

## **Embedded Clauses in Bulgarian and English:** da and če // to and that

Hagen Pitsch (University of Leipzig, Germany)

Both če and da introduce embedded clauses in Bulgarian. Their distribution depends (i) on the matrix verb, and (ii) on the speaker's attitude towards the embedded proposition. Thus, e.g., iska 'want' differs from nadjavam se 'hope' in that it selects only da-Constructions (daCs), while the latter can take če-Clauses (čeCs), as well; cf. (1)-(3).

Within a minimalist framework (Chomsky 1995, 2001), the talk provides an analysis of Bulgarian daCs and čeCs, identifying da as subjunctive marker, located in T(ense), which is shown to be linked to its core meaning of **non-factivity** (cf. Lyons 1977; Aygen 2006). Albeit temporally defective (cf. Lavine & Freidin 2002; Szucsich in Press), da-T<sup>0</sup> is assumed to be equipped with a **full set of \phi-features**; the former fact allowing to derive the observable temporal dependency of daCs as to their matrix, the latter accounting for their finiteness.

More importantly, da-T<sup>0</sup> is supposed to attract the verb for **cliticization** (cf. Werkmann 2003), which can explain certain word order restrictions, cf. (1b), (2b), (3b). C0 is assumed to be empty, seizing on an intuition dating back to Gołab (1954) suggesting that daCs are connected with the matrix clause without a complementizer". Syntactic evidence in terms of both movement and comparison with English will support these views.

če in turn is supposed to be a 'customary' complementizer in C<sup>0</sup>. As such, it does not affect T<sup>0</sup>, which is temporally complete. Moreover, čeCs receive a factivity reading by default.

The subjects of both daCs and čeCs show variable referential interpretation (coreference vs. **obviation**). Analyzing both čeCs and daCs as CPs can partially account for this behavior. Furthermore, when related to the fact that Bulgarian is a Null Subject Language, the different degrees of 'markedness' coming along with the use of either a subject pronoun or an empty category (pro) can be given an explanation; cf. (1b)-(3b) vs. (1a)-(3a).

The comparison of Bulgarian and English reveals that they share an identical structure in that da equals with to (both in T<sup>0</sup>; see Sternefeld 2006), while that corresponds to če; cf. (3)-(5). The English infinitival complementizer for (see Kayne 1981) provides further evidence in this respect, cf. (4d).

## Examples <sup>1</sup>

(1) a. Majkata

iska da mljako. pie  $drink_{3:SG:PRS}$ SBJ $milk_{n:SG}$  $mother_{f:SG:DEF}$  $want_{3:SG:PRS}$ 'The mother wants (#her) to drink milk.'

b. Majkata iska da (\*tja) pie mljako. tia  $mother_{t:SG:DEF}$  $want_{3:SG:PRS}$ she SBJ  $drink_{3:SG:PRS}$   $milk_{n:SG}$ 'The mother wants #(her) to drink milk.'

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> '#' should be read as '(relatively) more marked', or '(relatively) less natural', respectively.

- c. \*Majkata iska **če** (tja) pie mljako.
- (2) a. Marija se nadjava **da** poluči stipendija.

  Mariaf:<sub>SG</sub> refl hope<sub>3:SG:PRS</sub> SBJ receive<sub>3:SG:PRS</sub> scholarship<sub>f:SG</sub>

  'Maria hopes (#her) to receive a scholarship.'
  - b. Marija se nadjava tja **da** (\*tja) poluči stipendija. *Maria<sub>f:SG</sub>* refl hope<sub>3:SG:PRS</sub> she SBJ receive<sub>3:SG:PRS</sub> scholarship<sub>f:SG</sub>

    'Maria hopes #(her) to receive a scholarship.'
- (3) a. Marija se nadjava, **če** šte poluči stipendija. *Maria<sub>f:SG</sub> refl hope*<sub>3:SG:PRS</sub> that fut receive<sub>3:SG:PRS</sub> scholarship<sub>f:SG</sub>

  'Mariai hopes that shei/#j will receive a scholarship.'
  - b. Marija se nadjava, (\*tja) **če** tja šte poluči stipendija *Maria<sub>f:SG</sub> refl hope*<sub>3:SG:PRS</sub> that she fut receive<sub>3:SG:PRS</sub> scholarship<sub>f:SG</sub> 'Maria<sub>i</sub> hopes that she#i/j will receive a scholarship.'
- (4) a. Marija<sub>i</sub> se nadjava  $C^0$   $pro_{i/\#j}$  **da** poluči stipendija. b.  $Maria_i$  hopes  $PRO_{i/*j}$  **to** receive a scholarship c. Marija<sub>i</sub> se nadjava,  $C_0$   $tja_{\#i/j}$  **da** poluči stipendija. d.  $Maria_i$  hopes \*(for)  $her_{i/*j}$  **to** receive a scholarship
- (5) a. Marija<sub>i</sub> se nadjava, **če** *pro*<sub>i/#j</sub> šte poluči stipendija. b. *Maria*<sub>i</sub> *hopes* **that** she<sub>i/i</sub> will receive a scholarship
  - c. Marija<sub>i</sub> se nadjava, **če** tja<sub>#i/i</sub> šte poluči stipendija.
  - d. Maria<sub>i</sub> hopes that she<sub>i/i</sub> will receive a scholarship

## **References:**

- Aygen, G. (2006): Finiteness and the Relation between Agreement and Nominative Case. In C. Boeckx (ed.): *Agreement Systems*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 63-98.
- Chomsky, N. (1995): *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge, MA/London, England: MIT Press
- (2001): Derivation by Phase. In M. Kenstowicz (ed.): *Ken Hale: A Life in Language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1-52.
- Gołąb Z. (1954): Funkcja syntaktyczna partykuły *da* w językach południowo-słowiańskich (bułgarskim, macedońskim i serbo-chorwackim). *Biuletyn Polskiego Towarzystwa Językoznawczego* 13: 67-92.
- Lavine, J. E. & R. Freidin (2002): The Subject of Defective T(ense) in Slavic. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 10: 253-289.
- Lyons, J. (1977): Semantics. Cambridge [et al.]: Cambridge University Press.
- Kayne, R. (1981): On Certain Differences between French and English. *Linguistic Inquiry* 12: 349-372.
- Sternefeld, W. (2006): Syntax. Eine morphologisch motivierte generative Beschreibung des Deutschen. Tübingen: Stauffenburg.
- Stowell, T. (1982): The Tense of Infinitives. *Linguistic Inquiry* 13: 561-570.

Szucsich, L. (in Press): Obviation and Feature Sharing in Subjunctive Clauses. In G. Zybatow, P. Biskup, U. Junghanns & D. Lenertová (eds.): *Proceedings of the Seventh European Conference on Formal Description of Slavic Languages (FDSL-7).*Frankfurt am Main [et al.]: Peter Lang.

Werkmann, V. (2003): Objektklitika im Bulgarischen. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.