

# **On the syntax of the Bulgarian adverbial clauses**

**Vesselina Laskova**  
University of Venice

## **0. Introduction\***

This paper has been largely inspired by Haegeman's work on adverbial clauses, more precisely, by the attempt to distinguish between two types of adverbial clauses – central adverbial clauses, also called event adverbial clauses and peripheral, or premise, clauses. It is an attempt to compare the behaviour of Bulgarian adverbial clauses with that of the adverbial clauses in English, mainly on empirical grounds. The data seem to suggest that, as far as the external syntax of adverbial clauses is concerned, Bulgarian data are consistent with the idea about the different merging positions of central and peripheral adverbial clauses. As to the internal syntax, the structure of the Bulgarian adverbial clauses seems to be quite different from that of the English adverbial clauses, both in terms of the position of the conjunction and in terms of the possibility to have Top and Foc in central adverbial clauses.

---

\*. I am very thankful to Alessandra Giorgi for discussion and valuable suggestions. I thank Anna Cardinaletti and Guglielmo Cinque for their useful comments. I owe thanks to Marco Coniglio, Michele Brunelli, Francesco Costantini, Julia Zegrean for discussing various aspects of this paper.

## 1. Theoretical background

### 1.1. Haegeman's theory of adverbial clauses

Haegeman (2002) and subsequent work put forward the proposal that there exists a systematic distinction between two types of adverbial clauses. To the first type belong those clauses which modify the event of the matrix clause. The following example is taken from Haegeman (2002:117):

- (1) If it rains we will all get terribly wet and miserable.

In (1), the relation between the two clauses is defined by Haegeman as a “sequential relation” in which the event of raining causes the event in the main clause.

To the second type of adverbial clauses belong the clauses of which the author suggests that they structure the discourse, rather than the main clause event. Consider example (2), (Haegeman 2002:117).

- (2) If [as you say] it is going to rain this afternoon, why don't we just stay at home and watch a video?

Haegeman calls the clauses belonging to the first type “central adverbial clauses” and the ones belonging to the second type “peripheral adverbial clauses”. Applying various tests, the author highlights the existing internal and external syntax distinctions between the two types. She tries to account for the external syntax distinctions in terms of difference in the position of merge. While central adverbial clauses can be argued to be merged in a position internal to the matrix clause, peripheral clauses, as she suggests, appear above the entire CP of the matrix clause.

In Haegeman (2002), the author puts forward an account for the internal syntax differences, which, gets revised in her later work. In Haegeman (2002) it has been observed that peripheral adverbial clauses do and central adverbial clauses do not allow for argument fronting. This observation is tightly related to Emond's (1969) distinction between root and structure preserving transformations. The distribution of root transformations is further analyzed in Hooper and Thompson's (1973) work. It has been suggested that Topic and Focus (among others) are Root transformation, which cannot be present in all embedded contexts. Haegeman suggests therefore that central adverbial clauses create a context in which MCP are not allowed and therefore Topic and Focus

are excluded there. Furthermore, the author suggested that the impossibility to have argument preposing in central adverbial clauses is tightly related to the absence of an independent illocutionary force. She argues that, for the lack of an independent illocutionary force, central adverbial clauses have a truncated structure of the left periphery, in which the projections of Top and Foc are missing. Therefore argument preposing is not allowed in these contexts.

The more recent proposal (Haegeman 2010) tries to explain the differences between the two types of clauses in terms of the presence versus absence of an operator movement.

Timpli, Papadopoulou and Mylonaki (2010) suggest that neither of Haegeman's proposals can explain the data from Greek, which present a totally different picture.

In this work, I am going to present data from Bulgarian, which, similarly to the Greek data, cannot, at first sight, be accounted for by either of Haegeman's syntactic proposals. I suggest, however, that this does not contradict the basic observation – that the distinction between the two types of clauses is based on the allowed (in peripheral adverbial clauses) vs. disallowed (in central adverbial clauses) presence of MCP.

## **1.2. Haegeman's analysis and the adverbial clauses in Greek**

Analyzing Greek adverbial clauses, Tsimpli, Papadopoulou and Mylonaki (2010), observe that Greek data come in support of Haegeman's proposal about the way in which adverbial clauses differ in terms of their external syntax. They claim, however, that Haegeman's proposal about the structure of the left periphery of adverbial clauses cannot at all accommodate Greek data. Tsimpli et al. show that Greek data can be accommodated only if we propose two different positions for the conjunction – a higher one for the conjunction introducing peripheral adverbial clauses and a lower one for the connective introducing central adverbial clauses. The authors place the higher connective in Force and the lower in Fin. The different positions are motivated by the possibility of peripheral adverbial clauses to host CLLD and Foc both in front and after the connective. Central adverbial clauses, on the other hand, allow for Top and Foc to occur only to the left of the conjunction. As to the structure of the left periphery, Tsimpli et al. follow Roussou's proposal about the presence of a third C head above Force. In a footnote, Tsimpli et al. suggest that they assume a structure in which Top and Foc are available both below and above Force, i.e. both between Force and Fin and between Force and the highest C head. The proposed analysis agrees with Haegeman that Topic and Focus cannot occur in the structure of central adverbial clauses.

In the next section I will show that Bulgarian temporal and premise adverbial clauses, in particular the ones introduced by the conjunctions *kato*, *!tom* and *kogato*, which I will discuss in more detail in the following sections, illustrate the distinction between central and peripheral clauses. I will do this by applying some of Haegeman's tests.

## 2. Central adverbial clauses versus peripheral adverbial clauses

In Haegeman (2002) and subsequent work, the author offers various tests that illustrate the syntactic distinction between central and peripheral clauses. Some of them, when applied to Bulgarian, show that the temporal clauses belong to central clauses and the premise clauses can be classified as peripheral clauses.

### 2.1. Epistemic modality

As Haegeman reports, it has been noticed in the literature (Declerck and Reed 2001) that central clauses cannot express epistemic modality, while peripheral clauses can. Bulgarian data seem to be consistent with this proposal. Consider the following sentences.

- (3) \***Kogato** Maria *verojatno* dojde, !te i razka"em kakvo se slu#i.  
 when Maria probably comes will (we) her tell what happened
- (4) Ne moga da si po#ivam, **kogato** vsi#kite mi kolegi *verojatno* rabotjat denono!tno.  
 Neg can DA take a rest when all my colleagues probably work day and night  
 "I can't permit a rest if all my colleagues work probably day and night."

Haegeman interprets these facts as supporting the idea that central adverbial clauses are within the scope of the modal operators of the main clause and therefore cannot express their own epistemic modality.

## 2.2. Negation scope

Another test illustrating the different behaviour of central and peripheral clauses concerns the scope of negation. Central and not peripheral clauses can enter into the scope of the negation of the matrix clause.

- (5) Ivan niama da zamine za Milano, !tom tja !te pristiga.  
 Ivan NEG DA leave for Milan if she will arrive.  
 “Since she arrives, Ivan will not leave for Milan.”
- (6) Malinata njama da tr\$gne !tom ja razklati!, a !tom natisne! kop#eto.  
 Machine-the NEG DA start if it (you) shake but if (you) press bottom-the  
 “The machine will start working not if you shake it but if you press the bottom.”
- (7) \*Ivan niama da zamine za Milano !tom Maria !te pristiga, a !tom Ivan go izvika.  
 Ivan NEG DA leave for Milan since Maria will arrive but since Ivan him called  
*Intended reading:* Ivan will not leave for Milan because Maria will arrive but because Ivan called him.

In 0, we see a matrix clause containing negation and a premise clause. In 0, what we see is a matrix clause which contains negation and a temporal embedded clause, which is actually in the scope of that negation. In 0 we see that if the adverbial clause is a premise adverbial introduced by *!tom*, the possibility to put the *!tom* clause under the scope of the matrix negation no longer exists. Therefore, we can conclude that premise clauses belong to the peripheral type of clauses, which are not as embedded as the temporal/conditional ones.

## 3. The internal syntax of the Bulgarian adverbial clauses

In this section, I analyse the internal syntax of adverbial clauses with a focus on three conjunctions. I will suggest that, as far as central clauses are concerned, the conjunction could be placed not only in CP but also in IP. This proposal will be based on the behaviour of the conjunction *kato* “after”, “as soon as”, “since”, which, in central clauses, seem to occupy a very low position, i.e. a position inside the IP. In peripheral

adverbial clauses, on the other hand, it exhibits completely different syntactic properties which show that, in that case, it is found in CP. Other two conjunctions will be analyzed as well – *!tom* “as soon as”, “since” and *kogato* “when”. Both of these are found in CP in peripheral and in central clauses. I will suggest that in central clauses, *!tom* can also be found in IP, similarly to *kato*. While the presence of more than one position for the conjunction can be due to cross-linguistic variation, another fact requires an explanation, namely that, *!tom* and *kogato*, allow for Top (in the form of CLLD) and Foc to appear in a position lower than the connective in central clauses, something which is neither possible in English nor in Greek.

### 3.1. The conjunction *kato*

#### 3.1.1. Temporal meanings

From a morphological point of view, the initial letter “k” makes the conjunction *kato* similar to a *wh*- element. Still, we are going to argue that *kato*, in its temporal readings is not part of the CP layer.

As to its semantics, *kato* can have two distinct temporal meanings depending on the aspect of the verb in the adverbial clause.<sup>1</sup> If the verb is perfective, *kato* expresses the meaning “after” or “as soon as”, as illustrated in the following example.

- (8) Ivan **kato** zv\$onna, Maria otvori vratata.  
 Ivan kato rang Maria opened the door  
 “As Ivan rang the bell, Maria opened the door.”

If the verb of the embedded clause is imperfective *kato* has the temporal meaning of “while”, as in 0.

- (9) **Kato** otivah na u#ili!te sre!tnah Maria.  
**kato** wentIMPERF to school met Maria  
 “As I was going to school I saw Maria.”

What is peculiar about this conjunction is that very few elements can appear in the slot between it and the verb of the embedded clause. When one of the temporal meanings is

---

<sup>1</sup>. Bulgarian, as a Slavic language, marks the aspect directly on the verb form.

expressed, there is a ban on the subject. The subject can either precede *kato* as in 0, or follow the verb as in 0, but can never appear between these two elements.

- (10) **Kato** zv\$na Ivan, Maria otvori vratata.  
 kato rang Ivan Maria opened the door  
 “As Ivan rang the bell, Maria opened the door.”

- (11) **\*Kato** Ivan zv\$na, Maria zatvori vratata.  
 kato Ivan rang Maria opened the door

“Kato” can be followed neither by a CLLD-ed element nor by a focalized element, as shown by the following two examples.

- (12) **\*Kato** knjigata ja iznesoh ot bibliotekata, zabeljazah, #e e #isto nova.  
 kato the book it took out of the library noticed that is brand new

- (13) **\*Kato** KNIGATA iznesoh ot bibliotekata, zabeljazah, #e e mnogo kâsno.  
 kato the book took out of the library noticed that is very late

Notice, however, that Foc and Top can precede *kato*.

- (14) Knigata **kato** ja iznesoh ot bibliotekata,  
 the book kato it took of from the library  
 zabeljazah, #e vsjaka edna ot stranitsite e sk\$šana.  
 noticed that each one of the pages is torn  
 “As I took the book out of the library, I noticed that each one of the pages was torn. ”

- (15) KNIGATA **kato** iznesoh ot bibliotekata, zabeljazah, #e e k\$šno.  
 The book kato took out of the library noticed that is late  
 “It is the book that I took out of the library when I noticed that it was late.”

The slot between *kato* and the verb can host all kinds of clitics. This is shown in 0.

- (16) **Kato** s\$*m* mu go podaval, ne!to e izpadnalo ot plika.  
 kato AUX him it passed something has fallen out of the envelope  
 “As I was passing it to him, something has fallen out of the envelope.”

Notice also that some very low adverbs, like *izcjalo* “completely” can fit in this position.

- (17) *Kato izcjalo* ja proceta, !te ti ja v\$*r*na.  
 kato completely it read will(I) you it give back  
 “When I read it all, I will give it back to you.”

Notice that the position between *kato* and the verb is not the only admissible position for the adverb *izcjalo*. Actually, its unmarked position is the post-verbal one.

- (18) *Kato* ja proceta *izcjalo*, !te ti ja v\$*r*na.  
 kato it read completely will(I) you it give back  
 “When I read it all, I will give it back to you.”

It is also allowed in front of *kato*, as in the following example.

- (19) *Izcjalo* kato ja proceta, !te ti ja v\$*r*na.  
 completely kato it read will you it give back  
 “When I read it all, I will give it back to you.”

It is important to notice that the positions of the adverb before *kato* and between *kato* and the verb are marked but do not need to be strongly focalized. Now notice that, if we add a subject and place the adverb in front of it, the example sounds acceptable only if the adverb is very strongly focalized. Indeed, it seems that we are dealing with a contrastive focus because, in case *izcjalo* precedes the subject, the example sounds best if we add *togava* “then” in the main clause, as shown below.

- (20) *Izcjalo* profesor\$*t* kato ja pro#ete, togava !te ti ja v\$*r*ne.  
 completely professor-the kato it read then will to you it give back  
 “The professor will give it back to you only when he reads the whole of it.”



I take the presence versus absence of a focalized reading as a significant piece of data distinguishing between two cases – the one in which the adverb precedes *kato* but is still inside the IP (since the adverb is not focalized) and the other, in which *kato* precedes the subject, in which case it is clearly found inside the left periphery, as suggested by the strong contrastive focus on the adverb.

Notice that the adverb *slu"ajno* “occasionally”, a presumably higher adverb, behaves in a different way. It can either precede or follow the subject (in this case occurring between the subject and *kato*). It does not need to be focalized in either of these cases. This adverb, however, can hardly occur between *kato* and the verb.

(Ivan has been very irritated these days, even when we go for a walk.)

(21) Slu#ajno njakoj kato go blšne taka se iznervja, che zapo#va da vika.

Accidentally someone when him jostles so much gets nervous that starts crying

“As someone accidentally jostles against him, he gets so angry that he starts crying.”

(22) Njakoj slu#ajno kato go zagovori, !te izpolzvam momenta da si vidja SMSa.

someone accidentally when with him starts talking (I) will see my SMS

“When he accidentally starts a conversation with someone, I will see my SMS.”

(23) \* Njakoj kato slu#ajno go blasne, mnogo se iznervja.

someone when accidentally him jostles against very much gets nervous

Actually, to construct a test with an overt subject is not an easy task, since it is quite difficult to establish whether the subject DP is in the subject position or in a Topic position. Therefore I used the pronoun *njakoj* “someone” in a context in which no person is supposed or expected to be referred to (cf. Kawasaki 1993 e Landau 2000). The last test may be interpreted in support of the claim that only very low adverbs can appear in the slot between *kato* and the verb, which shows that *kato* is in a low position inside the IP.

Maybe the following test might also be a help to show that, in any case, *kato* is lower than the subject. The context of this example is the following: Maria is inside an apartment, the door is locked and she cannot go out. Her friend, who does not know about this, is desperately persuading her to go out, asking her when she will finally go out. It is possible to give the following sentence as a short response:

- (24) (Ami), njakoj kato mi otvori.  
 well someone kato to me opens  
 “When someone opens the door for me.”

It is also possible to place *njakoi* “someone” after the verb but not between *kato* and the verb.

- (25) (Ami), kato mi otvori njakoj.  
 Well kato to me opens someone  
 “When someone opens the door to me.”

- (26) \*(Ami), kato njakoj mi otvori.  
 well kato someone to me opens  
 “When someone opens the door to me.”

It is rather improbable that *njakoj* “someone” is in Top position in this example because there is absolutely no intended or implied person. Therefore this example might be interpreted as a further piece of evidence that *kato* is lower than the subject and is not in CP.

In sum, the data presented above, in particular the subject restriction and the distribution of the adverbs suggest that *kato* in temporal adverbial clauses is a very low conjunction, which seems to stay inside the IP, rather than in the CP.

### 3.1.2. The “premise” meaning of *kato*

The temporal meaning is not the only possible meaning of *kato*- clauses. The latter may also be interpreted as a “premise” to the event of the matrix clause. The relevant piece of data is the fact that, in their premise meaning, *kato*- clauses have an entirely different syntax. To begin with, no restriction is imposed on the subject, which can freely occur between *kato* and the verb.

- (27) Kato ti si mu go obel'tal, ti !te mu go nameri!.  
 Since you AUX him it promised you AUX.FUT him it find  
 “If you promised it to him, you must find it for him.”

Moreover, premise *kato*- clauses, unlike their temporal counterpart, allow for a Top to occur between the conjunction and the verb.

- (28) Ne razbiram zashto prodalzhavash da nastojavash kato knigata veche sa ja prodali.  
 Neg understand why continue (you) DA insist since the book already Aux it sold  
 “I don’t understand why you keep on insisting if the book has already been sold.”

This type of clauses allow also for the Foc to appear between the conjunction and the verb.

- (29) Ne razbiram za!to prod\$! "ava! da nastojava! kato NOVITE PRAVILA  
 Neg understand why continue (you) DA insist if the new rules  
 ve#e opredeljat koj da ostane na rabota i koj da si otide (a ne starite).  
 already determine who DA remain at work and who DA leave (and not the old ones)  
 “I don’t understand why you keep on insisting if the new rules are the ones that determine who will remain at work and who will leave.”

The examples illustrating the syntactic behaviour of premise *kato*- clauses seem to show that, on this interpretation, the conjunction is definitely part of the CP layer.

In the next section, I am going to present another conjunction – *!tom* “as soon as”, “since”. I am going to compare its syntactic behaviour to that of *kato*.

### 3.2. The conjunction *!tom*

#### 3.2.1. Temporal meaning

Similarly to *kato*, this conjunction may have both a temporal and a premise interpretation. Its temporal meaning is “as soon as”. While *kato* can have two temporal interpretations, depending on the aspect of the verb, *!tom* can only have one. It is also dependent on the aspect of the verb in the embedded clause but in the sense that the temporal meaning is only available with perfective verbs. With imperfective verbs, *!tom* can only have a premise interpretation. This is shown in the examples below.

- (30) **!tom** prekra#ih praga na magazina, policajat me povika.  
 As soon as (I) crossed the threshold of the shop the policeman called me  
 “As soon as I crossed the threshold of the shop the policeman called me.”

- (31) **!tom** Maria spi zna#i Ivan e izljaz\$.  
 If Maria sleeps, it means Ivan has gone out  
 “If Maria is asleep, Ivan has gone out.”

There are several crucial differences distinguishing the syntactic behavior of *kato* from that of *!tom* in temporal adverbial clauses. First, *!tom* does not impose any restriction on the subject of the embedded clause. The latter can freely appear between the conjunction and the verb, as shown below.

- (32) **!tom** Maria izleze ot stajata, Ivan zatvori vratata.  
 As soon as Maria went out of the room, Ivan closed the door  
 “As soon as Maria went out of the room, Ivan closed the door.”

CLLDed noun phrases cannot follow *kato* but can follow *!tom*.

- (33) **!tom** vratata ja otvoriha, decata huknaha da izlizat.  
 As soon as the door it (they) opened the children rushed to go out  
 “As soon as they opened the door, the children rushed out.”

Neither can focused elements appear after *kato*. The latter can freely follow *!tom*.

- (34) **!tom** PLIKA vzeme trjabva da reagira!. (a ne ne!to drugo)  
 As soon as the envelope takes (you) must do something  
 “The moment she takes the envelope, you must do something.”

There is one similarity between the two elements and it lies in the fact that focused and left-dislocated elements can precede both of them.

- (35) Plika **"tom** go otvorihme, razbrahme, che ..  
 the envelope as soon as it (we) opened understood that...  
 “As to the envelope, the moment we opened it, we understood that...”

- (36) PLIKA 'tom otvorihme razbrahme, #e  
 the envelope as soon as (we) opened understood that...  
 "It is when we opened the envelope that I understood that.."

The above presented data suggest that, unlike *kato*, *!tom* is an element of CP layer. There is, however, more to it than this. I will suggest that a low position, like the one in which *kato* is found is available also for the conjunction *!tom* as well as for the conjunction *ako* "if" (a conjunction which I will not analyze in detail here). I will argue that these conjunctions can use both the high and the low positions. *Kato* is the odd element in that it is restricted only to the low position. The following examples show that *!tom* and *ako*'s behaviour with respect to the above discussed adverbs is very similar to that of *kato*.

- (37) *Izcjalo* !tom ja pro#eta, !te ti ja v\$rna.  
 completely as soon as it read will(I) you it give back  
 "When I read it all, I will give it back to you."

Notice that the adverb *izcjalo* may not be focused. If we add a subject, however, this is no longer possible.

- (38) ?*Iztjalo* profesorat !tom ja pro#ete, togava !te ima! negovoto mnenie.  
 completely the professor as soon as it read then will (you) have his opinion  
 "Only when the professor reads it to the end, will you have his opinion."

Apart from the fact that the sentence sounds odd, a Foc on the adverb is needed in order to interpret it. The following example shows the same behaviour about *ako*.

- (39) *Izcjalo* ako go pro#eta do pet\$ka, !te ti se obadja.  
 completely if it read (I) by Friday, will (I) call you  
 "If I finish reading it by Friday, I will call you."

- (40) *Izcjalo* ako njakoj ti go pro#ete do pet\$ka, samo togava !te polu##i! rezultat.  
 completely if someone it read by Friday, only then will receive result  
 "Only if someone reads it completely by Friday, will you receive any feedback."

Notice that the following sentence is also possible.

- (41) *Njakoj izcjalo ako go pro#ete, mo"e idejata ti da mu se haresa.*  
 someone completely if it read may idea your DA him appeal  
 "It may be that your idea appeals to someone who reads it to the end."

In this case *njakoj* does not refer to an individual which is implied or supposed to read the work. Therefore it is quite improbable that it is found in a Top position. In this case, again, the low adverb which precedes *ako* may not be focalized. The same sentence is not felicitous if the adverb is placed in front of the subject without being Focalized.

### 3.2.2. Premise meaning

In its premise meaning *!tom* can be followed either by a Top or a Foc, as illustrated below.

- (42) *%tom knjigata si ja pro#ela, zna#i poznavaj javlenieto.*  
 if the book it read (you) means know (you) the phenomenon  
 "If you have read the book, this means that you know this phenomenon."
- (43) *%tom PISMOTO e pro#ela, zna#i znae za slu#aja, (a ne ot bele"kata).*  
 Since THE LETTER has read means knows (she) about the case (and not from the notice)  
 "Since she has read the letter, she knows about the case."

Top and Foc can also precede premise *!tom*.

- (44) *Ne bele"kata, ami PLIKA !tom e vzela, zna#i znae ne!to.*  
 Neg the notice but the envelope if has taken means knows (she) something  
 "Since she has read the letter, she knows about the case."
- (45) *Plika !tom go e vzela, zna#i znae za slu#aja.*  
 the envelope if it has (she) taken means knows (she) about the case  
 "If she has taken the envelope, she knows about the case"

These data show that temporal and premise *!tom*- clauses do not differ significantly in terms of their internal syntax. In the next section I turn to the conjunction *kogato* “when”.

### 3.3. The conjunction *kogato*

#### 3.3.1. Temporal meaning

The conjunction *kogato* “when” differs from the other three conjunctions in that it cannot appear in a position inside the IP. Low adverbs can appear in front of *kogato* only if contrastively focused, if at all.

- (46) *Vnimatelno/Izcjalo*    *kogato*    *go*    *procheta*    *togava*    *shte*    *ti*    *go*    *varna*.  
           carefully/completely    when    it (I) read then (I) will give it back to you.  
           “As I read it to the end/carefully, I will give it back to you.”

Moreover, while it is possible to place *njakoj* “someone” as a subject of a clause which contains *kato* in an IP position, it is not possible to use *kogato* in the same way.

- (47) *Njakoi*    *kato*/\* *kogato*    *te*    *popita*    *za*    *hobito*    *ti*    *ti*    *kakvo*    *otgovariash*?  
           someone    *kato*/\**kogato*    you asks about hobby your you what respond  
           “When someone asks you about your hobby, what do you respond?”

As to the use of Top and Foc, I will simply mention that *kogato* behaves the same way as *!tom* – it allows both to Top and Foc either to precede it or to follow it. Therefore we conclude that this element can only occur as part of the CP layer and cannot have a low variant.

#### 3.3.2. The premise meaning

*Kogato* can also have a meaning different from the temporal meaning discussed above. In order to keep the same pattern, I will refer to it as a “premise” meaning, though this label may not be the most precise one. The following sentence is ambiguous.

- (48) Ne moga da si po#ivam, **kogato** vsi#ki moi kolegi rabotjat tolkova us#rdno.  
cannot (I) DA take a rest when all my colleagues work so assiduously  
“I cannot permit myself a rest if all my colleagues work so assidueously.”

This sentence can have both a temporal reading and a premise reading. In its temporal reading, *kogato* refers to time, while in its premise meaning, the conjunction has the meaning “given that”, “since”.

In its premise meaning *kogato*, can be followed both by a Top and a Foc.

- (49) Ne moga da sam spoken kogato kole"kata mi ja uvolniha taka bez pri#ina.  
Cannot be DA be calm if colleague my her released from work without a reason  
“I can’t stay calm it they released my colleague without any reason.”

- (50) Ne moga da sam bezu#asna, kogato MOITE POD&INENI sa horata,  
Cannot be DA be indifferent if my dependents are the people  
koito trjabva da otgovarjat za !tetite a ne tvoite.  
who must DA take the responsibility for the damages and not yours  
“I can’t be indifferent if the people who have to take the responsibility for the damages are my dependents and not yours.”

Since premise clauses with *kogato* are rather rare, it is difficult to form sentences with a Foc or a Top preceding the conjunction.

The data illustrating the position of the three conjunctions inside the embedded clause as well as the positions of Top and Foc with respect to the conjunctions can be summarized as follows: In the temporal interpretation, conjunctions *!tom* and *kato*, as well as the conjunction *ako*, can be placed both in CP and in IP. *Kogato*, on the other hand does not seem to have an IP variant.

To account for these data, a possibility would be to accept Tsimpliy et al’s approach in assuming Roussou’s (2000) model of the three C position structure of the left periphery. While this might be a solution considering the syntactic places of the conjunctions, and of Top and Foc, the problem concerning the presence itself of the Focus in central adverbial clauses remains unresolved. I tackle this problem in the next section.



#### 4. The position of Foc in central adverbial clauses in Bulgarian

As we have seen above, in Bulgarian central clauses introduced by *kogato* and *!tom*, Focus and CLLD can either precede or follow the conjunction. I will try to explain this piece of data by suggesting that neither CLLD nor Focus seem to be MCP in Bulgarian. If this is true the deviation from Haegeman's proposal about the internal structure of the adverbial clauses will be reduced to cross-linguistic variation. Thus Bulgarian data will not contradict the idea about the different distribution of MCP in adverbial clauses.

Hooper and Thompson (1973) notice that some verbs take complements that are asserted while others take complements that are presupposed. A very clear example of the latter type of verbs is the group of factive verbs – *regret, be sorry, be surprised, be strange, be interesting*, etc. Another claim that Hooper and Thompson make is that Root transformations can only occur in contexts which are asserted. Therefore, as we would expect that complements of factive verbs would never allow root transformations. This explains why, in English, we may never have focalization in a complement of a factive verb. As far as Bulgarian is concerned, however, this rule no longer holds. Consider the following example.

(51) Ne tolkova za knigata, stranno e/u#udvam se, #e &ANTATA si e zabravit.

Not so much about the book, strange is/I am surprised that THE BAG has (he) forgotten

“It is not so surprising that he forgot his book but that he forgot his bag.”

Since we would not expect that the semantic characteristics of the Bulgarian correspondents of English factive verbs could differ in a way to allow for asserted complements, it would be more reasonable to propose that the focalization in Bulgarian does not have the status of a MCP. Notice that the same holds true for the CLLDed noun phrases.

(52) Stranno e/u#udvam se, #e knigata sa mu ja otkradnali.

It is strange/I am surprised that the book (they) have to him it robbed of

“It is strange/I am surprised that they have robbed him of his book.”

This would explain why, in Bulgarian, focus and CLLD can freely occur in central adverbial clauses, while in English they cannot.

Now I would like to consider one more piece of data. The following examples show that tag questions can be formed only to peripheral and not to central (temporal) adverbial clauses.

(peripheral)

- (53) Ivan raboti varhu teorijata, dokato Maria podgotvja dannite, nali?  
 Ivan work on the theory while Maria prepare the data, doesn't she?  
 "Ivan works on the theory while Maria prepares the data, doesn't she?"

(temporal)

- (54) \*Ivan raboti varhu teorijata, dokato Maria podgotvja dannite, nali? (as a tag to the temporal clause)  
 Ivan works on the theory while Maria prepares the data, doesn't she?

The distribution of tag questions may be interpreted as a signal that the distinction between the two types of clauses has to do with the presence versus absence of illocutionary force, as suggested in Haegeman (2002).

## 5. Conclusion

This paper was an attempt to describe the structure of the Bulgarian adverbial clauses in the light of Haegeman's proposal about the distinction between central and peripheral adverbial clauses. We have seen that Bulgarian data comply with Haegeman's distinction between central and peripheral clauses in view of the external syntax of adverbial clauses. As to the internal syntax, we have seen that Bulgarian offers a very different picture both in comparison with the English data and in comparison with the Greek data. First of all we have seen that certain conjunctions introducing central adverbial clauses can appear both in CP and in IP. The data discussed in this work point to the conclusion that, when the conjunctions are found inside the CP layer, in Bulgarian, the distinction between central and peripheral clauses is syntactically not so obvious. It was tentatively suggested that the three C model of the left periphery, suggested by Roussou (2000), could be a way to solve the problem with the two Top and Foc positions occurring in the adverbial clauses. Finally, it was suggested that CLLD and Foc do not seem to behave as MCP in Bulgarian, given that they are allowed in presupposed contexts. With these considerations in mind we can conclude that,

though the internal structure of Bulgarian adverbial clauses seems to be quite different from that of English adverbial clauses, Bulgarian data do not seem to contradict the idea about the distribution of MCP.

## References

- Cinque, G. 1999. *Adverbs and functional heads*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Declerck, R and S. Reed. 2001. *Conditionals: a comprehensive empirical analysis*. Amsterdam, Mouton de Gruyter.
- Haegeman, L. 2002. "Anchoring to the speaker, adverbial clauses and the structure of CP". *Georgetown University Working Papers in Linguistics 2*, 117-180.
- Haegeman, L. 2004. "Topicalization, CLLD and the left periphery". Ms. UMR 8258 Silex du CNRS.
- Haegeman, L. 2006. "Conditionals, factives and the left periphery". *Lingua* 116, 1651-1659.
- Haegeman, L. 2010. "Internal syntax of adverbial clauses". In K. Grohmann and I.-M. Tsimpli (eds.), *Exploring the left periphery*. Thematic issue, *Lingua* 120, 628-648.
- Hooper J. and S. Thompson. 1973. "On the applicability of root transformations". *Linguistic Inquiry* 4, 465-497
- Kawasaki, N. 1993. "Control and arbitrary interpretation in English". Ph.D. dissertation, University of Massachusetts at Amherst.
- Landau, I. 2000. *Elements of control*. Dordrecht, Foris.
- Rizzi, L. 1997. "The fine structure of the left periphery". In L. Haegeman (ed.), *Elements of Grammar*. Dordrecht, Kluwer.
- Roussou, A. 2000. "On the left periphery: modal particles and complementizers." *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 1, 65-94
- Tsimpli, L.M., D. Papadopoulou and A. Mylonaki. 2010. "Temporal modifications in Greek adverbial clauses: The role of aspect and negation". *Lingua* 120.3, 649-672.