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Factive Islands

1. a. [Which article] did you regret/understand/forget that I had selected $t_i$?
   b. *How did you regret that his son had fixed the car $t_i$?

   (ex. from Rooryck 1992: 2, (1c,b))

2. a. What do you know that he wrote $t_i$ quickly?
   b. *How do you know that he wrote a new book $t_i$?

3. a. [Which article] did you believe that I had selected $t_i$?
   b. How do you believe that I had selected the article $t_i$?
FACTIVE ISLANDS

• Factive verbs (*regret, remember*) select complements clauses that are presupposed to be true; non-factive verbs (*say, believe, want*) do not. (Kiparsky & Kiparsky 1970)

• Long-distance extraction out of factive complements creates *weak islands* (WI).

(4) Argument extraction is possible

\[ \text{Wh}_{\text{arg}} \ldots [_{\text{factive complement}} \ldots \text{Wh}_{\text{arg}}] \]

(5) Adjunct extraction is not possible

\[ \ast \text{Wh}_{\text{adj}} \ldots [_{\text{factive complement}} \ldots \text{Wh}_{\text{adj}}] \]

(Rizzi 1990, Rooryck 1992)
Different approaches:

- CP is different in factive constructions, involving nominal or referential properties and/or presuppositional status (see Kiparsky and Kiparsky 1970, Rouveret 1980, Rizzi 1990, de Cuba 2007, de Cuba & Ürögdi 2009, among many others). See also Haegeman & Ürögdi 2010, Haegeman 2012 for Movement restrictions are accounted in terms of operator movement
• **OUR CLAIM**

  • We claim that the **matrix verb** itself also plays a role in creating islands.

  • Data from Romance (French, Italian) and Balkan (Modern Greek, Serbian [Niš], Serbian [Belgrade], Croatian, Bulgarian).
    • In these language groups, factive constructions may involve strong islands (SI), when both arguments and adjuncts are banned for extraction.

  • Three formal features are responsible for the island effects observed.
    • Normally these features are spelled out as a complementizer, but sometimes they can be spelled out on the matrix verb.
BACKGROUND

• Nanosyntax

• Three main ingredients
  • Verbal fseq
  • Comp fseq
  • Featural RM
We adopt the nanosyntactic idea that morphemes are internally complex and composed of syntactico-semantic features which are hierarchically ordered according to a functional sequence (fseq).

Crosslinguistic variation is understood in terms of different patterns of lexicalization.

THREE MAIN INGREDIENTS

(i) Verbal fseq (Ramchand 2008, Puskas 2013, Baunaz 2017, Baunaz and Puskas (submitted), a.o)

(ii) Complementizer fseq (Baunaz 2015, 2016, 2018; Baunaz and Lander 2018, 2019, a.o)

THREE MAIN INGREDIENTS

Featural RM (Rizzi 2004, 2013; Starke 2001) and factive islands (Baunaz 2015, 2016, 2018)

(6)
   a. *\(\alpha \ldots \alpha \ldots \alpha\)
   b. \(\alpha \beta \ldots \alpha \ldots \alpha \beta\)  (Starke 2001: 8 (16))

(7)
   a. *\(\alpha \ldots \alpha \beta \ldots \alpha\)
   b. *\(\alpha \beta \ldots \alpha \beta \ldots \alpha \beta\)  (Starke 2001: 8 (17))

\([Wh_{\text{arg}} / Wh_{\text{adj}}]\) … Comp … \(Wh_{\text{arg}} / Wh_{\text{adj}}\)
FACTS AND ANALYSIS

• Complementizers
  • French and Standard Italian always select *que* or *che* to head an embedded tensed CP complement.
  • Other languages show variation on this point (see Manzini & Savoia 2003, 2010, Ledgeway 2015 (a.o) on Italian dialects and Roussou 2010, 2019 on Greek).
  • Some Balkan languages have multiple different complementizers.

• Islandhood
COMPLEMENTIZERS CROSS-LINGUISTICALLY

• Romance

• Balkan
  • Direct vs. Indirect complementizers
  • Specific vs. partive complementizers
COMPLEMENTIZERS CROSS-LINGUISTICALLY

(8) **French**: *que*
    
    **Italian**: *che*

(9) **Modern Greek** (MG): *oti*, *pu* (and *pos*, not discussed here)
    
    **Bulgarian**: *deto* and *če*
    
    **Serbian/Croatian**: *što* and *da*

- In addition, some Balkan languages have a special mood particle to indicate the subjunctive mood (*na* in MG, *da* in Bulgarian, *da* in SC).

- The exact status of this particle will not be discussed today (is it a complementizer, T-particle, or both? see Giannakidou 2009, a.o.).
REMEMBER-TYPE PREDICATES: GREEK

Cognitive factives optionally select for *pu* or *oti*

(10)  

a. O Janis paraponethike *pu/oti* ton ksexasa.
the John complained.3SG that him forgot.1SG
‘John complained that I forgot him.’

b. Thimame *pu/oti* ton sinandisa sto Parisi.
remember.1SG that him met.1SG in.the Paris
‘I remember that I met him in Paris’

(MG)

(Giannakidou 2011: 3, (6))

(Giannakidou 2009:1887, (9))
REMEmBER-TYPE PREDICATES: GREEK

Christidis (1982)

- Content of *pu*-complements is directly perceived; content of *oti*-complements is not (see also Giannakidou 1998, Siegel 2009, Roussou 2010, 2019, Angelopoulos 2019 and many others).

(11) a. Iðha oti efighe.
    saw.1SG that left.3SG
    ‘I saw that he left’

b. Ton idha pu efighe.
    3SG.ACC saw.1SG that left.3SG
    ‘I saw him leaving’ (Angelopoulos 2019: 218, (61))
REMEMBER-TYPE PREDICATES: GREEK

$pu \neq oti$

(12) a. Thinmithika (istera apo poli prospathia) *oti ton icha sinadisi s-to Parisi. remembered.ISG after from a lot of effort that 3SG.ACC had.ISG met in.the P. ‘I remembered after a lot of effort that I had met him in Paris’

b. Thinmithika (*istera apo poli prospathia) pu ton icha sinadisi s-to Parisi. remembered.ISG after from a lot of effort that 3SG.ACC had.ISG met in.the P. ‘I remembered after a lot of effort that I had met him in Paris’ (Angelopoulos 2019: 218, (62))
“A verb like thimame (‘remember’) can take either oti or pu as its complement. A factive reading can be available with oti presumably due to the semantics of the matrix predicate (we remember/recall events that have somehow taken place). (…) In the context of a verb like thimame, the distinction between an oti- and a pu-complement can be viewed in terms of **weak vs. strong presupposition** respectively, in the sense of Terrell (1977).”

(Roussou 2010: 590, our bold)
# Complementizers So Far

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Indirect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Modern Greek</td>
<td>$pu$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Factives like ‘know’ can select da or što

(14) Znam da/što si bio u Gentu.
3know.1SG that AUX.PAST.2SG been in Ghent
‘I know that you've been to Ghent.’ / ‘I'm familiar with the fact that you've been to Ghent.’
(Baunaz 2018 : 219, (4a))
Remember-type predicates: Serbian (Niš)

Arsenijević (2015, 2020a,b)

(14) a. Sećaš se što je Jovan imao sestru?
    remember.2SG REFL that AUX Jovan had sister
    ‘Remember the sister that John had?’ (or: ‘Remember the well-known fact that John had a sister?)

b. Sećaš se da je Jovan imao sestru?
    remember.2SG REFL that AUX Jovan had sister
    ‘Remember that John had a sister?’
    (Arsenijević 2020a: 29, (39))

“The use of što in [(15a)], on the more easily available reading, marks that the described situation is familiar and unique, which then infers that the sister is also familiar and unique (i.e. that Jovan has only one sister and that the interlocutors know who she is) – even though the nominal expression is the same as in [(15b)], where the reading is ambiguous with a tendency for the indefinite interpretation. The use of da is hence neutral in this respect, even though in both examples the subordinate clause is clearly factive.” (Arsenijević 2020a:29, our bold)
## COMPLEMENTIZERS SO FAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIRECT</th>
<th>INDIRECT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Modern Greek</td>
<td><em>pu</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbian (Niš)</td>
<td><em>što</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REMEMBER-TYPE PREDICATES: BULGARIAN

Factives like ‘remember’ can select deto or če

(15) Pomnja, %deto/če te sreštnax na pazara.
    ‘I remember that I met you at the market/meeting you at the market’
    (Baunaz 2016:72, (9b))
Factives like ‘regret’ can select deto or če

(16) Naistina sǎžljavam, deto/če ne otedlix poveče vnimanje na postrojkata.
   ‘I really regret that I did not devote greater attention to the construction’

(Krapova 2010, 26, (56a))

«Bulgarian is very similar to [MG/Serbian (Niš)] in that respect: recall that
Bulgarian has two declarative complementizers: deto and če. Some (factive) verbs
appear to optionally select both. For instance, Krapova (2010) reports that a
(sub-)type of emotive factives can select deto as well as če. Some (other)
speakers also optionally accept deto with semi-factives (especially ‘remember’)
(Teodora Radeva-Bork, p.c.).» (Baunaz 2018)
COMPLEMEN TIZERS: BULGARIAN

- Simeonova (to appear):
  - deto is the factive complementizer; involves definiteness
  - če is neutral (unmarked) with respect to factivity; propositional
# COMPLEMENTIZERS SO FAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Indirect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Modern Greek</td>
<td><em>pu</em></td>
<td><em>oti</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbian (Niš)</td>
<td><em>što</em></td>
<td><em>da</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgarian</td>
<td><em>deto</em></td>
<td><em>če</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Baunaz (2015, 2016, 2018) interprets the facts discussed above in terms of existential presupposition. Using a terminology developed independently to account for wh-extraction (see Baunaz 2008, 2011, 2016; Starke 2001), she argues that pu/deto/što are specific complementizers and oti/če/da – when embedded under factive verbs – are partitive complementizers.

• Verbs like ‘remember’ may select for partitive oti/če/da that range over (a given set of) propositional variables (either true or false).

• ‘remember’ may also select for specific pu/deto/što that locate the complement proposition with respect to a given point of reference, binding a single propositional variable, which corresponds to a single truth value (true) (see also Roussou 2010).
Some verbs select for non-presupposed complementizers (typically non-factive verbs). This type of complementizer ranges over non-finite sets of propositional variables (neither true nor false); it is neither specific nor partitive.

Structurally speaking, non-presupposed complementizers are the least marked (have the least structure).

Modern Greek and Bulgarian use *oti* and *če* here, Serbian and Croatian *da*.

**The Comp fseq:** Specific > Partitive > c
### COMPLEMENTIZERS SO FAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Specific [Spec [Part [c]]]</th>
<th>Partitive [Part [c]]</th>
<th>Non-presupposed [c]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Modern Greek</td>
<td>pu</td>
<td>oti</td>
<td>oti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgarian</td>
<td>deto</td>
<td>če</td>
<td>če</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Non-factive matrix verbs select for the non-presupposed Comp
- Factive matrix verbs select either for the specific or partitive Comp
• Modern Greek
  • Well-behaved

• Bulgarian
  • Well-behaved

• Serbian/Croatian
  • Not well-behaved, with variation among speakers of different areas
    • Serbian (Niš)
    • Croatian
    • Serbian (Belgrade)
FACTIVE ISLANDS ARE CONDITIONED BY THE COMPLEMENTIZER

Modern Greek

(17)  a. *Pjon, thimase pu sinandises ti?
     who remember.2SG that met.2SG

  b. *Pote, thimase pu sinandises Maria ti?
     when remember.2SG that met.2SG Mary

  c. Pjon, thimase oti sinandises ti?
     who remember.2SG that met.2SG

  d. ??Pote, thimase oti sinandises Maria ti?
     when remember.2SG that met.2SG Mary

(Baunaz 2018: 234, (22), (24)); pu examples are from Roussou (1992, 126, (7))

\[ pu \rightarrow \text{strong island} \]

\[ oti \rightarrow \text{weak island} \]
**Factive Islands Are Conditioned by the Complementizer**

**Bulgarian**

(18)  
(a)  * Kakvo si spomnjash, **de**to Ivan e napisal?  
what remember:2SG that I. has written

(b)  * Kade si spomnjash, **de**to Ivan e napisal pismoto.  
where remember:2SG that I. has written letter:the

(19)  
(a)  Kakvo si spomnjash, **če** Ivan e napisal?  
what remember:2SG that I. has written

(b)  * Kade si spomnjash, **če** Ivan e napisal pismoto.  
where remember:2SG that I. has written letter:the

We thank Tomislav Sočanac and Iliana Krapova for these data.
## Complementizers and Islandhood

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Islandhood</th>
<th>Specific [Spec [Part [c]]]</th>
<th>Partitive [Part [c]]</th>
<th>Non-presupposed [c]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Modern Greek</td>
<td><em>pu</em></td>
<td><em>oti</em></td>
<td><em>oti</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgarian</td>
<td><em>deto</em></td>
<td><em>če</em></td>
<td><em>če</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islandhood</td>
<td><strong>STRONG</strong></td>
<td><strong>WEAK</strong></td>
<td><strong>NONE</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Serbian/Croatian present less clear-cut patterns.

• Serbian (Niš)

‘know’, ‘remember’ znati / sećati se + sǐo Strong island
‘know ’,‘remember’ znati / sećati se + da Weak island
‘say’, ‘think’ reći / mislići + da No island

So far so good…

See Appendix, ex. (i)-(iii)
SERBIAN (NIŠ)

‘regret’  žaliti + da  Weak island  (expected, da = [Part [c]])
žaliti + sčo  Weak(!!) island  (unexpected, sčo = [Spec [Part [c]]])

- ‘regret’ with da = ‘apologize, regret to inform’  (non- (or less) emotive reading)
- ‘regret’ with sčo = ‘feel sorry, wish differently, etc.’  (emotive reading)

See Appendix, ex. (vi)-(v)
**SERBIAN (NIŠ)**

- Different kinds of $što$ (syncretism): emotive and non-emotive
  - [c]  
    - $(reći +) da$  
    - Verb of saying with non-presupposed Comp
  - [Part [c]]  
    - $(žaliti +) da$  
    - Non-emotive reading of ‘regret’
  - [Emo [Part [c]]]  
    - $(žaliti +) što$  
    - Emotive ‘regret’; not $da$ because $da$ lacks [Emo]
  - [Spec [Part [c]]]  
    - $(sećati se +) što$  
    - Cognitive reading of ‘remember’
  - [Emo [Spec [Part [c]]]]  
    - $(sećati se +) što$  
    - Emotive reading of ‘remember’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Emotive Specific</th>
<th>Specific</th>
<th>Emotive Partitive</th>
<th>Partitive</th>
<th>Non-presupposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Serbian (Niš)</td>
<td>$što$</td>
<td>$što$</td>
<td>$što$</td>
<td>$da$</td>
<td>$da$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## COMPLEMENTIZERS AND ISLANDHOOD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Specific [Spec [Part [c]]]</th>
<th>Partitive [Part [c]]</th>
<th>Non-presupposed [c]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Modern Greek</td>
<td>ḫu</td>
<td>oti</td>
<td>oti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgarian</td>
<td>deto</td>
<td>če</td>
<td>če</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbian (Niš)</td>
<td>sňo</td>
<td>da</td>
<td>da</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Islandhood**: STRONG, WEAK, NONE
CROATIAN

• Croatian has NO strong islands, except when complement clause is coindexed with a pronoun ‘it’

(20) \( \text{Žalim to što je otišao} \rightarrow \text{‘regret’ + [Spec [D]] + [Part [c]]} \)

regret.1SG it that he left

‘regret’ \( \text{žaliti + to + što} \) \hspace{2cm} \text{Strong island} \rightarrow \text{Cf. *Which article do you regret it that I selected?}

‘regret’ \( \text{žaliti + što} \) \hspace{2cm} \text{Weak Island}

‘say’, ‘think’ \( \text{reći / misliti + da} \) \hspace{2cm} \text{No island}

See Appendix, ex. (vi)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Specific [Spec [Part [c]]]</th>
<th>Partitive [Part [c]]</th>
<th>Non-presupposed [c]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Modern Greek</td>
<td>ὰυ</td>
<td>oti</td>
<td>oti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgarian</td>
<td>deto</td>
<td>če</td>
<td>če</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbian (Niš)</td>
<td>sšo</td>
<td>da</td>
<td>da</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatian</td>
<td>to + sšo</td>
<td>sšo</td>
<td>da</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Islandhood      | STRONG                    | WEAK                 | NONE                |
• However, also *da* with weak islands:

‘remember’ \[ sjećati se + da \] \text{Weak Island}

• Unexpected, since *što* should create weak islands and *da* should create no islands in Croatian.

See Appendix, ex. (vii)
If these verbs can spell out the feature Part, then only $c$ is left over to be lexicalized as $da$.

- **well-behaved situation (e.g. Greek):** $[\text{REMEMBER…}] + [\text{Part } [c]]$
  
  $otî \rightarrow \textbf{weak island}$

- **‘remember’ in Croatian:**
  
  $[\text{REMEMBER… } [\text{Part}]] + [c]
  
  $da$

  $\rightarrow \textbf{weak island}$ because extraction has to cross verb (with Part) too
LEXICAL ENTRIES IN CROATIAN

- ‘regret’ [REGRET …]
  - Selects the partitive complementizer što.

- ‘remember’ [REMEMBER … [Part]]
  - Such an entry forces the complementizer to shrink to da, since Part can be – in fact must be (Anchor Condition) – spelled out on the verb.
Like Croatian, this variety has:

- ‘regret’  žaliti + što  **Weak Island** (well-behaved)
- ‘remember’  sećati se  + da  **Weak Island** (Part on verb)

See Appendix, ex. (viii)-(xix)
But ‘know’ selects *da* and creates a strong island

{\textit{znati}} + *da* \hspace{2cm} \textbf{Strong island}

Meaning not only [Part] but also [Spec] is packaged on the verb.

\begin{align*}
\text{[KNOW... [Spec [Part]]]} & + [c] \\
\end{align*}

\begin{itemize}
  \item \( c \) has to be realized as *da*
  \item The verb contains the features problematic for extraction.
\end{itemize}

See Appendix, ex. (x)-(xi)
• **Bulgarian** is just like Serbian (Belgrade) on this point:
  • Bg. ‘know’ takes če and creates a strong island

  ‘know’   **znam + če**                **Strong Island**

• Meaning not only [Part] but also [Spec] is packaged on the verb.

  [KNOW… [Spec [Part]]]   +   [c]

  • c has to be realized as če
  • The verb (with Spec) blocks extraction.

*See Appendix, ex. (xii)*
ENGLISH AND ROMANCE ’KNOW’ TYPE

English (WI) vs Romance (SI)

(21) a. What do you know that he wrote what quickly?
    b. * How do you know that he wrote a new book how?

(22) a. *?? Qu’est-ce que tu sais qu’il a écrit rapidement?
    b. * Comment est-ce que tu sais qu’il a écrit un nouveau livre?

(23) a. ??/* (Che) Cosa sai che (lui) ha scritto velocemente?
    b. * Come sai che (lui) ha scritto un libro?

The English data are expected, the Romance data are unexpected.
ENGLISH AND ROMANCE 'KNOW' TYPE

English
Unclear what is causing the Island effects, since English *that* is syncretic:

- Simplest analysis: \([\text{KNOW…}] + [\text{Part} \ [c]]\)
  \[\text{que} \rightarrow \text{Weak island}\]

- But could also be: \([\text{KNOW…} \ [\text{Part}]] + [c]\)
  \[\text{que} \rightarrow \text{Weak island} \because \text{extraction has to cross verb (with Part) too}\]
Romance

Unclear what is causing the island effects, since French *que* is syncretic:

- Simplest analysis: \([\text{KNOW...}] + [\text{Spec [Part [c]]}]
  \quad \text{que} (\rightarrow \text{Strong island})\)

- But could also be: \([\text{KNOW... [Spec [Part]]]} + [c]
  \quad \text{que} (\rightarrow \text{Strong island})\)
Individual verbs can show variation between them because each verb has its own lexical entry, allowing for verb-specific packaging.

Some verbs do not package Comp features, others package either Part or both Spec and Part in their lexical structure.

Greek and (for the most part) Bulgarian are well-behaved in that distinctions made in their complementizer systems tell us what kind of islandhood patterns to expect.

Serbo-Croatian varieties show more variation, with different lexical packaging strategies available.

Our analysis shows that verbs can also be considered interveners, which is a brand-new insight.
**Serbian (Niš)**

is much like Greek, though with the complication of emotivity packaged on Comp.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Part</th>
<th>Spec</th>
<th>[c]</th>
<th>(pu)</th>
<th>SI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>[VERB…]</td>
<td>[Spec]</td>
<td>[Part]</td>
<td>[c]</td>
<td>(pu)</td>
<td>SI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Part]</td>
<td>[c]</td>
<td></td>
<td>(otí)</td>
<td>WI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Part</th>
<th>Spec</th>
<th>[c]</th>
<th>(to što)</th>
<th>SI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Croatian</td>
<td>[REGRET…]</td>
<td>[Spec]</td>
<td>[Part]</td>
<td>[c]</td>
<td>(to što)</td>
<td>SI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[BE SAD…]</td>
<td>[Part]</td>
<td>[c]</td>
<td></td>
<td>(štò)</td>
<td>WI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[SAY…]</td>
<td>[c]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(da)</td>
<td>NI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[REMEMBER… [Part]]</td>
<td>[c]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(da)</td>
<td>WI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Part</th>
<th>Spec</th>
<th>[c]</th>
<th>(što)</th>
<th>WI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Serbian (Belgrade)</td>
<td>[REGRET…]</td>
<td>[Part]</td>
<td>[c]</td>
<td></td>
<td>(što)</td>
<td>WI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[REMEMBER… [Part]]</td>
<td>[c]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(da)</td>
<td>WI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[KNOW… [Spec [Part]]]</td>
<td>[c]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(da)</td>
<td>SI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Part</th>
<th>Spec</th>
<th>[c]</th>
<th>(deto)</th>
<th>SI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bulgarian</td>
<td>[REMEMBER…]</td>
<td>[Spec]</td>
<td>[Part]</td>
<td>[c]</td>
<td>(deto)</td>
<td>SI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Part]</td>
<td>[c]</td>
<td></td>
<td>(če)</td>
<td>WI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[KNOW… [Spec [Part]]]</td>
<td>[c]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(da)</td>
<td>SI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[SAY…]</td>
<td>[c]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(da)</td>
<td>NI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX
'know', 'remember': znati / sećati se + što/da

(i) a. * Koga si sećas što si upoznao t? who remember.2SG that AUX meet.PAST.PART ‘Who do you remember that you met?’

b. * Kad si sećas što si upoznao Mariju t? when remember.2SG that AUX meet.PAST.PART Maria
   * ‘When do you remember that you met Maria?’

(ii) a. ? Koga si sećas da si upoznao t? who remember.2SG that AUX meet.PAST.PART ‘Who do you remember that you met?’

b. * Kad si sećas da si upoznao Mariju t? when remember.2SG that AUX meet.PAST.PART Maria
   * ‘When do you remember that you met Maria?’
‘say’, ‘think’  
reći / misliti + da

(iii)  
a. Koga je Pavao rekao da je vidio?
who aux. Paul say.PAST.PART that AUX see.PAST.PART
‘Who did Paul say that he saw?’

b. Kad si rekao da svidio Pavla?
when AUX say.PAST.PART that AUX see.PAST.PART Paul
‘When did you say that you saw Paul?’
SERBIAN (NIŠ) (EXAMPLES)

‘regret’ : žaliti + da / što

(iv) a. Koga žalili što si povrijedio ti?
   Who regret.2SG that AUX hurt.PAST.PART
   ‘Who do you regret that you hurt?’

   b. * Kad žalili što si otišao ti?
      when regret.2SG that AUX leave.PAST.PART
      ‘When do you regret that you left?’

(v) a. Koga žalili da si povrijedio ti?

   b. * Kad žalili da si otišao ti?
(vi) a. Kogaš žališ što si povrijedio ti?
   ‘Who regret.2SG that AUX hurt.PAST.PART
   ‘Who do you regret that you hurt?’

 b. * Kadš žališ što si otišao ti?
    ‘When regret.2SG that AUX leave.PAST.PART
    ‘When do you regret that you left?’
Što se sjećaš da je Ivan napisao u Berlinu?
what remember.2SG that has 1. written in Berlin

Kad se sjećaš da je Ivan napisao knjigu u Berlinu?
when remember.2SG that has 1. written book in Berlin
(viii) a. Koga, žališ što si povrijedio t?’
   Who regret.2SG that AUX hurt.PAST.PART
   ‘Who do you regret that you hurt?’

   b. * Kad, žališ što si otišao t?’
   when regret.2SG that AUX leave.PAST.PART
   ‘When do you regret that you left?’

(xix) a. Koga, se sećas da si upoznao t?’
   who remember.2SG that AUX meet.PAST.PART
   ‘Who do you remember that you met?’

   b. ?? Kad, se sećas da si upoznao Mariju t,
   when remember.2SG that AUX meet.PAST.PART Maria
   ‘When do you remember that you met Maria?’
znati + da

(x)  

a. Znaš da je Ivan prevario nekoga
   know.2SG that AUX Ivan cheat.PAST.PART someone
   ‘You know Ivan cheated on someone’

b. Znaš da je Ivan stigao tad
   know.2SG that AUX Ivan arrived then
   ‘You know Ivan arrived then’

(xi)  

a. * Koga, znaš da je Ivan prevario ti?
   Who know.2SG that AUX Ivan cheat.PAST.PART

b. * Kad, znaš da je Ivan stigao ti?
   When know.2SG that AUX Ivan arrived
BULGARIAN (EXAMPLES)

znam + če

(xii)  

a. *Kakvo znaesh, če toj e napisal v Berlin?
   what know.2SG that he has written in Berlin

b. *Kade znaesh, če toj e napisal nova kniga?
   where know.2SG that he has written new book

We thank Tomislav Sočanac and Iliana Krapova for these data.