it was the new car that he/she/you sold.’
- b. *Novata li kola misliš će prodade?*
 new.def Q car think.1sg that sold.2/3sg
 ‘Was it the NEW car that you think that she/he/you sold?’

In both, *novata kola* ‘the new car’ moves from underlying object position of the embedded verb *prodade* ‘sold’ to SpecFP. In (100a) it is preceded by a topic; in (100b) it moves further to

SpecCP, but, since only *novata* is in focus, the highest copy of *kola* cannot be pronounced, just as in (99c).

Bošković (2001: 238) cites (101), with *kola* pronounced *in situ*, as ungrammatical, but speakers I have consulted report it to be only slightly degraded.

- (101) ?Novata **li** misliš će prodade kola?
 new.def Q think.2sg that sold.2/3sg car
 ‘Was it the NEW car that you think he/she/you sold?’

For some reason, the copy of *kola* in SpecFP is not pronounced in (101). One can imagine (at least) four ways of obtaining this result: either (i) movement is through SpecFP but nothing is pronounced in that position, (ii) there is an FP, but movement of *novata kola* proceeds directly to SpecCP and does not pass through SpecF, (iii) there is no FP, so movement of *novata kola* is direct to SpecCP, or (iv) there is no CP here and *li* is actually in F⁰. Under any of these scenarios, there is no left-branch extraction, which, as discussed in Bošković (2003), is not possible in Bg. Instead, *novata kola* in (101) moves as a constituent, but *kola* is silent because it is not [+F], forcing a lower occurrence of *kola* to be pronounced. This is corroborated by Roumyana Slabakova (p.c.), who judges (102) completely out, in clear contrast to (101):

- (102) *Novata misliš će prodade kola.
 new.def think.2sg that sold.2/3sg car

The same contrast obtains within a simple clause:

- (103) a. ?Novata **li** prodade Petko kola?
 new.the Q sold.3sg Petko car
 ‘Was it the NEW car that Petko sold?’
 b. *Novata prodade Petko kola.

Thus, deletion of non-focal material in SpecCP, when headed by focal *li*, gives the false impression of left-branch extraction.

7. Summary

In this article I have argued for a highly derivational account of *li* placement in Bg. The fundamental semantic property of this element is to express Yes/No interrogative features, but it can, in addition (or instead), express focus. It has a single, simple prosodic requirement of being enclitic, meaning that it cannot be initial in its prosodic word. When *li* is stranded with no prosodic host (i.e., a focused constituent) to its left within its own projection, it must be pronounced at the right edge of the prosodic word to its right.⁵³ Since this only happens in neutral questions, the relevant prosodic word will be the verbal complex (104a), or some prosodically independent portion thereof (104b).⁵⁴ When the special clitics are Utterance initial, they undergo Reordering Merger and are (re)linearized to the right of the verb (104c).

- (104) a. [_v [_ω [_ω **šte mi** pokazvaš] + **li**] [_ω knjigata]]
 ‘Will you show me the book?’
- b. [_v [_ω [_ω **ne si**] + **li**] [_ω **mu gi** pokazvala]]
 ‘Haven’t you shown them to him?’
- c. [_v [_ω [[_{CG} **si mu gi**] pokazvala] + **li**]] ⇒ [_v [_ω [pokazvala + **li**] + [_{CG} **si mu gi**]]]
 ‘Have you shown them to him?’

When focus movement (sometimes in combination with *wh*-movement) places a potential prosodic host to the left of *li*, more complex and discourse sensitive results obtain which require PF-deletion of non-focal material when that material precedes *li*. In analyzing this mechanism, various formal possibilities were entertained, each with its problems and advantages. Many puzzles about *li* placement thus remain for future research.

References

- Arnaudova, Olga (2003). Focus and Bulgarian clause structure. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Ottawa.
- Billings, Loren (2002). Why clitics cluster together in Balkan Slavic: non-templatic morphology. In *Formal approaches to Slavic linguistics: the second Ann Arbor meeting, 2001*, Jindřich Toman (ed.), 75–96. Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publications.
- Billings, Loren (2004). Review of Bošković 2001. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 12:291–328.
- Billings, Loren and Catherine Rudin (1996). Optimality and Superiority: A new approach to multiple-wh ordering. In *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics: the College Park Meeting, 1994*, Jindřich Toman (ed.), 35–60. Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publications.
- Bobaljik, Jonathan David (2002). A-chains at the PF-interface: Copies and ‘covert’ movement. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 20:197–267.
- Bošković, Željko (2001). *On the Nature of the Syntax–Phonology Interface*. Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Bošković, Željko (2002). Clitics as nonbranching elements and the linear correspondence axiom. *Linguistic Inquiry* 33(2):329–40.
- Bošković, Željko (2003). On left branch extraction. In *Investigations in Formal Slavic Linguistics — Contributions of the Fourth European Conference on Formal Description of Slavic Languages*, Peter Kosta, Joanna Błaszczak, Jens Frasek, Ljudmila Geist and Marzena Zygis. (eds.), 543–577. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Bošković, Željko and Steven Franks (2002). Phonology–syntax interactions in South Slavic. *Balkanistica* 15:49–74.

- Browne, Wayles (1974). On the problem of enclitic placement in Serbo-Croatian. In *Slavic Transformational Syntax*, Richard Brecht and Catherine Chvany (eds.), 36–52. Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Materials.
- Caink, Andrew (1999). Extended projections in South Slavic. In *Topics in South Slavic Syntax and Semantics*, Mila Dimitrova-Vulchanova and Lars Hellan (eds.), 91–123. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Chomsky, Noam (1995). Bare phrase structure. In *Government and Binding Theory and the Minimalist Program*, Gert Webelhuth (ed.), 383–439. Cambridge: Blackwell.
- Chomsky, Noam (2001). Derivation by phase. In *Ken Hale: A Life in Language*, Michael Kenstowicz (ed.), 1–52. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Ćavar, Damir and Chris Wilder (1994). Long head movement? Verb movement and cliticization in Croatian. *Lingua* 93:1–58.
- Derzhanski, Ivan (2002). Presupposition and interrogation (The formation of *yes/no* questions: Some unexpected restrictions and what they can teach us). In *Papers from the Third Conference on Formal Approaches to South Slavic and Balkan Languages*, Mila Dimitrova-Vulchanova, Donald Dyer, Iliyana Krapova and Catherine Rudin (eds.). *Balkanistica* 15:147–169.
- Embick, David and Roumyana Izvorski (1995). On long head movement in Bulgarian. In *Proceedings of ESCOL '94*, J. M Fuller, H. Han and D. Parkinson (eds.), 104–115.
- Embick, David and Roumyana Izvorski (1997). Participle–auxiliary word order in Slavic. In *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics: the Cornell Meeting, 1995*, Wayles Browne, Eva Dornisch, Natasha Kondrashova and Draga Zec (eds.), 210–239. Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Materials.

- Embick, David and Rolf Noyer (2001). Movement operations after syntax. *Linguistic Inquiry* 32:555–595.
- Englund, Birgitta (1977). *Yes/no questions in Bulgarian and Macedonian*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International.
- Franks, Steven. 1998. Clitics in Slavic. Unpublished paper presented at the Comparative Slavic Morphosyntax Workshop, Spencer, Indiana, June, 1998. [Available on line at <www.indiana.edu/~slavconf/linguistics/franks.pdf>.]
- Franks, Steven (2000). Clitics at the interface. In *Clitic Phenomena in European Languages*, Frits Beukema and Marcel den Dikken (eds.), 1–46. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Franks, Steven (1995). Adverb interpolation in the Bulgarian clitic cluster. In *A Festschrift for Charles Gribble*, Robert Rothstein, Ernest Scatton, and Charles Townsend (eds.). Bloomington, Slavica.
- Franks, Steven (2006). Clitic placement in Bulgarian compound tenses: PF–Side versus syntactic approaches. Unpublished manuscript, Indiana University, Bloomington.
- Franks, Steven (in press). Agnostic movement. In *Proceedings of North East Linguistics Society* 36, Chris Davis, Amy Rose Deal and Youri Zabbal (eds.). Amherst: GLSA, University of Massachusetts.
- Franks, Steven and Željko Bošković (2001). An argument for Multiple Spell–out. *Linguistic Inquiry* 32:174–183.
- Franks, Steven and Tracy King (2000). *A Handbook of Slavic Clitics*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Franks, Steven and Ljiljana Progovac (1994). On the placement of Serbo-Croatian clitics. In *Indiana Slavic Studies 7, Proceedings of the 9th Biennial Conference on Balkan and South*

- Slavic Linguistics, Literature and Folklore*, George Fowler, Henry Cooper and Jonathan Ludwig (eds.), 69-78.
- Franks, Steven and Catherine Rudin (2005). Bulgarian clitics as K^0 heads. In *Formal approaches to Slavic linguistics: the South Carolina meeting, 2004*, Steven Franks, Frank Y. Gladney and Mila Tasseva-Kurktchieva (eds.), 106–118. Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Materials.
- Golden, Golden, Marija and Milena Milojević Sheppard (2000). Slovene pronominal clitics. In *Clitic Phenomena in European Languages*, Frits Beukema and Marcel den Dikken (eds.), 191–207. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Halpern, Aaron (1992/1995). *On the Morphology and Placement of Clitics*. Stanford: CSLI Publications. [slightly revised version of 1992 Stanford Ph.D. dissertation]
- Izvorski, Roumyana (1993). On WH–movement and Focus–movement in Bulgarian. Paper presented at the second Conference of the Student Organization of Linguistics in Europe (CONSOLE), University of Tübingen.
- Izvorski, Roumyana, Tracy H. King and Catherine Rudin (1996). Against *li* lowering in Bulgarian. *Lingua* 102: 187–194.
- Kayne, Richard (1994). *The Antisymmetry of Syntax*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- King, Tracy H (1994). Focus in Russian yes–no questions. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 2(2): 92–120.
- Krapova, Iliyana (1997). Auxiliaries and complex tenses in Bulgarian. In *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics: The Cornell Meeting, 1995*, Wayles Browne et al., 320–344. Ann Arbor, Mich: Michigan Slavic Publications.
- Krapova, Iliyana (1999). The system of auxiliaries in Bulgarian. In *Topics in South Slavic Syntax and Semantics*, Mila Dimitrova-Vulchanova and Lars Hellan (eds.), 59–89. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

- Lambova, Mariana (2000). The typology of multiple wh-fronting in Slavic revisited. In *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics: the Philadelphia Meeting, 1999*, Tracy H. King and Irina Sekerina (eds.), 338–258. Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Materials.
- Lambova, Mariana (2002). Is head movement syntactic: evidence from Bulgarian? In *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics #43*, Tania Ionin, Heejeong Ko and Andrew Nevins (eds.), 89–102.
- Lambova, Mariana (2003). On information structure and clausal architecture: Evidence from Bulgarian. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. University of Connecticut, Storrs.
- Lambova, Mariana (2004a). V(P) fronting and V raising in Bulgarian. In *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics: the Ottawa Meeting, 2003*, Olga Arnaoudova, Wayles Browne, María-Luisa Rivero, Daniela Stojanović (eds.), 269–292. Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Materials.
- Lambova, Mariana (2004b). On triggers of movement and effects at the interfaces. In *Triggers*, Anne Breitbarth and Henk van Riemsdijk (eds.), 231–258. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Lema, José and María-Luisa Rivero (1989). Long Head Movement: ECP vs. HMC. In *Proceedings of NELS 20*, 333–347. Amherst: GLSA, University of Massachusetts.
- Migdalski, Krzysztof (2003). Participle preposing in Bulgarian. In *Generative Linguistics in Poland: Morphosyntactic Investigations*, Piotr Bański and Adam Przepiórkowski (eds.), 79–91. Warszawa: Instytut Podstaw Informatyki PAN.
- Mišeska Tomić, Olga (1996). The Balkan Slavic clausal clitics. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 14:811–872.
- Moro, Andrea (2000). *Dynamic Antisymmetry*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Nespor, Marina and Irene Vogel (1986). *Prosodic Phonology*. Dordrecht: Foris

- Pancheva, Roumyana (2005). The rise and fall of second position clitics. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 23:103–167.
- Percus, Orin (1993). The captious clitic. Unpublished manuscript, MIT, Cambridge.
- Progovac, Ljiljana (1996). Clitics in Serbian/Croatian: Comp as the second position. In *Approaching Second: Second Position Clitics and Related Phenomena*, Aaron Halpern and Arnold Zwicky (eds.), 411–428. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- Progovac, Ljiljana (2000). Where Do Clitics Cluster? In *Clitic Phenomena in European Languages*, Frits Beukema and Marcel den Dikken (eds.), 249–258. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Progovac, Ljiljana (2005). *A Syntax of Serbian: Clausal Architecture*. Bloomington: Slavica.
- Rivero, María-Luisa. 1993. Bulgarian and Serbo-Croatian Yes–No questions: V⁰-raising to *–li* versus *–li* hopping. *Linguistic Inquiry* 24:567–575.
- Rudin, Catherine, Tracy King and Roumyana Izvorski (1998). Focus in Bulgarian and Russian YES–NO questions. In *UMass Occasional Papers #21*, 209–225.
- Rudin, Catherine, Christina Kramer, Loren Billings, and Matthew Baerman (1999). Macedonian and Bulgarian *li* questions: Beyond syntax. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 17(3): 541–586.
- Rudnickaya, Elena. (2000). The derivation of Yes–No *Li* questions in Russian: Syntax and/or phonology? In *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics: the Philadelphia Meeting, 1999*, Tracy H. King and Irina Sekerina (eds.), 347–362. Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Materials.
- Schütze, Carson (1994). Serbo-Croatian second position clitic placement and the phonology syntax interface. In *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics #21*, 373–473.

- Stepanov, Arthur (1998). On Wh-fronting in Russian. In *Proceedings of North East Linguistics Society* 28, Pius N. Tamanji and Kiyomi Kusumoto (eds.), 453–467. Amherst: GLSA, University of Massachusetts.
- Stjepanović, Sandra (1999). What do second-position cliticization, scrambling and multiple wh-fronting have in common? Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. University of Connecticut, Storrs.
- Werkmann, Valja. 2003. *Objektklitika im Bulgarischen*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.
- Zwicky, Arnold (1977). On clitics. Bloomington: Indiana University Linguistics Club.

Steven Franks
Department of Linguistics
Indiana University
Memorial Hall 322
1021 East Third Street
Bloomington, Indiana 47405-7005
USA

franks@indiana.edu

Notes

* I am grateful to the following Bulgarian speaking linguists for their (sometimes conflicting) judgments, as well as advice about analysis: Olga Arnaudova, Iliyana Krapova, Mila Tasseva-Kurktchieva, Mariana Lambova, Roumyana Pancheva, Roumyana Slabakova, and Yovka Tisheva. This article has additionally benefited from the comments of two anonymous *TLR* reviewers, as well as from discussions over the years with Željko Bošković and Ljiljana Progovac.

¹ This view, although often disregarded in syntactic analyses, has a considerable following in the literature. It was first developed in Sproat (1985) and has, since being suggested in Chomsky (1995), been at the core of much research, both within the Distributed Morphology framework (cf. e.g. Embick and Noyer 2001) and minimalism of various ilk (cf. e.g. Moro 2000).

² In the examples throughout this article, clitics are given in boldface for ease of identification.

³ Even aspectual adverbials such as *veče* ‘already’ that sometimes break up the clitics + verb sequence can never do this; cf. Bošković (2001: 222) or Franks (2005, 2006).

⁴ The literature on the syntax and semantics of *li* (in Bg and other Slavic languages) is too vast to do it complete justice in this article; see, among others, Englund (1977), Rivero (1993), King (1994), Izvorski et al. (1996), Rudin et al. (1998), Rudnickaya (2000), Franks and King (2000: 349–57), Bošković (2001: 197–253), or Franks (2005) for critical discussion.

⁵ The facts are summarized from Franks (2000). See also Bošković (2001) for extensive discussion of these issues.

⁶ More specifically, I have in mind the morphological operation Embick and Noyer (2001) refer to as “Local Dislocation,” which applies after vocabulary insertion, is blind to syntactic structure, and is sensitive to linear adjacency.

⁷ But see Embick and Noyer (2001: 584–591) for a more complete (and not purely morphological) analysis of *do*-support, which is needed to resolve various additional complexities.

⁸ While they opt for a scrambling type of analysis, whereby the noun is extracted first, a left-branch extraction account may in fact be preferable, in keeping with typological observations most recently examined in Bošković (2003). I put aside these details here.

⁹ This may be changing. Jasmina Miličević (p.c.) provides the following example, where the (copular) clitic *smo* separates the preposition *protiv* from its complement:

(i) Protiv smo dijaloška velikih na štetu trećih zemalja.
 against are.1pl dialog.gen great.gen to detriment third countries
 ‘We are against a dialog between the great powers to the detriment of third countries.’

¹⁰ The question still remains of why SC *li* fails to undergo PI, if this option exists in principle. Perhaps it is the availability of *da*-support in SC that circumvents the need for more costly PI RM to apply.

¹¹ But see Schütze (1994) for arguments that SC clitics exhibit some distributional properties which defy a syntactic explanation.

¹² Various metaphors for this process exist; an alternative and I think conceptually more appealing way to conceive of this is in terms of multiattachment (cf. e.g. Frampton 2004). Multiattachment ensures identity, but, for present purposes, the effect is the same.

¹³ See Bošković (2001: 100–116), as well as Bošković and Franks (2002), for discussion and arguments that the second *wh*-phrase is indeed moving in the syntax.

¹⁴ Once again, I abstract away from the details and put aside issues relating to the internal structure of VP.

¹⁵ Bošković simply calls this head “F”.

¹⁶ This seems an unlikely property given that, for many speakers, *e* can even be tonic and, when it is, it supports *li*:

- (i) **E** **li** došâl?
 aux.3sg Q arrived
 ‘Has he arrived?’

Consider also the following example, in which copular *e* constitutes a completely independent intonational phrase:

- (ii) Tova, koeto pravi neštata interesni, **e**, če toj ...
 that which makes things interesting is that he
 ‘That which makes things interesting is that he ...’

¹⁷ On this point, Billings (2002: 83) takes Bošković to task, commenting that “every speaker ... consulted reports that these adverbs are indeed stressed.” My inquiries confirm this, although some degree of destressing is often possible.

¹⁸ Rivero (1993) is an early purely syntactic attempt to account for the *li* facts. She maintains that, whenever the verb precedes *li*, as in (35a), it has undergone (sometimes long) head movement to *li* in C; see however Izvorski (1993) for arguments against movement to C and Franks and King (2000) for problems with long head movement. Rivero further proposes that negation blocks head movement, forcing a last resort syntactic lowering of *li* from C, to left-adjoin to the finite verb in the Agr/T+V complex. As demonstrated by Izvorski et al. (1996), the syntactic lowering analysis faces myriad problems. For example, it clearly cannot work for examples like (35b, c) in which the clitic group itself is split.

¹⁹ I suspect all phrases are phases partly because movement seems to pass through all available intermediate specifier positions, as evidenced e.g. by Q–float of *all*:

- (i) [TP The students [VP (**all**) ~~the students~~ seem [TP (**all**) ~~the students~~ to [AuxP (**all**) ~~the students~~ have [AuxP (**all**) ~~the students~~ been [AspP (**all**) ~~the students~~ [VP invited (***all**) ~~the students~~]]]]]]].

²⁰ See Billings (2004) and Franks (2005, 2006) for additional critical discussion of Bošković (2001). See Mišeska Tomić (1996), Franks and King (2000), and Progovac (2005), for alternative ways of deriving relative clitic order in terms of locating the various clitics in distinct head positions.

²¹ Although his system can be viewed as less stipulative than traditional templates, since it is the artifact of constraint interaction and competing PF desiderata.

²² While speakers differ in how felicitous they find adverb interpolation at different sites, the observed contrasts were confirmed by all speakers consulted. See also Krapova (1997) and Billings (2002) for examples for discussion.

²³ I thank Mariana Lambova (p.c.) for corroboration of the paradigm summarized in (42).

²⁴ If so, this may explain the somewhat freer distribution of these particles versus aspectual adverbs, which are XPs hence only adjoin to phrases.

²⁵ Mišeska Tomić (1996) and Progovac (2005) reach the same conclusion. My account more closely resembles that of Mišeska Tomić, who places auxiliary clitics in T/Agr_S, pronominal clitics in the head below that (Agr_O, in her system), and third singular (*j*)*e* in the V head below that. Progovac, on the other hand, who develops a split system for both tense and agreement, generates SC *je* in the high (subject layer) T_S position and the other clitic auxiliaries in a low (object layer) T_O position.

²⁶ Although in the other South Slavic languages the future marker comes higher, I take this not to be in T, but rather to be a Modal head, above Agr_S. It can be inflected, as in SC, or not, as in Bg, where it is then in fact followed by subject agreement.

- (i) (Vie) šte *ste* *mu* *go* *kazali*.
 you will aux.2pl him.dat it.acc said
 ‘You will have told him it.’

²⁷ Whether T-to-C raising occurs in Bg subsequent to PI of *li* is a complex matter. Izvorski (1993), discussed in Bošković (2001: 243–249), argues that it does not; this conclusion fits with the system adopted here. The reason is that, if there were T-to-C raising, we would need to encliticize *li* to the following prosodic word before head movement took place, but since material in SpecCP also supports *li* (and obviates PI), we would need to wait to apply PI until CP is completed.

²⁸ There is a growing literature on participle + auxiliary constructions, originally discussed under the rubric of “Long Head Movement” by Lema and Rivero (1989). See, for example, Embick and Izvorski (1995, 1997), Krapova (1997, 1999), Lambova (2002, 2003, 2004a, 2004b), and Migdalski (2003).

²⁹ Interpolation of subjects, as in (45a), is marginal for many speakers. These issues are examined in depth in Franks (2006); see Krapova (1997, 1999) for additional examples.

³⁰ For a detailed treatment of focus and topic in Bg, see Arnaudova (2003) and Lambova (2003).

³¹ “F” is not a syntactic label here, but just indicates focus.

³² They also intervene with the other order:

- (i) Na Ivan, knjigata beše **mu ja** kupila Marija.
 for Ivan book had.3sg him.dat it.acc bought Maria
 ‘As for Ivan and as for the book, Maria had bought it for him.’

This is not as surprising since, as shown in (45), non-clitic material can marginally intervene here as well. These phenomena are explored at length in Franks (2006).

³³ With the other compound tenses the data are more complicated and there is a certain amount of variation, suggesting that there is an additional position for the auxiliary above the landing site of the clitics. This seems to be a Mood head, since the word order facts indicate that conditional *bix* and renarrated (but not pluperfect) *bil* go in the higher position. Compare, for example, the following, from Krapova (1999: 73):

(i) Az **sâm** bila napâлно забрвила за nego.
 I aux.1sg have completely forgotten about him
 ‘(They say) I have completely forgotten about him.’

(ii) *Az **sâm** napâлно bila zabravila za nego.

³⁴ Interestingly, the data suggest that CP is obligatorily present when FP appears in embedded clauses. Bg allows certain complementizer-less complement clauses. If these are analyzed not as CPs but as bare IPs (or AgrSP or TP, depending on one’s assumptions about clausal functional projections), then the matrix verb will count to obviate TM effects:

(i) Vjarvam **si go** pital veče.
 believe.1sg aux.2sg him.acc asked already
 ‘I believe you asked him already.’

The absence of CP means that the clitics *si go* are not Utterance initial. However, if the verb is focused, then the TM order reemerges:

(ii) Vjarvam, pital **si go** veče.
 ‘I believe you ASKED him already.’

The fact that linearization feeds TM RM in (ii) implies the presence of a CP (headed by a null complementizer), placing *vjarvam* ‘I believe’ higher and rendering *si go* Utterance initial. Since (ii) involves focusing of *pital*, I tentatively conclude that an FP must be selected by a C.

³⁵ The observations in this final section should be taken together with those in Bošković (2001), who similarly entertains a variety of not entirely satisfactory solutions.

³⁶ As discussed below, prepositions raise additional complications, largely due to the fact that they can undergo morphological (and prosodic) restructuring with the following element.

³⁷ In her translation, the entire conjunct is focused, although focus on just ANNA is a perfectly natural reading as well.

³⁸ In Russian this must be SpecFP, given Stepanov’s (1998) arguments that (overt) *wh*-movement in Russian, unlike in the other Slavic languages, is not as high as SpecCP. If clause

initial material in Russian really remains to the right of *li*, prosodically sensitive RM (that is, PI) is expected. The consequence is obligatory splitting in Russian, but for a completely different reason than optional splitting in Bg (which, I argue below, is the result of the (prosodic) impossibility of pronouncing non-focused material in the specifier of the phrase headed by [+F] *li*, so that the next copy down is pronounced instead).

³⁹ One thought is that the problem somehow results from the attempt to combine *li* with *i*, which presumably gives *ili* ‘or’ (and which is of course normal here: *xljaba ili sireneto*). An anonymous *TLR* reviewer comments that *Xljaba li, ili sireneto, ... ?* ‘Was it the bread, or the cheese, ...?’ sounds much better than (67b). This suggests that perhaps prosody may still be at work in producing the various judgments reported for placement of *li* before the conjunction *i* ‘and’.

⁴⁰ The comitative is far more restricted than in West or East Slavic, but coordination is evidenced by plural agreement in (i):

- (i) *Xljabât sâs sireneto bjaxa/*beše na masata.*
 bread.def with cheese.def were/was on table
 ‘The bread and (with) the cheese were on the table.’

⁴¹ While he does add the qualification that this restriction holds “for most speakers,” I have found that it can always be overridden if an appropriate discourse context is provided, supporting my contention that focus factors are at work here, rather than, as he maintains, a special prosodic restriction on *li* such that it be located second in its intonational phrase.

⁴² The oddity of (77b), where I have put “*” in parentheses because all speakers I consulted found it possible, may be related to a similar status for such questions in English, when the emphatic *wh*-phrase remains *in situ*, either in multiple *wh* (i) or echo *wh* (ii):

- (i) *Who buys what on earth?!
- (ii) *John bought what on earth?!

⁴³ Iliyana Krapova (p.c.) even offers (i), with multiple instances of emphatic *li*.

-
- (i) Koga **li** kâde **li** pak **šte** **se** sreštnem?
 when Q where Q again will refl meet.1pl
 ‘Whenever (and) wherever will we meet again?’

Other speakers I have consulted, however, do not accept multiple *li*, stating that (i) would require coordination of the *wh*-phrases (*koga li i kâde li ...*). If nonetheless iteration is indeed possible, this might be taken as support for Bošković’s (2001: 239–249) idea that focal *li* is some kind of inflection (with the restrictions semantic rather than syntactic in nature). It could also be taken as support for my idea that focal *li* in C moves there from F, since then there are two available positions where [+F] could be lexicalized as *li* (along the lines of doubling of simple clitics in colloquial Russian, such as modal *by* in *Ja by ne skazal by čto ...* ‘I would not say that ...’). The existence of precisely two positions for *li* finds additional empirical support in that, for Krapova at least, no more than two instances of *li* are possible. Needless to say, these phenomena require further study.

⁴⁴ Bošković (2001: 242, fn. 60) suggests that speakers who allow such things must have “lost the second position requirement on the focus *li*.” Note that this proposal, while surely inevitable given the kinds of examples in the following footnote, must not be allowed to extend to Yes/No *li* if Bošković’s scattered deletion approach is to succeed.

⁴⁵ Bošković (2001: 236–237) offers some similar examples, e.g.:

- (i) Sâvsem nova **li** roklja noseše?
 completely new Q dress wore.2/3sg
 Was it a COMPLETELY NEW dress that she/he/you wore?
- (ii) ?Tolkova mnogo **li** xora imaše?
 so many Q people had.3sg
 ‘Were there SO MANY people?’
- (iii) ?Isključitelno skâpa **li** kola prodade?
 exceptionally expensive Q car sold.2/3sg
 ‘Was it an EXTREMELY EXPENSIVE car that he/she/you sold?’

The sort of facts in this and the following footnote lead Bošković to consider, as one of four possible accounts, the idea that focus *li* is some kind of inflectional element. However, *li* does not have the phonological properties on an inflectional element (for example, it does not block final devoicing on its host) and it is unclear how this could be instantiated within a formal model of morphology such as Distributed Morphology.

⁴⁶ Bošković (2001: 240) offers similar examples, e.g.:

- (i) ?*Sâvsem li nova roklja noseše?*
 completelyQ new dress wore.2/3sg
 ‘Was it a COMPLETELY new dress that she/he/you wore?’
- (ii) *Tolkova li mnogo xora imaše?*
 so Q many people had.3sg
 ‘Were there SO many people?’
- (iii) *Isključitelno li skâpa kola prodade?*
 exceptionally Q expensive car sold.2/3sg
 ‘Was it an EXTREMELY expensive car that he/she/you sold?’

Note that the judgments he provides are in complementary distribution with those in the previous footnote, in that those which are perfect when just the adverb is focused are degraded when the the entire AP is focused, and vice versa. The reason, I claim, is that speakers are simply assessing the relative likelihood of different focusing options, so that these necessarily compete as a function of pragmatic feasibility.

⁴⁷ Interestingly, the copula can be similarly placed:

- (i) *Mnogo li sa mokri râkavite mu?*
 very Q were wet sleeves.def him.dat
 ‘Were his sleeves VERY wet?’

⁴⁸ This sort of approach is adaptable to scrambling and pronunciation of split constituents, as in Stjepanović’s (1999) work on SC, but, unlike Russian or SC, there is no general scrambling in Bg, just movement to initial position for topic and/or focus reasons. In this regard, see also

Arnaudova (2003). To the extent that the highest and next to highest copies are very close, unlike in Russian or SC, in Bg very little can separate them.

⁴⁹ Mariana Lambova (p.c.) however points out that, for various reasons, *li* is semantically incompatible or pragmatically incongruous with most of the parentheticals in (87), so that this clash naturally affects judgments.

⁵⁰ For a formalization of *wh*-movement with the desired effect, see Franks (in press). Note also that, since order in SpecFP is free, “highest” here must be defined on the basis of A-positions, which perhaps more naturally appeals to a multiattachment rather than literal copy approach.

⁵¹ Lambova (2000, 2003), however, proposes a different account, in terms of intonation clash.

⁵² For Yovka Tisheva (p.c.), however, (92) is slightly degraded in contrast to placement of *li* after only the first *wh*-phrase or after the entire sequence.

⁵³ Crucially, material *outside* its projection, such as the presentential topics in (57) and (58), is irrelevant to pronunciation of *li*, since, assuming that Spell-out is cyclic, linearization of *li* necessarily takes place before that material is introduced; cf. also Franks and Bošković (2001).

⁵⁴ Recall that the invariant future marker *šte* is enclitic, the special (auxiliary and pronominal paradigmatic) clitics cannot be ph(r)ase initial, and that proclitic *ne* is post-stressing.