On the syntax of two Bulgarian 'that' complementizers: *če* and *deto*

This paper presents two Bulgarian complementizers both translated in English as 'that': a declarative complementizer for sentential complements, *če*, shown in (1), and a relative complementizer, *deto*, shown in (2). In addition, (1) and (2) show that the two are not interchangeable.

(1)   Mislja [*če/*deto* Ivan znae otgovora].
        think.1.SG če Ivan knows answer.DEF
        I think that Ivan knows the answer.

(2)   Chovekŭt, [*deto/*če* te vidja] e Ivan.
        man.DEF deto/če you.ACC saw.3.SG is Ivan
        The man that saw you is Ivan.

However, in complements to **factive predicates**, *deto* is suddenly allowed, as shown in (3).

(3)   Petar sŭzhaljava [*če/deto* Ivan vidja Maria].
        Petar regrets če/deto Ivan saw.3.SG Maria
        Petar regrets that Ivan saw Maria.

These data have been taken by Krapova (2010) to be in support of the proposal by Kiparsky and Kiparsky (1970) that complements of factive predicates have the structure of relative clauses and are thus syntactically different from complements of non-factive declaratives (think, say, etc.). The relative clause concept more generally has been recently picked up by Arsenijević (2009) and Kayne (2014). In addition, *če* behaves like a weak island for extraction and *deto* is a strong island, which again seems to support the relative clause hypothesis.

This talk provides proposes an alternative to the relative clause with extra nominal structure analysis. It is inspired by the idea of various sizes of complementizers by Baunaz (2015), the relation between definiteness and factivity (Melvold, 1991), and the proposal by Roussou (2010) that complementizers can be nominal elements themselves - i.e., there is no need to posit an extra silent nominal structure in order to have nominal features such as definiteness.

The proposal is that *deto* is syntactically 'bigger' than *če* due to a morphologically inherent extra iota feature which is what makes it a viable relative complementizer too - in Bulgarian, even relative Wh-phrases have overtly this iota morphology (but for an alternative proposal see Rudin and Franks, 2013). It does not result in a meaning difference between *če* and *deto* when used in complements to factive predicates, but accounts for blocking extraction, as definiteness is a strong island for extraction. This is carried out without postulating a separate [silent] nominal layer that the complementizer is relativizing, and is also 'cheaper' than an operator movement account, as in Haegeman and Ürögdi (2010).

References

Arsenijević, Boban (2009). Clausal complementation as relativization. *Lingua*, 119(1):39–50.
Baunaz, Lena (2015). On the various sizes of complementizers. *Probus*, 27(2):193–236.

Haegeman, Liliane and Ürögdi, Barbara (2010). Referential cps and dps: An operator movement account. *Theoretical linguistics*, 36(2-3):111–152.

Kayne, Richard (2014). Why isnt this a complementizer? *Functional Structure from Top to Toe: A Festschrift for Tarald Taraldsen.*

Kiparsky, P. and Kiparsky, C. (1970). Fact. In Bierwisch, M. and Heidolph, K., editors, *Progress in linguistics*, pages 143–173. Mouton, The Hague.

Krapova, Iliyana (2010). Bulgarian relative and factive clauses with an invariant complementizer. *Lingua*, 120(5):1240–1272.

Melvold, Janis (1991). Factivity and definiteness. In *MIT working papers in linguistics*, volume 15, pages 97–117.

Roussou, Anna (2010). Selecting complementizers. *Lingua*, 120(3):582–603.

Rudin, Catherine and Franks, Steven (2013). Sorting out *to* and *što*: Bulgarian and macedonian relative markers. In *Presented at FASL, McMaster university, Hamilton, Canada.*