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Abstract

The paper offers an analysis of Bulgarian relative clauses introduced by the invariant complementizer deto ‘that’, whose distribution also extends to factive contexts. Using reconstruction as primary evidence for movement, I review the basic facts for its presence (amount readings, idiom interpretation, binding and scope) and absence (Principle C) and argue that both a raising and a matching analysis must be available for the derivation of deto-relatives. I also discuss the distribution and structural properties of resumptive clitics which are shown to block reconstruction in all types of contexts and hence to be compatible with a matching derivation only. Given the structural ambiguity in the derivation of Bulgarian complementizer relatives and in search of a unified treatment of their potentially ambivalent behavior, the paper applies Cinque’s (2003, 2008) analysis of relative clauses, which postulates two identical copies of the relativized Head (internal and external) and exploits different movement options to account for the raising and the matching derivations. It is then argued that such a proposal, which also exploits distinct CP positions, can successfully accommodate all of the observed reconstruction effects (or lack thereof), including the option of resumption. The paper also offers a discussion of factive clauses introduced by the same complementizer and proposes that they are best treated as hidden relatives embedded under a more complex structure involving a PP projection and a silent D head.
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1. Introduction

Bulgarian possesses an invariant subordinator, deto, which can be used in headed relative clauses and also as a subordinating conjunction introducing complement clauses of some factive (and emotive) predicates. The two uses are illustrated in (1a) and (1b).

(1) a. Tova e čovek, deto (go) sinimax včera. this is man-the that him.CLAcc photographed-1sg yesterday
   ‘This is the man that I photographed yesterday’

b. Sǎžaljavam, deto ne možax da dojda. regret-1sg that not could-1sg Mod come-1sg
   ‘I regret that I couldn’t come’
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Building on work by Rudin (1986), in this paper I will further examine the properties and distribution of deto, in an attempt to propose a unified account for (1a) and (1b). The underlying idea is that deto is a complementizer but of a specific type, namely a relative complementizer, and as such it is bound to occur in relative clauses (RCs) only. Support for this proposal will come from the analysis of clauses like (1b) which, differently from other factive clauses, introduced by the default complementizer ĉe ‘that’, are shown to instantiate a hidden relative structure, whose head is the null variant of the demonstrative tova ‘this’. Thus, the structural difference between (1a) and (1b) can be attributed to properties of the relativized head (overt or covert), rather than to the type of clause involved in each case.

In section 2, I will present some basic facts concerning the distribution of deto-relative clauses and their properties with respect to the possibility of resumption. In section 3, I will discuss the available theoretical options for deriving relative clauses (RCs), comparing the well-known raising and matching analyses, and will argue that both are needed for the structural description of deto-relatives. I will then, in section 4, show that Cinque’s (2003, 2008, in preparation) analysis, which postulates a prenominal Merge structure for the derivation of all types of relative clauses, can account successfully for all of the observed properties of deto-relatives, including the specifics of resumption. In section 5, I will discuss the basic facts of the apparent complementation phenomenon of (1b) and will concentrate on the reasons for assimilating it under a relative clause structure.

2. General overview of deto-relatives

2.1. Brief historical remarks

Traditional Bulgarian grammars have paid attention mainly to the functions of deto as a relative marker (there is only a brief mention of its usage with factive verbs) and describe it as a relativum generale, capable of relativizing all sorts of lexical heads (AG, 1983:309, Nitsolova, 1986:137). Historically, deto derives from the adverbial relative kādeto ‘where’, the locative meaning of which, starting from Early Modern Bulgarian, gradually weakened—a process which was accompanied by a phonological reduction: kādeto > gdeto/deto.1 In the 17th and 18th century deto already appears, especially in Damaskin literature2, as a multi-purpose relativizer, synonymous to several other relativizers, such as “where”, “for this reason, that”, “in which”, “which”, “that”. Cf. the examples in (2). This structural reanalysis of the wh-adverbial, based on extension of its functional meaning, gradually culminated in the contemporary use of deto as an invariable relative marker, typical of colloquial speech3 (including that of educated speakers) and particularly widespread in Bulgarian dialects, where it shows up under different phonological forms: detu/denu/det/deto/deso/deno in the Eastern dialects and dek/deka (de < kāde + ka) in the Western ones. Cf. Karabelova (1998) from where the examples in (3) have been taken:

(2)

a. Blažena si ty ot sičkyte ženy, deto si takova dete rodila… deto = because blessed are-2sg you from all-the women that are-2sg such child born-prt-f
   ‘You are blessed among all the women, because you gave birth to such a child…”

b. …da ti kažem radost goljama, deto šešša da badeš na sičkyte crykvi božii oučitelš. deto = that
to you CLDat tell-1pl joy great that will-2sg to be-2sg to all-the churches God’s teacher
   ‘to tell you a great joy, that you will be the teacher of all God’s churches’

c. I dade mu deto držaše v rācete svoi ključovete. deto = which
   and gave-3sg him.Cldat that held-3sg in hands-the his-refl keys-the
   ‘And he gave him the keys that he was holding in his hands’

Trojanski damaskin, 17th c., p. 43, Dacheva, Tisheva (2005)

1 The relative adverbial itself derives from the interrogative adverbial kāde ‘where’, to which the anaphoric definiteness marker –to has been added.
2 Miscellanea collections of religious precepts and parables written in colloquial style.
3 The reason deto did not enter the standard language are extralinguistic and have to do with the strong normative tradition which prevailed in the modern period of the language, coupled with Church Slavonic influences introduced artificially through literary communication. These tendencies brought about a restoration of deto’s original locative meaning in the written form of the language, while its other usages got restricted to the colloquial register (Dacheva and Tisheva, 2005).
Bulgarian is not unique among the Slavic languages in using an uninflected complementizer as a relativum generale, alongside a relative pronoun. The same strategy is found in many other Slavic languages: Polish co (Broihier, 1995; Pesetsky, 1998; Szczegielniak, 2005); Czech co (Toman, 1998); Russian čto (Lavine, 2003; Szczegielniak, 2005); Slovenian ki, Serbo-Croatian što (Browne, 1986; van der Auwera and Kučanda, 1985); Ukrainian ščo (Lavine, 2003) and Macedonian što (Gareiss, 1996; Topolinjska, 1997). Outside of Slavic, well-known cases of invariable relativizers include Swiss German wo (Riemsdijk, 1989; Salzmann, 2006); Greek pu (Stavrou, 1984; Alexiadou, 1998; Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou, 1999); Albanian që (Kallulli, 2008), English that (at least in some varieties of English). Among the Slavic languages Bulgarian however seems to be unique in two respects: (1) it is the only language in which the invariable relative marker is associated diachronically with the wh-adverbial where, and (2) it is the only language which (apparently) has extended the use of the relative marker into the domain of sentential complementation, as in (1b) above. Outside Slavic Bulgarian seems to pattern in both of these respects with Greek where too an adverbial complementizer (pu ‘where/that’) is used in factive/emotive complements, in addition to relative clauses.

One property that deto shares with invariable relative markers in other languages is that it is not marked for case and hence does not bear the case assigned to the relative clause internal gap. Neither is it marked for number and gender. In these two respects it differs crucially from relative pronouns which distinguish three genders in the singular and a plural form, and two case forms—nominative and accusative for masculine animates. Cf. (4) and in particular, compare (4b) with (1a) above:

(4) a. Tova e čovekāt, koiţo me sņima vĉera
   this is man-the who-m-Nom me-ClAcc photographed-3sg yesterday
   ‘This is the man who photographed me yesterday’

b. Tova e čovekāt, kogoto sņima vĉera
   this is man-the whom-m-Acc photographed-1sg yesterday
   ‘This is the man whom I photographed yesterday’

c. Tova e ženata, kajato sņima vĉera
   this is woman-the who-fem photographed-1sg yesterday
   ‘This is the woman whom I photographed yesterday’

The absence of Case features in deto is the most important argument advanced by Rudin (1986:130) in favour of its complementizer status. Another potential argument that Rudin offers is that if deto were a relative pronoun, it would be able to pied-pipe a preposition, given the impossibility of preposition stranding in Bulgarian. However, this is not the case, as (5a) shows. The only way the ungrammaticality of (5a) can be repaired is to use a resumptive pronoun as the object of the preposition, (5b), a strategy unavailable in wh-relatives, (5d), since the preposition here is needed to assign Case to the relative pronoun, (5c):
The contrasts in (5) therefore can be made sense of if deto is generated directly in C, while the wh-pronoun is moved to Spec,CP.

A third argument for complementizer status comes from co-occurrence restrictions. While deto is incompatible with other complementizers (Bulgarian does not possess double complementizers), it is also incompatible with wh-words. This latter restriction is more significant since Bulgarian is a multiple wh-fronting language in both wh-question and free wh-relatives, so the ungrammaticality of (6b,d) would be unexpected if deto were a wh-adverbial or a wh-pronoun in Q1 general$^4$.

Rudin concludes that deto appears in typical C positions according to selection requirements (cf. also Penčev, 1998:120). Building up on these observations, I will consider deto as a complementizer.$^5$

### 2.3. Pronominal resumption in deto-relatives

The case-deficiency of deto can be compensated for by a resumptive pronoun agreeing in gender and number with the head of the relative clause and spelling out the case of the relative clause internal gap. According to Penčev (1998),

---

$^4$ Rudin (1986) explicitly mentions that the properties of deto do not stem from its adverbial nature, since it is found in all contexts where a wh-relative (nominal or adjectival) would be found but it would have to agree with the NP head (p. 130).

$^5$ As pointed out by an anonymous reviewer, deto is not available in free relatives, cf. (i) below, except in contexts where it substitutes for the locative wh-adverbial ka˘deto 'where', cf. (ii):

(i) *Šte kupja kakvoto*deto mi kazës. 
will buy-1sg whatever me-CIDat tell-2sg
‘I will buy whatever you tell me to buy’

(ii) Namira˘ si zlato, deto/kâdeto potârsí. (Ivajlo Petrov, 1978:161) FIND-2sg self-CIDat gold where search-2sg
‘You can find gold wherever you search for it’

$^6$ In recent work on English that Kayne (2008) suggests that all complementizers are in fact relative pronouns, hence possibly phrases. Cf. also Koopman and Sportiche (2008) on que/qui in French as weak relative pronouns. Such a proposal might reopen the old question of whether the invariable marker is a subordinating conjunction, i.e. a complementizer, or a relative pronoun. This issue, highly relevant for South Slavic where the two “forms” are often morphologically identical (see for example the discussion in van der Auwera and Kucˇanda (1985) on Serbo-Croatian što ‘that’), will be left for future exploration.
a resumptive pronoun is necessary in all deto-relatives, apart from those in which the resumptive would correspond to a non-embedded Nominative subject, which is always non-clitic. Cf. (7):

(7)  
*čovekāt, deto toj, govorešë s tebe…  (Penčev 1998:120)  
   man-the that he talked-3sg with you  
   ‘the man that was talking to you’

With respect to internal argument positions, the resumptive pronoun can show up as a clitic or non-clitic, and the choice between the two seems to be governed by the following descriptive generalization: wherever a clitic is available, the corresponding non-clitic is excluded. See the contrast in (8) which illustrates indirect object resumption. Whenever a clitic is unavailable, a non-clitic becomes the only option: all prepositional objects for which there is no available clitic are necessarily resumed by a non-clitic pronoun preceded by the preposition. This is shown by (9a,b):

(8)  
a. čovekāt, deto mu razkazax istoriata  
   man-the that him-ClDat told-1sg story-the  
   lit. ‘the man that I told him the story’

b. *čovekāt, deto razkazax istoriata na nego  
   man-the that told-1sg story-the to him  
   lit. ‘the man that I told the story to him’

(9)  
a. momčeto, deto govorix  *(za nego).  
   boy-the that talked-1sg about him  
   ‘the boy that I talked about’

b. kolata, deto tja sleze  *(ot neja)  
   car-the that she got-out-3sg from her  
   ‘the car that she got out of’  (Penčev 1998, 120)

As regards resumptives realized as a clitic, Rudin (1986:35f) observes that sometimes they are obligatory and sometimes optional in deto-relatives (cf. also Maslov, 1982:385). Upon closer examination it turns out that dative clitics, whether possessor or indirect object clitics, are obligatory, while accusative ones are optional. This asymmetry, illustrated by the contrast between (10a,b) and (10c), shows up only in restrictive deto RCs. In non-restrictive RCs, on the other hand, all resumptive clitics are obligatory, regardless of their syntactic function. See (11):

(10) a. Tova e čovekāt, deto Ivan kupi kāštata *(mu).  
    this is man-the that Ivan bought-3sg house-the him-Cl.Dat  
    ‘This is the man whose house Ivan bought’

b. Tova e čovekāt, deto *(mu) govorix za teb.  
    this is man-the that him-Cl.Dat talked-1sg about you  
    ‘This is the man that I talked to about you’

c. Taja pola sâm ja kupila ot nagradite, deto mi (gi) dadoxa  
   this skirt am her-Cl.Acc bought-1sg from awards-the that me-Cl.Dat them.Cl.Acc gave-3pl  
   ‘This skirt I bought with the bonus that they gave me.’

(11) a. Tova e Ivan, deto *(mu) govorix za teb.  
    this is Ivan that him-Cl.Dat talked-1sg about you  
    ‘This is Ivan whom I talked to about you’

b. Tova momče, deto *(go) običaš, njama da se oženi za tebe.  
    this boy that you-Cl.Acc love-2sg will-not Mod refl marry-3sg for you  
    ‘This boyfriend of yours, whom you love, is not going to marry you’

The absolute ban on overt Nominative resumptives is of a more general nature, referred to in McCloskey (1990, 2006) as the Highest Subject Restriction and shared by a wide variety of languages (cf. Aoun and Li, 1990; Shlonsky, 1992; Lavine, 2003; Salzmann, 2006, a.o.). I will not pursue this issue further and will simply assume that in such cases an obligatory null resumptive appears in subject position. The idea is plausible, given that many of the languages which share the Highest Subject Restriction are pro-drop, although it is not at all clear what antilocality property of overt pronouns forces pro to be obligatory (see Borer, 1984, and McCloskey’s 1990 A’-disjointness requirement). See also the discussion in Boeckx (2003:83ff).

The same pattern of distribution holds for non-relative contexts as well.
In what follows, I will not discuss non-restrictive RCs or the issue of the obligatory presence of a clitic in such relatives. I just want to point out that the facts in (10)–(11) accord with Bianchi’s (2004:80) empirical generalization paraphrased here in (12):

(12) If a language allows for resumptive pronouns in restrictive RCs, this language should also allow for resumptive pronouns in non-restrictive RCs.9

As it is still unclear what syntactic properties underlie the implicational relation expressed in (12), in this paper (section 4) I will set myself a more limited goal: to look at the distribution of accusative resumptive clitics in restrictive deto-relatives, and to show that the optionality of the clitic (as in, e.g. (10c) above) is only apparent, in the sense that structures containing a resumptive clitic involve a different derivation as compared to those not containing such a clitic. I will have nothing to say about the semantic/pragmatic conditions which call for one or the other type of structure.

As for dative clitics, I will assume that their obligatoriness depends on an orthogonal factor, namely the need to recover the preposition of the missing indirect or possessor object. (Both require a prepositional phrase, na ‘to’ DP, when expressing a full-fledged argument.) This effect might be attributed to a principle such as the one in (13), from Bianchi (2004:96):

(13) Inherent case must be spelled out.

A number of authors have noted that (13) is correct, at least for Slavic, in that a resumptive pronoun is obligatory whenever an oblique position bearing inherent Case is relativized. See for example Pesetsky (1998) for Polish and Russian, Toman (1998) for Czech, and Lavine (2003) for Slavic more generally. Similar observations have been made for other languages (e.g. Greek, Alexopoulou, 2006). Working in an OT framework, Pesetsky (1998) proposes that oblique Cases need “phonetic support” since they are visible for the Recoverability condition. Hence, they block the application of the lower-ranked principle Silent t, which bans pronunciation of silent copies. This approach provides a unitary account of all the cases involving an oblique object in Bulgarian, such as possessors, and indirect objects which in Bulgarian are expressed as a PP. Other PP objects such as those in (9) pattern with indirect objects in that they too need to be expressed overtly in order for the preposition to be recovered. Since preposition stranding is disallowed in Bulgarian, the obligatory nature of resumptives in PPs can be explained as a last resort strategy that prevents a locality violation.10

As far as structural Cases in resumptive relatives are concerned, there seems to be much richer cross-linguistic variation. This is especially true for RCs with invariable complementizers (Boeckx, 2003). For example, Swiss German does not allow accusative resumptives (Salzmann, 2006), but a number of Slavic languages seem to require them, as discussed in Lavine (2003) on the basis of Polish and Ukrainian. Greek and Albanian also force obligatory resumption of direct objects in their respective that relatives, provided the head of the RC is indefinite and/or topicalized (Stavrou, 1984; Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou, 1999; Kallulli, 2008, a.o.). So, the second part of Pesetsky’s proposal, namely that structural case is “recoverable” and therefore must not be resumed, appears not to be

9 Bianchi discusses a third type of relative clause, which she calls, following Grosu and Landman (1998) a ‘maximalizing relative’ (also known as ‘amount relative’, in Carlson’s, 1977 terms). In the latter type, the relativized “head” does not denote a set of individuals, but a set of amounts. Resumptive clitics do not seem to be possible here, as can be seen by the two examples given in (i):

(i) a. Sážaljavam za vremeto, deto ti (*go) izgubil.
   regret-1sg about time-th that you-CLDat it-CLAcc wasted-1sg
   ‘I am sorry about the time I wasted on you.’

b. Vidjaj tova, deto trjabvaše da (*go) vidja.
   say-1sg this that had-3sg Mod it-CLAcc see-1sg
   ‘I saw what I had to see.’

If the judgements in (i) and (ii) are correct, as I believe they are, then Bulgarian patterns with Italian, Hebrew, Brazilian Portuguese and Irish in disallowing a resumptive clitic in maximizing relatives (Bianchi, 2004:79). These relatives are briefly discussed in the next section, although I will not consider here their differences with the other restrictive relatives. For finer-grained distinctions within maximizing relatives, the reader is referred to McNally (2008) and Herdan (2008) for some Slavic and Balkan languages. See also the discussion in Aoun and Li (2003:107f).

10 On the basis of data from Greek, Alexopoulou (2006) argues that obligatory resumption with PP objects is due to the failure of identification of the non-argument’s phi-features. Resumption thus arises as a last resort mechanism which ensures the identification of such phrases at LF.
true (see also Lavine, 2003). Nevertheless it is important to find out for each language what parameters determine the overt realization of the accusative feature as a resumptive pronoun. These parameters might well turn out to be of a pragmatic nature such as specificity, D-linking, or presupposition of existence.11 However, in what follows, I will not discuss this issue further but will focus on the structural effects of resumption or absence thereof and the implications of these two distinct configurations for the derivation of RCs.

3. Towards an analysis of deto-relatives: raising, matching or both?

3.1. Reconstruction effects

The absence vs. presence of an accusative clitic in restrictive RCs seems to correlate with the two known derivations of RCs: Head raising (Brame, 1968; Schachter, 1973; Vergnaud, 1974; Kayne, 1994; Bianchi, 1999) and matching (Chomsky, 1977; Ross, 1967, and its more recent version in Sauerland, 1998, 1999; cf. also Salzmann, 2006). For a particularly clear discussion of the comparison between the two analyses the reader is referred to Aoun and Li (2003:100–107).

The raising analysis has different variants, but the common idea sketched in (14) is that the Head of the RC is merged inside the RC and subsequently raises to Spec,CP (or to a higher specifier). Thus, a direct chain relationship is established between the overt Head and its trace (the unpronounced copy) inside the RC:

The Raising analysis (Kayne 1994)

(14) [DP D [CP–RC Head C [TP ... V ... Head...]]]

According to the matching analysis, (15), on the other hand, there are two Heads, an external and an internal one. The external Head is the relativized NP, i.e. the Head of the RC which gets connected to the internal Head (the gap inside the RC) possibly in the form of an empty operator (Op) raising from the gap position to Spec,CP. In other words, no direct transformational relationship exists between the overt Head NP and the RC internal position. Additionally, the classical matching analysis makes use of adjunction of the RC to the Head in order to ensure that the two enter into a predication relation:

The matching analysis (Ross, 1967; Chomsky, 1977; Sauerland, 1998; Salzmann, 2006, a.o.)

(15) [NP/DP [NP/DP [CP Op, C [IP ... V... t...]]]]

Crucial arguments in favour of the raising analysis come from RCs with amount readings and idiom chunks in Head position. Consider (16a) from English (taken from Sauerland, 1998:68), and (16b) which provides an equivalent example from Bulgarian:

(16) a. No linguist would read the many books that John should prepare many books for the exam.

b. Nito edin lingvist ne bi pročel knigite, deto Ivan trjábva da podgotvi knigi not one linguist not would read-prt books-the that Ivan must MOD prepare-3sg za izpita.

for exam-the ‘No single linguist would read [all] the books that Ivan must prepare for the exam’

The interpretation of (16b) alongside that of (16a) is that linguists would not read the number of books that Ivan has to prepare for the exam. This interpretation instantiates the so-called ‘amount reading’ (‘identity of quantity’) and, as argued since Carlson (1977) (see also Sauerland, 1998; Grosu and Landman, 1998), requires that (part of) the overt Head (knigi in (16b)) be reconstructed to a position within the RC, in which the covert amount quantifier can be

11 Bosković (in press) discusses the obligatory presence of a direct object clitic in Serbo-Croatian što ‘that’ relatives and in corresponding deto-relatives, and suggests that the factors triggering resumption are related to animacy and/or specificity, which he analyses as effects of differential object marking (DOM), also instantiated by ‘clitic doubling’ in various languages. As the author recognizes, the exact factors governing DOM may not be the same and are in need of a better understanding. For a discussion of animacy effects under resumption in other Slavic languages, see Lavine (2003).
interpreted also in the scope of the modal *trjabva* ‘must’. Reconstruction then can be taken as direct evidence that *deto* RCs may involve raising of the Head.\(^{12}\)

A second argument in favour of the raising analysis comes from idiom chunks, illustrated here with the idiom chunk *okazvam natisk* ‘put pressure’ (17a). It is well-known (since Brame, 1968) that idiom chunks force reconstruction too, since the relativized part of the idiom must be reunited at LF with the rest of the idiom for interpretation (see also Schachter, 1973; Bianchi, 1999:43–45; Sauerland, 1999 for a relevant discussion regarding the strength of this argument).

Since the idiomatic reading is preserved in the relative clause in (17b) the overt Head *natisk* ‘pressure’ must have undergone reconstruction inside the relative clause. The example thus provides another piece of evidence that Head raising has applied\(^{13}\):

\[(17)\]  
(a) Evropa okazva natisk na Bəlgaria zaradi OMO Ilinden.  
Europe exerts pressure on Bulgaria because of OMO Ilinden

(b) Natiskat, *deto* Evropa okazva natisk na Bəlgaria zaradi OMO Ilinden,  
pressure-the-SUBJ that Europe exerts on Bulgaria because-of OMO Ilinden
e nepravomeren.  
is illegal  
‘The pressure that Europe puts on Bulgaria because of OMO Ilinden, is illegal’

Reconstruction effects in *deto*-relatives are also detectable in the context of anaphor (plus pronominal) binding illustrated in (18). In this case reconstruction is driven by the need to license the reflexive anaphor *si* ‘her’ contained in the relative Head but since at LF the reconstructed position is under the scope of the quantifier *vsjaka* ‘every’, the reflexive also receives a bound variable (distributive) reading:

\[(18)\] Snimkite na deteto si, *deto* vsjaka majka nosi snimki na deteto si v portmoneto si pictures-the of child-the her-refl, that every mother carries in purse-the her-refl

‘the pictures of her child that every mother carries in her purse.’

Bulgarian *deto*-relatives also show reconstruction effects for scope purposes, yet another indication that reconstruction takes place (Bianchi, 1999:45–46, 122–123; Aoun and Li, 2003:98–99):

\[(19)\]  
(a) Vsemi režisior *trjabva* da snima dva/#dvata filmi v Sozopol.  
Each director must Mod shoot-3sg two films in Sozopol.

‘Each director must shoot two films in Sozopol’ \((∀ > 2)\)

(b) Dvata filmi, *deto* vskari režisior *trjabva* da snima v Sozopol, šte učasvat  
two-the films that each director must Mod shoot.3sg in Sozopol will take-part-3pl  
vāv festivalnata programma.  
in festival-the program  
‘The two films that each director has to shoot in Sozopol, will participate in the festival program’ \((∀ > 2)\)

In (19a) the indefinite object QP *dva filmi* ‘two films’ is in the scope of the universally quantified subject and the quantifier *two* can only get a narrow scope reading with respect to each. This gives rise to a distributive interpretation according to which each director must shoot two different films. The interpretation survives when the object QP is relativized, as in (19b), and under the plausible assumption that the definiteness feature of the relativized Head is not

\(^{12}\) This seems true for other Slavic languages as well. See in particular Szczegielniak (2005:17) for Polish and Russian complementizer relatives.

\(^{13}\) Additionally, the examples in (17) provide an argument in favour of Kayne’s (1994) original suggestion that the raising derivation of relative clauses must contain an external D (Bianchi, 1999:43–48), cf. (14) above. As can be seen from the ungrammaticality of (i) below, the nominal part of the idiom chunk must not bear the definite article, which in Bulgarian is postposed and has the shape –*a* for masculine nouns in object position. This indicates that in the text example (17b), the definite article –*a˘t* (for masculine nouns in subject position) appearing on the relativized Head cannot have been carried along with it from inside the relative clause but must have its source in the external D position:

\[(i)\] *Evropa okazva natiska* na Bəlgaria zaradi OMO Ilinden.

\(^{14}\) Odrinsko-makedonska organizacija Ilinden, a political organization in Bulgaria.
carried along with it (if this were so (19a) would be incoherent) but comes from the external D merged outside of CP (footnote 13), the preservation of scope in examples like (19b) indicates that QP has been raised from the object position inside the relative clause.

To summarize, so far we have seen four pieces of evidence that *deto*-relatives can involve reconstruction effects: amount readings, idiom chunk interpretation, binding, and scope. Given the analysis of reconstruction as diagnostic for the presence of movement (Chomsky, 1993) and the conclusion that such an approach constitutes an argument in favour of the Head raising analysis (Kayne, 1994:87), the data examined so far are naturally interpreted as evidence that complementizer relatives in Bulgarian can exploit a movement strategy. Within the copy theory of Chomsky (1993) the reconstruction facts we saw in (16)–(19) above fall out naturally, since the trace left behind by overt movement is a copy of the moved element which is unpronounced at PF but present at LF, thus allowing the higher copy of the chain (the “overt” Head) to be interpreted in the position of the lower copy (the trace/gap inside the RC).

3.2. Reconstruction and resumption

This subsection will examine reconstruction effects in relative structures involving a resumptive clitic and will discuss the problems such constructions present for the raising analysis. The following sentences demonstrate that both the amount reading and the idiomatic interpretation are lost when the RC contains an accusative (direct object) clitic:

(20) a. Nito edin lingvist ne bi pročel knjige, *deto* Ivan trjaba da gi prepar3sg for exam-the
not one linguist not would read-prt-m books-the that Ivan must MOD them-Cl.Acc
podgotvi za izpit.
prepare-3sg for exam-the
‘No single linguist would read the books that Ivan must prepare for the exam’

b. *Natiskat, deto Evropa go okazva natisk na Balgaria zaradi OMO Ilinden, pressure-the that Europe it-ClAcc exerts on Bulgaria because-of OMO Ilinden e nepravomen.
is illegal
‘The pressure that Europe puts on Bulgaria because of OMO Ilinden is illegal’

What (20a) means is that there is a specific set of books which Ivan has to prepare for the exam and that no linguist would like to read the books in this set. This ‘identity of substance’ interpretation, being the only one admissible, implies that the resumptive clitic blocks the possibility for reconstruction of the relative Head, hence the latter cannot get the ‘amount’ reading. Absence of reconstruction is also the reason for the ungrammaticality of (20b), since the relevant part of the idiom chunk can no longer be paired with the rest of the idiom, as opposed to (17b) above. The examples in (20) thus provide an argument against movement and consequently against the raising derivation of resumptive *deto*-relatives. See Szczegielniak (2005:22ff) for a discussion of analogous data and conclusions based on other Slavic languages (Polish and Russian).

A resumptive clitic also blocks anaphor/pronominal binding, cf. (21a), as well as scope reconstruction, cf. (21b). In (21a) the anaphor *si* ‘her-refl’ contained in the relativized Head can no longer be bound by the relative clause internal quantifier, rendering unavailable the bound variable reading we saw possible in (18), the “raising” analog of (21a).

The distributive reading is also unavailable in (21b); in contrast to (19), the relativized Head can only have a wide scope reading with respect to the relative clause internal quantifier, leading to an incoherent interpretation:

(21) a. *Snimkata na deteto si, *deto vsjaka majka ja nosi v portmoneto si, ...
picture-the of child-the her-refl that every mother it-ClAcc carry-3sg in purse-the her-refl
‘the picture of her child that every mother carries [it] in her purse…’

b. #Dvata filma, deto vseki režišor trjaba da gi snima v Sozopol,
two-the films that each director must Mod them-ClAcc shoot-3sg in Sozopol
šte učastvat vav festivalnata programa.
will take-part-3pl in festival-the program
‘The two films that each director has to shoot in Sozopol, will participate in the festival program’ (*∀ > 2; 2 > ∀)
In the presence of a resumptive clitic the Head cannot reconstruct inside the relative clause.

Another argument against the raising analysis comes from the absence of Principle C effects in resumptive relatives. Consider (22) where the R-expression (*Ivan*) within the Head of RC is coreferent with the pronoun *toj* ‘he’ inside the RC. The raising analysis would predict a Condition C violation since under reconstruction the copy of the R-expression inside the relative clause would end up being c-commanded by the coindexed pronoun. The fact however that Condition C is obviated in (22) shows that no reconstruction, hence no movement is involved in such cases:

(22) Onazi snimka na Ivan, deto toj, ja xaresva mnogo, e naistina xubava.

That picture of Ivan that he it-Cl.Acc like-3sg a lot is really nice

‘That picture of Ivan that he likes [it] a lot is really nice’

As discussed in Sauerland (1998:68, 2003), absence of Condition C effects are a major challenge to the raising analysis of relative structures, especially given the contrast with *wh*-movement where Condition C effects systematically show up. Sauerland further argues, following in the steps of Carlson (1977), that at least for those cases where reconstruction/movement is unavailable, the matching analysis must be made available given that under the latter (cf. (15)), the relativized Head is generated externally rather than being moved from inside the relative clause. The data in (20)–(23) from Bulgarian thus provide evidence that a matching structure is potentially available in *deto*-relatives, given the absence of properties such as amount readings, idiom chunks, anaphor/pronominal binding, narrow scope readings, and Condition C effects.

Note however that the lack of Condition C effects in *deto*-relatives is independent from resumption, since alongside (22), which contains the resumptive clitic *ja* ‘it’ (23) is also possible with no resumptive clitic and no Principle C effect either:

(23) Onazi snimka na Ivan, deto toj, xaresva mnogo, e naistina xubava.

That picture of Ivan that he likes a lot is really nice

‘That picture of Ivan that he likes a lot is really nice’

The systematic contrast between “raising” relatives and resumptive relatives seems to break down only with respect to Condition C. However, the data can be interpreted as an indication that gap relatives are “structurally ambiguous”, i.e. compatible with both raising and matching, depending on factors which force one or the other derivation. To see this, consider the two examples in (24) constructed on the basis of the test proposed by Sauerland (1998:71) for English *that* relatives. In (24a) reconstruction of the relativized Head which contains an R-expression is forced by the idiomatic interpretation; in (24b) this happens for variable binding. Both examples are ruled out as a Condition C violation since the reconstructed the R-expression finds itself in the domain of a coreferent pronoun. Therefore, Principle C effects re-emerge once a raising derivation is enforced:

15 This is true for Bulgarian as well. As illustrated by the minimal pair in (i)–(ii), Condition C effects are present in *wh*-questions, as opposed to Heads of relative clauses. Note that (i) is ungrammatical irrespective of whether a resumptive clitic is present or not, indicating that a movement configuration is established under resumption with the clitic acting as a “double” of the *wh*-phrase moving to Spec,CP. Since outside of Condition C contexts resumptive clitics are available in d-linked *wh*-questions in Bulgarian, the ungrammaticality of (i), as opposed to (ii), must be explained as reflecting a difference between relative clause formation and other cases involving movement:

(i) *Koja snimka na Ivan, toj. (ja) xaresva t mnogo?*

which picture of Ivan he it-Cl.Acc likes a lot

‘Which picture of Ivan does he like a lot?’

(ii) Koja e snimka na Ivan, deto toj. (ja) xaresva mnogo?*

which is picture-the of Ivan that he it-Cl.Acc likes a lot

‘Which is the picture of Ivan that he likes a lot?’
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Given (24), it follows that the absence of a Condition C violation in (23) cannot be explained on the basis of the raising analysis, suggesting that a matching analysis should also be available for the derivation of gap relatives.

As for resumptive relatives, a raising derivation cannot be enforced in contexts parallel to (24), because, as already pointed out (from the ungrammaticality of (21)–(22)), a resumptive clitic is systematically excluded whenever reconstruction is required to take place. I interpret this as an indication that resumptive relatives are compatible with a matching derivation only.\footnote{Additionally, resumptive relatives do not show WCO effects, as can be seen by (i):}

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textit{Tova e edin film, deto vsicki, koi to sa *(go) gledali, mnogo go xaresvat.}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{This is a film that all who are-3pl it-CIAcc seen-prt-pl a-lot il-CIAcc like-3pl}
\item \textit{This is a film that all who have seen it like it a lot’}
\end{itemize}
\item \textit{..Čovekát, deto tja se uplaši, kato *(go) vidja da izliza ot stajata.. man-the that she refl got-scared-3sg when him-CIAcc saw-3sg Mod leave-3sg from room-the lit. ‘the man that she got scared when she saw him leaving the room’}
\item \textit{Vidjaj edna kniga, deto faktát, če *(ja) prodavat, me iznenada. (Rudin 1986:142, ex. (42a)) saw-1sg a book that fact-the that her-CIAcc sell-3pl me-CIAcc surprised-3sg ‘I saw a book that the fact that they’re selling it surprises me’}
\end{enumerate}

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textit{However, unlike “true” resumptives in Lebanese Arabic which are only found within islands (Aoun and Choueiri, 1997; Aoun et al., 2001), and can thus be seen as some kind of “intrusive”/last resort element (Sells, 1984; Boeckx, 2003:148f)\footnote{Lasnik and Stowell’s (1991) explanation of WCO as due to the quantificational status of the operator, cannot apply here: (ii) Ne vsiški, deto msljat, če majka im *(gi) običa, sa šastlivii. not all that think-3pl that mother them-CIAcc loves are happy ‘Not all people that think their mother loves them are happy’ If WCO depends on the type of ‘variable’ (pronominal vs. gap), the presence of WCO effects in the corresponding structures containing a gap strengthens the conclusion that gap relatives involve a quantificational structure, as opposed to resumptives which do not.}}
\item \textit{\textit{Q2}{\textit{Lingua xxx (2009) xxx–xxx}}

\textit{I. Krapova/Lingua xxx (2009) xxx–xxx}}
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used to amnesty an island violation (Kroch, 1981). Bulgarian “true” resumptives, I suggest, can occur in all contexts involving matching. The right way to phrase this distinction seems to be that the antecedent–resumptive relation in Bulgarian deto-relatives may cross an island boundary, while in Lebanese Arabic it must cross an island boundary (Aoun et al., 2001:394). This distinction will turn out to have consequences for the derivation of resumptive relatives in Bulgarian to be discussed in section 4.5.

Cross-linguistically, lack of reconstruction effects and island insensitivity do not appear to always correlate, as they do in Bulgarian. Depending on the language, resumptive pronouns in complementizer relatives can show or not show reconstruction effects and can be island sensitive or not, the two dimensions apparently being independent from one another. For example, reconstruction effects are present in Hebrew and Irish resumptive relatives but the clitic is insensitive to islands (Shlonsky, 1992; McCloskey, 1990, 2002). Just the opposite seems true for Scottish Gaelic (Adger and Ramchand, 2005; Boeckx, 2003:111), Greek (Alexopoulou, 2006), and Romanian (Dobrovie-Sorin, 1990) in that these languages exhibit no reconstruction effects under resumption but the clitic is island sensitive. This cross-linguistic difference is apparently found even within one and the same language. A case in point is Lebanese Arabic where reconstruction effects can be detected in definite resumptive relatives (provided that they do not occur in an island context), although not in indefinite relatives and in definite relatives in which the resumptive appears inside an island (Aoun and Choueiri, 1997; Aoun et al., 2001).

The tension between (non-)reconstruction and island (in)sensitivity obviously cannot be resolved by relying exclusively on a movement or a non-movement derivation. The base-generation type of approaches to resumption (positing some sort of Agree relationship not followed by Move) faces the problem of accounting simultaneously for reconstruction effects and for the possibility that in some languages resumptives are island sensitive. Conversely, movement type approaches (positing Agree followed by Move) fail to predict absence of reconstruction effects (as in e.g. the ‘big-DP’ approach of Boeckx, 2003) and/or insensitivity to islands (as in the resumptives-as-spelled-out-traces approach of Pesetsky, 1998).

On the basis of the observations made above from Bulgarian, we can suggest that the tension between the two dimensions can be “resolved” by assuming that languages may exploit either raising or matching in the derivation of their relative clauses. Reconstruction implies that raising has applied (whether the structure contains a gap, as in Bulgarian, or a resumptive, as in languages where reconstruction effects are found also under resumption). Island effects on the other hand do not necessarily imply a raising derivation; they may also be found under matching. In other words, what I propose basically is that the matching derivation comes in two varieties: one which involves movement internal to the relative clause and another one which involves merging of an empty Operator, as in standard (base-generation) approaches to resumption not showing locality effects (McCloskey, 1990, 2002; Shlonsky, 1992; Suñer, 1988; Rouveret, 2002, a.o.). In fact, Aoun and Li (2003) try to capture this tripartite distinction as observed in English, Lebanese Arabic and Chinese, by proposing that UG makes the following strategies available for the derivation of relative constructions: (a) Head raising (promotion analysis); (b) wh-operator movement (matching analysis); and (c) direct base-generation (no-movement analysis). In what follows I will continue to treat (c) as a subcase of the matching derivation (b).

To summarize, in this subsection we have seen evidence, based on the absence of reconstruction effects, in favour of analyzing a subset of deto-relatives (gap relatives and relatives containing a resumptive element), as compatible with a matching rather than a raising derivation. This raises the question of how to reconcile in a structural way this latter evidence with the evidence presented in section 3.1. which pointed towards full scale reconstruction effects (amount readings, idiom interpretation, pronominal and anaphor binding, narrow scope and Principle C effects) and hence to the necessity of a raising analysis. On a descriptive level, a natural solution would be to assume that depending on the type of Head, one or other of the derivations is forced, a proposal which I will develop in the next section, following

---

17 Welsh (indirect) relatives, according to Rouveret (2002, 2007), also show reconstruction effects with respect to pronominal binding and anaphor binding, although not with respect to Principle C. The absence of a Principle C effect could be accounted for if a matching derivation is adopted for such cases. This is what Rouveret (2007) eventually seems to propose but from a different perspective arguing for a non-movement analysis of Welsh resumption. It is to be expected that in Welsh too, should something force reconstruction, a Principle C violation would re-emerge, as it does in English and Bulgarian. In fact the scope phenomenon reported in Rouveret (2002) whereby in (non-specified) resumptive relatives displaying multiple individual (distributive) readings Principle C effects do show up as a result of a forced reconstruction seems to confirm this expectation.

18 According to Aoun and Li (2003:114), strategy (b) applies to wh-relatives (as opposed to non-wh-relatives which exploit strategy (a)) but I believe it can be generalized to also cover relatives matching relatives involving relative clause internal movement to be discussed below.
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4. Towards a unified analysis of deto-relatives

4.1. Raising AND matching

The goal of this section is to propose that the two derivations we saw above can be accommodated in a unitary structure without abandoning the idea of antisymmetry (for which the classical matching analysis is problematic given the necessary adoption of a rightward adjunction structure). I will argue that this goal can be achieved under Cinque’s (2003) proposal, which states crucially that the RC is not adjoined to the right of the head but is merged in a specifier of the extended projection of the NP, i.e. prenominally. One conceptual argument, independent of antisymmetry considerations, in favour of such a prenominal Merge position may come from the fact that RCs, much like adjectives, are modifiers of the NP, actually of the extended projection of the NP. If RCs are a sort of “syntactic adjective”, it is reasonable to suppose that they too are merged prenominally and enter the hierarchy of the NP’s functional projections in a specific position. According to Cinque, another consideration, of a more general conceptual–empirical type, is “the pervasive left–right asymmetry found cross-linguistically” (Cinque, 2009), in the sense that generally, there is a unique (unmarked) order of complements, modifiers and functional heads when the latter occur to the left of a lexical head (N, V, etc.), while when they occur to the right of the head, there exist at least two possibilities: either the same order as the one found to the left of the head, or its mirror image. This has led him to conclude that constituents found to the right of a head, including relative clauses in languages where they appear postnominally, are possibly never merged there, but come to be there as a consequence of the head moving leftward past them.

Cinque argues that the position of Merge of finite relative clauses is above the Numeral (Num) and the (various types of) Adjectives, but below Universal Quantifiers, Demonstratives and Definite determiners, as indicated in the hierarchy in (26) below, which in Cinque (2005) is argued to be (a fragment of) the universal Merge structure of nominal phrases:

(26) Universal Quantifier > Demonstrative/Definite Determiner > (finite) Relative Clause > Numeral/Indefinite Determiner > Adjective ... Adjective > NP

In what follows, I will abstract away from the relative order of elements within the NP’s extended projection since it is not relevant for the issue at hand, and will follow Cinque in using “external Head” to refer to the complex Head, modified by the RC, which contains material that has been independently shown to appear below the RC in (26), i.e. Numerals/Indefinite Determiners, Adjectives, and the NP.

Based on the above premises, Cinque proposes that there is a single structure underlying all types of RCs under both the raising and the matching derivations. In this structure, the RC is an IP merged as a modifier of the portion of the extended projection of the noun phrase, occupying a specifier position of that extended projection. Within the RC, there is an exact match (a full independent copy) of the external Head at the relativization site, what Cinque calls the “internal Head”. See (27b) which represents the Merge structure of the relative clause in (27a). The postulation of two Heads basically follows the guidelines of the original matching analysis (cf. Chomsky, 1965; Ross, 1967) and its more elaborate recent modifications (especially Sauerland, 1998, 1999, 2003), but the structure in (27b) also incorporates the insight (of the raising analysis) that the determiner is merged outside of the union of the Head and the RC. Cinque (2008) further proposes that each copy of the Head is represented by an indefinite NP which he labels “dP”. 19 dP contains only weak determiners in the sense of Milsark (1974) (a numeral, an indefinite article, etc.) and takes the entire extended projection of the NP as its complement.

---

19 For arguments that the relativized Head is indefinite, see Choueiri (2002, section 3), Cinque (2008) and references therein. The empty internal D of the moved relative DP that Bianchi (1999, chapter 6) proposes (see e.g. (i)) refining Kayne’s (1994) Head raising analysis could be rethought in terms of this lower indefinite head:

(i) [IP [L the ] [CP [dP ⊗ thing [c that [IP [dP happened ]]]]]] (Bianchi, 1999:176)
Given the structure in (27b), in a language like English or any other language with postnominal relative clauses, the formation of the overt “head” can be conceived of as resulting from a movement operation involving either the internal or the external Head or both. Essentially, these two options correspond to the raising and the matching analysis, respectively, the choice between them being driven by familiar semantic considerations which require, or block, reconstruction of the overt Head.

Turning to Bulgarian, consider for example the idiom relative clause in (17b) repeated below as (28a). The raising analysis of *deto*-relatives is argued here to involve raising (attraction) of the internal Head to a CP position which in (28b), the structural representation of (28a), is indicated as the specifier of the functional head where the complementizer is merged, i.e. Spec,CP. Since the internal Head comes to occupy a hierarchically higher position c-commanding the external Head, the former can delete the latter under identity at PF and will thus get pronounced at Spell-out. In the structure (28b), as well as in all subsequent structures in the text below, only the relevant part of the example is represented and details are omitted; the PF deleted copy of the Head is shadowed in grey:

---

20 The notations dP₁ and dP₂ are used only for convenience; the two copies are meant as non-distinct.

21 For reasons of simplicity, I abstract away from issues relating to the Doubly-filled Comp Filter which has been claimed to be operative in Bulgarian (Rudin, 1986), as in Slavic languages more generally (Borsley, 1997; Lavine, 2003).

22 There are several ways in which such PF deletion can be conceived of but I will not dwell on this issue further. I just refer the reader to Citko (2001) and Sauerland (2003). The latter author argues that the corresponding mechanism is “relative deletion” and views it as akin to ellipsis. Under Sauerland’s proposal the internal Head gets (Op NP) deleted under identity with its base-generated copy, i.e. the external Head, so the mechanism of “relative deletion” is available only in matching relatives, but not in raising ones which are derived by an extra movement of the internal Head. In Cinque’s system, on the other hand, the overt Head is derived by movement in both raising and matching relatives, as we will see, so either copy of the Head can delete, depending on structural height. For the problem posed by the second occurrence of the idiom chunk in the external Head, see Cinque (in preparation).

23 Note that D hosts the definite article which in Bulgarian is postposed and affixal in nature. Current analyses of the Bulgarian DP propose that the definite article is affixed to N already in the numeration (rather than being generated under D) and either raises to or is in an Agree relation with Spec of D (see e.g. Dimitrova-Vulchanova and Giusti, 1996; Caink, 2000; Franks, 2000). I will assume that this interpretation is correct. Nevertheless in the structures that follow the article will be represented under D, in accordance with the traditional treatment of the structure of relative clauses.
The structures in (27b) and (28b) are based on the assumption that the extended projection of the noun phrase has a richer structure than assumed by the classical analyses of relativization, containing a CP area. Bianchi (1999) too has convincingly shown that the relative clause left periphery can be accommodated under the Split CP approach of Rizzi (1997). Below I will present evidence from Topic and Focus placement in Bulgarian which can give us a clue about the relative order between the two CPs in (28). For the time being we can assume that the complementizer occupies C₁ and hosts the internal Head dP₂ in its specifier. This type of movement may be thought of as corresponding to Chomsky’s (1977) Operator movement triggered possibly by the necessity to create a representation that translates directly into an open A-predicate entering into a predication relation with the relativized Head (Sauerland, 2003). Since movement of the internal Head leaves a copy in the position of the gap inside IP, the entire range of reconstruction effects detected above for raising relatives (see examples (16)–(19)) can be accounted for, given the direct chain relation established between the higher occurrence of the internal Head (in Spec,CP₁) and its copy inside IP.

Now recall our earlier conclusion based on (22)–(23) above that, unless a raising derivation is enforced, in which case a resumptive clitic is not allowed and reconstruction effects re-emerge (cf. (24) above), absence of Condition C effects in deto-relatives calls for a matching derivation. So let’s see how the input structure (27b) can accommodate this derivation.

Cinque (2003, 2008, in preparation) follows the classical matching analysis in assuming that in matching relatives the “overt” Head is the external Head. However, Cinque supposes that the external Head dP₁, instead of being base

---

24 More precisely, Bianchi (1999) has argued that the left periphery of wh-relatives involves a lower CP projection, TopP, hosting the wh-phrase (moved together with the NP from inside IP), and a higher CP projection, ForceP, hosting the wh-operator on the second step of the derivation. For a tentative proposal concerning the identification of the two CP positions in (28b), see section 4.3.

25 For an alternative treatment in terms of an Op feature sharing operation (Agree) followed by EPP-driven Move see McCloskey (2002) and Rouveret (2002).
generated to the left of the relative clause CP, i.e. \([\text{NP}/\text{DP} \ \text{NP}/\text{DP} \ [\text{CP}_{\text{relative}}]]\) (cf. e.g. Sauerland, 1998; Citko, 2001; Aoun and Li, 2003), is, as shown in (27b) and (28b), that portion of the extended projection of the NP which is immediately below (is modified by) the relative clause IP merged prenominally. As will be discussed in some detail later, the external Head \(dP_1\) gets attracted to a position higher than that targeted by the internal Head \(dP_2\) in the raising derivation, namely Spec,\(CP_2\). See the structural representation in (29) below. From that position \(dP_1\) c-commands \(dP_2\) (in Spec,\(CP_1\)) and deletes it at PF.

(29)

[Diagram]

The structure in (29) has the potential to account for the absence of reconstruction effects in matching relatives (see (20)–(23) above) since the two Heads are not part of the same movement chain. In particular, the “overt” Head which is the external Head (\(dP_1\)), is not related to the relative clause internal position by movement. (I will come back to Condition C effects in section 4.4.) However, movement of the internal Head \(dP_2\), being internal to the relative clause, would predict that locality effects should be present in a matching type of structure, which is not always the case, as mentioned. The sharp contrast between relatives containing a gap and resumptive relatives in terms of island sensitivity in Bulgarian (see (30)) suggests that movement of the internal Head takes place in the derivation of the former although not of the latter.

(30)  
\[\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{Tova e edin film, } \text{deto vsicki, koito sa } \text{t gledali, mnogo go xaresvat.} \\
& \text{this is a film that all which-pl are-3pl seen-prt-pl a-lot it-ClAcc like-3pl} \\
& \text{‘This is a film that everybody who has seen it likes it a lot’} \\
\text{b. } & \text{Tova e edin film, } \text{deto vsicki, koito sa } \text{go gledali, mnogo go xaresvat.} \\
& \text{this is a film that all which-pl are-3pl it-ClAcc seen-prt-pl a-lot it-ClAcc like-3pl} \\
& \text{‘This is a film that everybody who has seen it likes it a lot’}
\end{align*}\]

The presence vs. absence of an Operator type of movement explains why a copy of the internal Head cannot appear inside an island, while a resumptive clitic pronoun can:

(31)  
\[\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{*External Head Internal Head [\text{Island } <\text{copy Internal Head}> ] <\text{copy External Head}>} \\
\text{b. } & \text{External Head [\text{Island CL Internal Head } ] <\text{copy External Head}>}
\end{align*}\]

---

26 Movement of the external Head takes place for reasons to be better understood. Cinque (in preparation) referring to Kayne (2004:205) supposes that in languages with initial complementizers this movement is due to the specific properties of the complementizers that attract them to their Spec. The situation is more complex in languages with final complementizers where the external Head does not always move.

27 Boeckx (2003:108ff) relates the presence/absence of island effects in resumptive relatives to the type of C: agreeing vs. matching. Within this proposal, \textit{deto} should be classified as a matching C, given the island insensitivity of the resumptive clitic, i.e. a type of C that does not enter into an agreement relation with the resumptive clitic, thus allowing the latter to appear inside islands (domains impervious to agreement). Resumption then would involve Move under Match rather than Agree, a stipulation apparently needed only to solve the island-sensitivity problem.
The structure sketched in (31b) produces a grammatical output because the clitic is a “true” resumptive in the sense of Aoun et al. (2001). I will come back to the derivation of resumptive relatives in section 4.5.

To summarize the proposal so far, movement of either the internal or the external Head has been shown to derive successfully the two types of Bulgarian RCs involving a complementizer. The two types proposed (raising and matching) have been argued to be both available for the derivation of deto-relatives in the sense that each is “specialized” with respect to semantic considerations that require or do not allow reconstruction. The raising derivation is restricted to relative clauses involving idiomatic readings, amount readings, anaphor and pronominal binding possibilities, and narrow scope interpretation. The matching derivation, on the other hand, is to be applied in the rest of the cases, and may involve an additional relative clause internal movement, which distinguishes the structure containing a gap from the one containing a resumptive element.

4.2. On the relative order between external and internal Head in gap relatives

A natural question to ask at this point is: What is the position targeted by the internal Head in gap relatives? Note that from the point of view of the system adopted here, this position must in any case be lower than the position targeted by the external Head, so that the latter can c-command the former and control for its deletion at PF. Corroboratory evidence for the surface relative order between the external Head and the internal Head comes from the distribution of Topic and Focus phrases in deto-relatives. In this subsection I will show that when a Topic or a Focus is present, such a phrase can distinguish clearly between the various positions in the Split CP of the relative clause.

Matching relatives exhibit a clear contrast to raising relatives with respect to the possibility of dislocating a Topic or a Focus phrase within the CP field. (32) contains two instances of a matching derivation: in the first, (32a), a dislocated Topic or Focus phrase is placed to the left of the complementizer,28 thus separating it from the relativized Head; in the second example, (32b), taken from a corpus of colloquial speech (Dacheva and Tisheva, 2005), there are two dislocated Topics (as can be inferred by the presence of the resumptive Accusative clitic gi ‘them’ reduplicating the lower Topic) and both of them intervene between the overt Head and the complementizer29:

(32) a. Tova e ženata, [Top/Foc naj-složnité pesni] deto pее... (Rudin 1986:128, ex. 10c)
   ‘This is woman-the most complex-the songs that sang-3sg’

b. onja be, [Top za mutrite [Top naj-jakite knigi [deto gi] napisa ]] that-one PRT about criminals-the most-interesting-the books that them-ClAcc wrote-3sg ‘that guy that wrote the most interesting books about the criminals’

Given that in a matching derivation the overt relative Head is the external Head, the above examples indicate that the latter raises to a position higher than the Topic and Focus position(s) in the left periphery. Now consider the position that the internal Head raises to. The evidence presented below illustrates that in a raising relative like the idiom chunk in (33a), it is impossible to topocalize or focalize material from within the RC to a position in between the overt Head and the complementizer. Since in a raising relative the overt Head is the internal Head, the ungrammaticality of (33b) can be taken as evidence that there is no “space” between deto and the internal Head to host a designated TopP or FocP, thus confirming our previous suggestion (see the structure in (28b) above) that the internal Head occupies the specifier position of deto. Moreover, (33c) shows that the TopP/FocP can only find itself to the left of the internal Head:

---

28 For arguments that bear on focus movement to FocP in Bulgarian, I refer the readers to Izvorski (1995), Krapova (2002), and Arnaudova (2003).
29 Note that in (32b) the two preposed phrases do not form a constituent, since they appear as separate phrases in other contexts not illustrated here.
30 The proposed constituent can receive a Topic or a Focus reading. Rudin uses this example to argue that deto is not in a Topic position. The same is true of restrictive relative clauses employing a wh-pronoun. Cf. (i) again from Rudin (1986:127, ex. (9a)):

(i) Tova e ženata, [Top/Foc naj-složnité pesni] kojata pее.
   ‘This is woman-the most complex-the songs which-fem sang-3sg’
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(33) a... Natiskát, deto Evropa okazva na Bâlgaria [zaradi zdravnata reforma], e neprestanen. pressure-the that Europe exerts on Bulgaria because-of health-care-the reform is constant ‘The pressure that Europe puts on Bulgaria because of the health care reform is constant’

b... *Natiskát [Top/Foc zaradi zdravnata reforma], deto Evropa okazva na Bâlgaria ti pressure-the because-of health-care-the reform that Europe exerts on Bulgaria is constant.

is constant lit. ‘The pressure, due to the health care reform, that Europe puts on Bulgaria is constant’

c... ?[Top/Foc zaradi zdravnata reforma], natiskát deto Evropa okazva na Bâlgaria ti because-of health-care-the reform pressure-the that Europe exerts on Bulgaria is constant.

is constant lit. ‘Due to the health care reform, the pressure that Europe puts on Bulgaria is constant’

Taken together, the examples in (32) and (33) show that the external Head raises to a position higher than the Topic and Focus position(s) which in turn, as evident from (33b,c) above, must be higher than the position to which the internal Head raises. We thus get the following hierarchical order of the CP elements in deto-relative clauses:

(34) external Head > Topic > Focus > internal Head > deto ....

If (34) is correct, the complementizer must be occupying a low position in the Split CP hierarchy of the RC’s left periphery. Just the opposite has been argued by Bianchi (1999) for relative that in English on the basis of the embedded topicalization and negative preposing data in (35a,b). Given that the complementizer is necessarily found to the left of discourse-related material, Bianchi suggests that that occupies the highest CP position (both in relative clauses and in complement clauses which exhibit similar evidence with respect to the positioning of Topic and Focus phrases (35c)). Within the universal structural CP hierarchy proposed by Rizzi (1997) and given in (36), this position is identified as Force.

(35) a. This is the kind of car that [Top for my son] I wouldn’t even have considered buying.

(Bianchi 1999:177, ex. (46a))

b. ?I saw a dress that [Foc under no circumstances] would I have considered buying for my daughter.

(Bianchi 1999:177, ex. (47a))

c. He said that [Top beans i [Foc never in his life] [had [he tAUX been able to stand tIADV][[[]])]]

(Bianchi 1999:179, ex. (50))

(36) [Force Force [Top Top [Foc Foc [Top Top* [Finn Fin IP ]]]]]

that

The exact identification of the C head spelled out by deto (C _1_ in (28b) and (29)) remains to be established, but it can be speculated that it corresponds to Fin (Finiteness) in (36). According to Rizzi (1997), Fin and Force are functionally equivalent in terms of features and can alternate in the sense that either one or the other can be realized overtly, unless splitting is forced by intervening Topic and Focuss projections in which case both must be realized. If Fin is indeed

---

31 As pointed out to me by Adam Szczegielniak, a pattern similar to that in (i) of footnote 30 is also found in Russian wh-relatives, although not in čto ‘that’ relatives where a Topic or a Focus phrase is precluded from appearing above the complementizer, a fact which Szczegielniak (1995) interprets as indicating that it occupies a higher position that the wh-pronoun. Although no account of wh-relatives is intended in this study, plausibly the wh-pronoun in Bulgarian, at least at some point of the derivation, occupies the specifier of the same projection filled by deto in complementizer relatives.

32 Aoun and Li (2003:122f) also assume, following Bianchi (1999), that the position of that is the highest C, namely Force. The two step Head raising derivation they propose for English that relatives is represented in (i) and involves movement of the DP (with a null D) from IP internal position to Spec of a Topic projection followed by subsequent movement of this DP to Spec, Force.

(i) [dp [the] [Foc IP ? boy] [force that [Top t [Top t I like tP]]]]

However, it is not clear under this account how these two CP positions will accommodate an embedded topic such as the one in (35a), given that Spec,TopP is already occupied by the trace of the moved DP, unless a recursive Topic projection is invoked.
filled by *deto*, Force can plausibly be taken to correspond to the higher position C₂ in (28b)–(29), which is empty and hosts the external Head in its specifier.³³

We are now in a position to derive the matching analysis of *deto*-relatives. Such an analysis can be said to involve the derivation sketched in (37b) for the relative clause in (37a). On the first step, the internal Head is attracted to the specifier of C₁/Fin, given that it cannot be separated from the complementizer *deto* by intervening (Topic or Focus) material. On the next step, the external Head is attracted to the specifier of Force. On the third step, PF deletion takes place, i.e. the external Head deletes the internal Head and gets pronounced as the overt relative clause Head.

(37) a. ... *knigite, deto Ivan kupi* ‘the books that Ivan bought’

(37) b. 

³³ Actually, Fin is not the only position available to host *deto*. As the examples (i)–(iii) show, this complementizer can also (somewhat marginally) appear to the left of the discourse phrases, indicating that it can also land in Force. In (i) it precedes the clitic left dislocated phrase, in (ii) the topicalized phrase, and in (iii) the Focus phrase. To account for these alternative orders, we can assume that provided that the internal Head is not attracted to its Spec, *deto* has the option of raising above the Topic and Focus positions to Force. What motivates complementizer raising in these cases remains to be understood, however.

(i) ?Rokljata *deto* [u pot velureinite obuvi] ja noseć, veče mi e otsnjala.  
‘That dress I used to wear with the suede shoes is already too tight on me’

(ii) ?Doktorat *deto* [za bolnico] už mnogo se griješ, go xvanali s podkup.  
‘The doctor that seemed to be taking good care of the patients was caught with a bribe’

(iii) ?Tova e ženata *deto* [naj-složnite pesni] peseš.  
‘This is woman-the that the Bulgarian most complex-the songs sang-3sg
‘This is the woman that was singing the most complex songs’
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4.3. An aside on the order of phrasal movements

The structure in (37b) makes it clear that the surface order of the two Heads reflects their order prior to movement, since the external Head is structurally closer than the internal Head to the CP field in terms of dominating nodes. The principle that ensures the preservation of the order of Merge cannot be Attract Closest (Chomsky, 1995; Bošković, 1997, 1999, 2002; Pesetsky, 2000) since (barring the “tucking-in” mechanism of Richards, 1997, 2001) it would predict that the closer phrase, i.e. the external Head, will move first and end up in the lower CP position, while the more distant phrase, i.e. the internal Head, will move second and end up in the higher CP position. The two movements would thus result in a reversal of the order in (33) above which we have independently established as the correct order between the two Heads.

This situation is analogous to contexts such as multiple wh-questions in Bulgarian (see (38)), where wh-phrases are ordered according to Superiority: the wh-phrase that is merged closer to CP (the subject koj ‘who’) ends up higher than the one that is merged lower (the object kakvo ‘what’). Movement thus results in a preservation of the initial order between the wh-phrases (cf. also Bošković, 1997, 1999, 1998). For a more extensive discussion of Superiority effects in multiple wh-contexts in Bulgarian the reader is referred to Rudin (1988), Bošković (1997, 1999, 2002), and Krapova and Cinque (2008a):

(38) [CP Koj [kakvo [if koj napravi kakvo]]]?
   Who did what?

While there have been a number of proposals to capture this (selective) Superiority effect, in Krapova and Cinque (2008a) we argued that it can be derived from Relativized Minimality if one adopts and extends to A-bar chains a principle originally proposed in Chomsky (2000, section 6; 2001, (17)) for A-chains. See (39):

(39) Only a whole (A or A-bar) chain, not just a link of a chain, counts as an ‘intervener’ for Relativized Minimality.

Relativized Minimality can be formulated as in Rizzi (2001) as a condition on chain links, (40), itself based on the Minimality notion given in (41) below:

(40) (A₁, ..., Aₙ) is a chain iff, for 1 ≤ i < n
    (i) Aᵢ = Aᵢ₊₁
    (ii) Aᵢ c-commands Aᵢ₊₁
    (iii) Aᵢ₊₁ is in a Minimal Configuration with Aᵢ

(41) Y is in a Minimal Configuration with X iff
    there is no Z such that
    (i) Z is of the same structural type as X, and
    (ii) Z intervenes between X and Y

In other words “each chain link involves identity (under the copy theory of traces), c-command and Minimality” (Rizzi, 2001:91). In the spirit of Rizzi (2001), Krapova and Cinque (2008a) take Z to count as an intervener between a trace Y and a target X if Z c-commands Y without c-commanding X, and if it is specified with the same feature as the target (quantificational, modifier (non-quantificational), etc.).

Within a system in which Superiority is subsumed under Relativized Minimality, the preservation of the pre-movement order of the phrases in the case of multiple movements can be ensured through the requirement in (41), which is a modification, as noted, of one of Chomsky’s principles.34 In other words, no (trivial or non-trivial) chain can intervene between the lower and the higher copy of another chain, if the two chains contain non-distinct features.

With (39), the order of the two exact copies of the relative clause Head in (37b), i.e. the external Head and the internal Head, can now be seen to follow from Relativized Minimality. The relevant derivations, and the resulting

---

34 Chomsky’s condition reads “Only the head of an A-chain (equivalently, the whole chain) blocks matching under the Minimal Link Condition” (Chomsky, 2001, (17)). Rizzi reached a conclusion similar to that of Chomsky’s in unpublished work refining his (1990, 2001) notion of Relativized Minimality.
representations are given in (42a,b). (42a) represents the only possible order of the two movements which respects both Relativized Minimality and the Extension Condition. (42b), on the other hand, violates Relativized Minimality whatever the order of the two movements is (and the Extension Condition in one of the two possible derivations).35

(42)

a. CP₂/ForceP
   CP₁/FnP

---

b. *CP₂/ForceP
   CP₁/FnP

---

In (42a) there is only a link of a chain (not an entire chain) intervening between the lower copy of the internal Head inside the RC (the ‘tail’ of the chain) and the higher copy in Spec,CP₁ (the ‘head’ of the chain). Similarly, only a link of a chain intervenes between the ‘head’ and the ‘tail’ of the chain created by movement of the external Head. Not so in (42b) where the entire (non-trivial) movement chain of the external Head intervenes between the two copies of the internal Head.36

To summarize, in this section I have shown that in matching gap relatives the external Head counts as the “overt” head since it targets the higher CP position (Spec,CP₂/ForceP) and gets pronounced after PF deletion of the internal Head located in the lower CP position (Spec,CP₁/FnP). The order of the two movements preserves the order of the two Heads at Merge in a manner respectful of Relativized Minimality and the Extension Condition.

4.4. Principle C effects

Principle C effects deserve special attention since strictly speaking, under representation (37b) and a copy theory of movement, a Principle C violation should be expected, contrary to fact. For example in (23) above repeated below as (43a) the R-expression (Ivan) in the internal Head dP₂ – see (43b) – should be able to reconstruct to the internal gap position, giving rise to a Principle C violation. As the sentence is grammatical, something special needs to be said about why that structure is allowed to void a Principle C violation:

(43) a. Onazi snimka na Ivan, deto toj, xaresva mnogo, e naistina xubava.
   that picture of Ivan that he likes a lot is really nice

b. [dp onazi [cp₂snimka na Ivan, [cp₁ deto [sc toj, xaresva [dp₂ snimka na Ivan, ] [dp₁ snimka na Ivan,]]
   that picture of Ivan picture of Ivan that he likes picture of Ivan picture of Ivan

In the resolution of ellipsis, a number of non-equivalencies between overt antecedents and their elliptical counterparts have been observed, most prominently by Fiengo and May (1994), who name this phenomenon vehicle change. Vehicle change was originally proposed on the basis of certain VP deletion facts in English, more specifically the fact that when the R-expression is more deeply embedded in the VP of the second conjunct, as in (44b,c) which contrast

---

35 Note that under this account of Superiority, it is crucial that Relativized Minimality applies at the end of the derivation, or on the representation. See Rizzi (2001, especially fn.6) for arguments to this effect.

36 The conclusion we can draw from the contrast between (42a) and (42b) has the general consequence of forcing a crossing (rather than a nesting) derivation of the Heads.
with (44a), a coreference relation is possible. Fiengo and May contend that in such cases the R-expression in the antecedent can correspond to a pronoun in the VP undergoing ellipsis. Given that the pronominal complies with Principle B in (44b,c) (though not in (44a)), no violation is to be expected there under reconstruction.37

(44) a. *John likes Mary, and she does <like her> too.
   b. John likes Mary, but she thinks he doesn’t <like her>.
   c. John likes the story about Mary, and she knows he does <like the story about her>.

Following Sauerland (1999, 2003) who in turn follows Fiengo and May (1994) (cf. also Safir, 1999), I tentatively suggest that the absence of Principle C effects in matching deto RCs containing a gap can be explained by way of vehicle change applying before movement takes place. As indicated by the indices in the schematic representation (45), vehicle change transforms the R-expression in the internal Head into a pronoun (nego ‘him’), which can then be interpreted as coreferent with the R-expression in the external Head (Ivan). Given that a pronoun counts as non-distinct from the proper name that it stands for (for a discussion of non-distinctness see Chomsky, 1965), the two Heads should also count as non-distinct (in a sense to be made more precise though), with the external Head acting as the antecedent of both (unpronounced) copies of the internal Head—the higher one in Spec,CP1/FinP and the lower one inside the RC (the reconstructed position). If so, no Principle C violation is expected under coreference between the lower copy of the internal Head and the subject of the relative clause IP:

(45) a. onazi CP₂/ForceP
   that snimka na Ivanι
CPι/FinP


\[\text{snimka na nego, picture of him} \]
\[\text{snimka na Ivan, picture of Ivan} \]
\[\text{snimka na nego, picture of him} \]
\[\text{1} \]
\[\text{2} \]

4.5. The derivation of deto-relatives containing resumptive clitics

A structural account like the one sketched above in (37b) should in principle be possible for deriving RCs which contain a resumptive clitic. It will be recalled that they are necessarily matching relatives not sensitive to islands. Since movement of the internal Head is unavailable in this case, the first step of the derivation in (36) does not take place. Instead, an empty operator is merged in Spec,CP₁/FinP to establish the desired link with the resumptive pronoun contained in the internal Head through binding. The derivation then proceeds by raising of the external Head to Spec CP₂/ForceP. The clitic on the other hand leaves the complex Internal Head and gets cliticized to the verb, and adjoins to the left of it.38 At the last stage the internal Head is deleted in situ stranding the resumptive clitic. The relevant structure is given in (46).

37 Vehicle change can be assumed to apply only in case the derivation involves two chains. If this were not the case, we should expect, contrary to fact, absence of a Principle C effect even when reconstruction takes place in a single chain like the one formed by overt wh-movement ((i)), whatever the analysis of wh-relatives. See also footnote 15:

(i) *Koja snimka na Ivan, toj, ja xresva snimka na Ivan?
   which picture of Ivan he it likes
   *‘Which picture of John, does he, like?’

38 As is well-known, Bulgarian clitics are verb-adjacent and appear immediately preceding the finite verb. Since the exact way in which this is achieved is immaterial to our purposes, I do not discuss the issue here. For an extensive discussion of the various syntax-based accounts of clitics in Bulgarian, see Bošković (2001, chapter 4) and Franks and Rudin (2005) for comments relevant to the mechanism of clitic doubling.
The absence of Principle C effects in resumptive relatives (see section 3.2 and example (23) repeated below as (47)) can be explained by invoking again the workings of the mechanism of vehicle change. The “offending” R-expression within the internal Head (Ivan) gets replaced by a pronoun (nego ‘him’) that can enter into a coreference relation with the R-expression contained in the external Head in Spec,CP₂/ForceP which counts as its antecedent. The resulting structure is represented in (48):

(47) Onazi snimka na Ivanₙ, deto toj, ja xaresva mnogo, e naistina xubava. that picture of Ivan that he her.CL.Acc ‘likes’ a lot is really nice it. ‘that picture of Ivan that he likes a lot’

(48)

\[
\text{[onazi [CP₂ [snimka na Ivanₙₚ]] [CP₁ deto [toj, ja xaresva [ap₂ [nego]] [ap₁ [snimka na Ivanₙₚ]]]]]}
\]

that picture of Ivan that he it likes picture of him picture of Ivan

4.6. “Apparent” and “true” resumption in Bulgarian

The presumed structure of the complex internal Head dP₂* in (46) is easily recognized as similar in spirit to a ‘Big-DP’ type of structure recently proposed by Boeckx (2003) for resumptive relatives. According to this approach, the resumptive pronoun/clitic (RP) is merged in the D-layer of its associate antecedent (the relativized NP, see (49)) in a ‘clitic doubling’ configuration of the type proposed by Kayne (1972), Uriagereka (1995), and Torrego (1998) and

\[\text{[DP onazi [CP₂ [snimka na Ivanₙₚ]] [CP₁ deto [toj, ja xaresva [ap₂ [nego]] [ap₁ [snimka na Ivanₙₚ]]]]]}
\]

that picture of Ivan that he it likes picture of him picture of Ivan

39 Since the two don’t make part of the same chain, no Principle B violation is expected.
subsequently extended to clitic left dislocation (Cecchetto, 2000). Resumptive chains are essentially derived by independent A-bar movement of the antecedent, leaving the clitic stranded within IP:

(49) \[ \text{DP} \ D \ (\text{RP}) \ [\text{NP} \ \text{Antecedent}] \] (Boeckx 2003, 154)

One drawback of this structure, as pointed out by Bianchi (2008), comes from the fact that the parallelism with clitic doubling/clitic left dislocation which Boeckx tries to capture breaks down when considering the nature of the moved element: in both clitic doubling and clitic left dislocation what is moved is typically a full DP rather than a proper subconstituent of it. See also the examples in (51) below from Bulgarian, which show that the antecedent of the clitic in the clitic left dislocation construction must be definite or at least specific.

Franks and Rudin (2005) propose, also in the spirit of Uriagereka (1995), an account of obligatory resumption in clitic doubling/Topic (clitic left dislocation) structures in Bulgarian.\(^{40}\) On their view, Bulgarian clitics are agreement elements (rather than true pronouns) and require more structure than just D; more precisely, they are heads of a bigger projection labelled KP (as in the rest of Slavic) and consisting of K\(^{0}\) plus a DP complement, cf. (50). Doubling obtains when the DP moves out through Spec,KP, triggering Spec-head agreement, instantiated by the overt clitic pronoun. Further movement of the associate to the left periphery derives the Topic (clitic left dislocation) structure underlying the examples in (51):

(50) \[ \text{KP} [\text{CL} [\text{DP} \ D \text{NP/QP/AP}]] \]

(51) a. Marija/*(Tazi) žena Ivan *(ja) običa.
    Maria/This woman Ivan her.Cl.Acc loves
    ‘Maria/This woman, Ivan loves her’

b. Edno momče *(go) boli glavata.
   one boy him-Cl.Acc hurts head-the
   ‘A boy has a headache’

Crucially, Franks and Rudin demonstrate that cases parallel to (51) share all the hallmarks of a movement derivation. Not only is clitic left dislocation allowed in precisely those environments in which wh-movement is also allowed (though Cinque, 1990, chapter 2), shows that successive cyclic wh-movement is systematically precluded), but both obey strong island constraints. For example, as illustrated in (52a), the resumptive clitic is sensitive to the Complex NP Constraint, exactly as the gap left by wh-movement in (52b).\(^{41}\) Additionally the minimal pair in (52c,d) shows that while the possessive reflexive clitic si ‘her’ may be bound by the negative quantifier nikoj ‘nobody’ following reconstruction of the clitic left dislocated phrase, no such possibility exists if the clitic is within an island.

(52) a. *Marija, srešnax [måza [kojto ja, običa]]
    Marija I-met man.the who her loves

b. *Kogo srešnax [måza [kojto običa __ ]]?
   whom I-met man.the who loves

c. [Starite si, drexi] nikoj, njama da gi obleče na pražnaka.
   old-the his-refl clothes nobody, will not them-ClAcc wear at celebration-the
   ‘His old clothes nobody is going to wear [them] at the celebration’

d. *[Starite si, drexi] ne poznnavam [nikoj, [kojto že gi, obleče
   old-the his-refl clothes not know-1sg nobody which-m will them-ClAcc wear
   na pražnaka]]

   at celebration-the
   lit. ‘His old clothes, I don’t know anyone who will wear [them] at the celebration’

\(^{40}\) But see Krapova and Cinque (2008b) for a finer-grained distinction between clitic doubling and clitic left dislocation in Bulgarian.

\(^{41}\) The same seems true for wh-relatives which arguably also involve movement (cf. Rudin, 1986:136). See the examples in (i):

(i) a. *Vidijax edna kniga, kojto fakūt, če (ja) prodavat, me iznenada.
   saw-1sg a book which fact-the that it-Cl.Acc sell-3pl me.Cl.Acc surprised-3sg
   ‘I saw a book that the fact that they’re selling it surprises me’

b. *čovekūt, kojto (ja se) uplaši, kato (go) vidja.
   the man who she refl got-scared-3sg when him-Cl.Acc saw-3sg
   ‘the man who she got scared when she saw him’
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Reconstruction therefore is unavailable in a context from which movement is impossible, such as a (strong) island:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{DP}_{\text{Topic}} \ldots [\ldots \text{CL } <\text{copy } \text{DP}_{\text{Topic}}>] \quad \text{– reconstruction available} \\
\text{b. } & \text{DP}_{\text{Topic}} \ldots [\text{island-}\ldots \text{CL } <\text{copy } \text{DP}_{\text{Topic}}>] \quad \text{– reconstruction unavailable}
\end{align*}
\]

Given the data in (52) and the generalization in (53), the resumptive clitic in the clitic left dislocated construction corresponds to an “apparent” resumptive element in the sense of Aoun et al. (2001), a behavior correctly captured by the movement approach advocated in Franks and Rudin (2005).\(^{42}\) The contrasting properties of the clitic in deto-relatives argued above (on the basis of (21) and (30b)) to correspond to a “true” (although not last resort) resumptive might at first sight cast doubt on the possibility of extending Franks and Rudin’s proposal to relative clauses. Nevertheless I believe that a ‘complex DP’ type of approach can still be maintained although in a slightly modified form.

As mentioned above (see section 4.1) and indicated in all of the structures given so far, in Cinque’s (2008) system, the relative Head (in its two non-distinct copies) is a phrase smaller than DP, what he refers to as dP (‘indefinite phrase’). Such a proposal, based on independently established evidence that Numerals/Indefinite Determiners, Adjectives, and the NP are the elements that may occur below the RC merged prenominally, implies that non-specific phrases can also be relativized. The following examples show that resumptive deto-relatives need not have a specific interpretation but can have an indefinite or a generic Head:\(^{43}\)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{Ne običam knigi, deto vseki } \bigstar \text{gi } \text{če ste samo zaštoto sa modni.} \\
& \text{not like-1sg books that everybody them-ClAcc reads only because are-3pl fashionable} \\
& \text{‘I don’t like books that everybody reads only because they are fashionable’} \\
\text{b. } & \text{Njama film, deto da ne sam go gledal.} \\
& \text{has-not film that Mot not am it-ClAcc seen-prt-sg} \\
& \text{‘There is no film that I haven’t seen’}
\end{align*}
\]

‘Doubling’ is impossible in the corresponding Clitic left dislocated construction, as has been noted by numerous researchers following Ivančev (1978):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{*Knigi vseki } \bigstar \text{gi } \text{če ste zaštoto sa modni} \\
& \text{books everybody them-ClAcc reads because are fashionable} \\
\text{b. } & \text{* (Nikoj) film (ne) sâm go gledal.} \\
& \text{no film not am it-ClAcc seen-prt-sg}
\end{align*}
\]

Even if in Bulgarian the noun is drawn from the numeration with the definite article suffixed onto it, as mentioned in footnote 23, the presence of this definite suffix does not imply that the clitic’s phrasal associate must be a full DP at Merge. One can plausibly assume that the definiteness/specificity feature is checked only after raising of the respective nominal projection to Spec,DP. So, we can conjecture that the clitic’s associate in (46) is a dP with a null d, corresponding to the null indefinite marker edin “one” (see Izvorski, 1993) which is underspecified for specificity.\(^{44}\)

However, this structure is never instantiated overtly, since movement of the internal Head (dP\(_2\)) in a matching derivation is not forced, as we saw on the basis of the absence of island effects in Bulgarian resumptive relatives, cf. (30b), so there is no problem for the clitic’s associate to delete at PF (in situ or in Spec,DP, as in Franks and Rudin’s (2005) approach). In CD/Topic constructions, on the other hand, the clitic’s associate is syntactically active and moving out of the ‘complex DP’, produces the effects in (51) and (52). These two options may be taken to correspond to the two different ways in which the empty category associated with the clitic is formed in an obligatory ‘clitic

\(^{42}\) As discussed in Boeckx (2003:157ff), in a number of languages (Yiddish, Welsh, Standard Arabic) resumptive pronouns under wh-movement differ from the ones found under relative clause formation in terms of island sensitivity.

\(^{43}\) Additionally, the examples show that there is no obligatory matching in definiteness between the overt Head and the complementizer (this has been claimed for corresponding pu ‘that’ relatives in Greek, Alexopoulou, 2006:22).

\(^{44}\) The featural specification of d remains to be established in future work. In any case, such a solution avoids the undesirable consequence of the DP analysis proposed in Boeckx (2003), which, as observed by Bianchi (2008), implies that relative clauses with a specific interpretation of the “head” should always have a resumptive pronoun, given that the D-layer encodes specificity, which however is not always the case neither cross-linguistically, nor in Bulgarian.
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doubling’ configuration at Merge (a-là Kayne, 2002): ‘trace’/copy of movement vs. an in situ deleted phrase. Thus, the
“neat opposition” between movement-derived (“apparent”) resumption and non-movement-derived (“true”) resumption can be maintained.

5. Deto as a subordinating conjunction

5.1. Factivity contexts

This section will present, in a somewhat descriptive way, the second type of contexts where deto may appear,
namely as an apparent subordinating conjunction after emotive predicates, more precisely predicates of emotive
reaction or emotive appraisal.45 The class includes several verbal and adjectival predicates such as sâžaljavam ‘regret’,
vinoven sâm ‘be one’s fault’, jed me e ‘be sorry; regret’, radvam se ‘be happy’, nedovolstvam ‘be dissatisfied’,
pritesnjavam se ‘worry’, žal mi e ‘be sorry’, mâčno mi e ‘be sad’, sram me e ‘feel ashamed’. Some examples are given
in (56) taken from oral and written colloquial speech:

(56) a. Naistina sâžaljavam, deto/če ne otdelix poveče vam manje na postrojkat.
   really regret-1sg not devoted-1sg more attention to construction-the
   ‘I really regret that I did not devote greater attention to the construction’

b. Samo me e jad, deto/če grivnata izčezna sled zatâmnenieto.
   only me.Cl.Dat is anger that bracelet-the disappeared-3sg after eclipse-the
   ‘I am only angry that the bracelet disappeared after the eclipse.’

In this section, I am going to argue that although with these predicates deto seems to freely alternate with the default
indicative complementizer če ‘that’ (apart from distinctions of style and/or register), it should not be characterized as
propositional, but as a relative complementizer. In other words, my proposal is that (56a,b) contain a hidden relative
structure underlying the apparent complement clause introduced by deto.

Before I turn to arguments supporting this conclusion, I will briefly mention some generalizations concerning the
distribution of deto in such contexts. The first generalization is that the predicates that may select for this
complementizer are not just emotive, but also factive, i.e. the truth of their complements is presupposed (Kiparsky and
Kiparsky, 1971). This can be seen from the three examples in (57) containing the factive verb sâžaljavam ‘regret’:

(57a) presupposes that the meeting has failed, although the speaker does not regret that; (57b) presupposes that the
visitors arrived earlier although the speaker believes this is not his fault. Additionally, (57c) shows that adding an extra
clause which cancels the presupposition of the factive complement results in a contradiction:

(57) a. Nikak ne sâžaljavam, deto/če sreštata im se e provalila.
   not-at-all not regret-1sg that meeting-their refl. is failed-prt
   ‘I do not regret at all that their meeting has not taken place’

b. Vinoven li sâm deto/če gostite pristignaxa kâsnõ?
   guilty Q am that the guests arrived-3pl late
   ‘Is it my fault that the guests arrived late?’

c. Sâžaljavam, deto/če ne moza da ostaneš poveče (*no vsâšnost ti ostana).
   regret-1sg that not could-2sg Mod stay-2sg more (but in fact you stayed-2g)
   ‘I regret that you couldn’t stay longer (but in fact, you stayed longer)’

Given that the truth presupposition cannot be cancelled, and remains unaffected by the presence of matrix operators
such as negation and the question operator, deto could be said to signal ‘factivity’. However, this would not be correct
since the above predicates constitute only a subset of the ones mentioned as factive in Kiparsky and Kiparsky (1971).

For no obvious reason transitive verbs such as razbiram ‘comprehend’, vzemam previd ‘take into account’,
imam predvid ‘bear in mind’, prenebregvam ‘ignore’, vâzmuštavam se ‘resent’, griža se ‘take care’ cannot take a

45 The phenomenon shows up with great frequency in colloquial speech, but it is also recurrent in literary texts where it has a certain stylistic
import. Traditional grammars refer to this usage of deto (appearing also in the form zadeto, as a “mixed object and causal complement” (AG,
deto-complement. Semi-factives are excluded too (e.g. znaja ‘know’, pomnja ‘remember’, otkrivam ‘find out’, viždam ‘see’, čuvam ‘hear’, zabeljazvam ‘notice’). The examples in (58) are thus possible with a če complement only. The precise generalization seems to be that the distribution of deto complements is limited to a subset of ‘true’ factives, including emotives:\(^\text{47}\)

(58) a. Vázmutix se če/ *deto ne sa mogli da provedat sreštata.
    resent-1sg refl that not are-3pl able to organize meeting-the
    ‘I resent [the fact] that they were not able to organize the meeting’

b. Otkrix če/ *deto sreštata im se e provali.
    found-out-1sg that meeting-the their refl is failed
    ‘I found out that their meeting has failed’

The next generalization concerns selection. There is one common property shared by all predicates compatible with a deto-complement, namely they also select for a PP complement headed by the preposition za ‘for’. This can be illustrated by (59a,b) which give the nominal paraphrases of (57a) and (57b), respectively. Other prepositions or preposition-less DPs are excluded:

(59) a. Sâžaljavam za/*na/*∅ provala na sreštata.
    regret-1sg for/of failure-the of meeting-the
    ‘I am sorry about the failure of the meeting’

b. Vinoven li sâm za/*na/*∅ zakâšnjenio na gostite?
    guilty Q am for/of delay-the of visitors-the
    ‘Am I responsible for the late arrival of the guests?’

Given this additional restriction, it becomes evident why a deto-complement is allowed only with a subset of emotive factives, namely because they subcategorize for the preposition za ‘for’. That the two conditions must be simultaneously present can be seen by the ungrammaticality of cases such as (58a) above: vâzmuštavam se ‘resent’

\(^{46}\) The complementizer če ‘that’, as mentioned, is the default complementizer in Bulgarian, so it may show up in all complement clauses, irrespectively of whether factivity is triggered or not. This fact, as well as the discussion to follow about the status of deto, might be taken to suggest that factivity in Bulgarian is not related to the choice of a particular complementizer, but to the factive context per se. For example, in (58a) the če complement receives a factive interpretation, as can be established by the usual tests for factivity, cf. (i):

(i) Vázmutix se če ne sa mogli da provedat sreštata (*no vašnost te provedoja sreštata)
    resent-1sg refl that not are-3pl able-pl Mod organize-3pl meeting-the (but in-fact they organized-3pl meeting-the)
    ‘I resent [the fact] that they were not able to organize the meeting’ (*but in-fact they did organize the meeting).

47 Macedonian and Serbo-Croatian possess a complementizer (što ‘that’) which exhibits similar selectional restrictions in that it can be used to introduce only complements of emotional and factive predicates. In both languages this complementizer derives from the interrogative pronoun meaning what (rather than from a relative adverbial as in Bulgarian) and functions as an (invariant) relativizer as well. In standard Macedonian, as in colloquial Bulgarian, the factive complementizer can alternate with the default declarative complementizer deka ‘that’, which, similarly to deto, derives from the locative adverbial kade ‘where’. In Serbo-Croatian however što and the declarative that complementizer (da) seem to be in (near) complementary distribution. Što clauses entail a truth presupposition and have been analyzed by Browne (1986) as specialized for factivity; da clauses on the other hand entail no truth presupposition and are almost never used with (true) factive verbs. Examples (i)–(ii) are from Tomić (2006) and (iii)–(iv) from Browne (1986):

(i) Se raduvam, što deka ve gledam.
    refl. rejoice-1sg that you.acc.pl see-1sg
    ‘I am glad to see you’

(ii) Radujemo se što su stigli.
    we-be-glad refl that are-3pl came
    ‘We are glad that they came’

(iv) Vjerujem da je Jovan bolestan.
    believe-1sg that is John sick
    ‘I believe that John is sick.’ (But he might not be.)

It seems therefore that we might be dealing with a similar pattern of complementation in Balkan Slavic. This (tentative) conclusion might have diachronic implications, in the sense that on its way to becoming a general complementizer, the invariant relativizer first extends to factive structures and only afterwards to other structural domains. This can be informally represented in the following (tentative) implicational hierarchy:

(v) Relative clauses > factive/emotiove clauses > semi-factive clauses > all clauses
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satisfies the semantic criterion, but it does not take a za-PP complement, which is why a deto-complement is disallowed with this kind of predicate.\(^{48}\)

The same syntactic restriction may be at the basis of Rudin’s (1986:45ff) observation that, unlike če, deto cannot introduce a sentential subject. See the contrast in (60):

\[
(60) \begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{če toj e xubav, } \text{ne me iznenada.} & \text{(Rudin 1986:45, ex. (6a))} \\
& \text{‘That he is handsome, not me-C1.Acc surprised-3sg} \\
& \text{‘That he is handsome did not surprise me’} \\
\text{b. } & \text{deto toj e xubav, } \text{ne me iznenada.} & \\
& \text{‘he is handsome, not me-C1.Acc surprised-3sg} \\
\end{align*}
\]

Although an account of factivity in Bulgarian remains outside of the scope of this work, I would like to suggest, following standard treatments of factive clauses, which, after Kiparsky and Kiparsky’s (1971) analysis, posit a nominal projection (a D head) above CP, that deto complements too contain an (expletive) D head realized by the demonstrative pronoun tova ‘this’ referring to the content of the proposition contained in the deto-clause. However, given the subcategorization requirements of the predicates which may select for a deto-clause, I further propose that the ‘factive’ DP structure is actually embedded in a PP headed by the preposition za ‘for’, as illustrated in (61). Both the demonstrative and the preposition can be null (or deleted), giving the impression that we are dealing with a complement clause:

\[
(61) \text{Săzaljavan/Jad me/ Măčno mi e ... [pp [p za/∅ [dp tova/∅ [cp deto ......]]]}
\]

If correct, (61) means that factive deto is a relative clause in disguise and thus a subcase of the headed relatives we have seen so far. The only structural difference between the two lies in the additional PP structure required by the factive deto RC.\(^{49}\)

Support for this analysis comes from the possibility of merging the preposition with the complementizer, forming a complex (prepositional) complementizer zadeto ‘for that’ which is sometimes (depending on verb semantics) used to introduce complements to the same factive predicates compatible with deto.\(^{50}\)

---

\(^{48}\) Thanks to an anonymous reviewer for bringing this point to my attention.

\(^{49}\) An anonymous reviewer points out that this raises the question of whether Bulgarian uses deto in restrictive relative clauses precisely because of its factivity. This would indeed be desirable given that restrictive relatives have been argued at least since Lakoff (1972) to be presupposed, a feature usually taken to reside in D. However, it is not the case that deto-relatives are always presupposed, and as discussed in section 4.6, the relative Head need not be definite nor generic. Two more examples are given in (i):

(i) a. Njama čovek, deto ne revnva.
   ‘Has-not person that not is-jealous
   ‘There is nobody who is not jealous’

b. Njama blagina, deto da ne e fakt bogadarenie na marzlilvite.
   ‘Has-not benefit that Mod not is fact thanks to lazy-the-pl
   ‘There is no good thing that has not become a fact thanks to the lazy people’

Bulgarian deto-relatives thus differ from Serbo-Croatian što ‘that’ + resumptive pronoun relatives, which, as noted by Browne (1986:71), are necessarily presupposed and possible with familiar referents only, i.e. known to both the speaker and hearer, a property which he believes can easily be extended to their factivity feature. See the examples in (ii) and especially (iib), which contains a non-presupposed subjunctive relative excluding što. Browne concludes that što relatives can have this complementizer precisely because of their factivity feature:

(ii) a. Film što ga je komisija odobrala bio je kupijen.
   ‘The film that Aux-3sg commission chose was Aux-3sg bought
   ‘The film the commission chose was bought’

b. Nema lekara da*što ne zna za taj slučaj.
   ‘there-is-not doctor that not knows of that case
   ‘There isn’t a doctor that doesn’t know of that case’

The contrast between (i) and (iib), namely the absence of a semantic connection with factivity in Bulgarian as opposed to Serbo-Croatian, gives one more argument against characterizing deto as ‘factive’ per se. Rather, as argued here, it is a “pure” adverbial complementizer which has extended its use into the domain of factive clauses.

\(^{50}\) This complementizer can also introduce a reason clause, and is thus equivalent to English for that, in that, for the reason that, because, cf. e.g. (i).

This usage should be clearly kept apart from the ‘factive’ usage, since it is not selected.

(i) Znam, če me mrazi, zadeto znam, no ne mi puka. zadeto = zašto ‘because’
   know-1sg that me-C1.Acc hates because know-1sg, but not me-C1.Dat care-3sg
   ‘I know he hates me because I know, but I don’t care’
In fact, this preposition must be spelled out if a PP is coordinated with the ‘factive’ clause:

(63) Sâzaljavam za bileta i *(za)deto propusna predstavlenieto.
regret-1sg for-ticket-the and for-that missed-2sg show-the
‘I am sorry for the ticket and for the fact that you missed the show’

Two pieces of evidence can be provided to show that there is a hidden PP structure underlying factive deto complements. The first comes from extraposition. See (64):

(64) a. *Sâzaljavam za tova, vâpreki želanieto mi, deto ne moţaxme da se sreşnem.
regret-1sg for this in-spite-of desire-the my that not could-1pl Mod refl meet-1pl
‘I regret that we couldn’t meet in spite of my desire’

b. *Sâzaljavam vâpreki želanieto mi, deto ne moţaxme da se sreşnem.
regret-1sg for in-spite-of promises-the my that not could-1pl Mod refl meet-1pl

The ungrammaticality of (64a) as a subjacency violation follows if the deto-clause is extraposed from inside a PP which counts for subjacency (cf. Riemsdijk, 1978). The same explanation could carry over to (64b), although here, it is also possible that the entire PP have been moved, hence subjacency cannot account for the ungrammaticality of the example. Plausibly, then, the null P head cannot be licensed if it is not adjacent to the verb. Indeed, if the whole PP with an overt P is moved, the sentence improves considerably, cf. (64c), indicating that in (64b), the corresponding null P is not adjacent to the verb. Such an explanation is strongly reminiscent of Bošković and Lasnik’s (2003) account of English null C, according to which null C is lexically specified as an affix, so if for some reason affixation is blocked, as is the case with subject extraction in English null C extraposed clauses, the PF merger of the affix cannot take place. No analogous configuration involving a null P is to be supposed for the corresponding če clause, if the contrast between (64b) and (64d) is taken at its face value, namely the če clauses is a sentential complements rather than a relative clause even if embedded under a factive verb.

The second piece of evidence has to do with extraction. The contrast between (65) and (66) shows that while a če-complement block adjunct extraction only, thus qualifying as weak islands, like factive clauses in English, extraction out of a deto-complement reveals a strong island effect, blocking extraction altogether:

(66) a. *Kakvo sâzaljavaš če Ivan e napravil t̆akvo?
what regret-2sg that Ivan has done
b. *Kâde sâzaljavaš če Ivan e otišal t̆akde?
where regret-you that Ivan has gone

The contrasts in (64) and (65)–(66) would have been unexpected if the behavior of the two complementizers was structurally parallel. If, however, deto complements involve more structure – in particular, a DP embedded in a PP – the island effects can be accounted for.

51 I thank an anonymous reviewer for pointing this out to me.
6. Summary and conclusions

In this paper, I have discussed complementizer relatives in Bulgarian introduced by the adverbial complementizer deto and I have argued that they cannot be analyzed by a single derivation, be it Head raising or matching. Rather, both derivations are needed and the choice between them is driven by familiar semantic considerations which require, or block, reconstruction of the overt Head. I showed that the raising derivation is needed to derive relative clauses involving idiomatic readings, amount readings, anaphor and pronominal binding possibilities, and narrow scope interpretation. The matching derivation, on the other hand, is to be applied in all other cases, as the respective structures are exempt from reconstruction effects. I also proposed, following Cinque (2003, 2008), that the two derivations can be accommodated in a single structure if two identical copies of the relative “head” (external Head and internal Head) are postulated for relative clauses cross-linguistically and argued to raise to different positions in the left periphery of the relative clause according to considerations based on Relativized Minimality. The hierarchical structures thus produced allow for the possibility that (depending on the type of the derivation, ‘raising’ or ‘matching’) the higher copy of the Head, i.e. the c-commanding copy, deletes the lower copy at PF and is spelled out as the overt relative clause “head”.

Island effects have been considered crucial in deciding whether resumptive relatives in Bulgarian, a language that makes productive use of resumption in complementizer relatives, are derived by movement, which, within the current framework “translates” as movement of the internal Head (in addition to the obligatory movement of the external Head). The empirical evidence, based on the absence of island effects showed that no such movement takes place in Bulgarian resumptive complementizer relatives, confirming the observations adduced earlier in the paper that the clitic in such structures behaves as a “true”, although not “last resort”, resumptive element. The mixed theory of resumption developed in Aoun et al. (2001) allows one to distinguish such resumptives from formally identical (“apparent”) resumptives appearing in other contexts and showing the hallmarks of movement. This distinction was derived by adopting a version of the ‘clitic doubling’ structure proposed in Boeckx (2003) for resumptive relatives, with the proviso however that apart from the movement option, instantiated in languages in which the associate of the resumptive leaves a copy next to it, a second option is also available in languages, like Bulgarian, in which the associate can be shown not to involve movement, namely, in situ deletion.

Lastly, I have discussed several arguments (selectional restrictions, extraposition and island behavior) in favour of analyzing apparent cases of factive deto complements as relative clauses whose head is a covert demonstrative embedded under a PP structure. On a structural level the relative and factive complementizers can be given a unified account, if factive complements are analyzed as hidden relative clauses, as argued here on the basis of their syntactic properties. Other proposals have been made to the same effect in the literature (see in particular Varlakosta, 1994 for Greek pu ‘that’ clauses, Aboh, 2005 for Gbe relatives and factives, and Arsenijević, 2009 for a discussion). Pushing such a conclusion to the limit, Kayne (2008) has recently made the proposal that, at least for English, sentential that is a subcase of relative that, so it might as well turn out in the end that factivity is not even at stake, and that all finite sentential complements are in fact relative clauses. I leave the testing of this hypothesis for further research.

Acknowledgements

A version of this paper was presented at the Third Meeting of the Slavic Linguistic Society, held at the Ohio State University, 10–12 June 2008 and at the Balkan Linguistics conference held at the University of Veliko Tarnovo, Bulgaria, 29 April–02 May 2009. I thank the audiences of these conferences for their questions and discussions. I also thank the two anonymous reviewers for their extremely useful comments regarding some particulars of the analysis and the way it is presented. I am especially grateful to Adam Szczegielniak and Guglielmo Cinque who read, commented, and discussed with me a previous version of this work.

Please cite this article in press as: Krapova, I., Bulgarian relative and factive clauses with an invariant complementizer. J. Lingua (2009), doi:10.1016/j.lingua.2009.08.002
References


Please cite this article in press as: Krapova, I., Bulgarian relative and factive clauses with an invariant complementizer. J. Lingua (2009), doi:10.1016/j.lingua.2009.08.002
I. Krapova / Lingua xxx (2009) xxx–xxx


Nitsolova, R., 1986. Българските местоимения. Нauка и izkustvo, София.


Please cite this article in press as: Krapova, I., Bulgarian relative and factive clauses with an invariant complementizer. J. Lingua (2009), doi:10.1016/j.lingua.2009.08.002