INTRODUCTION

Variation and cross-linguistic comparison has been the subject of many recent and not so recent studies with the purpose of understanding structures and processes exhibited by natural languages. That is why comparing languages with similar or not so similar characters, has been defined as one of the reasons that accounts for the variation within the Universal Grammar.

In this paper I propose an analysis of the yes-no questions in the Bulgarian and the European Portuguese languages examining the distribution of the yes-no interrogative clitic li in Bulgarian and the absence of an equivalent in the overt syntax of the European Portuguese yes-no questions. This work is focused upon the complex interaction of syntactic and pragmatic factors.

To demonstrate the formation of yes-no questions across languages, I am going to use as examples the most frequently studied languages in the syntactic literature such as English, French, Portuguese, Chinese and Bulgarian.

1. English

Subject- auxiliary verb inversion\textsuperscript{1}

(a) Are you coming?

Subject-auxiliary verb inversion

(b) Do you want coffee?

2. French

Subject-clitic\textsuperscript{2} inversion:

(c) A-t-il acheté le livre?

*Has-he bought the book*

‘Did he buy the book?’

Est-ce-que (without inversion):

(d) Est-ce-qu’il a acheté le livre?

*Est-ce-que he has bought the book*

‘Did he buy the book?’

\textsuperscript{1} Also defined as light inversion in terms of Pollock (1987)

\textsuperscript{2} In terms of Rizzi & Roberts (1996)
Rising intonation:
(e) Il a acheté le livre?
\textit{He has bought the book}
‘Did he buy the book?’

3. \textit{Portuguese}
\textbf{Rising intonation:}
g) Ele comprou o livro?
\textit{He bought the book}
‘Did he buy the book?’

4. \textit{Chinese}
\textbf{Interrogative particles:}
i) Lei yam gaafe maa?\textsuperscript{3}
\textit{You drink coffee Q-PART}
‘Do you drink coffee?’

5. \textit{Bulgarian}
\textbf{Interrogative particles:}
j) Pieš li kafe?
\textit{Drink-2p.sg. Q-PART coffee}
‘Do you drink coffee?’

In limiting my work to the study of yes-no questions in the Bulgarian and Portuguese languages, it is important to highlight that the Bulgarian language belongs to the generic subfamily of the Eastern South Slavic languages and that the Portuguese language is a member of the Romance languages and most specifically the Ibero-Romance group.

In this work, I will analyze from a comparative perspective, the distribution of the yes-no questions in the Bulgarian and Portuguese languages, assuming that there exists a strong relation between focus and interrogation. Traditionally the term focus is related to the information structure and has been seen, as that part of the sentence, which is new i.e. this, is

\textsuperscript{3} Exemplo de Kuong (2008), p.716, ex (2),
In original Lei5 yam2 gaa3fe1 maa3?
the new information. Following Chomsky (1971, 1976), I will adopt his definition of focus to be the nonpresupposed part of the sentence, the presupposed one being the information shared between speaker and listener. Natural languages use different strategies for expressing focus—through prosody, morphology or specific syntactic positions and movements.

The objectives of this work are as follows:

1. (i) identify the distribution of the interrogative particle li, assuming that it always represents focal features; (ii) find arguments that confirm or reject the hypothesis in (i); (iii) examine the different contexts in which the particle can appear with a particular reference to the wh-li questions; (iv) distinguish dali, nali and li-questions concerning their interpretations; (v) review and systematize the analysis previously made on the distribution of the particle li.

2. (i) review the syntactic literature regarding the Portuguese yes-no questions; (ii) organize different approaches for understanding which are the processes that define the Portuguese yes-no questions; (iii) consider syntactic mechanisms such as clefts and subject-verb inversion.

3. (i) find a parallel between polar interrogatives in the Bulgarian and Portuguese languages with a specific reference to focus features exhibited by them; (ii) identify areas for future research, assuming the complexity of the questions involved and the limitations imposed by a Master’s thesis.

This thesis is organized into five chapters and presents in a logical way the objectives listed above.

**Chapter 1** discusses the four types of yes-no questions in the Bulgarian language, referring when possible to the syntactic analysis already made. This chapter concerns the presentation of the Bulgarian yes-no questions and details a background regarding the interrogative elements that can occur in them as well as their interpretational particularities. Chapter 1 is divided in four sections: section 1.1 dali-questions, 1.2 nali-questions, 1.3 li-questions and 1.4 yes-no question without an interrogative marker. As the study is focused on the nature and the distribution of the particle li, section 1.3 is further organized in sub sections that explain li’s occurrences.

**Chapter 2** focuses on the distribution of the particle li and provides a hypothesis for an analysis, assuming that li disposes of strong focus features, transmitted to the elements that provide a host for the particle. My basic argument is that V-li and XP-li positions are both focal. The purpose of this chapter is to present evidence for this idea based on data from the
responsive system and some structures representing evidence against the Prosodic Inversion approach introduced in section 2.2.1.

**Chapter 3** introduces the Portuguese yes-no questions and the different strategies to mark focus in the domain of polar questions. The subject-verb inversion, intonation, clefts are among the techniques considered here. In this chapter, I will review previously made research and different approaches dealing with the Portuguese yes-no questions, an area once again, rarely considered in the syntax literature with the exception of the works already referred to.

**Chapter 4** presents a direct comparison of the Bulgarian and Portuguese polar questions. I have taken as a starting point the Bulgarian language, because this is the language, in which an interrogative operator appears in an explicit way. Considering the long-noticed relation between focus and interrogation, I analyze syntactic mechanisms and processes that involve focus, to draw a parallel between the languages considered in this study. In this chapter, I assume that languages utilize different strategies in the formation of polar interrogatives and focal structures.

**Chapter 5** details concluding remarks and identifies some general ideas for future work. I believe that there is a need to make a unified analysis of focal elements, such as particles, adverbs, and complementizers and to present evidence against the assumption that the Portuguese yes-no questions have the same syntactic structure as declaratives. Finally, I will examine the hypothesis put forward by Ambar (2013, forthcoming) according to which the yes-no questions are licensed by strategies similar to those involved in the formation of wh-questions.

This study therefore is integrated into the framework of the Generative Grammar and its recent versions (Chomsky 1995, 2001, 2007, 2008, 2013), and mainly the Minimalist Program, especially considering scientific works concerning the existence of a Left Periphery (a perspective also known as ‘cartographic’). In the paper I assume a Left Periphery corresponding to a Split-CP domain, a domain referred to previously (Government and Binding Theory, Chomsky, 1981) as the one responsible for the relation between ‘propositional content’ (IP domain) and discourse (Rizzi, 1997, Ambar, 1996, 1999).

Therefore, this comparative work attempts to make a modest contribution towards a better understanding of the structures in question, exploring the connection between question and focus.
CHAPTER 1
BACKGROUND REGARDING BULGARIAN YES-NO QUESTIONS

Yes-no questions in Bulgarian language – types

There are two types of yes-no questions in the Bulgarian language that have been identified in the syntactic literature – dali-questions and li-questions. Each one of them is characterized by its close relation to focus and by the interpretational nuances, they represent. These two types of yes-no questions differ mainly by the type of the question operator - the first type is the complementizer dali and the second one is the interrogative particle li.

Traditional grammar textbooks, such as The Bulgarian Academy of Science Grammar (1983), distinguish another type of yes-no questions – nali-questions (or TAG questions). These questions often lose their interrogative interpretation, given the expected confirmative answer with the presence of the TAG nali (for the purposes of this argument I will use the designation TAG-questions for nali-questions).

A fourth type of yes-no questions in the Bulgarian language could be considered the ones where the interrogation values are transferred only through intonation. This last type of yes-no question has a significant similarity to an exclamative sentence, described in Nunes et al. (1979) as “expressing a strong sentiment (indignation, surprise, enthusiasm, admiration).” The lack of an interrogative operator in this type of questions leads to the interpretation of these questions as evaluative.

In the first part of this thesis, I will attempt to integrate an intuitive description of these constructions and of the corresponding interpretational nuances, by testing where and when possible the analysis previously made in the literature.

1.1 Dali-questions

Dukova-Zheleva (2010) considers dali as a true interrogative complementizer and proposes that it is an equivalent to the silent question operator Q in the English language. By proposing the following unified analysis for Wh-questions and yes-no question, the author assumes that dali takes scope over the whole phrase by heading CP:
In studying question and focus movement in the Bulgarian language, Izvorski (1995) proposes for the polar question with *dali* such as (1) the structure illustrated in (2):

(1) Dali Ivan pie?  
    *Q Ivan drinks*  
    ‘Does Ivan drink?’

(2) [CP C *dali* [FP XP F [ … ]]]

Another characteristic of the complementizer *dali* is that, unlike the particle *li*, it cannot appear in constituent questions. Dukova-Zheleva (2010) argues that this characteristic of the complementizer makes it similar to the declarative complementizer *če* ‘that’ that also cannot appear in constituent questions. Her assumption suggests that Bulgarian is a language that does not allow an overtly filled $C^o$.

Further argument for the complementizer nature of the interrogative word *dali* is the fact that *dali*-interrogatives lack subject-verb inversion, as shown in the example (1).

It is interesting to refer to the semantic interpretation of *dali*-interrogatives. Mateus et al. (2003) assumes that an interrogative phrase not always presents a verbal request for information:

“Algumas interrogativas são pedidos indirectos de uma acção e por isso não requerem resposta verbal mas sim um acto futuro do alocutário; por exemplo: (i) Podes fechar a janela? (ii) Passas-me a pimenta? (iii) Importaste-te [importas-te] de pôr o rádio mais baixo?”
I believe that *dali*-questions have that capacity and because of that, this comprises one of their basic uses – they represent an indirect request for an action and do not require a verbal response. This is illustrated in (3a.):

(3)  a) Dali šte e văzmožno da mi dadeš kniaga?  
     *Q* will it be possible to me give the book  
     ‘Is it going to be possible to give me the book?’

b) Dali šte mi dade kniaga?  
     *Q* will me-dat. give the book  
     ‘Will he/she give me the book? /’I am wondering if he/she will give me the book.’

c) Toj dali šte mi dade kniaga?  
     He *Q* will me-dat. give the book  
     ‘Will he/she give me the book? /’I am wondering if he/she will give me the book.’

d) *Toj šte mi dade kniaga dali?*  
     He will me-dat. give the book *Q*

The example (3b.) shows that yes-no questions with *dali* can be considered as a wondering - ‘I am wondering if he/she will give me the book’. In the same time (3c.) illustrates the fact that even though being mandatory initial, *dali* still permits the occurrence of sentence-initial topics. In (3d.) the sentence-initial nature of the complementizer is demonstrated.

Hamblin (1973), on the other hand, assumes that questions in general correspond to the declarative sentences embedded under a silent morpheme or *whether*, which plays the role of a question operator. Thus, *dali* is seen as equivalent of the English *whether*, that similarly to *li* may have a focal interpretation on the constituent on its right. It is commonly accepted that the first word after the complementizer has focus features. This is illustrated in the examples below, as in Dukova-Zheleva (2010:182, ex. (19)):

(4)  a) Dali Ivan risuva vseki den?  
     *Whether Ivan draws every day*  
     ‘(I want to know) whether Ivan draws every day.’

b) Dali IVAN risuva vseki den?  
     *Whether Ivan draws every day*
“(I want to know) whether IVAN draws every day.”
“(I want to know) whether IVAN is the one who draws every day.”
c) Dali RISUVA Ivan vseki den?

Whether draws Ivan every day

“(I want to know) whether Ivan DRAWS every day.”/(I want to know) whether it is drawing what Ivan does every day.”

The examples in (4a.), (4b.) and (4c.) show that dali-interrogatives also can involve focus, but not necessarily, in contrast to the li-interrogatives in which the element preceding the particle is always focused. I will attempt to explore this question further in the following chapter making the assumption that the particle always represents focus features. Having in mind the examples above, we can note that in (4a.) the complementizer dali has a scope over the whole phrase. In (4a.) the information to be received is ‘whether Ivan draws every day’. In (4b.) and (4c) the focus stress leads to a different interpretation, which respectively is “whether Ivan is the one who draws every day” and ‘whether it is drawing what Ivan does every day”. The examples in (4a-c) additionally illustrate the role which intonation plays while dealing with focus - the capital letters indicate high stress. In (4b.) and (4c.) the high stress is on the constituent that represents focus, respectively IVAN and RISUVA “draw.” Here I suggest that the ‘commonly’ accepted interpretation for the focus nature of the complementizer dali is a question that should be exclusively tested in terms of the connection between prosodic stress as one of the elements capable of licensing contrastive focus structures. According to Rooth (1995:1) focus is:

The term focus is used here to describe prosodic prominences serving pragmatic and semantic functions [...]. [...] focus is marked as a feature on phrases in a syntactic description, a feature which is to have both a phonological/phonetic and a semantic/pragmatic interpretation.

On the other hand, the nature of dali as a true complementizer can be established by the fact that it cannot occur in constituent questions. The combination wh+dali is not possible (in contrast with the combination wh+li, discussed in section 1.3), as shown by the example below:

(5) * Kakvo dali Ivan pravi vseki den?

What Q Ivan does every day
As already mentioned above, *dali* is traditionally assumed to be the Bulgarian equivalent of the English *whether*, as it can be usually found in the context of embedded clauses (additional evidence for its complementizer nature):

(6) Iskam da znam dali Ivan risuva vseki den.

_Want.1p.sg.pres. to know.1p.sg.pres. Q Ivan draws every day_

‘I want to know whether Ivan draws every day.’

### 1.2 *Nali*-questions

Bulgarian *nali*-questions, or TAG questions if we want to find an equivalent in English, are not considered true yes-no questions as discussed in Kostov (1939), Čolakova (1959) and Nikolova (1973). *Nali*-interrogatives represent the speaker’s expectation that the statement is true. The listener, on the other hand, is expected to confirm the statement, so the interrogative word *nali* is considered a marker for confirmative questions. This type of questions can be characterized by a strong presupposition – the speaker and the listener share the same background knowledge.

Concerning its position in the phrase, *nali* is flexible enough to occupy an initial or final position, as demonstrated in examples (7) and (8). It can also be preceded by topic(s), as in (9):

(7) Nali šte dojdeš?

_TAG will come-2p.sg_

‘You are coming, aren’t you?’

(8) Šte dojdeš, nali?

_Will come-2p.sg., TAG_

‘You are coming, aren’t you?’

(9) Ivan nali beše tam?

_Ivan TAG was there_

‘As for Ivan, he was there, wasn’t he?’

---

4 Traditional grammars assume that *nali* (or its archaic form *neli*) is a reduced form of *ne e li* ‘no is Q’;
The TAG _nali_ has not been researched in detail by generative linguists. Penčev (1998) argues that the TAG _nali_ is a synonym of the complementizer _dali_, as they both originate from the particle _li_. The main and obvious difference between these two is that _dali_-interrogatives are true questions and _nali_-interrogatives are confirmative questions. Another difference is that _dali_ cannot occur sentence-finally. On the other hand, both questions can appear sentence-initially or following sentence-initial topics as shown in (3c) and (9). Referring to previous example (3c.):

(3) c. Toj dali šte mi dade knigata?

_He Q will me-dat. give the book_

‘Will he/she give me the book? /’I am wondering if he/she will give me the book.’

Tiševa (2003) describes some important characteristics of the TAG _nali_, for example, its matrix nature as in (10), where it takes scope over the whole sentence and cannot occur as a subordinator, as shown in (11):

(10)   Nali ti mi kaza, če Ivan dojde?

_TAG you me-dat. told that Ivan came_

‘Didn’t you tell me that Ivan came?’

(11)   * Toj ne mi kaza nali Ivan dojde

_He neg. me-dat. told TAG Ivan came_

The grammatical error in example (11) can be corrected by the complementizer _dali_ or by the particle _li_. Both elements have the capacity to occur in a matrix and in embedded clauses (12-13):

(12)   Toj ne mi kaza dali Ivan doide.

_He neg. me-dat.told COMP Ivan came_

‘He didn’t tell me whether Ivan came or not.’

(13)   Toj ne mi kaza Ivan dojde li.

_He neg. me-dat. told Ivan came Q_

‘He didn’t tell me if Ivan came.’
Another important property of *nali* is its impossibility to occur with *wh*-elements (in contrast to particle *li*). It is also incompatible with the proper complementizer *dali* or the particle *li*. As for the word order, in *nali*-questions the subject-verb order is maintained as in a declarative sentence, without inversion.

According to the analysis presented by Tiševa (2003) all fronted elements involve focus features. In this work I will not present a proposal for analysis, but will attempt to demonstrate that TAG *nali* behaves somehow similarly to the complementizer *dali*, attributing focus to the element(s) on its right. According to my understanding, all of the fronted elements should be considered topics. In this respect, Tiševa makes an important point concerning the restrictions on the fronted element. The verb alone, or in combination with other fronted elements, cannot occur *nali*-left as examples (14a-c) shows. All the combinations with verb-right, on the other hand, are grammatical (15a-c):

(14) a. *Zaminava nali Ivan za Sofia utre?*  
_Leaves TAG Ivan for Sofia tomorrow_  
‘Ivan leaves for Sofia tomorrow, doesn’t he?’

b. *Ivan zaminava nali za Sofia utre?*  
_Ivan leaves TAG for Sofia tomorrow_

c. * Za Sofia utre zaminava nali Ivan?*  
_For Sofia tomorrow leaves TAG Ivan_

(15) a. Nali Ivan zaminava za Sofia utre?  
_TAG Ivan leaves for Sofia tomorrow_  
‘Ivan leaves for Sofia tomorrow, doesn’t he?’

b. Ivan nali zaminava za Sofia utre?  
_Ivan TAG leaves for Sofia tomorrow_

c. Ivan utre nali zaminava za Sofia?  
_Ivan tomorrow TAG leaves for Sofia_

The work in question, supports the argument that *nali* occupies a fixed head position higher than the verb. The author furthermore considers that *nali* in final position should be treated separately from *nali*-initial and *nali* proceeded by topic(s). According to her, the final position of the TAG is not a result from Verb movement (as it is commonly assumed for the particle *li*). The author argues that these are cases, which should be considered as an equivalent to the English TAG-questions, which are the true TAG.
As I have already pointed out this thesis will not analyze the TAG-questions in the Bulgarian language, but will attempt to provide some empirical evidence that *nail*-questions can resolve the complexity of the Bulgarian yes-no questions.

### 1.3 *Li*-questions

The word *particle* from semantic point of view is derived from the Latin term *partikula* meaning ‘part of’. In the traditional grammars, the particle is described as a part of discourse that has an important role for the communication process. The particles are syntactically dependent and morphologically invariable. The semantics of the particles coincides with their stylistic and grammatical functions as described by Čolakova (1959). I will assume the particles in general as lexical units strongly related by connotation to the semantics of the word or the whole sentence. They modify the semantics of the word or the sentence.

Particle *li* is defined as an interrogative particle that occupies the position after the verb and always participates in polar questions imposing an affirmative or a negative answer.

In comparison to the other two types, *li*-questions have complex characteristics. The interrogative particle *li* is very flexible and depending on its position, different interpretations can be made.

After the Multiple Fronted Wh-Questions, the *li*-problem is one of the topics that have provoked syntacticians’ interest and studies since the 80s. Some of the most important works are those of Rudin (1997), Rudin et al. (1999), Rivero (1993), Bošković (2000, 2002), Franks and Bošković (2001), Izvorski (1995), Lambova (2001, 2004). Different arguments have been put forward. According to some of them as outlined in Rivero (1993) the particle *li* in Bulgarian and Serbian-Croatian is generated in C°. In her view, the order is derived by a movement of the verb to C°, followed by lowering of the interrogative particle.

On the other hand, Rudin (1997) and Rudin et al. (1999) assume *li*’s clitic nature and propose a derivation including the mechanism of Prosodic Inversion. Rudin (1997) suggests that the interrogative particle *li* is a special type of interrogative complementizer. The author distinguishes two versions of *li* - V-*li* e XP-*li*, assuming that the second one involves a strong presupposition context. Rudin et al. (1999) compares the Bulgarian and the Macedonian *li*-questions and concludes that, in both languages, the particle meets its focal features in C°,
which results in interrogative interpretation. According to this analysis, if there is no focused element, the verb will be incorporated in $C^0$ within a right adjunction:

(16) 
```
CP
  Spec
  C'
  C^0
  IP
  li + V
  ...t...
```

Obviously, the order that this analysis shows is not possible, because the particle is always preceded by the verb or by another constituent different from the verb. In order to resolve this problem the authors propose that the incorporation of the verb in $C^0$ is followed by the Prosodic Inversion mechanism. In cases where $li$ encliticizes to a XP, this XP element moves to SpecCP where it meets its focus features.

An important part of their work is a discussion of the prosodic system presented by the Bulgarian and Macedonian languages. As observed by the authors the two systems in question are contrastingly different. The Macedonian language has a constant antepenultimate stress, whereas according to the Bulgarian system the stress can be anywhere. It is noted that clitic(s) can change the position of the stress (marked by capital letters) in Macedonian, while in Bulgarian it remains the same:

a. DOnesi  
   *Bring!*

b. doNEsi go  
   *Bring it.acc!*  
   Macedonian

c. doneSI mi go  
   *Bring me.dat it.acc!*

d. doneSI  
   *Bring!*

e. doneSI go  
   *Bring it.acc!*  
   Bulgarian

f. doneSI mi go  
   *Bring me.dat it.acc!*

Considering Slavic clitics and the Tobler-Mussafia Law, exhibited by the Bulgarian ones, Bošković (2000) and Franks and Bošković (2001) assume that $li$ is a special type of
interrogative complementizer situated in C°. Bošković (2001a) furthermore proposes the mechanism of scattered-deletion for licensing li-structures. According to the Bošković’s analysis, Slavic clitics not only can, but also must be derived without Prosodic Inversion. The analysis consists in a pronounce-a-copy approach, which is also applicable for Bulgarian and Macedonian:

(17) a. Vera mi go dade včera.  
Vera me.dat it.acc gave yesterday
‘Vera gave it to me yesterday.’

b. Včera mi go dade Vera.  
Bg: OK Mac: OK

c. Mi go dade Vera včera.  
Bg: * Mac: OK

d. Dade mi go Vera včera.  
Bg: OK Mac: *

Considering the examples above, a significant difference between the Bulgarian and Macedonian’s clitics can be distinguished - in the first case they are enclitics and in the second – proclitics. Given this difference and according to the phonological requirements for each of these two systems, a copy of the clitics is presented above and below the verb. The head of the chain is pronounced only, if it does not make a phonological violation. In Macedonian the clitics’ nature is a proclitic one and therefore nothing goes wrong. In Bulgarian, however the verb can precede the clitic, but only if there is not additional lexical material:

(18) X clitic V clitic  
    clitic V clitic.

Li- constructions, on the other hand, are traditionally characterized as “the strongest remaining case for the Prosodic Inversion.” In his work, Bošković considers two traditional types of li- constructions – neutral and focalized. In spite of the general characteristics of the Bulgarian and Macedonian clitics, the clitic li encliticizes in both of this languages.

(19) a. *Go vidja li?  
    He-dat saw Q
    Did she/he/you see him?

b. Vidja li go?
c. Go vide li?  
Macedonian

He-dat. saw Q

d. *Vide li go?

Referring to Rudin’s analysis for right adjoining, the author demonstrates a derivation of li-constructions without applying the mechanism of the Prosodic Inversion, proposing left adunction with a movement that leaves a copy behind:

(20) [C[go vidja/vide]+li] go vidja/vide

As already shown for the Macedonian language the head go vide must be pronounced since it does not cause violation. As for the Bulgarian, go is pronounced in a lower position, the verb being the head where li finds a host:

(21) [C[go vidja]+li] go vidja

As we can see, in Bulgarian, one part of the chain is pronounced in the head position and the other in the tail, thus, according to the Nunes’s (2000) proposal for ‘scattered deletion’.

In her work Izvorski (1995), also distinguishes two types of polar questions in Bulgarian – dali-interrogatives and li-interrogatives in which dali and li occupy separate positions. With regards to li-questions, the author assumes that li heads a clause-internal focus projection, as in example (22):

(22)  [FP [XP F li […]]]

The argument made in this work is that li is generated in F(ocus)º and has a [+Q] features.

In Izvoski (1995), as in Rudin et al. (1999) there are two separate types of li – Verb-li, considered neutral, and XP5-li, considered focused.

Lambova (2001, 2004) presents an interesting analysis and proposes an independent focal projection ΔP, occupying a position below Cº. Lambova’s study is concentrated mainly

---

5 For XP it can be assumed every category is different from the verb.
on the constituent questions, but the projection proposed in her work also can be applied to polar questions.

With respect to the treatment of the particle *li*, it is important to note its clitic nature. Being a clitic the particle is phonologically dependent and a prosodically deficient element for which there should be a host in the sentence. The clitic’s and clitic cluster’s problem in Slavic is widely discussed as a central theme in various linguistic works. Franks (2005) provides a detailed overview on the clitics’ position in South Slavic (Serbian-Croatian, Slovenian, Bulgarian, and Macedonian) and in the West Slavic (Czech and Polish):

**Serbian-Croatian:**

(23) Da li ste mi ih danas kupili?

*C Q aux.2pl me.dat them.acc today bought*

‘Did you buy me them today?’

**Slovenian:**

(24) Janez mu ga je še dal.

*Janez him.dat it.acc aux.3sg still gave*

‘Janez still gave it to him.’

**Bulgarian:**

(25) Ti si mu gi pokazvala.

*You aux.2sg him.dat them.acc shown.fem*

‘You have shown them to him.’

**Macedonian:**

(26) Mi go dade Vera včera.

*Me.dat it.acc gave Vera yesterday*

‘Vera gave me it yesterday.’

**Czech:**

(27) Představila jsem mu tě včera.

*Introduced aux.1sg him.dat you.acc yesterday*

‘I introduced you to him yesterday.’
Polish:

(28) Piotrek mi je dał.

Peter me.dat. them.acc gave
‘Peter gave me them.’

As identified by Franks (2005) and as shown by the examples above there are two types of positions for the clitic cluster. The first one is the second position as illustrated by the examples for Serbian-Croatian (23), Slovenian (24) and Czech (27) and the second one being the verb-adjacent position as in Bulgarian (25) and Macedonian (26). In all Slavic languages the clitics’ order is fixed – auxiliary, dative, accusative, but all of them appear preceded by the interrogative clitic li in cases of yes-no questions, which could be considered as evidence for li’s special status among clitics.

Further attention is paid to the apparent divergences shown by the Macedonian language, which is the only language in the Slavic group that allows the clitic cluster to appear in an initial position, and also allows it to appear after the verb. In Bulgarian, on the other hand, this may happen only if there is another item that can serve as a host for the clitics. In his work Franks also refers to one of the more popular opinions, concerning the clitics’ order and its impossible (in the majority of the Slavic languages) first position – the Prosodic Inversion. According to this phonological mechanism, syntactically initial clitics move to a verb-adjacent position in order to satisfy their prosodic requirements.

In the Bulgarian language, the elements that are traditionally considered to be clitics are the following:

- Pronominal clitics
- Present perfect auxiliary
- Interrogative particle li
- Future auxiliary šte

Another linguistic phenomenon that should be considered while discussing the placement of clitics in Bulgarian is the Tobler-Mussafia Law, i.e. clitics do not appear in a sentence-initial position, they need a host, to which they can encliticize to. The only exception is the future auxiliary šte. As for the li-particle, it obeys the Tobler-Mussafia Law, but as we will see, it is completely flexible, i.e. occupying the second position in the phrase is not mandatory. Being an enclitic, the particle does not receive a stress, but the element that it cliticizes onto, the element with logical stress, is pronounced with an increasing intonation.
As already discussed above, Bošković (2001a) and Franks and Bošković (2001) refer to a mechanism such as scattered deletion, as the one accounting for the placement of the particle. In their works they discuss an unique feature which represents another argument for li’s different status. The Bulgarian clitics, phonologically deficient units, can meet their prosodic requirement even when preceded by the prosodically deficient conjunction i ‘and’:

(29) I mi go dade Vera včera.
    And me.dat it.acc gave Vera yesterday
    ‘And Vera gave it to me yesterday.’

(30) * Mi go dade Vera včera.

(31) Dade mi go Vera včera.

Interestingly the same phenomenon is not observed in the case of the interrogative clitic li.

(32) Dade li ti go?
    Gave Q you.dat it.acc
    ‘Did she/he give it to you?’

(33) * I li ti go dade?

(34) I dade li ti go?

I think that this evidence shows that the placement of the particle is not dependent upon its clitic nature. This idea will be discussed further in sections 2.2.1 and 2.2.2 of the following chapter.

1.3.1 Li across Slavic languages

The objective in this part of the study is to attempt to systematize li’s occurrences across Slavic languages. In my opinion, this is necessary for understanding the li’s distribution and its treatment as an interrogative marker.
As it will be further discussed the particle can occur in two basic positions, as an enclitic to the verb or as an enclitic to a XP different from the verb. This is a subject discussed extensively in the Bulgarian\(^6\) syntactic literature.

As for other languages, members of the Slavic group, the particle \(li\) can be found also in Russian, Serbian-Croatian, Macedonian and Czech, displaying differences in interpretation and use. For the purposes of this study, I will give some examples\(^7\) of \(li\)’s distribution in some of these languages in order to create a general overview. I will give special attention to the South Slavic (Serbian-Croatian and Macedonian) languages as it is generally assumed to have many similarities with Bulgarian.

As already established the particle \(li\) can be found in two basic positions \(V-li\) and \(XP-li\). As for the \(V-li\) position it can be found in Russian (Rus), Macedonian (Mac) and Serbian-Croatian (SC):

**\(V-li\)**

(35) Čitaet \(li\) on knigu?  \hspace{1cm} Rus  
read.3SG Q he book  
'Does he read a book?'

(36) Daješ \(li\) mu ih vsaki dan?  \hspace{1cm} SC  
give.2SG Q him.dat them.acc every day  
'Do you give them to him every day?'

(37) Ti go dade \(li\)?  \hspace{1cm} Mac  
you.DAT it.ACC gave.3SG Q  
'Did you give it to him?'

As for subordinate interrogative clauses, Bulgarian shows the optional occurrence of the particle, which can be substituted by the interrogative complementizer \(dali\) (something that will be further discussed). Russian, on the other hand, shows that \(li\) always appears in subordinated interrogatives, while its occurrence in main clauses is optional, as shown in (38a) and (38b):

\(^7\)All of the examples in this section are presented as they were found in Schwabe (2004)
(38) a. Ja choču znat' čitaet *(li) Petr knigu.
   I want.1.sg know.INF read.3sg Q Petr book.acc
   'I want to know whether Petr is reading a book.'

b. Čitaet (li) Petr knigu.
   Read-3.sg Q Petr a book.acc
   'Is Petr reading a book.'

As we can see these three languages all use the particle but its interpretation and position in the clause however varies. As for the West Slavic languages (Czech, Slovak and Polish), the particle is considered archaic. In Czech, it is productive as conditional marker and can also occur in embedded clauses but only as a clitic to clause-initial verb:

(39) Nevíme,mají-li dnes medovinu.       Cz
    neg.-know.1.PL have3PL-Q today honey
    'We don’t know whether they have honey today.'

Polish, on the other hand, uses for the formation of interrogative the marker czy that, in contrast to the particle li is not a clitic.

Being a clitic, the particle needs to have a host in the sentence (XP or VP). If the latter is a verb, it can be a full verb or an auxiliary verb, with the possibility to be a clitic, it can be stressed or not. The examples from Serbian-Croatian found in Franks and King (2000) below show that the auxiliary biti ‘to be’ in Serbian-Croatian can provide a host for the particle only where it is not phonologically deficient or is high stressed.

The examples in (40a) and (40b) present opposition of si ‘to be-2p.sg’ and jesì ‘to be-2p.sg’ in which, according to native speakers, the first one is a reduced and phonologically deficient form of the second one. Thus, the phonetic ‘weakness’ of si ‘to be-2p.sg’ results in its impossibility to represent a host for the particle, while, in (40b.), jesì has this possibility. However, once again according to Serbian-Croatian speakers, si is archaic and more typically used for poetic discourse. The examples in (40c.) and (40d.), on the other hand show the same opposition but this time regarding the auxiliary biti ‘to be’ in 3p.sg. This time, as shown in (40d) the auxiliary je ‘is’ has the possibility to provide a host for the particle only in cases in which a high stress is involved:
In my opinion, the question of high stress (marked in (40d) by capital letters) is frequently ignored while dealing with clitics. It will be taken into consideration, with respect to Bulgarian in section 2.2.1 in the following chapter. I assume that in Bulgarian the position of the particle in the context of auxiliary verbs follows the same model as in Serbian-Croatian, i.e. when high stress on the auxiliary in 3p.sg occurs, the appearance of the particle as an enclitic to the auxiliary becomes possible.

A difference between these two languages however can be found in cases in which li occurs as an enclitic to a participle, something nonproductive in Serbian-Croatian, while grammatical in Bulgarian and Macedonian. The example in (41a-b) represents the past participle pokazval ‘shown’ and the past participle dal ‘given’ in Bulgarian and Macedonian respectively, where both of the past participles can serve as a host for li. In Serbian-Croatian’s example (43), however, davao ‘given’ + li is not grammatical:

(40) a. *Si li čitao knjigu?  
  aux.2SG Q read.PART book.ACC  
  'Have you read a book?'

b. Jesi li čitao knjigu?  
  aux.2SG Q read.PART book.ACC  
  'Have you read a book?'

c. *Je li on došao?  
  aux.3SG Q he come.PART  
  'Has he come?'

d. JE li on došao?  
  aux.3SG Q he come.PART  
  'Has he come?'

(41) a. Pokazval li si mu ja dnes?  
  show.part. Q aux.2SG him.DAT her.ACC today  
  'Have you shown her to him today?' (Avgustinova 1994:34)

b. Si mu gi dal li parte?  
  aux.2SG him.DAT them.ACC give.part Q money.DEF  
  'Have you given him the money?'
(42) *Davao li si mu ih vscaki dan?  
    give.part. Q aux.2SG him.DAT them.ACC every day  
    'Did you give them to him every day?'

As already mentioned above, the clitic li across Slavic languages can be found in two main positions: V-li (discussed above) and XP-li as in (43-45). All of these examples, according to Schwabe (2004) involve focus on the constituent to which the particle encliticizes and, thus, marked by F(ocus):

**XP-li**

(43) [KNIGUi] F li on čitaet ti?  
    book.ACC Q he read.3SG  
    'Is it a book that he is reading?'

(44) [KNJIGEi] F li Ana čita ti?  
    books Q Ana read.3SGG  
    'Are what Ana is reading books?'

(45) [KNIGATAi] F li podarij Krasi tj ti?  
    book DEF Q you.DAT gave.3SG Krasi  
    'Is it the book that Krasi has given to you?'

Schwabe (2004) makes an important distinction regarding the position of the particle. According to the examples below, in Russian and Serbian-Croatian, li always cliticizes to the first phonological word in the sentence in the case of a complex DPs. The capital letters on the constituents in (46) and (47) show the high stress while the F(ocus) marker indicates focus features only on the first phonological word within the complex DP. For ease of understanding, the complex DP is separated from the rest of the material by parenthesis […]:

(46) [INTERESNUJU F li knigu]i Petr čitaet ti?  
    interesting Q book.ACC Peter read..3SG  
    'Is the book that Petr is reading interesting?'
In (48) and (49) below it is once again demonstrated that in Russian and Serbian-Croatian it is the first phonological word that serves as a host for *li*, the one that represents the focused element. The focus being marked by *F(ocus)* and the element in focus being further separated by parenthesis. According to these criteria, (48b.) and (49b.) are presented as opposite and ungrammatical in contrast with (48a.) and (49a.). As we can observe in (48b.) and (49b.) the Russian *knigu* ‘book.ace’ and the Serbian-Croatian *knige* ‘books’ cannot be marked by capital letters, i.e. cannot involve high stress, nor *F(ocus)*, while the particle precedes them. The entire complex DP also cannot be marked by *F(ocus)*, given the fact that in these languages only the first phonological word can be focused.

(48) a. [[INTERESNUJU]F li knigu]i Petr čitaet ti?
   interesting Q book.ACC Petr read.3SG
   'Is the book that Petr is reading interesting?'

   b. *[InteresnujuF li KNIGUF]i F Petr čitaet ti?
   interesting Q book.ACC Petr read.3SG
   'Is it an interesting book that Peter is reading?'

(49) a. [[SKUPE]F li knjige]i Ana čita ti? (Bošković 2001)
   expensive Q books Ana read.3SG
   'Are the books that Ana is reading expensive?'

   b. *[SkupeF li KNJIGEF]i F Ana čita ti?
   expensive Q books Ana read.3SG
   'Are what Ana is reading expensive books?'

On the other hand, the reverse model can be observed in Bulgarian and Macedonian. *Li* is not necessarily attached to the first phonological word, but may encliticize into each of the elements of a complex DP, which consequently will receive focus. The examples in (50a-c) indicate that *novata* ‘new-def.’, *zelena* ‘green’ and *riza* ‘shirt’ can all be focused and that they receive high stress (again marked by capital letters) as a result of the focus. As in the
case of (50a.), in contrast of (50b.) and (50c.), it is further assumed that when li cliticizes to the last constituent of the complex DP the preceding one(s) also receive focus:

(50) a. [NovataF zelenaF RIZAF]i F li ti podarij Krasi tj ti?
    new.DEF green shirt Q you.DAT gave.3SG Krasi
    'Is it the new green shirt that Krasi has given to you?'

    b. [Novata [ZELENA]F li riza]i ti podarij Krasi tj ti?
    new.DEF green Q shirt you.DAT gave.3SG Krasi
    'Is the new shirt that Krasi has given to you green?'

    c. [[NOVATA]F li zelena riza] i ti podarij Krasi tj ti?
    new.DEF Q green shirt you.DAT gave.3SG Krasi
    ‘Is the green shirt that Krasi has given to you new?'

As for the non-polarity interrogative use of li across Slavic languages, Schwabe (2004) considers the occurrence of the particle in wh-questions, which is possible in Bulgarian and Serbian-Croatian. However, this occurrence in the former one is considered archaic (Bošković 2001):

(51) a. Kakvo li nameri?
    what Q found.3SG
    'What, if she has found anything, has she found?'

    b. Sta li si mi to kupio?
    what Q aux.2 SG me.DAT part buy.PART
    'What, if you have bought anything for me, have you bought?'

The Wh-li combination in Bulgarian will be further examined in section 1.3.4 of the present chapter in terms of Obenauer’s (2004) non-standard wh-questions and Ambar’s (2003) non-pure questions.

As for other Slavic interrogative markers, it is necessary to point out Slovenian (Sln) ali, which always occupies a sentence-initial position and occurs only in the main clauses (52)
as well as in Belorussian (Br) and Ukrainian (Ukr) sentence-initial particles ci and čy respectively (53-54):

(52) Ali mi ga boš dal?  
Q me.DAT it.ACC aux.FUT.2SG give.PART  
'Will you give it to me?'

(53) Ci ne xoladna tabe?  
Q ne cold you.dat  
'Aren't you cold?'

(54) Čy ty tam buv?  
Q you the re were  
'Were you there?'

The aim of this section is to show the distribution of li across the Slavic languages, something that is necessary in order to understand some particularities of the particle and to compare, when possible with other languages from the same generic family. As shown in Schwabe (2004), Russian, Serbian-Croatian, Macedonian and Bulgarian share a lot of similarities regarding the formation of a yes-no question. However, variations across languages can be found, especially in the context of XP-li questions. For further analysis of the examples presented above, it is useful to consider the table created by Schwabe (2004) that summarizes the basic features and occurrences of the particle li in the Slavic languages. According to the table (55), indicates archaic uses of li, brackets stand for optionally, shows li as a part of word formation while shows mandatory use:

(55)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>V3-li</th>
<th>XP-li</th>
<th>conditional li</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>matrix subord.</td>
<td>matrix subord.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>Serbian/Croatian</td>
<td>● ●</td>
<td>○ ○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bulgarian</td>
<td>● ● ● ●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Macedonian</td>
<td>● ● ● ●</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Slovenian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS</td>
<td>Czech</td>
<td>● ◯</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Slovak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>◯</td>
<td>◯</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sorbian</td>
<td>◯</td>
<td>◯</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>(●) ● (●) ● ◯</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ukrainian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Belorussian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.3.2 V/XP-li questions

Referring again to the formal description of the interrogative particle *li* and as previously mentioned, it could be found in different contexts. The two standard positions already identified in which *li* follows the verb or an element different from the verb:

(56) Kupi li knigata?

*Bought Q the book*

‘Did you buy the book?’

(57) Knigata li kupi?

*The book Q bought*

‘Did you buy the book (or the newspaper)?’ / ‘Was it the book that you bought?’

The examples in (56) and (57) are both true questions, questions without rhetorical or evaluative interpretation. The subtle difference between these two examples is contained in the position of the particle, which in (56) is verb-right and in (57) DP-right. In (56) we do not know if the person X bought or did not buy the book and that is why the question in (56) is defined in the literature as a neutral yes-no question. It is assumed to be a simple request for information for the value of the whole sentence. In (57) the speaker has some previous background knowledge, knowing that the person X has bought something, but he is not sure if that is a book or something else. Here the speaker clearly has some background knowledge, so a pressuppositional context is introduced. Therefore, the example (57) is interpreted as a focal question, the contrastive focus being attributed by the particle *li*, while (56) is an example of information focus.

The question of focus has been defined as an area of importance in the linguistic literature, provoking linguists’ interest since Chomsky (1971). His work was the first to discuss the question of focus in light of the generative framework. Jackendoff (1972), Chomsky (1975), Kiss (1998), Roberts (1998) are just some of the many works concerned with the understanding of the concept of focus, a concept that intrinsically involves interaction between prosody, syntax, semantics and pragmatics.

Kiss (1998) distinguishes two types of focus, information focus and identification focus, the former being more commonly known as contrastive. Identification (or contrastive)
focus is further characterized by the values [±exhaustive] and [±contrastive] and according to Kiss (1998) has the following definition:

"Identificational focus represents a subset of the set of contextually or situationally given elements for which the predicate phrase can potentially hold; it is identified as the exhaustive subset of this set for which the predicate phrase actually holds."

Kiss (1998:249)

Information focus, on the other hand, is defined by Jackendoff (1972) as ‘the information that is not shared by speaker and addressee’ (c.f Krifka (2006)), i.e. all the new and nonpressuposed information without specific identification. In Roberts (1998) information focus is furthermore distinguished from contrastive focus with respect to the exhaustiveness of the second one. According to Roberts (1998) and following Rooth (1985) information focus is defined as ‘a constituent in an utterance whose value is permitted to vary in determining the Focus Alternative Set for the utterance, i.e., its denotation.’ (Kenesei, 2005).

As regards focus in Portuguese, Ambar (1996, 1999) distinguishes two domains for the understanding of focus - one concentrated on how focus is presented in the Universe of Discourse and another according to how focus is formally expressed. The question of focus in Portuguese will be explored further in section 3.2, Chapter 3.

Regarding the examples in Bulgarian in (56) and (57) and in terms of Kiss (1998), we can assume that in the first one where li cliticize to the verb, we have information focus, while the example in (58) presents identificational focus, where the constituent knigata ‘the book’ is marked as [+exhaustive].

Considering Kiss (1998) the example in (57) involves a DP which carries a contrastive\(^8\) focus feature, but in fact this can be any XP as shown in (58), (59) and (60). All of the examples below, just like the example (57) present contrastive focus on the constituent providing a host for the particle. In my opinion, včera ‘yesterday’, interesna ‘interesting’ and ot knižarnitza Helikon ‘from the Helikon bookshop’ can be characterized as having the feature [+exhaustive].

---

\(^8\) For ease of understanding, I will use the commonly known and more conventional term ‘Contrastive focus’.
Včera li kupi knigata?

Yesterday Q bought the book?

‘Did you buy the book yesterday?’

Interesna li beše knigata?

Interesting Q was the book

‘Was the book interesting?’

Ot kniţarnitza Helikon li kupi knigata?

From the Helikon bookshop Q bought the book

‘Did you buy the book from the Helikon’s bookshop?’

In terms of interpretation, it is necessary to underline the fact that this type of yes-no question involving the particle li, represents a request for specific identification and confirmation of the constituent representing host for the particle. In my view, this assumption can be furthermore supported by the particularities of the Bulgarian answering system, a question that will be discussed in 2.2.1 of the following chapter.

1.3.3 Li-final questions

As seen above, V-li and XP-li are the two most discussed positions, in which the particle can occur. In this paper, I would like to distinguish a third type of li-placement, demonstrated in (61):

(61) Kupi knigata li?

Bought the book Q

‘You bought the book?’

This type of li-placement has not been widely explored in the syntactic literature. Traditionally is assumed that all the left-li material is focused, which in my opinion, probably presents difficulties in processing multiple filled SpecFocP. In this thesis, I suggest that, similarly to the V-li and XP-li question, only the element preceding the particle is focused.
More specific interpretation of *li*-final questions is the stronger presupposition introduced by the topicalized element. Supporting evidence to consider is that, in contrast to the other two types of positions in which the particle can occur this one involves stronger presupposition. These types of yes-no questions in Bulgarian are introduced by an event, or previous knowledge of an action that could probably happen. Consider the following situation:

*The speaker X already knows that the listener Y is about to buy a particular book about which they previously talked about. Seeing the listener Y walking out of a bookshop and having background knowledge, it is natural that the speaker X asks a question similar to the one in (61).*

On the other hand, the situation mentioned above, can also trigger a question in which the particle encliticizes to a XP *knigata* ‘the book’, as in (57) (referred to again below), so the difference between (61) and (57) can be presented as really subtle and context-dependent:

(57) Knigata li kupi?
   *The book Q bought*
   ‘Did you buy the book (or the newspaper)?’ / ‘Was it the book that you bought?’

(61) Kupi knigata li?
   *Bought the book Q*
   ‘You bought the book?’

However, in my opinion XP-*li* and *li*-final should be treated separately as they present different types of evidence when studying *li*’s properties. Most importantly, *li*-final position represents evidence against the common assumption that the particle is a second-position clitic and that the second position is triggered by the Prosodic Inversion’s mechanism. This question will be further explored in the following chapter.
1.3.4. Wh-li question

Another context in which we can find the particle *li* is the wh-questions. As we know Bulgarian is a language in which the wh-element(s) always occupy the initial position in the sentence and the wh-in-situ is an impossible option as shown by the examples (62) and (63):

(62) Koj dojde?
  *Who came*
  ‘Who came?’

(63) *Dojde koj?
  *Came who*

When the particle *li* appears in wh-question, it is automatically attached to the wh-word making the sentence more focused and even interpreted as a rhetorical one:

(64) Koj li dojde?
  *Who Q came*
  ‘Who came?’

The question in (64) does not usually require an answer. It represents a wondering often directed to the speaker himself or can be even associated to a more poetic/literary context. In terms of Ambar (2003) and Obenauer (2004) the example above can be defined as an example of non-pure or non-standard wh-question respectively. Another characteristic of wh-*li* questions is their incompatibility with negative answers. What has been discussed in the literature is that these questions involve focus on the wh-element, but in any cases, the wh+*li* combination has not provoked a great interest for the generative linguists.

As in the case of multiple fronted wh-words, a question widely discussed in the syntax literature, the situation becomes even more complicated, given the fact that there are a lot of different opinions about the placement of the particle *li* and that, practically *li*’s position is a question strongly dependent on the speakers’ choice. Usually, the speakers accept the third position of *li* as shown in the example below:

(65) Koj kakvo li kupi?
  *Who what Q bought*
  ‘Who bought what?’
On the other hand, the second position of the particle is also acceptable as in (66):

(66)  Koj li kakvo kupi?

*Who Q what bought*

‘Who bought what?’

The difference in the interpretation is really subtle, even though it would sound logical to say that in (65) only the first wh-constituent is focused and the second one is not, the preferences of the native speakers are sometimes contradictory. But in any cases (65) and (66) are both grammatical and generally accepted, something that cannot be said about the example in (67) which is considered strange:

(67)  ?? Koj kakvo koga li kupi?

*Who what when Q bought*

‘Who bought what and when?’

The example in (67) is not acceptable. This is an example of multiple fronted wh-words focused by the *li*-particle. If the *li*-particle is omitted the sentence in (67) will be accepted, so it can be considered that the features of *li* make the construction too heavy.

As for the double *li*, these kinds of examples are only considered acceptable with the presences of the conjunction *I* ‘and’, even though some researchers⁹ find the example in (69) a grammatical one:

(68)  Koj li I koga li šte dojde?

*Who Q and when Q will come*

‘Who is coming when?’

(69)  ?? Koj li koga li šte dojde?

*Who Q when Q will come*

‘Who is coming when?’

---

⁹ Krapova (1999) assumes an example as the one above as an evidence for emphatic *li* construction. However speakers that I consulted, prefer coordinated construction (as in (68)) for these cases and do not accept multiple *li*:

(i)  Koga li kâde li pak šte se sreštnem?

′Whenever (and) wherever will we meet again?’
1.4. Yes-no questions without an interrogative marker

As referred in the beginning of this work another type of yes-no questions can be identified in the Bulgarian language – yes-no questions without an interrogative word. Traditionally, it is considered that the true interrogatives are the ones including the interrogative particle li or the interrogative word dali. At the same time, traditional grammars refer also to a type of questions without interrogative element. In The Bulgarian Academy of Science Grammar (1983), this type of questions is identified by its increasing intonation. Another characteristic, according to the same grammar is that, using this type of interrogatives, the speaker often asks for confirmation, indicates that he waits for additional information or expresses a certain emotional reaction such as indignation, admiration, and surprise. These situations are demonstrated in (70), (71) and (71) below in the respective order:

(70) A: Az iskah da kupja knigata.
    *I wanted-1p.sg. PREP buy the book*
    ‘I wanted to buy the book.’
B: Ti? Az misleh če Petăr iska da ja kupi.
    *You? I thought-1p.sg. that Petăr want-3p.sg PREP it-acc. Buy*
    ‘You? I thought it was Petăr who wanted to buy it.’

(71) A: Iskah da kupja knigata, no…
    *Wanted-1p.sg. PREP. buy the book but...*
    ‘I wanted to buy the book, but...’
B: No?
    *But*
    ‘But what?’

(72) A: Az iskah da kupja knigata.
    *I wanted-1p.sg. PREP buy the book*
    ‘I wanted to buy the book.’
B: Ti? Ti ňamaš nikakvi pari! Kak šte ja kupiš?
    *You? You not have-2p.sg. any money! How PART.FUT. it-acc. buy-2p.sg?*
‘You? But you don’t have any money! How will you buy it?

As the examples in (70), (71) and (72) show, interrogatives without an interrogative word have a strong similarity to exclamatives, even though the interrogative character is somehow explicit, mostly in the case of (71). In my view, these cases represent situations showing that some structures belong to more than one type of sentence, as referred to in Mateus et al. (2003):

“Assim acontece com exclamativas como as chamadas interrogativas retóricas, que partilham propriedades de exclamativas totais e de frases interrogativas”

Summary

In the first chapter I distinguished, four types of yes-no questions in the Bulgarian language – dali-questions, li-questions, nali-questions and questions without an interrogative word. I provided a review of the syntactic literature that has studied these different types of yes-no questions and attempted to give some thoughts at an interpretational level. In addition to the presented data, I systematized the basic characteristics of the interrogative operator in the table below. The table below divides the Bulgarian yes-no questions in three categories – true questions, +exclamation yes-no question (for this type I assume the existence of yes-question without interrogative word discussed above) and +pressuposition, where it is assumed that there is a strong presuppositional context. In the table below shows that the type of question is fully in this category, while stands out for partiality:

(73)
CHAPTER 2
THE PARTICLE LI

Introduction and objectives

The syntax of the Bulgarian interrogatives has been subject of much research by Slavic linguists since the 80’s. This interest has resulted in a thorough analysis of the Multiple Wh-fronting, the order of the wh-elements when appearing clause initially and the clitic’s position among other phenomena.

The subsequent analysis of the Bulgarian Multiple Wh-questions has resulted in different hypotheses that have been made, including the movement to multiple SpecCP, the movement to SpecFocus, the Principle of Minimal Compliance.

As for the syntax of the Bulgarian polar interrogatives, syntactician’s interest has been focused mainly on the placement of the interrogative particle li. Two main types of hypothesis have been put forward:

(i) the particle is considered as a complementizer in Rudin (1997), Rudin et all (1999), Boskovič (2000), Franks (2005) among others and (ii) the interrogative particle generated in a lower position heading a clause-internal focal projection situated between CP and TP as in Izvorski (1995).

This analysis is based upon the assumption that the particle li disposes of both interrogative and focal features. My approach is entirely syntactical and the following sections are systematized in a way that attempts to explain individually the possible syntactical positions of the particle motivated, in my view, by the need to capture the different interpretations corresponding to li’s placement. I will divide this chapter as follows:

1. The particle li as an enclitic to the verb

The aim in this first section is to present some arguments, demonstrating that the traditionally considered as neutral V-li position, is actually also an example of a focal construction. In my opinion, li is always focal, independently of the nature of the constituent to which the particle encliticizes.
2. The particle *li* in its combination with XP or V – analysis

In section 2 of the chapter, by briefly discussing some suggestions for the analysis of the positions of the interrogative particle *li*, I present a unified approach for analyzing XP-*li* and V-*li* structures arguing that both of them are focal.

3. The particle *li* in the final position

Section 3 contains some thoughts on the structures in which the particle occurs in the final position based on the idea that even in these cases the host for *li* continues to be the only focused element.

4. The particle *li* as an enclitic to a wh-constituent

In section 4 I propose an analysis of the cases in which the XP, a host for *li*, is a wh-word. These types of questions involve a specific interpretation and context of use, which makes them different from the standard wh-questions. Here I assume the proposal made in Ambar (1996, 1999) about the wh-interrogatives and the wh-exclamatives – unifying mirror effects.

A separate analysis will be discussed for the Bulgarian yes-no question that includes the complementizer *dali* and also the occurrence of the complementizer and the particle in embedded clauses, which is an argument against the analysis of the particle as a complementizer situated in CP.

2.1 Some general points concerning the nature of the interrogative particle *li*

Particle *li* traditionally has been considered a clitic. The term clitic has been defined in the literature (Martins (2010) concerning the Portuguese clitics) as a lexical item without prosodic stress but flexible in its positions. Clitics do not represent a phonological unit and for this reason, they need a stressed word that represents their host in the sentence. Cliticization is the process that joins the particle and its host. Clitics in general are further characterized by a certain morphological autonomy, but as I discussed in the previous chapter, this is not the case.
for li. In this work from the beginning, I have assumed that the particle is a clitic. However, it is necessary to emphasize that an interdisciplinary prosodic study will be taken into account in the future and in my view this question can be considered open.

Therefore, assuming that the particle is a clitic, it obeys the Tobler-Mussafia Law, a law known from Medieval Romance studies that prevents the appearance of clitics in the sentence initial position. That is why the particle li, as a clitic searches for a suitable element to represent its host in the sentence i.e. li searches for phonological support. The Tobler-Mussafia phenomenon is demonstrated below as in Legendre (1996):

\[(74)\]
\[\text{a. Az sùm mu go dal.}\]
\[\text{I have him-dat it-acc given}\]
\[\text{‘I have given it to him’.}\]
\[\text{b. Dal sùm mu go.}\]
\[\text{‘(I) have given it to him’.}\]

However, in Franks (2005), the argument is made that the Tobler-Mussafia Law is not entirely a prosodic phenomenon. Franks shows that “no Tobler-Mussafia effect is achieved in Bulgarian if anything precedes the clitics, even elements that are themselves prosodically deficient”:

\[(75)\]
\[\text{a. I}^{10} \text{ si mu gi pokazvaš.}\]
\[\text{and aux.2sg him.dat them.acc shown}\]
\[\text{‘And you have shown them to him.’}\]
\[\text{b. Šte mu gi pokazvaš.}\]
\[\text{will him.dat them.acc shown}\]
\[\text{‘You will show them to him.’}\]

It is necessary to mention here again the elements considered clitics in Bulgarian:
- Pronominal clitics
- Present perfect auxiliary
- Interrogative particle li
- Future auxiliary šte

\[^{10}\text{The conjunction ‘and’ is an element considered prosodically deficient i.e. it cannot be a stressed element.}\]
Interestingly, as shown in Bošković (2000) the same phenomenon is not observed in the case of the interrogative clitic li:

(76)  a. Dade li ti go?
     \[Gave \ Q \ you.dat \ it.acc\]
     ‘Did she/he give it to you?’
     b. * I li ti go dade?
     c. I dade li ti go?

The example in (76) shows that with li present, the conjunction i ‘and’ is not capable of providing a host for the particle in contrast with (75a), where the same prosodically deficient conjunction is ‘strong’ enough to serve as a host for the rest of the clitics. The example in (75b) furthermore illustrates that even another clitic (the future particle šte) is able to appear in an initial position and to give prosodic support to the rest of the clitics.

The example in (75b) then leads to the idea that the particle cannot be treated as the rest of the clitics. Its placement follows other requirements, probably stronger related to syntax and pragmatics than to phonology.

As we already have seen in section 1.3 of the previous chapter, recent research (Rudin (1997), Rudin et all (1999), Izvorski (1995) among others) distinguishes two types of li: (i) li associated to the verb and (ii) li associated to a word different from the verb:

(77)  Kupi li knigata?
     \[Bought \ Q \ the \ book\]
     ‘Did you buy the book?’

(78)  Knigata li kupi?
     \[The \ book \ Q \ bought\]
     ‘Did you buy the book (or the newspaper)?’ / ‘Was it the book that you bought?’

The basic claim is that in the first case, shown in example (77) we are dealing with a neutral yes-no question and in the second (78) with a focal interpretation of the element presenting a host for the particle – knigata ‘the book’. This idea will be central in the first part of the present analysis, assuming that there is just one type of li-structures – focused.
2.2. The syntax of the Bulgarian polar question: an analysis of previous studies and a new derivation

In this work, I am proposing a distributional analysis according to which the particle *li* involves focus features. My assumption is based upon data from the Bulgarian responsive system and upon examples involving a focused copula verb. My main issue, when dealing with the *li*-structures, is to define a suitable place for the particle that takes into account its focus and interrogative features, according to its positions in the sentence.

2.2.1. The particle *li* as an enclitic to the verb

One of the basic assumptions for the *li*-particle is that its position is strongly related to its clitic requirements, following the Prosodic Inversion mechanism that according to Halpern (1992) has the following definition:

For a DCL [directional clitic], X, which must attach to a o [phonological word] to its left (respectively right),

a. If there is a o, Y, comprised of material which is syntactically immediately to the left (right) of X, then adjoin X to the right (left) of Y.

b. else attach X to the right (left) edge of the o composed of syntactic material immediately to its right (left).

In other words, the Prosodic Inversion is the mechanism through which prosodically deficient elements move in order to find prosodic support.

Rudin (1999) following the claim made in Rudin (1993), Rivero (1993) and King (1996), assumes that the particle is incorporated in C° and that, as an enclitic, it follows the stressed element. Separating two versions of *li* – V-*li*, being a neutral one, and XP-*li*, being a focused one, Rudin proposes for V-*li* that the verb rises to check *li*’s interrogative features by right adjunction. This is followed by the Prosodic Inversion of the particle, which as a clitic, needs prosodic support. As for XP-*li*, it is assumed that the XP element moves to SpecCP where it meets its focus features.
Referring back to the representation in (16) below, we can observe the particle in C° and the verb that has already risen in order to receive [+interrogative] by the particle by right adjunction. As we can see, the resulting li-V order in (16) is not possible in Bulgarian. Following Rudin et al. (1999) in this moment the mechanism of the Prosodic Inversion occurs as in (16.1). According to this mechanism, prosodically deficient elements move to their right and can obtain prosodic support. So, li moves to the right of the verb and consequently can obtain the order V-li.

\[
\begin{align*}
(16) & \quad \text{CP} \\
& \quad \text{Spec} \\
& \quad C' \\
& \quad C° \quad \text{IP} \\
& \quad li + V \quad ......
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
(16.1) & \quad \text{CP} \\
& \quad \text{Spec} \\
& \quad C' \\
& \quad C° \quad \text{IP} \\
& \quad li + V \quad ......
\end{align*}
\]

Although, I accept the strong clitic characteristics of the particle, I do not think that Prosodic Inversion is the mechanism responsible for the placement of the particle. One of the arguments against the Prosodic Inversion may be the fact that, as already demonstrated in the previous chapter, li is perfectly flexible and it has the ability to occur in different positions, even in a final one as in the example (81) below. As pointed out by Dukova-Zheleva (2010), the proposed Prosodic Inversion may be suitable for languages like Serbian-Croatian in which the particle obeys the second-position requirement, but this is not the case in Bulgarian. Following Helpern’s definition (1995), li-final does not correspond with the idea of being
moved through Prosodic Inversion. Consider the possible occurrences of the particle in the examples (79-82):

(79) Kupi li knigata?
     \textit{Bought Q the book}
     ‘Did you buy the book?’

(80) Knigata li kupi?
     \textit{The book Q bought}
     ‘Did you buy the book (or the newspaper)?’ / ‘Was it the book that you bought?’

(81) Knigata kupi li?
     \textit{The book bought-3p.pl Q}
     ‘As for the book, did you/he/she buy it?’

(82) Koj li kupi knigata?
     \textit{Who Q bought-3p.pl. the book}
     ‘I am wondering who bought the book?’

Furthermore, it is easy to demonstrate that the particle has the capacity of occurring and focusing on even another clitic, which is the case of the copula verb \textit{sŭm} ‘to be’\textsuperscript{11} (the capital letters in the example below indicate high stress).

(83) Toj E li dobŭr president?
     \textit{He is Q good president}
     ‘Is he a good president? (or isn’t)’

In my view, the ability of the particle to cliticize onto another prosodically deficient element, which is the copula \emph{e} ‘is,’ can be considered as an argument against the assumption that the Prosodic Inversion mechanism is responsible for the formation of the Bulgarian yes-no questions (Rudin (1997) and Rudin et al. (1999). Furthermore, if I assume that \emph{li} is generated in C this will lead to its interpretation as a complementizer. If I assume that the

\textsuperscript{11} As it has been referred above present perfect auxiliary \textit{sŭm} ‘to be’ is considered a clitic.
particle is a complementizer, this would mean that it will be able to have a scope over the entire clause, which is not the case, given its specific interpretation.

According to this hypothesis, it is not the particle that follows the stressed element of the sentence, it is the element, providing a host for the particle that receives a prosodic stress as a consequence of li’s features. In other words, my argument is that the interrogative and focal particle li is merged in a projection (let us suppose Focº) and that the focused element moves afterwards to the Specifier position in order to receive [+interrogative] and [+focus] features. In my view, the example in (83) can be considered support for this hypothesis. If the auxiliary is prosodically deficient, being a clitic itself, it is exactly a consequence from li’s properties that e ‘is’ receives high prosodic stress. I suggest here that the sentence in (83) clearly represents an example of the interaction between syntax, pragmatics and prosody.

Considering the example in (83), we can see that the copula can be treated in a different way than expected. It can receive focus directly from the particle as an enclitic. The example in (84), however, represents a yes-no question with an identical interpretation as the one in (83):

(84) Toj dobūr president li e?

He good president Q is

‘Is he a good president? (Or a bad one)’

The difference between (83) and (84) is in the position of the particle, which in the case of example (83), is attached to the copula and is also a clitic in Bulgarian. This can serve as additional argument against the mechanism of Prosodic Inversion. In (84) the particle encliticizes to the DP dobūr president ‘good president’ and has a scope over the entire DP, not only on the noun president ‘president’ or on the adjective dobūr ‘good’. Dobūr president ‘good president’ represents the predicative of the small clause.

Another difference between (83) and (84) is that the focused copula brings more emphatic interpretation to the sentence, which in my opinion results from the fact that the copula verb is not usually focused. The example in (84) can lead to the indication that because of the “impossibility” of the copula sūm ‘to be’ to predicate, the question is automatically orientated to the predicative of the small clause, i.e. dobūr president ‘good president’. Here, I will make the point that the sentence in (83) is characteristic of oral speech and its use here can be considered even emphatic.
The example in (83), illustrating cliticization to the copula, once again shows, not only that the phonologic exigencies of the particle are not responsible for its placement, but also that the speakers manage to arrange a way in which to emphasize the focus that is presented in the case of (84) by default. According to my hypothesis this means, that copula verbs are always focused, even if \textit{li} is directly attached to the predicative. The difference, between (83) and (84) consists of the fact that copula+\textit{li} brings more emphasis on the question. Here it is useful to recall example (31d) from section 1.3.1, Chapter 1 (here under (85)) that presents a similar situation for Serbian-Croatian and how \textit{li} cliticizes to the stressed auxiliary verb JE ‘to be-3p.sg’:

\begin{equation}
(85) \quad \textbf{JE li on došao?} \\
\quad \text{aux.3SG Q he come.PART} \\
\quad \text{‘Has he come?’}
\end{equation}

Therefore, I suggest that, in contrast to the distinction traditionally made about the two versions of \textit{li}: \textit{V-li} being neutral and \textit{XP-li}, being focused, there is only one version of the particle, \textit{V} and \textit{XP+li}, which is [+interrogative] and [+focus].

The argument against the complementizer nature of the particle and its focus features is also made in Dukova-Zheleva’s (2010) work, which is based on a previous works by Lambova (2001, 2004) and Izvorski (1995). The work argues for a clause-internal focal position, situated below \textit{C°}. The particle \textit{li} is considered a “focus-sensitive question operator,” \textit{dali} is seen as an interrogative complementizer, it is assumed that wh-words in Bulgarian move to a specifier position of a focal phrase. The following syntactic derivation is proposed:

\begin{equation}
(86)
\end{equation}
The syntactic analysis proposed above suggests a unified structure for all the interrogatives in Bulgarian and gives a correct prediction for the possibility of the particle to occur with wh-elements. This analysis demonstrates the splitting of the wh-cluster, given the order of the wh-words and also the relation between the focus feature and the wh-element. Assuming that the particle *li* can only be positioned after all the wh-constituents, both projections that serve as landing sites for wh-words precede the Focus projection where *li* is situated.

Returning to the hypothesis proposed in this thesis, I suggest that:

(i) the mechanism of the Prosodic Inversion is not responsible for *li*’s placement, i.e. the fact that the particle is a clitic that needs prosodic support in the sentence is not the only factor that conditions its occurrences;

(ii) the particle assigns focus on the preceding constituent independently from it if this is a Verb or another XP different from the verb;

As already demonstrated above, the suggestion made in (ii) is supported by data illustrating focused copula verb. Further arguments for the assumption in (ii) can be found in the Bulgarian responsive system. Typically a yes-no question presupposes a yes-no answer, being the yes-answer the affirmative and the no-answer the negative. Some languages, like Bulgarian and Portuguese, also accept a verbal answer.12 Bulgarian also is a language that accepts a pronoun answer and even an adverb answer, being more restricted in this type of use. Let us consider the examples below:

(87) A: Dade li mu knigata?
   *Gave-2p.sg. Q him the book*
   ‘Did you give him the book?’
   ‘Yes.’
 b. Ne.
   ‘No.’
c. Dadoh mu ja.
   *Gave-1p.sg. him it*
d. * Dadoh

---

12 Portuguese is a language for which the verbal answer is more neutral one. See Martins (2012)
Gave-1p.sg.

e. Dadoh mu ja, dadoh mu ja
    Gave-1p.sg. him it Gave-1p.sg. him it
f. * Knigata, knigata.
    The book, the book

(88) A: Včera li kupi kolata?
    Yesterday Q bought-2p.sg. the car
    ‘Did you buy the car yesterday?’
    ‘Yes.’
b. Včera.
    Yesterday
c. Včera, včera
    Yesterday, yesterday
d.*Kupi, kupi
    Bought, bought
e. * Kolata, kolata
    the car, the car

(89) A: Toj li kaza istinata?
    He Q told the truth
    ‘Did he tell the truth?’ or ‘Was he the person who told the truth?’
    ‘Yes.’
b. Toj.
    he
c. Toj, toj
    he, he
d. * Kaza, kaza
    Told, told
The main argument that we can use here is represented by the V or XP reduplication structures. In my opinion these characteristics of the Bulgarian answering system are a consequence of the focal nature of the particle li, which differentiates contrastingly the focused constituent, XP or VP or TP. Here, I adopt the generalization made in Martins (2012) according to which the verb reduplication mechanism is only possible in languages that have V-to-C movement or V-to-Σ movement. The category Σ represents a projection with strong polar features, as proposed in Laka (1990).

The questions in (87), (88) and (89) represent all li-interrogatives, in which the element preceding the particle is a verb, an adverb and a pronoun respectively. Using these three examples, I compare directly verb-li questions with XP-li questions in a question-answer context.

In (88) and (89), it can be observed that the element preceding the particle can also be present in the answer and even can be duplicated for more emphasis. All (87f.), (88d.), (88e.), (89d.) and (89e.) show that no other element, except the focused one, can represent an answer (all of them are marked by * which indicates their ungrammaticality).

As shown by the examples in (88b.) and (88c.) the adverb včera ‘yesterday’ can form the answer, and even can be duplicated, as in (88c.). The same cannot happen in case of the verb (as in 88d.), nor in case of the direct object (as in (88e.)). In example (89) the pronoun toj ‘he’ is the focused XP element and consequently the answers in (89b.) and (89c.) it appears as the focused element alone, or duplicated.

Therefore, the answer model in (88) and (89) is identical - the focused constituent i.e. the constituent preceding the particle is the only one that can serve as a legitimate answer and the one that can be even duplicated for further emphasis (except adverbial da ‘yes’ and ne ‘no’ answers). This, of course can be assumed to be predictable, given the fact that the constituent preceding li is a XP, i.e. it involves focus.

Interestingly one can assume the example in (87). Consider that in (87) the element preceding the particle is the verb dadoh ‘gave’:

---

13 This work assumes the denomination TP. However IP is kept as a reference to other works in which it is used.
(87) A: Dade li mu knigata?

   *Gave-2p.sg. Q him the book*

   ‘Did you give him the book?’

   ‘Yes.’

 b. Ne.
   ‘No.’

 c. Dadoh mu ja.
    *Gave-1p.sg. him it*

 d. * Dadoh
    *Gave-1p.sg.*

 e. Dadoh mu ja, dadoh mu ja.
    *Gave-1p.sg. him it Gave-1p.sg. him it*

 f. * Knigata, knigata.

   *The book, the book*

Here the same response pattern can be noted as in (88) and (89) - the element preceding *li* can also represent the answer and can be even duplicated, just like the adverbial answers *da* ‘yes’ and *ne* ‘no’.

In my view, the fact that a V or XP answer exists and more importantly the reduplication of the V or XP supports the idea that the element preceding the particle is always focused, even if this element is the verb. It is important to notice the mandatory presence of the clitic cluster represented in (87d.), which supports the view that the Bulgarian language is less discourse-oriented.

As for the prosodic aspects of V or XP reduplication, it is important to mention the lack of a prosodic pause and the increasing intonation, which suggests that we are not dealing with a simple phrase repetition. In case of the European Portuguese, on the other hand, the verb reduplication can be also used in a context of positive disagreement, making the XP reduplication impossible:

(90) [A] a. O João não comprou o carro, pois não? / comprou?

   the J. not bought the car *POIS-CONFIRMATIVE no / bought

   „John didn’t buy the car, did he?”

To summarize this section I maintain that, contrary to what has been previously shown, V-\textit{li} constructions involve focus. In my analysis I have considered evidence against the Prosodic Inversion mechanism and introduced further examples taken from the Bulgarian responsive system, which represents an argument for \textit{li}’s focal features in its combination with V. Furthermore, I have shown evidence involving copula verb + \textit{li} that can lead to the conclusion that the copula verbs in a yes-no question are \textit{li}-focused by default.

\section*{2.2.2 The particle \textit{li} in its combination with XP or V – analysis}

The second context in which the particle can occur is as an enclitic to a XP different from the verb. As discussed above I argue for a unified approach according to which \textit{li} always involves focus and interrogative features i.e. V-\textit{li} and XP-\textit{li} are both focused. In this work I assume that XP-\textit{li} and V-\textit{li} constructions are both characterized by their focal features. In this subpart, I will discuss some recent proposals in the literature regarding this phenomenon and I will put forward a hypothesis for a unified XP/V-\textit{li} analysis.

First, consider some examples representing XP-\textit{li} constructions:

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textbf{(91)} Knigata li kupi?
    \begin{quote}
      The book \textit{Q} bought
    \end{quote}
    ‘Did you buy the book (or the newspaper)?’ / ‘Was it the book that you bought?’
  \item \textbf{(92)} Včera li kupi knigata?
    \begin{quote}
      Yesterday \textit{Q} bought the book?
    \end{quote}
    ‘Did you buy the book yesterday?’
  \item \textbf{(93)} Interesna li beše knigata?
    \begin{quote}
      Interesting \textit{Q} was the book
    \end{quote}
    ‘Was the book interesting?’
\end{itemize}
(94) Ot knižarnitza Helikon li kupi knigata?

*From the Helikon bookshop Q bought the book*

‘Did you buy the book from the bookshop Helikon?’

The examples (91) to (94) illustrate that different XP can also occur in the *li*-host position. The interpretation of all of them includes contrastive focus, the rest of the sentence being presupposed information. In my view the contrastive or the identificational focus here is a result from the exhaustiveness of the element preceding *li*. In terms of Kiss (1998) the element carrier of contrastive focus values is marked by [+exhaustive], which according to this paper is the basis for the yes-no questions.

Each of the yes-no questions above represent a focused part of the next declarative sentence:

(95) Včera kupi interesna kniga ot knižarnitza Helikon.

*Yesterday bought-2p/3p.sg. interesting book from bookshop Helikon*

‘Yesterday you/he/she bought an interesting book from the bookshop Helikon’

The example in (95) shows that a declarative acquires an interrogative interpretation only when *li* is present. The possible positions of the particle stand for a different focal interpretation and have the same interrogative features.

Considering Rizzi’s (1997) Split-CP-Hypothesis, my analysis of the particle *li* (in 96) argues for both interrogative and focal features (the proposal in (96) corresponds to the example in (91) repeated below). In my view, the particle should occupy Focº, being the focused element in SpecFocP:

(91) Knigata li kupi?

*The book Q bought*

‘Did you buy the book (or the newspaper)?’ / ‘Was it the book that you bought?’
My idea is that the particle is generated by Merge in \( \text{Foc}^o \) and the element that serves as a host is moved to SpecFocP in order to check its \([+Q]\) and \([+\text{Foc}]\) features. I assume that in this projection \( li \) has the capacity to check its features (both focal and interrogative). Miyagawa (2010) considers wh-questions as focus constructions, which have interrogative features on C. The following definition for wh-questions is assumed:

*A focus probe merges on the question C. It enters into Agree with the focus feature of the closest wh-phrase.*

Miyagawa (2010:128)

Here I believe that there exists a strong relation between the focus and the interrogativity and I assume that the Bulgarian \( li \)-particle mandatorily provides interrogative features, a fact supported by its occurrence in interrogative sentences only. In Laka (1990) and Martins (1994), it is furthermore assumed that \( \Sigma P \) is the locus of interrogative and focus licensing.
Similarly, this analysis will look into the V-li and also in the PP-li, AdjP-li, AdvP-li constructions. The syntactic derivation in (92.1), (93.1) and (94.1) corresponds to the examples in (92), (93) and (94):

(92) Včera li kupi knigata?

Yesterday \(Q\) bought the book?

‘Did you buy the book yesterday?’

(92.1) [TopP [Top’ [FocP včera ti [Foc’ li [FinP…kupi knigata ti

\[
\text{yesterday } Q \text{ bought the book}
\]

(93) Interesna li beše knigata?

Interesting \(Q\) was the book

‘Was the book interesting?’

(93.1) [TopP [Top’ [FocP interesna ti [Foc’ li [FinP…beše ti knigata

\[
\text{Interesting } Q \text{ was the book}
\]

(94) Ot knižarnitza Helikon li kupi knigata?

From the Helikon bookshop \(Q\) bought the book

‘Did you buy the book from the bookshop Helikon?’

(94.1) [TopP [Top’ [FocP ot knižarnitza Helikon ti [Foc’ li [FinP…kupi knigata ti

\[
\text{From the Helikon bookshop } Q \text{ bought the book}
\]

It is also helpful to observe the extraction of an element from a complex DP like interesna kniga ‘interesting book’. Notice the differences between (97) and (98):

(97) Interesna kniga li četeš?

Interesting book \(Q\) read-2p.sg.

‘Are you reading an interesting book?’

(98) Interesna li kniga četeš?

Interesting \(Q\) book read-2p.sg.

‘Is the book that you are reading interesting?’
In (97) the entire DP *interesna kniga* ‘interesting book’ is in *li*-left position, i.e., according to my hypothesis the entire DP in this example should be focused. In my view, the sentence in (97), should be presented in the following way:

(97.1) [TopP [Top’ [FocP *interesna kniga* ti [Foc’ li [FinP… četeš ti

The example in (98), on the other hand, shows a situation in which only one of the components of the complex DP is focused (in *li*-left position). The adjective *interesna* ‘interesting’. *Knigata* ‘the book’ is then assumed to be a topic, something that further will coincide with the interpretation of the sentence. The question in (98) presents a situation in which the speaker has already known that its interlocutor is reading a book and thus he is asking if the book is interesting or not. The analysis of (98) should be similar to (98.1) in which *interesna* ‘interesting’ is still present in the Specifier position, while *kniga* ‘book’ is considered a topic:

(98.1) [TopP [Top’ [FocP *interesna* ti [Foc’ li [TopP *kniga* ti [Top’ [FinP… četeš ti ti

Moreover, regarding the context of focused complex DPs, we can recall here what was demonstrated and assumed from the examples from Schwabe (2004), discussed in Chapter 1, section 1.3.1:

(50) a. [NovataF zelenaF RIZAF]i F li ti podarij Krasi tj ti?
   new.DEF green shirt Q you.DAT gave.3SG Krasi
   ‘Is it the new green shirt that Krasi has given to you?’

b. [Novata [ZELENA]F li riza]i ti podarij Krasi tj ti?
   new.DEF green Q shirt you.DAT gave.3SG Krasi
   ‘Is the new shirt that Krasi has given to you green?’

c. [[NOVATA]F li zelena riza] i ti podarij Krasi tj ti?
   new.DEF Q green shirt you.DAT gave.3SG Krasi
   ‘Is the green shirt that Krasi has given to you new?’

51
The example in (50) shows that when the entire complex DP preceds the particle, as in (50a), a focus feature $F(\text{ocus})$ is assigned to all of its elements, while if $li$ is located within the DP complex only the element directly preceding the particle is $F(\text{ocus})$ marked, as in (50b-c).

As we can see, according to Schwabe (2004) high stress (marked by capital letters) is assigned only to the constituent directly followed by the particle, which, in my view, is another example for the interaction between syntax and prosody.

Schwabe’s (2004) syntactic analysis of the particle $li$ across the Slavic languages proposes a slight modification of the Rizzi’s Split-CP-Hypothesis. In Schwabe’s view there exists a functional head, higher than ForceP that hosts frame setting topics:

\[ \text{FrameP} > \text{ForceP} > \text{TopP} > \text{FocP} > \ldots > \text{VP} \]

The topics situated in the Frame are independent from the sentence type that is why the FrameP dominates the ForceP. As already shown in section 1.3.1, Chapter 1 the main goal of Schwabe’s work is to study the different positions of the particle, distinguishing two types of $li$ positions - V-$li$ and XP-$li$. Schwabe distinguishes two basic groups of languages that behave differently with respect to $li$’s placement - Russian and Serbian-Croatian, on one hand, and Bulgarian and Macedonian, on the other.

For the first group of Slavic languages, the author considers that $li$ is situated and generated in Forceº because of the different position of the particle in its combination with participle and auxiliary clitics. In Russian the clitic nature of $li$ presupposes that it needs as a host, a phonological word. If the host is located on the right side, cliticization must occur via the Prosodic Inversion (PI) so $li$ cliticizes into the verb which is in Tº, as in example (99):

(99) Čitaet $li$ on knigu?

*Read-3p.sg Q he book.acc*

‘Is he reading a book?’
As for Serbian-Croatian, it is assumed that the combination V-\(lí\) is in Force\(º\). Here, similar to Russian the mechanism of prosodic inversion is considered as a result of the assumption that „Prosodic Support (PS) prevents spelling out the highest clitic copies since they don’t have any host”\(^\text{1}\). This is illustrated in the example (100) below:

(100) \(\text{Daješ } lí \text{ mu ih vscai dan?}\)

*Give-2p.sg. Q him.dat. them.acc every day*

‘Do you give them to him every day?’

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{ForceP} \\
\text{lí} \\
\text{AgrSP} \\
\text{AgrS'} \\
\text{AgrIOp} \\
\text{mu-ih} \\
\text{daješ} \\
\text{mu ih daješ}
\end{array}
\]

According to Schwabe (2004) \(lí\) cliticizes onto the verb (recall that in Serbian-Croatian the particle cannot cliticize onto a participle) through Prosodic Inversion:

(101)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{lí } \{\text{daješ}\} \text{C } \text{mu ih} \\
\{\{\text{daješ}\} \text{C } \text{lí}\} \text{C } \text{mu ih} \\
\{\{\text{daješ}\} \text{C } \text{lí}\} \text{C } \text{mu ih}\}
\end{array}
\]

On the other hand, for Bulgarian and Macedonian she argues that \(lí\) is adjoined to V in T\(º\) and afterwards it is merged in Force\(º\). For these two languages the author assumes that because of the fact that in Bulgarian and Macedonian \(lí\) can cliticize onto a participle, it is not generated in Force\(º\). Actually, in Macedonian the clitics even cliticize onto the participle without the Prosodic Inversion, as they are proclitics and subject to the Pronounce Highest Copy mechanism. This process for Macedonian is demonstrated below:
In Bulgarian the Prosodic Support prevents the Pronounce the Highest Copy mechanism, so *li* is adjoined to V in T° and then moved to Force° in order to check its interrogative features:

Considering the second type of *li*-XP-*li* - the author continues to consider the two groups of languages. For Russian it is assumed that *li* manages to check its focus features in SpecFoc and it is then moved to ForceP to check its wh-features. This proposal has as an argument the fact that in Russian the participle can cliticize only onto the first focused phonological word.

In Bulgarian, the particle adjoins to the focus marked XP in SpecFocP, where it checks its focus features. Afterwards it is moved to Force° in order to check its interrogative features.

However, in my view, an analysis of this type does not take into account the cases in which the particle *li* occurs in the final position as in the example below:
(104) Kupi knigata li?

*Bought the book Q*

‘Did you buy the book?’/ ‘You bought THE BOOK?’

Using Schwabe’s analysis, an example like the one in (104) will represent a multiple filled SpecForceP:

(105) [ForceP [Force’ kupi knigata; li] [FinP kupi t; knigata t;]

On the other hand, if the verb kupi ‘bought’ is considered to be a Frame topic, this will be an even more complicated option because the projection FrameP, introduced in this analysis, takes into account the so called ‘frame setting topics’, which are ‘not affected by the sentence type and sentence mood’. The verb, being the predicative in this sentence, appears with certain difficulties in this definition:

(106) [FrameP kupi] [Frame’ [ForceP [Force’ knigata; li] [FinP kupi t; knigata t;]

My proposal for the cases in which the particle occurs in the final position will be discussed in the following section.

2.2.3 The particle *li* in the final position

*Li*’s final position is a case rarely considered as possible in the majority of linguistic analysis. If considered, *li*- final position is traditionally assumed to be a situation in which the entire phrase preceding the particle is focused. This analysis represents the logical consequence of *li*’s focal nature. If the material preceding *li* is focused, that means that in case of the particle being final, the entire phrase will be focused.

Here, I am not arguing against this proposal of the entire clause being focused, but I would like to present a different approach, based upon some interpretational characteristics. An important issue that we are dealing with in this type of sentences is the fact that on a pragmatic level they are more strongly related to the context. They cannot be an ‘opening line’ and are always preceded by another assertion or action. In my view, this is a sufficiently
strong argument that requires a different type of analysis. In other words, it is not sufficient to say that the entire phrase preceding *li* is focused.

Another difference can be found even on a structural level. What is the difference for example between (105) and (106):

(105) Ivan kupi li knigata?
    *Ivan bought Q the book*
    ‘Did Ivan buy the book?’

(106) Ivan kupi knigata li?
    *Ivan bought the book Q*
    ‘Did Ivan buy the book?’

If in (105) the name *Ivan* is a topicalized element this will mean that *kupi* ‘bought’, in (104) also represents a topic. This difference can be demonstrated more clearly by the examples (107) and (108) in which there are two (+human) elements that often causes a certain ambiguity:

(107) Ivan MARIJA li celuna?
    *Ivan Marija Q kissed*
    ‘Did Ivan kiss Marija?’

(108) Celuna MARIJA li Ivan?
    *Kissed Marija Q Ivan*
    ‘Did Ivan kiss Marija?’ or ‘Did Marija kiss Ivan?’

As illustrated by the examples above, in (107) the interpretation is the only one possible i.e. ‘Did Ivan kiss Marija?’, but in (108), the fact that not *Ivan* but *celuna* ‘kiss’ is in the Topic projection results in an ambiguous interpretation: ‘Did Ivan kiss Marija?’ or ‘Did Marija kiss Ivan?’ Notice that the ambiguity in (108) exists independently from the Focus assigned to the constituent *Marija*, this being the only focused element in the sentence. The focus on *Marija* is furthermore marked by high stress (capital letters here indicate high prosodic stress in both (107 and (108)). In my opinion the ambiguity here is related to the fact that topicalized subjects traditionally appear sentence-initially, which is not the case in (108). This is why in (108), where *Ivan*, the subject, can be interpreted as an object, *Marija* being the focused element, the subject of the sentence.
With these examples, I want to affirm my proposal for topic interpretation of the material that is not directly connected to the particle. Revising the pragmatic issues of the li-final structures, in my view the presuppositional material, which in general is all the material not focused by the particle, has stronger values by being topicalized and this is the way to insist on the presupposition features of the element(s) in a topic. Considering all mention above, I would like to propose the following analysis for the yes-no questions with li-final particle:

\[(109)\quad \text{[TopP} \text{Ivan kupi}[\text{Top}'][\text{FocP} \text{knigata}[\text{Foc'}li[\text{FinP}...]])] \]

\[\text{Ivan bought the book Q} \]

In the derivation proposed in (109), I assume that li is merged in Foc, knigata ‘the book’ is moved to Specifier position in order to check focus, which is assigned to it by the particle. Ivan and kupi ‘bought-3p.sg’ are moved to SpecTopP position as I assume that these are the topicalized elements of the sentence. A hypothesis for the analysis in (109) can be the one of the Remnant TP movement as in Kayne (1994, 1998) and Kayne and Pollock (1998) with the following representation in which TP is moved to the Specifier position of TopP, as shown in b.:

\[(109.1)\quad \text{a. [TopP Top'}[\text{FocP} \text{knigata}, [\text{Foc'}li[\text{TP} \text{Ivan kupi knigata, }])])] \]

\[\text{b. [TopP [TP} \text{Ivan kupi knigata, }k \text{ Top'}[\text{FocP} \text{knigata, } [\text{Foc'}li [\text{TP} \text{Ivan kupi knigata, }k ] ]])] \]

I will leave the question of the movement to SpecTopP for future work. However, notice that the topicalized material in (109) consists of just two elements - Ivan and kupi ‘bought-3p.sg’ – a fact that contributes to its acceptance. On the other hand, there is more lexical material preceding the particle in (110), thus (110) represents much heavier and difficult for processing construction:

\[(110)?\quad \text{Ivan včera včFNAC v tri sledobed kupi knigata li?} \]

\[\text{Ivan yesterday in FNAC at three afternoon bought the book Q} \]

‘Was it the book that Ivan bought yesterday at 3 in the afternoon in FNAC?’
However the phrase in (110) will be acceptable if the focused element *knigata* ‘the book’ appears sentence-initially, as in (111):

(111) Knigata li kupi Ivan včera văv FNAC v tri sledobed?

*The book Q bought Ivan yesterday in FNAC at three afternoon*

‘Was it the book that Ivan bought yesterday at 3 in the afternoon in FNAC?’

Here following the same examples from the responsive system a question can be raised. As I already used the question-answer context as a basic argument proving that the V-*li* combination is also a focused one, here, it is relevant to apply the same test. Let us consider the example in (112):

(112) A: Kupi knigata li?

*Bought-2p.sg. the book Q*

‘Did you buy the book?’ or ‘Was it the book what you bought?’


‘Yes.’

b. * Knigata.

*the book*

c. * Knigata, knigata

*the book, the book*

d. Kupih ja.

*Bought it-acc.*

The example above demonstrates that, in contrast to the examples in (87), (88) and (89) the element preceding directly the particle cannot represent an answer. Recall examples (87-89):

(87) A: Dade li mu knigata?

*Gave-2p.sg. Q him the book*

‘Did you give him the book?’


‘Yes.’

b. Ne.
‘No.’
c. Dadoh mu ja.
   * Gave-1p.sg. him it

d. * Dadoh
   * Gave-1p.sg.

e. Dadoh mu ja, dadoh mu ja.
   * Gave-1p.sg. him it Gave-1p.sg. him it

f. * Knigata, knigata.
   * The book, the book

(88)  A: Včera li kupi kolata?
   * Yesterday Q bought-2p.sg. the car
   ‘Did you buy the car yesterday?’

   ‘Yes.’

b. Včera.
   * Yesterday

c. Včera, včera
   * Yesterday, yesterday

d.*Kupi, kupi
   * Bought, bought

e. * Kolata, kolata
   * the car, the car

(89)  A: Toj li kaza istinata?
   * He Q told the truth
   ‘Did he tell the truth?’ or ‘Was he the person who told the truth?’

   ‘Yes.’

b. Toj.
   * he

c. Toj, toj
   * he, he
d. * Kaza, kaza  
*Told, told

e.* Istinata, istinata  
*the truth, the truth

On the other hand, the answer in (112d.) can be considered a proper answer. Even assuming, that the entire lexical material preceding the particle is focused, this asymmetry seems unusual, because knigata ‘the book’ is, as already mentioned, directly preceding the li element.

To summarize the subject of the li-final questions, I suggest an approach different to the traditional assumption according to which all the material preceding the particle is focused. In my opinion, the question here is that we have more topicalized elements (recall that SpecTopicP cannot be too heavy as in (110)).

2.2.4 The particle li as an enclitic to a wh-constituent

The forth type of li-position is the one in which the particle occurs as an enclitic to a wh-constituent or to one of the wh-elements if the case is Multiple Fronted Wh-Questions. As previously mentioned in Bulgarian wh-word(s) appear always sentence-initially, a result from wh-movement to C, and that wh-in-situ is not grammatical, as already illustrated in the examples (62-63) in section 1.3.4, Chapter 1:

(62)  Koj dojde?  
*Who came  
‘Who came?’

(63)  *Dojde koj?  
*Came who

Therefore, li is not responsible for licensing the wh-questions, but as it will be further explained, it can occur in this type of questions, modifying the interpretation and assigning focus to the wh-constituent. I assume that these cases are examples of non-standard wh-questions in terms of Obenauer (2004).
Starting with a formal description of wh-\textit{li} questions, these are typical for internal, monologue speech, representing a strong wondering, which derives from focusing the wh-element, and which often do not require an answer:

(113) Koj li dojde?
\textit{Who Q came}  
‘Who came?’ or ‘I am wondering who came’

The example in (113) is a sentence representing a consequence of a presuppositional context – the speaker heard that someone came, so he is wondering who this person is. The wh-\textit{li} question can be considered rhetorical (as in (114) and (115)):

(114) Koj li običa da plašta danāci? \hfill (Obenauer (2004))  
\textit{Who Q likes to pay-present3p.sg taxes}  
‘Who likes to pay taxes?’

(115) Kakvo li e napravil tozi pūt?  
\textit{What Q is do-past.participle this time}  
‘What did he do this time?’

One of the main characteristics of the wh-\textit{li} questions is their incompatibility with negative answers, a question discussed in works such as Ambar et al. (1998), Ambar (2000, 2003) about the wh-in-situ questions in Portuguese. If a standard wh-question as in (116) can receive an answer similar to (116B), this is not possible for the example in (116.1) and also for examples (114) or (115):

(116) A: Koj dojde?  
\textit{Who came}  
‘Who came?’

B: Nikoj.  
\textit{No one}  
‘No one.’

(116.1) A: Koj li dojde?  
\textit{Who Q came}
‘Who came?’ or ‘I am wondering who came’

B: *Nikoj.

No one

‘No one.’

However, I should highlight here that in contrast to (115) and (116.1), the example in (114) can actually receive a negative answer, but in my view, the negative answer for (114) is implicitly involved in the question itself, the question being rhetorical. On the other hand, (115) and (116.1) both represent a strong wondering, which will be labeled further according to the non-standard wh-questions’s definition in terms of Obenauer (2004).

Moreover the incompatibility with negative answers, in my view, makes the wh+li questions’ interpretation very similar to the wh-in-situ questions in French, which, as noted in Cheng & Rooryck (2000), are associated with a “strongly presupposed context”. In these questions, the situation is previously established, so a negative answer will be assumed unusual, given this a presupposed context.

Once the points in which the wh+li questions differ from the standard questions is established, we can assume that the wh+li questions deserve a special treatment. To the best of my knowledge, generative linguists have not studied these structures in any great detail. What has been traditionally considered is that the wh-element in these structures also receives focal interpretation, because it is a host for the interrogative and focal particle li. Considering this assumption here, the question that arises is, is it really focus that we are considering for the type of questions and if so, what kind will it be.

Considering wh+li question a non-standard type of question or non-pure in terms of Ambar (2003), in my analysis I follow the approach of Obenauer (2004) in which the author makes a distinction between three different types of non-standard wh-questions - cannot-find-the-value-for-x questions, rhetorical questions and surprise/disapproval questions.

According to Obenauer’s proposal in the first type the speaker cannot find a value for the variable with which the wh-element makes a relation. As for the second type, rhetorical questions do not ask for information, in contrast to the third type – surprise/disapproval questions in which an evaluation has been made. Considering the author’s distinction, we can see that the Bulgarian wh+li questions can be incorporated into the first two types, depending on the context (see example (114) and (116.1)). On the other hand, they cannot represent a surprise/disapproval question. I believe that the presence of the particle prevents this interpretation and the question receives the interpretation of rhetorical questions or cannot-
find-the-value-for-x questions. Considering the examples in (114) and (116.1), we can furthermore find that the example in (114) can maintain its rhetorical interpretation even without the presence of the particle *li*:

(114) Koj li običa da plašta danaci? (Obenauer (2004))

*Who Q likes to pay-present3p.sg taxes*

‘Who likes to pay taxes?’

(114.1) Koj običa da plašta danaci?

*Who likes to pay-present3p.sg taxes*

‘Who likes to pay taxes?’

I believe that the occurrence of the particle in the example (114) results in a stronger emphatic interpretation of the rhetorical question, which maintains its rhetorical values by default, i.e. the particle in (114) does not license the rhetorical interpretation.

Having in mind the examples above, I can assume that the wh-*li* questions are cannot-find-the-value-for-x questions. Obenauer (2004) defines this type of non-standard wh-questions considering examples from Pagotto, where it is observed ‘higher rising’ of the wh-element that appears sentence-initially:

(117) *L’ à- tu catà andé?*  
*cl have-cl found where*  
‘Where did you find it?’

(118) *Andé l’à- tu catà?*  
*where cl have-cl found*  
‘Where (the hell) did you find it?’

The examples above show that while in (117) the wh-element appears sentence-finally and consequently the interpretation is wh-standard, in (118), where the wh-element *Andé* ‘where’ occurs sentence-initially, the interpretation is not the standard one. Just as in the case of Bulgarian wh-*li* questions, in (118) ‘the speaker expresses that he is unable to come up with a (plausible, acceptable) value, though he has tried to find one (or more).’ As explained in Obenauer (2004), cannot-find-the-value-for-x questions can be defined as some kind of “thinking aloud” and “putting the question to oneself rather than to an interlocutor.”
With respect to the surprise/disapproval questions, we can refer to the examples in (119) and (120). In (119) there is a standard wh-question, while in (120) it is a wh-*li* question. I want to highlight here the fact that, while (120) cannot serve as an example for any kind of evaluation, the example in (119) can. The example in (119), which is, once again a standard question, can be assumed as a surprise/disapproval question if a high stress on the wh-element and a rising intonation (although typical for all wh-questions and thus not considered as a criteria) are present. I suggest that this is not possible for the example in (120) and (121) - a consequence from *li*’s features:

(119) KAKVO jadeš?!  
*what eat-*2p.sg.present.*  
‘What are you eating?!’

(120) ?? Kakvo li jadeš?  
*What Q eat-*2p.sg.present*  
‘What are you eating?’

(121) ?? KAKVO li jadeš?  
*What Q eat-*2p.sg.present*  
‘What are you eating?’

In respect to the non-standard Wh-questions, I will consider the distinction made in Ambar (2003), in which the author argues for two types of echo: *full echo* and *echo-flavor*. The former being described as ‘lack of a full blown interrogative interpretation, though not all properties (contrarily to full echo, they are still questions)’. In my view, the situation in the Bulgarian wh+*li* questions can be described as an example for *echo-flavor* because they do not stop being a request for an identification of a variable. The presence of the particle *li* turns the values of the presupposed information (i.e. the right periphery of the sentence) stronger, encliticizing to the wh-element. I will assume that there are some similarities between wh+*li* structures and wh-question with the complementizer *hogy* in Hungarian, referred to in Ambar’s work, which also lacks a full-blown interrogative reading:

(122) Hogy mennyi pénzt fizettem ki ezért a házért?  
*That how_many money_ACC paid1psg_part this_for art house_for*
Thus, in my proposal for analyzing wh+li questions in Bulgarian, I will adopt Ambar’s proposal for Split-CP in which the author considers two different types of projections related to two different aspects of Discourse, the Common Ground and the Universe of Discourse. Both of these domains represent the information shared by the speaker and listener but differ by the fact that “only in the latter the information is defined by the Universe of Discourse itself”. In other words, it is in the domain of the Universe of Discourse where the utterance receives a value by the interaction with the interlocutor. The following functional projections are presented:

- **Common AssertiveP** – that accounts for presupposed information
- **Ground EvaluativeP** – that accounts for the evaluations made by the speaker

- **Universe Focus**
- **Of XP**
- **Discourse WhP**

Therefore, considering Ambar’s analysis, I propose that, as the Hungarian hogy, Bulgarian li checks assertive by merge, which is followed by a further movement of the wh-element from WhP to SpecAssertiveP in order to receive the echo-flavor interpretation by the particle li:

(123) (i) [AssertiveP[Assertive’ li[XP[WhP Koj, [Wh’[FocP[Foc’[XP[IP dojde t_i]]]]]]]]]

(ii) [AssertiveP Koj, [Assertive’ li[XP[WhP t_i [Wh’[FocP[Foc’[XP[IP dojde ]]]]]]]]]

### 2.2.5 Embedded clauses

As already indicated in the introduction to this chapter, I will provide an analysis for Bulgarian’s embedded clauses. Embedded clauses in Bulgarian are traditionally considered to include the complementizer dali. Interestingly, the interrogative particle li can have an embedded character.
In Chapter 1 I distinguished *dali*-interrogatives as a type of yes-no questions that exist in the Bulgarian language. I also demonstrated that *dali*-questions and *li*-questions differ not only structurally but also from interpretational point of view. *Dali*-questions are considered to be an indirect request for information, as a simple wondering that often does not receive an answer. On the other hand *li*-questions, in their V-*li*, XP-*li* or *li*-final variants, are true questions. Consider the examples in (124) and (125):

(124) Dali iska da dojde?

*Whether wants to come*

‘Does he want to come?’ or ‘I am wondering if he wants to come?’

(125) Iska li da dojde?

*Wants Q to come*

‘Does he want to come?’

The examples in (124) and (125) differ in that in (124) an answer is not necessary, the sentence could be interpreted as embedded under a silent operator. The example in (125) is a true yes-no question and asks for information. The indirect nuance in (124) is, in my view, explainable given the complementizer nature of *dali*. The examples in (126) and (127), on the other hand are examples of embedded clauses, which in (126) include the complementizer *dali* and in (127) the particle *li*:

(126) Popitah dali šte dojdeš s men.

*Asked-1p.sg. if will come-2p.sg. with me*

‘I asked if you are coming with me.’ or ‘I asked whether you are coming with me or not.’

(127) Popitah šte dojdeš li s men.

*Asked-1p.sg. will come-2p.sg. Q with me*

‘I asked if you are coming with me.’ or ‘I asked whether are you coming with me or not.’

From an interpretational point of view, the difference between (126) and (127) is very subtle. Native speakers’ opinions differ, assuming that the construction in (126) is more
natural and grammatical. The second option, presented in (127) is defined as a repetition of a previously made question, as shown in (128):

(128)  A: Šte doideš li s men?
       \textit{Will come-2p.sg. \textit{Q} with me}
       ‘Are you coming with me?’ or ‘Will you come with me?’
B: Kakvo?
   ‘What?’
A: Popitah šte dojdeš li s men.
       \textit{Asked-1p.sg. will come-2p.sg. \textit{Q} with me}
       ‘I asked if you are coming with me.’ or ‘I asked whether are you coming with me or not.’

When analyzing \textit{dali} and \textit{li}-embedded clauses I adopt Rizzi’s work (1999) in which the author introduces the Int(rogative) projection that represents a distinct position for the complementizers.

In examples (129) and (130) I assume that the complementizer \textit{dali} is in Int, a position that suggests the possibility to be preceded by a TopicP (as in (129) where \textit{na Ivan} ‘to Ivan’ is a topic) and be followed by a FocusP (as in (130) where \textit{na Ivan} ‘to Ivan’ represents a focused element):

(129)  Popitah na Ivan dali dade knigata
       \textit{Asked-1p.sg. to Ivan COMP gave-2p/3p.sg the book}
       ‘I asked if you/he/she gave the book to Ivan.’
(130)  Popitah dali na Ivan dade knigata.
       \textit{Asked-1p.sg. COMP to Ivan gave-2p/3p.sg the book}
       ‘I asked if it was to Ivan that you/he/she gave the book’

In the following distributional analysis (131) and (132) would correspond to the examples in (129) and (130):

(131)  \[\text{Top na Ivan\text{[Top' [Int..[Int’dali[Foc[Foc'[TP dade knigata na Ivan]]]]]]]]}\]
(132)  \[\text{Top..[Top’[Int..[Int’dali[Foc na Ivan, [Foc'[TP dade knigata na Ivan]]]]]]}\]
As can be observed in the examples (131) and (132) the complementizer *dali* can be preceded by a topic and can be followed by a focus. Let us recall that even in main clauses it can be followed by a focused element, different from the verb as in (133):

(133) Dali NA IVAN kazaha istinata?

`COMP to Ivan told-3p.pl. the truth`

‘Was it TO IVAN that they told the truth’

As discussed in chapter one and demonstrated in chapter two’s analysis, the interrogative particle *li* has not only interrogative but also focus features that transmit to the element on its left. I assume that the cases in which the focus/interrogative particle *li* appears, are cases where the particle continues to attribute focal features to the element in the specifier position:

(134) Popitah Ivan li pokaniha?

`Asked-1p.sg. Ivan Q invited-3p.pl.`

‘I asked if it was Ivan that they invited.”

For the example (134), I propose the representation (135) below:

(135) [Top..[Top’[Int..[Int’[Foc Ivan] [Foc’li [TP…pokaniha Ivan]]]]]]

As already explained, embedded clauses with *dali* or *li* seem to have a quite similar, identical interpretation. Although native speakers demonstrate a preference for the *dali*-type, *li*-embedded clauses are also acceptable. This preference can be explained by the empty Int projection in the case of the particle.

In this work, my main goal is to present an analysis for the different contexts in which the particle *li* can occur. Having as a priority *li*-questions and structures in which the particle appears, I will not provide, here an analysis for *dali*-question. I would argue that *dali*-questions should undergo the same analysis as *dali*-embedded clauses, the projection ForceP being filled by a silent question operator.

**Summary**

The second chapter of this work covers the nature of the interrogative particle *li* and the possible positions in which it can occur. The chapter is divided into four sections, where
each one has an objective on its own. My aim here is to demonstrate, that there are not two types of li-questions (neutral and focused), but just one always focused. This idea is based on evidence from the Bulgarian responsive system. The second aim is to provide a separate analysis for cases in which the particle occurs sentence-final or when it encliticizes to a wh-element. Finally, I provide a comparative study of embedded dali- and li-clauses assuming Rizzi’s (1999) proposal for the projection Int(errogative).

CHAPTER 3
YES-NO QUESTIONS IN EUROPEAN PORTUGUESE – A DESCRIPTION

The Portuguese yes-no questions have always been considered to have the same syntactic structure as the declaratives. Their interrogative features are only notable through the specific rising intonation. Similar to all interrogative phrases the Portuguese ones are considered by Mateus et al (2003), to be a direct act of speech which purpose is to ask for missing information. As I already established, they are characterized by the specific intonational curve, but can also involve some different word order, subject-verb inversion.

3.1 Word order

Let’s observe the examples\textsuperscript{14} below:

(136) O António telefonou.

\textit{Det. António called-3p.sg.}

‘António called.’

(137) O António telefonou?

\textit{Det. António called-3p.sg.}

‘Did António call?’

(138) Telefonou o António?

\textit{Called-3p.sg det. António}

\textsuperscript{14} Examples are sourced from MATEUS M.H.M., BRITO, A.M., DUARTE I., FARIA I.H., 2003 Gramática da Língua Portuguesa, CAMINHO, pag.461, chapter developed by Ana Maria Brito
‘Did António call?’

In these examples, some strategies for attributing focus features can be observed in the European Portuguese language. In examples (137) and (138), the subject-verb inversion implies some different interpretations of these two phrases. In example (137), the speaker is expecting António’s call, so here the entire phrase represents presuppositional information. On the other hand, the phrase in (138), involves focus. Here the speaker wants to know if the person who called was Antonio or someone else. In the case of (138), the call was actually made, while in (137) is expected.

In this respect, it is necessary to refer to the Portuguese syntactic literature (Duarte, 1996, 1997, Ambar, 1988, 1996, 1999), where it has been long established that different word orders represent different information structures.

In Costa (1998) there are examples demonstrating that in Portuguese, in the context of focus feature, new information appears to the right while information previously referred to in a discourse, appears in the left periphery. Costa (1998) shows the importance of word order with the examples below, given the specific context and constituent focused. Here are some examples provided by Costa (1998:195):

(139) **Object focused:**

A: O que é que o Paulo partiu?

What Paulo broke

B: **O Paulo partiu a janela.**

Paulo broke the window.

#Partiu o Paulo a janela.

#Partiu a janela o Paulo.

#A janela o Paulo partiu.

#A janela partiu o Paulo.

(140) **Sentence-focus:**

A: O que é que aconteceu?

What happened?

B: **O Paulo partiu a janela.**

Paulo broke the window.

#Partiu o Paulo a janela.
Partiu a janela o Paulo.
#A janela o Paulo partiu.
#A janela partiu o Paulo.

(141) Subject and object focused:
A: Ninguém partiu nada.
Noone broke anything
B: #O Paulo partiu a janela.
Paulo broke the window.
Partiu o Paulo a janela.
#Partiu a janela o Paulo.
#A janela o Paulo partiu.
#A janela partiu o Paulo.

(142) Subject is focused:
A: Quem é que partiu a janela?
Who broke the window
B: #O Paulo partiu a janela.
Paulo broke the window.
#Partiu o Paulo a janela.
Partiu (a janela) o Paulo.
#A janela o Paulo partiu.
#A janela partiu o Paulo.

Returning to the representation of the focus in the Portuguese yes-no questions, different ways of expressing it have been observed. Brito (2003) distinguishes a prosodic focus, as in (143), and a syntactically expressed one, as in (144) and (145) where there are two types of clefts:

(143) A Inês vai a Lisboa AMANHÃ?
Det. Ines goes to Lisbon tomorrow
‘Is Ines going to Lisbon tomorrow?’
3.2 Intonation and stress

Considering example (143), it is necessary to refer to a well-known and already established fact that there is a strong relation between focus and stress. According to Chomsky (1997) there are two types of relations between focus and prosody, summarized as The Nuclear Stress Rule and the Emphatic/Contrastive Stress.

A principle, proposed by Chomsky (1971) and Jackendoff (1972) and referred to in Zubizarreta (1998) as the Focus Prosody Correspondence Principle establishes the following:

‘The focused constituent (or F-marked constituent) of a phrase must contain the intonational nucleus of that phrase.’

This principle, as argued by Zubizarreta (1998), is responsible for locating the rhythmically most prominent word within the phrase, given the extension of the principle above, concerning German and Romance:

‘The F-marked constituent of the phrase must contain the rhythmically most prominent word within the phrase.’

Thus, the Nuclear Stress Rule is the one that governs the relation between focus and prosody.

As for the second rule, it is considered to result from the fact that not only lexical words can contain focus. Function and even subparts of the word can be focused too:
- I said CONfirmation (not AFFirmation).
- I said I drink my coffee WITH sugar (not WITHOUT sugar).

In Zubizarreta’s work (1998) the so-called contrastive stress is partly metagrammatical and partly focus related, given the fact that the main function of the contrastive stress is denying some part of the listener’s proposition. It is introduced as a variable and not as a value. The principle is defined as follows:

“A word with contrastive stress must be dominated by every F-marked constituent of the phrase.”

In the Syntactic literature concerning the relation between prosody and focus in Portuguese, Frota (1994, 1995) argues that the focus in Portuguese should be represented as a phonological category. This claim appears to be correct for example (100) in which a contrastive focus is present (capital letters indicate high stress). In her work on Syntax of Focus in Portuguese, Ambar (1996) assumes two types of criteria. They are classified according to how the information is introduced in the Universe of Discourse:

(i) contrastive focus – “the one where new information is viewed in contrast with other specific old or new information.”

(ii) presentation focus – “the one where the focused constituent simply introduces new information without contrasting it with any other type of information, either old, or new.”

On the other hand, and according to the specific properties exhibited by each construction, Ambar (1996) makes a further and a finer distinction in relation to how focus is formally expressed:

(iii) focal stress – “those in which just a marked focal stress is assigned to the focused element and no visible movement shows up – both the verb and the focused element appear in their canonical order.”
(iv) visible movement – “those in which, besides a particular stress assigned to the focus constituent, focus-licensing is crucially syntactic, i.e. movement is visible.”

In order to present this in a clearer way, consider the examples in (146), (147) and (148):

(146) A MÁRIA beijou o Pedro.
MARY kissed Peter

Contrastive focus, high stress on Maria,
exclusive/restrictive value

(147) A Maria beijou o Pedro.
Mary kissed Peter

Presentational focus, unmarked stress on the entire sentence,
exclusive/restrictive value

(148) A: Quem comeu a tarte?
Who ate the pie?

B: a. Comeu a Joana
Ate the Joana
b. A Joana....comeu.
Joana...ate

Presentational focus on subject – VS order
is required, unmarked stress

Contrastive focus, non-restrictive/non-
exclusive value, partial answer

The examples above represent a systematic classification of different criteria in order to make a clearer definition of the concept of focus and its specific properties in Portuguese.

As mentioned before, intonation has always been assumed to occupy a central place in the yes-no questions structure. According to Cheng’s and Rooryck’s (2000) work that examines French in-situ, there exists an intonation morpheme [Q:] which also licenses yes-no questions. This intonation morpheme, according to the authors, is realized as [Q: y/n] at LF and this underspecified morpheme verify Q-features in Cº. According to Cheng and Rooryck (2000) the presence of an intonation morpheme for yes-no questions and wh-in-situ questions leads to the assumption that they have the same structure. Ambar (2012, 2013), on the other hand, shows that for the Portuguese yes-no questions there exist adverbs, as sempre ‘always’ and lá ‘there’ that have a different behavior in the context of the yes-no questions. As for the last one, lá, it is an adverb that can have different readings – locative or negation among others. Ambar (2012, 2013) demonstrates that this adverb is incompatible with the yes-no questions but can appear in wh-in-situ. The fact that lá blocks the yes-no question cannot be
explained with its negation features, as this is not observed with other negation operators. All of these conclusions made by Ambar (2012, 2013), lead to the idea that the Portuguese yes-no questions are not licensed only by intonation.

3.3 Clefts

As for the clefts strategies for expressing focus, the European Portuguese has a large variation of clefts techniques, consisting of a large typology of clefts structures:

a) Clefts - Q
b) Basic Pseudo Clefts
c) Inverted Pseudo Clefts
d) Basic Semi-Pseudo Clefts
e) Inverted Pseudo Clefts with é que

According to Duarte (2003), all of the clefts structures are copula, in which the focused element is the predicate of a small clause as shown below:

(149) … ser [SmallCl [α] [SN]]

Duarte (2003) claims that α occupies the position of subject of the small clause, which is underspecified by copula and corresponds to a clause constituent which contains a null position, associated to an operator.

The examples below demonstrate the different types of clefts in Portuguese (a-d):

a) Foi o queijo o que o corvo comeu.
   
   was the cheese det. What the raven ate
   
   It was the cheese what the raven ate.  

   (Clefts – Q)

b) O que o corvo comeu foi o queijo.
   
   Det. what the raven ate was the cheese
   
   What the raven ate, was the cheese.

   (Basic Pseudo Clefts)

c) O queijo foi o que o corvo comeu.
   
   The cheese was det. what the raven ate
   
   The cheese was what the raven ate.

   (Inverted Pseudo Clefts)
d) O corvo comeu foi o queijo.
   The raven ate was the cheese.  
   What the raven ate was the cheese.  
   (Basic Semi-Pseudo Clefts)

e) O queijo é que o corvo comeu.
   The cheese is that the raven ate.
   The cheese is what the raven ate.
   (Inverted Pseudo Clefts with é que)

Duarte (2003) assumes that all the clefts techniques, illustrated above, have as a centre the focused clause element. She identifies this focus as a quantificational one, special for the clefts focus, i.e. it only serves for the identification of the operator or for the identification with exclusion, defined as a contrastive focus.

Two basic types of analysis have been proposed for the syntax of clefts strategies across languages:

(i) the cleft element is considered as a predicate of a sentential subject (Akmajian 1970; Frascarelli 2000; Costa & Duarte 2001);

(ii) the generated cleft element is a full clause starting as a subject or a completment of be, where it moves to a peripheral position (Emonds 1976; Chomsky 1977; Obenauer 1976, 1981 1994; Kiss 1996, Ambar, 2005).

The Portuguese language disposes of a large palette of cleft techniques as mentioned before. In the syntactic literature consigning the Portuguese clefts, two main types of approaches have been differentiated. One of them is covered by Costa & Duarte (2001), where the authors assume a unified approach to all types of clefts, all of them being treated as structures of identification type in which the copula chooses a small clause for a complement. Ambar (2005), on the other hand, presents evidence from tense and focus-topic relations in Portuguese clefts, attempting to describe relevant properties, especially, clefts and pseudo-clefts and argues for the movement of the cleft constituent from the full clause. In her work, two types of restrictions are taken into account:
(i) ‘the cleft constituent may precede the copula in Portuguese, but then the copula will always be 3rd person singular, present tense, irrespective of the tense in the embedded domain’, i.e. an agreement in the clefts leads to ungrammaticality, as shown in (150a), (150b) and (150c):

(150) a. O livro(s) é que o João comprou
    The book(s) is that the John bought
b. *O livro foi que o João comprou.
    The book was that the John bought
c. *Os livros são/foram que o João comprou.
    The books are/were that the John bought

(ii) “…in (pseudo-) clefts the tense in the copula has to be identical to the tense in the embedded lexical verb…” This restriction is shown below in (151a) and (151b):

(151) a. Foi o livro que o João comprou.
    Was the book that the John bought
b. * Foi o livro que o João vai comprar/comprará/comprava.
    Was the book that the John is going to buy/will buy/bought (imperfect)

A special attention is paid to the Basic-Semi-Pseudo Clefts (or that-less clefts in terms of Ambar (2005)). Here the same pattern is observed as in the regular clefts described in (i) i.e. the copula has to have the same tense as the lexical verb. These type of clefts are considered by various syntacticians as being a parts of different type of analysis, assumed to be derived from a deletion of the wh-pronoun (Kato & Raposo (1996)), by the mechanism of remnant IP movement (Ambar (2005)), or considered to involve non-maximal VPs (Costa & Duarte (2001)).

In terms of Ambar (2005) the presence of focus in these structures is assumed to derive from where their contrastive flavor. Ambar (1999) has argued for a TopicFocusP, a projection which head is considered to have two features – a topic and a focus. The former is checked by Event related elements, as the verb that rises to the head of the projection in an unmarked case and that leads to the presentational focus on the lexical element on the right of the verb. Under Ambar’s analysis the verb ser ‘be’ is assumed as a lexicalization of Tense.
When *ser* is tensed, it fills the head of the FocusP and lexicalizes, so that the focus feature is over the element in the FP domain.

Ambar (2005) argues against the analysis of the clefts as relative-like structures, showing differences between them - only clefts, not relatives, require a *tense matching condition*. This work aims to demonstrate the strong factor represented by the tense and the tense asymmetries, between the copula and the lexical verb.

### 3.4 Adverbs and quantifiers

Mateus et al. (2003:463, ex. (7-8)) identifies another type of yes-no questions in Portuguese, questions with *adverbial expressions or quantifiers*, as in (152) and (153):

(152) Vais a Lisboa de comboio?
    Go-2p.sg. to Lisbon by train
    Are you going to Lisbon by train?

(153) Estiveste em Lisboa muito tempo?
    Be-2p.sg.past in Lisbon much time
    Did you stay in Lisbon for a long time?

Considering (152), the adverbial expressions invoke delimitation, a restriction that puts focus on the adverbial expression. Example (153) is an example for a presentational focus in which the object appears in its base position.

As already mentioned in this chapter, the Portuguese adverbs can have different interpretations depending on their position. The example in (153) represents a quantifier expression, interpreted as focus, in contrast with (154) where the same expression acquires different interpretation in the context of an exclamation sentence:

(154) Muito tempo o João esteve em Lisboa!
    Much time the John stay-3p.sg.past in Lisbon

Referring to Ambar (1999) *muito tempo* ‘much time’ in example (154) should have an evaluative interpretation, moving to the specifier position of the projection EvaluativeP.
Ambar (2003) examines the behavior of another special adverb in comparing the European and the Brazilian Portuguese languages— the adverb *sempre* ‘always’. In European Portuguese, this adverb can have two interpretations – confirmative and temporal. In contrast, the Brazilian Portuguese disposes with the latter one – temporal. The sharp difference between the European and the Brazilian Portuguese is based, according to Ambar (2003), upon the fact that in the European Portuguese V-movement to CP is a possibility, while in the Brazilian Portuguese, this movement is generally not allowed.

Ambar (2008) further observes the behavior of *mesmo*, an adverb that can be interpreted as “really, definitely”, having a scope on the entire proposition, or interpreted as “even”, when its scope is on the element on its right, as shown in example (155), when comparing the European and Brazilian Portuguese:

(155) O João comprou mesmo o livro.
John bought really/even the book
‘John definitely bought the book.’
‘John bought even the book.’

The example in (155) is grammatical for both the European and the Brazilian Portuguese, both again having the two available for *mesmo* interpretations. However, the situation is different in examples (156) and (157), concerning the compatibility with wh-word in-situ:

(156) **European Portuguese** O João comprou mesmo o quê?
The John bought really what
‘John definitely bought what?’

**Brazilian Portuguese** * O João comprou mesmo o quê?

(157) **European Portuguese** * O João comprou o quê mesmo?
The John bought what really
‘John bought what definitely?’

**Brazilian Portuguese** O João comprou o quê mesmo?
What is suggested by the examples (156) and (157) is that the ambiguity described in (155) is lost, i.e. only the interpretation of \emph{mesmo} as ‘really, definitely’ is available. The examples (156) and (157) furthermore show the preference of the European Portuguese for the pre-wh-word position of the adverb \emph{mesmo}, in contrast to the Brazilian Portuguese, where the preferred position is the post-wh-word one.

In these two cases, the proposed derivation originates in the verb movement, possible for the European Portuguese, the verb being the one that pied-pipes the focus head to the projection AssertiveP. This derivation is not possible for the Brazilian Portuguese because of the absence of V-to-C movement:

\begin{equation}
\text{(158) [TopP o João} [AssertiveP comprou-mesmo} \_vm [WhP o quê} \_k [Wh \_tvm [FocusP \_tvm [XP [IP t\_j t\_v t\_k
\end{equation}

As for the Brazilian Portuguese, the strategy for the derivation proposed is through Remnant IP movement as shown in (159):

\begin{equation}
\text{(159) [AssertiveP [IP O João comprou} \_j [WhP o quê} \_i [Wh [FocusP mesmo[XP [IP t\_j ]]]]]
\end{equation}

Finally, Ambar’s work (2003, 2008) provides evidence for the unexpected behavior of some adverbs, highlighting the contrastively different nature of the two closely related languages, namely the European and the Brazilian Portuguese, as another evidence for the split nature of the CP domain.

\section*{3.5 Responsive system}

Another important component of the present description, taken into account when dealing with the Bulgarian yes-no questions in the previous chapter, is the Responsive system. There are different strategies for replying to a yes-no question across languages. The more commonly accepted ones are an affirmative or a negative adverb, respectively \emph{yes} or \emph{no} or through echoing the finite verb of the question, as shown in Martins (1994) for Portuguese.
Holmberg (2011) argues for a cross-linguistic unified approach, assuming that all answers to the yes-no questions obey the structure in (160)\(^{15}\):

\[(160) \text{yes Foc [IP …x…]}\]

According to the structure, presented above, IP contains a variable with two values – affirmative or negative, this value being assigned by the focused polarity expression. Holmberg (2011) assumes for the languages where a yes-no question is answered by echoing the finite verb that the verb moves to SpecFocP.

For Portuguese, the responsive system is characterized by the verb answering in the context of positive agreement or positive disagreement. A typology of the Portuguese Responsive system can be observed in Martins (2012). Her work demonstrates the properties of the Portuguese responsive system, and compares the European and the Brazilian answering systems, showing their different properties.

Martins (2012, ex. (11-14)) bases this work upon the dichotomies positive/negative and agreement/disagreement, classifying Portuguese as a language in which the adverb *sim* ‘yes’ obeys the some restrictions of use, being unable to express negative agreement, as shown below:

\[(161) \begin{align*} \text{A} & \text{ a. Ele hoje vai sair?} \\
& \text{he today goes go-out-INFIN} \\
& \text{„Is he going out today?”} \\
& \text{B} & \text{ b. Vai.} \\
& \text{go-3SG} \\
& \text{c. Sim.} \\
& \text{yes} \\
& \text{d. Não.} \\
& \text{no} \end{align*} \]

\[(162) \begin{align*} \text{A} & \text{ a. Ele hoje não vai sair?} \\
& \text{he today not goes go-out-INFIN} \\
& \text{„He is not going out today?”} \end{align*} \]

\(^{15}\)Holmberg (2011) page 1, example (1)
Summary:

In conclusion, this chapter aims to describe some central properties of the Portuguese yes-no questions such as the intonation, the word order and more specifically the subject-verb
inversion, the different types of cleft structures, the special features of some adverbs and examples from the responsive system. The Portuguese yes-no questions belong to a part of grammar where little research has been conducted. In this chapter, I attempt to investigate the question-focus relation and to pay special attention to previous studies concerning the focus in Portuguese. I will leave the responsive system (Martins, 1995, 2012, Holmberg, 2011) for further research, a future comparative study based on examples from Bulgarian and Portuguese. In the next chapter I will attempt a direct comparison of the Bulgarian and Portuguese yes-no questions centered around the topics of resemblance/dissemblance.

CHAPTER 4
BULGARIAN AND EUROPEAN PORTUGUESE – DRAWING A PARALLEL

The fourth chapter of this thesis will attempt to make a direct comparison of the yes-no questions in Bulgarian and Portuguese and to systematize everything examined so far in a clearer way. This is a difficult task, especially in choosing which criteria to be used. As demonstrated so far, Bulgarian and Portuguese differ crucially in the formation of a yes-no question. Given all the evidence shown previously, in this chapter, I will take the following steps to make a comparison:

(i) Intonation and stress, which continues to be the most important element in the formation of the Portuguese yes-no questions;

(ii) Word order and its relation to the focus: different strategies in Bulgarian and Portuguese;

(iii) The Portuguese and the Bulgarian adverbs and their occurrence in the yes-no questions.

Following these three items, I will attempt to present a different perspective, which will be able to illustrate in a systematic way the main differences between the languages in question.
4.1 Intonation and stress

As already discussed in the previous chapters, Portuguese always has been considered to be among the languages in which the yes-no questions are licensed only through intonation. Intonation is assumed to be the unique element able to distinguish a yes-no question from a declarative:

(165) A Inês vai a Lisboa?
   Det. Inês goes to Lisbon
   ‘Is Inês going to Lisbon?’

(166) A Inês vai a Lisboa.
   Det. Inês goes to Lisbon
   ‘Inês is going to Lisbon.’

Examples (165) and (166) illustrate that apparently no visible account is given to distinguish one from the other, if not for the intonation. Examples (167) and (168), on the other hand, demonstrate not only the role of the intonation within a Portuguese yes-no question, but also the high stress on amanhã ‘tomorrow’, indicating the focused constituent:

(167) A Inês vai a Lisboa AMANHÃ?
   Det. Inês goes to Lisbon tomorrow
   ‘Is Inês going to Lisbon tomorrow?’

(168) A Inês vai a Lisboa amanhã.
   Det. Inês goes to Lisbon tomorrow
   ‘Inês is going to Lisbon tomorrow.’

To this last pair, another example can be added, supporting the idea that the focus tends to occupy the right side of the sentence:

(169) Amanhã a Inês vai a Lisboa?
   Tomorrow det. Inês goes to Lisboa
   ‘Is Inês going to Lisbon tomorrow?’
Example (169) presents a sentence in which there are no focused constituents, the whole question is nonpressupposed information that needs a confirmation.

It has already demonstrated that in Bulgarian, the questions without interrogative elements, formed just through intonation, are interpreted as echo questions or questions representing some kind of a comment. Let us recall here examples (70), (71) and (72), found here as (170), (171) and (172) from section 1.4, Chapter I:

(170) A: Az iskah da kupja knigata.
   I wanted-1p.sg. PREP buy the book
   ‘I wanted to buy the book.’
B: Ti? Az misleh če Petăr iska da ja kupi.
   You? I thought-1p.sg. that Petăr want-3p.sg PREP it-acc. Buy
   ‘You? I thought it was Petăr who wanted to buy it.’

(171) A: Iskah da kupja knigata, no…
   Wanted-1p.sg. PREP. buy the book but...
   ‘I wanted to buy the book, but.’
B: No?
   But
   ‘But what?’

(172) A: Az iskah da kupja knigata.
   I wanted-1p.sg. PREP buy the book
   ‘I wanted to buy the book.’
B: Ti? Ti njamaš nikakvi pari! Kak šte ja kupiš?
   You? You not have-2p.sg. any money! How PART.FUT. it-acc. buy-2p.sg?
   ‘You? But you don’t have any money! How will you buy it?’

The three examples above indicate that in Bulgarian, the intonation is not a sufficient factor that can account for a yes-no question, but it is more of an element that belongs to the evaluative structures, expressing a strong reaction to a previous assertion. As for the type of intonation in the so called “standard li-questions”, in contrast to the Portuguese one, it is
decreasing, the element to which the particle cliticizes being the stressed one. Note that the example (173b.) is ungrammatical:

(173) a. KUPI li knigata?
   ‘Did you buy the book?’

b. ?? Kupi li knigata?
   ‘Did you buy the book?’

The example (173) then, can lead to the idea that the particle is compatible only with rising intonation and high stress. This may be considered as a consequence of its interrogative/focal nature. On the other hand, it is possible this example to be considered to support the argument made in Cheng & Rooryck (2000) for the existence of an intonational morpheme that checks the interrogative value in $C^0$, in the case of languages such as Portuguese. In Bulgarian, this has already being verified by the particle. However, as discussed in the previous chapters, $li$ can co-occur with a wh-element. Let us reconsider example (65) from section 1.3.4, Chapter I, numbered here as (174):

(174) Koj kakvo li kupi?
   Who what Q bought
   ‘Who bought what?’

If intonation does not play a role in Bulgarian and if we assume that the SpecCP in already filled by the wh-word $koj$ ‘who’, this means that $C^0$ is overtly filled by the second wh-constituent $kakvo$ ‘what’ and by the particle $li$. The example in (174) raises the possibility that the particle $li$ cannot be considered an ‘equivalent’ to the intonational morpheme proposed in Cheng & Rooryck (2000). In the same work and in respect of the wh-in-situ, the authors
suggest that in languages such as Chinese and Japanese, languages with wh-particles, it is the particle that checks Q features in C°, so that the wh-word stays in-situ:

(175) Hufei mai-le shenme (ne)
Hufei buy-PERF what PRT
'What did Hufei buy?'

As demonstrated in (174), Bulgarian is among the languages that do not allow in-situ even in a context of multiple wh-questions. The example in (174) shows that in Bulgarian multiple wh-questions are mandatorily fronted, so the analysis presented in Cheng & Rooryck (2000) cannot be verified by the examples above.

4.2 Word order

Bulgarian and Portuguese are both languages of SVO type as demonstrated below:

(176) O João comprou o livro.
John bought the book

(177) Ivan kupi knigata.
John bought the book

As show in Costa (1998) and considering the examples above (139-142), Portuguese tends to display focus on the right side of the sentence. Ambar (1988) also considers the presentational focus as postverbal. Reconsidering the examples found in Costa (1998), here as (178), (179), (180) and (181):

(178) Object focused:
A: O que é que o Paulo partiu?
What Paulo broke
B: O Paulo partiu a janela.
Paulo broke the window.
#Partiu o Paulo a janela.
(179) *Sentence-focus:*

A: O que é que aconteceu?
   What happened?
B: **O Paulo partiu a janela.**
   Paulo broke the window.
   #Partiu o Paulo a janela.
   #Partiu a janela o Paulo.
   #A janela o Paulo partiu.
   #A janela partiu o Paulo.

(180) *Subject and object focused:*

A: Ninguém partiu nada.
   Noone broke anything
B: #O Paulo partiu a janela.
   Paulo broke the window.
   **Partiu o Paulo a janela.**
   #Partiu a janela o Paulo.
   #A janela o Paulo partiu.
   #A janela partiu o Paulo.

(181) *Subject is focused:*

A: Quem é que partiu a janela?
   Who broke the window
B: #O Paulo partiu a janela.
   Paulo broke the window.
   **Partiu (a janela) o Paulo.**
   #A janela o Paulo partiu.
   #A janela partiu o Paulo.
As the examples illustrate, focus always appears in the right side of the sentence. Following Costa (1998), in the examples (182-185) the behavior of the Bulgarian language can observed, regarding the same context situations and identifying where the focus is displayed:

(182) *Object focused:*

A: Kakvo sčupi Ivan?
What broke Ivan

B: **Ivan sčupi prozoreza.**
Ivan broke the window.
#Sčupi Ivan prozoreca.
#Sčupi prozoreca Ivan
#Prozoreca Ivan sčupi.
#Prozoreca sčupi Ivan.

(183) *Sentence-focus:*

A: Kakvo se sluči?
What happened?

B: **Ivan sčupi prozoreza.**
Ivan broke the window.
#Sčupi Ivan prozoreca.
#Sčupi prozoreca Ivan
#Prozoreca Ivan sčupi.
#Prozoreca sčupi Ivan.

(184) *Subject and object focused:*

A: Nikoj ništo ne sčupi.
Noone anything not broke

B: **IVAN sčupi prozoreza.**
Ivan broke the window.
#Sčupi Ivan prozoreca.
#Sčupi prozoreca Ivan
#Prozoreca Ivan sčupi.
#Prozoreca sčupi Ivan.
Examining the contexts of the object, the sentence, the subject and the object and only the subject focused, we can observe that Bulgarian and Portuguese basically follow the same model in case of the Object and Sentence focused structure, which is that the focused constituent appears on the right side of the sentence. The main difference here can be found in the contexts of both Subject and Object focused and only Subject-focused (examples (186) and (187)), where in contrast to the Portuguese, which continues displaying the focused element(s) on the right, Bulgarian prefers FocP in the left periphery for the focused elements:

(185) *Subject is focused:*

A: Koj sčupi prozoreca?
   Who broke the window?

B: **Ivan go sčupi.**
   Ivan it-dat. broke.
   #Sčupi Ivan prozoreca.
   #Sčupi prozoreca Ivan
   #Prozoreca Ivan sčupi.
   #Prozoreca sčupi Ivan.

(186) *Subject and object focused:*

A: Nikoj ništo ne sčupi.
   Noone anything not broke

B: **IVAN sčupi prozoreza.**
   Ivan broke the window.

(187) *Subject is focused:*

A: Koj sčupi prozoreca?\(^{16}\)
   Who broke the window?

\(^{16}\) It is useful to recall the contexts of wh+/li interrogatives, showing that the example in (187) illustrates also the presence of the particle *li*:

(i) Koj li sčupi prozoreca?
   *Who Q broke the window?*

   'I am wondering who broke the window.'

However, for the question in (i), in contrast to the question in (187), the lack of an answer would be the most usual situation.
B: a) **Ivan go sčupi.**  
Ivan it-dat. broke  
b) ?? Prozoreca sčupi Ivan  
The window broke Ivan

Referring again to the examples in (184) and (185), it is important to consider the situation in (185), here presented as (186), the prosodic stress on Ivan (marked by capital letters), which represents an indication of a prosodically expressed contrastive focus. It is furthermore necessary to highlight the mandatory presence of the clitic in the case of (187B.a). Moreover, these examples show that as for subjects being focused, Bulgarian maintains the SVO model, having the tendency for the focused subject to appear sentence-initially.

Continuing with the question of focus and its relation to word order, we can go back to the examples examined in Brito (2003:461)

(188) O António telefonou.  
*Det. António called-3p.sg.*  
‘António called.’

(189) O António telefonou?  
*Det. António called-3p.sg.*  
‘Did António call?’

(190) Telefonou o António?  
*Called-3p.sg det. António*  
‘Did António call?’

As already discussed above, examples (189) and (190) differ contrastingly in their interpretation. In example (189) there is a presentational focus with *António* as the topic, this one being the element representing the ‘old’ information, i.e. the information shared between interlocutors. In (189) the following situation can be described:

*Speaker A expects António’s call. Coming home the speaker A asks the speaker B if António has called or not.*
The example in (190), on the other hand, presents the subject António as being contrastively focused. The speaker in (190) wants to know if the received call was from António or from someone else. Here we have the following situation:

Speaker A comes home. Speaker B informs A that someone called and wanted to talk to speaker A. Speaker A asks if the person who called was António (not Pedro, nor João)

Syntactically, the difference between these two sentences is found in the subject-verb inversion. In (189) António is topicalized, and represents the ‘old’ information, shared by the interlocutors. In (190) António represents the element, which is contrastively focused.

Bulgarian, on the other hand, insists on the mandatory presence of the particle *li* in the context of a yes-no question. Its absence leads to an evaluative interpretation of the whole sentence. *Li* is responsible for the interrogative interpretation of the yes-no questions in Bulgarian, a fact, furthermore verified by its impossibility to appear in the declaratives. The examples in (191-194) once again support this argument:

(191) Ivan se obadi.
_Ivan he-refl. called_
‘Ivan called.’

(192) Ivan obadi li se?
_Ivan called Q he-refl._
‘Did Ivan call?’ or ‘As for Ivan, did he call?’

(193) Obadi li se Ivan?
_called Q he-refl. Ivan_
‘Did Ivan call?’

(194) Ivan li se obadi?
_Ivan Q he-refl. called_
‘Was Ivan the one that called?’

As already expected, in contrast to Portuguese, where the word order brings the difference in the interpretation, in Bulgarian the position of the particle *li* is responsible for
this. Examples (192) and (193) can be considered both equivalents to the Portuguese example (189). On the other hand, (192) and (193) do not differ crucially from each other in their interpretation. The only difference between these two is the subject Ivan, topicalized in (192). The example in (194) moreover corresponds to the Portuguese example in (190) and it is the enclitic position of the particle that is responsible for this interpretation and that focalizes contrastively the subject Ivan.

All these examples above indicate that there are two different types of languages and two different types of strategies. The important fact here is that in a yes-no question Portuguese continues to display the focused element on the right side of the sentence:

(195) Telefonou o António?

Called-3p.sg det. António

‘Was António the one who called?’

At the same time, Bulgarian continues a representation in which the focused constituent(s) appear on the left (example (197) and is marked by ‘??’ that indicates its peculiarity:

(196) Ivan li se obadi?

Ivan Q pron.refl. called

‘Was Ivan the one who called?’

(197) ?? Obadi se Ivan li?

Called pron.refl. Ivan Q

‘Was Ivan the one who called?’

However, the example in (196) exhibits a unique characteristic already mentioned. That is a singular feature of the Bulgarian language, in which the focused subjects mandatorily appear sentence-initially, as shown in (198):

(198) Subject is focused:

A: Koj sčupi prozoreca?

Who broke the window?

B: a)Ivan go sčupi.
Ivan it-dat. broke
b) ?? Prozoreca sčupi Ivan
   The window broke Ivan

Having said this, I assume that (197) is considered unusual, because the focused element is a subject. Consider the phrase in (199) in which the focused element is an object:

(199) a. Knigata li kupi?

   *The book Q bought-2p/3p.sg*
   ‘What you/he/she bought was the book?’

b. Kupi knigata li?

   *bought-2p/3p.sg the book Q*
   ‘Did you/he/she/ buy the book?’ or ‘What you/he/she bought was the book?’

The phrase in (199b) is grammatical as expected, if we consider the paradigm above, according to which focused objects may appear on the right side:

(200) Object focused:

   A:Kakvo sčupi Ivan?
     What broke Ivan

   B: **Ivan sčupi prozoreza.**
     Ivan broke the window.
     #Sčupi Ivan prozoreca.
     #Sčupi prozoreca Ivan
     #Prozoreca Ivan sčupi.
     #Prozoreca sčupi Ivan.

However, in Chapter 1 I already discussed the final position of the particle, as well as the specific interpretation involved. The examples in (199a) and (199b) have a very subtle difference but in my opinion, the example in (199b) can be considered a prove that the elements in Bulgarian yes-no questions follow a hierarchy. According to this hierarchy, the subject always appears sentence-initially when contrastively focused by the particle *li*, while no such rule appears to exist for the focused objects. In any case, being *li*-focused every element has the tendency to appear sentence-initially.
All the information presented above, demonstrates that in Bulgarian focused constituents appear on the left side of the sentence, while in Portuguese, where there is an information focus, a preference is displayed for these elements to appear on the right.

A different context in which the languages can be compared is the one of clefts, referred to in Mateus et al. (2003). Although these structures are encountered in free distribution and do not warrant the formation of the Portuguese yes-no questions, they can provide examples for comparison in the present study. Here I assume that clefts represent the equivalent to the Bulgarian XP-\textit{li} questions at least from an interpretational point of view. Consider examples (201) and (202):

(201) 
\begin{itemize}
  \item Knigata li kupi?
  \item The book \text{Q bought-1/3p sg.}
  \item ‘Was the book the thing that you bought?’
\end{itemize}

(202) 
\begin{itemize}
  \item Foi o livro o que o João comprou?
  \item Be-\text{3p.sg.past the book pron. that João-def. bought}
  \item ‘Was the book the thing that John bought?’
\end{itemize} 

In order to draw a parallel between the two languages, in the context of identifying the Portuguese equivalent for the Bulgarian XP-\textit{li} questions, clefts would seem to be a suitable source, regarding the question of focus and the \textit{contrastive flavor} assumed by Ambar (2005).

However, because Bulgarian is a language that also disposes of clefts constructions and once affirmed the assumption that clefts are in free distribution and cannot be regarded to be responsible for licensing the yes-no questions, these structures, in my view, cannot represent evidence for the present study.

4.3 Adverbs and quantifiers

The behavior of the adverbs and the quantifiers (Ambar, 2012, 2013) has been probably one of the strongest arguments against the traditional assumption that the Portuguese yes-no questions have a similar structure to declarative sentences.
As shown in Ambar (2003) and Ambar et al. (2004), the behavior of the so called “special” adverbs differ considerably in European and Brazilian Portuguese such as the adverb *sempre* ‘always’. In European Portuguese, this adverb can have two interpretations – confirmative and temporal. In contrast, Brazilian Portuguese disposes only with the former one – the temporal. The well-defined difference between European and Brazilian Portuguese is based, according to Ambar (2003), upon the fact that in European Portuguese V-movement to CP is available, while in Brazilian Portuguese this movement is generally not allowed.

Another of Ambar’s work (2012) that analyses the yes-no questions, argues for their syntactic licensing and assumes a structure similar to the one in wh-questions, i.e. movements are still involved. Evidence for that assumption is that the adverb *lá* ‘there’ can have two interpretations – locative or negation. The ungrammaticality of the yes-no questions in which *lá* represents negation, puts forward a strong argument that the yes-no questions in Portuguese have much more complicated derivation than expected.

Let us consider another special adverb that has been long discussed in the syntactic literature – the adverb *only* (Rooth (1995)). *Only* is a focus-sensitive adverb that in both Portuguese and Bulgarian is subject to some restrictions. For Portuguese, it is necessary to recall Martins’s (2012) observations on the behavior of this adverb in the question-answer contexts:

(203) [A] a. Ele só dorme?!
   he *only* sleeps
   “Does he only sleep?!”
         sleep-3SG
   c. Sim.
         yes
   d. Só.
       *only

(204) [A] a. Só ele sabe a verdade?
     *only* he knows the truth
     “Is it only him who knows the truth?”
           know-3SG
c. Sim.
   yes

d. Só.
   only

Consider that for both examples (203) and (204) the only answer available is the adverb-answer with só ‘only’. Example (205) on the other hand, represents a different interpretation and consequently has different answers available:

(205) [A] a. Ele comeu só as batatas?
   he ate only the potatoes
   “Did he eat only the potatoes?”

   ate-3SG

c. Sim. (yes)

In (205) the traditional verbal answer for the Portuguese responsive system is already available. This, in terms of Martins (2012) is a consequence of the fact that the adverb is part of the VP internal material, which leads to the availability of the verbal answer.

Let us consider the behavior of samo ‘only’ in Bulgarian in examples (206-208) where pairs of declarative-interrogative are presented:

(206) a. Toj samo spi.
   He only sleeps

   b. Toj samo spi li?
   He only sleeps Q
   ‘Does he only sleep?’

   c. * Samo li spi?
   Only Q sleep

(207) a. Samo toj znae istinata.
   Only he knows the truth
   ‘He is the only one that knows the truth’

   b. Samo toj li znae istinata?
Only he Q knows the truth
‘Is he the only one who knows the truth?’
c. * Samo li toj znae istinata?
Only Q he knows the truth

(208) a. Toj izjade samo kartofite.
He ate only the potatoes.
b. Toj samo kartofite li izjade?
He only the potatoes Q ate
c. *Toj samo li kartofite izqde?
He only Q the potatoes ate

All the examples above show the same model. Only and the particle li both can be found orientated to the same constituent in the sentence, the combination only+li being impossible. This impossibility can be found in the focused nature of both elements. Considering Portuguese and Bulgarian and the examples represented above, I assume that for Bulgarian focus in questions is always available, because of the focus-sensitive nature of the adverb samo ‘only’ that is transmitted to the element on its right. The evidence presented from the Portuguese answering system, on the other hand shows that the position in which the adverb precedes the constituent leads to the assignment of focus to the same constituent, as in (203) and (204). On the other hand, the example in (205), apparently does not involve further focus movement to C for the constituent batatas ‘potatoes’, which remains VP-internal, as pointed out in Martins (2012). However, compared to Bulgarian, where this movement in the yes-no questions additionally triggered by the particle is available, I assume that these structures should be more complicated and should involve further movements as suggested by Ambar (2012). This question will be explored in future works.

CHAPTER 5
CONCLUDING REMARKS

The purpose of this work was to present evidence from the Bulgarian and the Portuguese yes-no questions in order to understand the elements, which trigger and license
this type of interrogatives. This study used a descriptive approach and proposed hypotheses for future research.

The present thesis was divided in two main parts. The first one dedicated to a comprehensive description and evidence of the Bulgarian yes-no questions. The second part outlined the main techniques for the formation of the yes-no questions in Portuguese and provided a comparison between the two languages, strongly orientated toward the question of focus.

In Bulgarian, four types of yes-no questions were identified – *dali*-questions, *li*-questions, *nali*-questions, and questions without a visible interrogative operator. These four groups were defined by the different type of operator involved (or by particularities provoked by the lack of an interrogative marker) and also semantically. Special attention was paid to the particularities of the particle *li* and its flexibility regarding its positions in the sentence. Four possible occurrences were distinguished (i) as enclitic to the verb, (ii) as enclitic to an element different from the verb, (iii) as enclitic to a wh-constituent and (iv) in a sentence-final position.

The main goal of the thesis was to present evidence that challenge the traditional assumption that there exist two versions of the particle – *V-li* and *XP-li*, the first one neutral and the latter one focused. In my view the particle is always focused and this idea was further supported by examples from the Bulgarian responsive system, mainly the possibility for verbal answers, and incorporating the proposal made in Holmberg (2011) and Martins (1995, 2012). I have suggested that the element focused by *li* moves to SpecFocP in order to check focus feature, while *li* is assumed to be merged in Focº. A different approach was assumed for the structure of the type wh-*li*. As we know these structures follow some restrictions, as they are incompatible with negative answers and they involve a strong presupposition context. For the treatment of this type of question I assumed Obenauer’s (2004) nonstandard questions and adopted the proposal made in Ambar (1997) for the SplitCP:

\[
\text{XP[EvaluativeP[Evaluative AssertiveP[AssertiveXP[WhP[wh[FocP[Foc AssertiveXP[IP}}
\]

My suggestion for this special type of constituent-*li* questions consist in the merging of the particle in Assertiveº followed by a movement of the wh-element from WhP to SpecAssertiveP in order to receive an echo-flavour interpretation.
Finally I examined another context that situates the particle *li* in the final position. Here, I proposed a derivation, according to which the particle continues to be associated to the element on its direct left and I assumed that the rest of the material is a topic. As for embedded clauses, it was considered that both the complementizer *dali* and the particle can occur. For these contexts the proposal made in Rizzi (1999) was adopted.

All of the topics discussed above constitute the first main part of the present work, dedicated to the Bulgarian yes-no questions. In this first part I tried to demonstrate all the possible occurrences of the particle, considering the other three types of yes-no questions in Bulgarian as an important background material.

In the second part of this work, my main goal was to present the idea that shows how focus is involved in the Portuguese yes-no questions. In my view this type of questions still has not received the deserved attention (with the exception of some recent works, namely Ambar, 2012, 2013, 2013a), being usually considered as declaratives with an interrogative intonation. The starting point here was the Bulgarian yes-no questions, that served as an indicator, because Bulgarian is a language that mandatory involves interrogative operators that license yes-no questions. In studying the Portuguese polar questions, I considered topics such as the subject-verb inversion, the role of intonation, clefts, special adverbs and quantifiers.

My work was focused on the idea of understanding and reviewing different analysis that already have been made. The literature that I referred to here was mostly orientated towards the topics of focus and focal structures in Portuguese. The question of the responsive system was also considered in order to build a parallel between these two languages. This second part of the work also had as an objective to present in a direct way a comparison of constructions in the two languages that differ contrastingly in the formation of interrogatives. The comparison introduced here involved several topics, such as intonation and stress, word order and adverbs.

However, during the development of the present thesis, I believe that there are limits to a Master’s paper that will not allow the analysis of various topics of crucial importance in understanding the yes-no questions. Some of these topics involve questions such as the order, the identification and the hierarchy of the functional projections entailed in this order, the relation syntax-discourse, the verb movement and related topics, such as, the behaviour of adverbs as an instrument for testing this movement, the movement from T to C, the relation with Tense (Agr. in some analysis), the relation between the Op(erator) and the variable, and the comparison with wh-questions and the non existence of wh-in-situ in Bulgarian.
All this leads to the conclusion that a Master’s thesis will not be able to explore all these questions, which complexity is furthermore underlined by the vast literature covering the related topics. As for the questions concerning the order and the relation syntax-discourse (Duarte 1987, Ambar 1988, Barbosa 1996, Costa 1998, Laka 1990, Martins 1994), the literature is divided. Some support an analysis of the existence of a Left Periphery (a perspective also known as cartographic) such as Ambar 1996, 1999, 2000, 2003, Cinque 1999, Kayne & Pollock 2008 Rizzi 1997, Speas & Tenny 2003, among others, while others a reduced number of projections and operations such as adjunction and scrambling. As for the questions of verb movement, works such as, Emonds 1976, Pollock 1987, Vikner (1995) Biberauer & Roberts 2010, Santorini & Kroch, 2007, Ambar 1988, 1998, 2005a, 2007, 2010 and many others, can be considered.

In my opinion, some of the questions that deserve further attention and reveal their complexity during the development of this study are as follows:

(i) analysis of *dali’s* behavior, also a complementizer with strong focus features;

(ii) exploration of TAG-questions and the positions that the complementizer *nali* can occupy, having in mind its occurrence in declaratives;

(iii) examination of the *wh-li* context with respect to the nonexistence of wh-in-situ in Bulgarian;

Another question that remains unsolved is the absence of interrogative operators, such as the particle *li* in Portuguese. My study assumed as a starting point when dealing with the Portuguese yes-no questions, that they do not have an identical structure as the one in declaratives as proposed in pioneering works such as Ambar (2012, 2013, 2013a). I believe that if languages such as Bulgarian and Chinese license the yes-no question by specific operators, Portuguese should also dispose of some more complex syntactic processes. However, this assumption needs further investigation in order to understand which are the elements or mechanisms that legitimize these types of interrogatives.

Examples from the responsive system provided strong evidence when dealing with the yes-no questions in both Bulgarian and Portuguese. Considering Martins (1994, 2012) and Holmberg (2011) who have argued for a cross linguistic unified approach, assuming that all
answers to yes-no questions conform to the structure and assuming for the languages where a yes-no question is answered by echoing the finite verb that the verb moves to SpecFocP. However, a different perspective can be explored. Ambar (2012, 2013) argues for an analysis, which is situating the yes-no questions closer to the wh-questions. Having this in mind, future work on the wh-questions can be developed from the idea that, considering the paire Op(erador)-variable in the yes-no questions, the variable always recovers the whole proposition.
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