

## Two Kinds of Dislocated Topics in Macedonian

*Slavica Kochovska, University of Nova Gorica*

The paper discusses two dislocated constructions in Macedonian, those where a dislocated DP co-occurs with a resumptive clitic (CLLD; see (1a)) and those where a dislocated DP occurs without a clitic (Topicalization; see (1b)). I show that the two constructions have distinct semantic and pragmatic properties, and as such should be treated as two distinct constructions. This has implications for the analysis of data like (1c), where the dislocated DPs seem to optionally allow for the presence of a clitic. I claim that this optionality is only apparent and that the presence/absence of the clitic in such cases follows the general pattern of CLLD and TOP.

- (1) a. Site/poveketo knigi/knigite, Ana \*(gi) pročita.  
 all/most books/books-the Ana them read  
 ‘All/most books/the books, Ana read them.’
- b. Mnogu/malku knigi, Ana (\*gi) pročita.  
 many/few books Ana them read  
 ‘Many/few books, Ana read.’
- c. Dve/nekolku knigi, Ana (gi) pročita.  
 two/several books Ana them read  
 ‘Two/several books, Ana read (them).’

One of the main differences between the two constructions is that CLLDed elements do not give rise to WCO effects, while topicalized elements do; see (2-3) (see [2] among others).

- (2) Dve deca<sub>i</sub>, majka im<sub>i</sub> gi<sub>i</sub> saka. (3) \*Dve deca<sub>i</sub>, majka im<sub>i</sub> saka.  
 two children mother theirs them loves two children mother theirs loves  
 ‘Two children, their mother loves them.’ ‘Two children, their mother loves them.’

Also, it is interesting to note that DPs in CLLD always take wide scope in the sentence, while DPs in TOP are always interpreted as taking narrow scope; see (4a-b).

- (4) a. Dve knigi<sub>i</sub>, sekoj student pročita. (i)  $\forall$  student  $>$  2 books  
 two books every student read (ii) ~~2 books~~  $>$   ~~$\forall$  student~~
- b. Dve knigi<sub>i</sub>, sekoj student gi<sub>i</sub> pročita. (i)  ~~$\forall$  student~~  $>$  2 books  
 two books every student them read (ii) 2 books  $>$   $\forall$  student  
 ‘Two books, every student read (them).’

In addition to these differences, the two constructions differ in terms of their available readings as well as the discourse context in which they are used.

**i) CLLD and Topicalization have different readings.** Consider a scenario where the top three students in the class, Ana, Petar, and Tea, were asked to solve a number of math problems. By the end of class, Ana had solved three (problem set no. 1, 2, and 3), while Petar and Tea had solved two (problem set no. 2 and 3). In this context, (5a) comes out true, while (5b) is false.

- (5) a. Dve zadači, site studenti gi rešija.  
 two problems all students them solved  
 ‘Two problems, all students solved them.’
- b. Dve zadači, site studenti rešija.  
 two problems all students solved  
 ‘Two problems, all students solved.’

As (5a) shows, CLLD picks out the two problem sets such that every student solved. In this case, the numeral refers to problem sets no. 2 and 3. The numeral in (5b), on the other hand, seems to pick out, incorrectly, the number of problem sets such that every student solved.

We find similar preferences in the use of the two constructions. CLLD seems to force a referential reading of the left-dislocated DP, while TOP seems to correlate with a cardinal reading (but doesn't exclude a referential reading). That CLLD is only possible with a referential reading is confirmed in contexts that force a cardinal reading. The prediction here is that TOP can be used in such contexts (because it allows for a cardinal reading), but CLLD cannot (because it forces a referential reading). The prediction holds, as shown in (6a-b) below.

- (6) a. Šest časi, možes da staviš vo kutijava.  
 six glasses can to put in box-this  
 'Six glasses, you can put/fit in this box.'  
 b. \*Šest časi, možes da gi staviš vo kutijava.  
 six glasses can to them put in box-this  
 'Six glasses, you can put/fit in this box.'

**ii) Discourse Contexts for CLLD and Topicalization.** It is commonly assumed that clause-initial elements in both CLLD and TOP mark topics ([1], [3], [4], etc.). This also holds for Macedonian. First, both types are excluded as answers specifying the content of a wh-question like (7). Second, both constructions are ruled out in out-of-the-blue contexts, such as (8).

- (7) a. What did Ana read?  
 b. \*Dve knigi, Ana pročita.  
 two books Ana read  
 'Two books, Ana read.'  
 c. \*Dve knigi, Ana gi pročita.  
 two books Ana them read  
 'Two books, Ana read them.'  
 (8) a. What happened at the games today?  
 b. \*Dve nagradi, Petar osvoi.  
 two prizes Petar won  
 'Two prizes, Petar won.'  
 c. \*Dve nagradi, Petar gi osvoi.  
 two prizes Petar them won  
 'Two prizes, Petar won them.'

Since both CLLD and TOP are similar in that they unambiguously mark their clause-initial DPs as topics, the only definitive difference that seems to emerge between the two is in terms of their referentiality: CLLD forces a referential reading of the initial DP, to the exclusion of a cardinal reading (see (6b)), while TOP seems to correlate with a cardinal reading (see (5b) and (6a)).

Building on these facts, I propose that CLLD and TOP are also derived differently: clause-initial direct object DPs in CLLD are base-generated in their surface positions (see (9a)) while topicalized DPs are derived through movement of the DP from the argument position of the verb (see (9b)). This analysis explains the lack/presence of WCO effects in (2-3) above.

- (9) a.  $[_{XP} DO_i \ [_{IP} S \ pro_i \ Cl_i \ V \ t_i \dots]] = (1a) \ \& \ (1c)$  b.  $[_{XP} DO_i \ [_{IP} S \ V \ t_i \dots]] = (1b) \ \& \ (1c)$   
 $\uparrow$   $\uparrow$

Finally, to explain the scope facts in (4a-b), I maintain that left-dislocated DPs are interpreted in their surface position. Assuming that QR of IP-internal DPs is an adjunction to IP, it is predicted that clause-initial direct objects will always have wide scope with respect to the subject. This accords with the observed wide scope of CLLDed DPs in (4a). Given that we have identified topicalized numerals as having a cardinal interpretation (see (5b) and (6a)), we can also explain the data in (4b). The apparent low scope interpretation of the numeral in this case is, in fact, due to a wide scope cardinal interpretation for it.

**References:** [1] Anagnostopoulou, E. 1997. Clitic Left Dislocation and Contrastive Left Dislocation. In *Materials on Left Dislocation*, E. Anagnostopoulou, H. C. van Riemsdijk, & F. Zwarts (eds.), 151-192. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. [2] Cinque, G. (1990) *Types of A' dependencies*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press. [3] Reinhart, T. 1981. Pragmatics and Linguistics: An Analysis of Sentence Topics. *Philosophica* 27: 53-94. [4] Ward, G. & B. Birner. 2004. Information Structure and Non-Canonical Syntax. In *The Handbook of Pragmatics*, L. R. Horn and G. Ward (eds.), 153-174. Oxford: Blackwell.