

Wh-movement and Focus-movement in Bulgarian

Roumyana Izvorski

This paper argues that Bulgarian has a functional projection below CP into whose specifier interrogative *wh*-pronouns and focused constituents move. A unified account is offered of subject-verb inversion in questions and of fronting in focusing constructions.

1. Introduction

A common assumption in the generative literature is that *wh*-movement targets Spec, CP, irrespective of whether a relative or an interrogative pronoun is fronted. This is also the account given for Bulgarian in Rudin (1986, 1988). Here I present arguments that the landing site of *wh*-movement in Bulgarian systematically varies: while relativization is to Spec, CP, interrogative *wh*-words are moved to a sentence-internal position, the Spec of F(focus)P.

The question of where interrogative *wh*-pronouns are placed is initially motivated by the observation that *wh*-questions in Bulgarian exhibit obligatory subject-verb 'inversion', as shown in (1) and (2):¹

- (1) a. Koe pismo napisa deteto?
which letter wrote the-child
'Which letter did the child write?'
b. *Koe pismo deteto napisa?
- (2) a. Tja me popita kade raboti toj.
she me asked where works he
'She asked me where he works.'
b. *Tja me popita kade toj raboti.

¹ This is a well-established fact about Bulgarian, discussed in Rudin (1986), Kraskow (1990), and Rivero (1993a), among others. It has to be noted that for some native speakers the (b) sentences are degraded, not totally impossible. For consistency with the previous literature I continue to mark such sentences with a * and not with a +.

In contrast, relativization does not trigger obligatory inversion (although in relative clauses the subject can optionally appear postverbally).

- (3) Pismo to, koeto deteto napisa, e na masata.
the-letter which the-child wrote is on the-table
'The letter which the child wrote is on the table.'

The problem we would want to explain is why inversion is necessary in Bulgarian and why relative clauses and questions differ with respect to it. To show that this behavior of *wh*-interrogatives is not an isolated phenomenon will be highly desirable. Finally, we would like to see the facts of subject-verb inversion follow from a general principle in the grammar of Bulgarian. The answer to these questions eventually leads to a reconsideration of the standard assumption that *wh*-movement in this language has a single landing site.

2. Stylistic inversion in French

A possibility that needs to be investigated is whether the above facts are not an instance of Stylistic Inversion (SI), a subject-rightward movement rule in French which, as Kayne and Pollock (1978) have argued, is triggered by *wh*-movement. Several differences exist between the two phenomena. First, SI applies in both questions and relative clauses. The inversion described in section 1 involves interrogative *wh*-words only. SI is optional; the inversion in (1) and (2) is obligatory. SI postposes the subject to the *end* of the sentence; the displaced subject cannot precede the object. While in Bulgarian the subject can appear last in *wh*-questions, it also can appear preceding the object:

- (4) Koga razbra Paulina vsičko tova?
when learned Paulina all this
'When did Paulina learn all this?'

The heaviness of the NP greatly increases the probability of SI. While a heavier subject in Bulgarian will tend to be sentence-final rather than preceding the objects, the obligatoriness of subject-verb inversion is not affected. Even pronouns are not acceptable pre-verbally following the *wh*-interrogative word.

I conclude that the inversion in (1), (2), and (4) is different from French SI. Bulgarian has an optional rule of subject postposing responsible for the inversion in relative clauses and for the movement of the subject to a sentence-final position past the objects. Thus in *wh*-questions the appearance of the subject in a postverbal position is the result of the obligatory inversion; any subsequent movement rightwards is the effect of the optional postposing rule.

3. Hypothesis 1: Verb-raising to C⁰

A first step in the analysis of the obligatory inversion is to consider whether it is due to movement of the verb to C⁰ (with the provision that, unlike in English, full verbs also raise, in matrix, as well as in embedded interrogative clauses). In essence, this is the proposal made by Torrego (1984) to account for the similar phenomenon of subject-verb inversion in *wh*-questions in Spanish.

After identifying some problems for the raising-to-C⁰ analysis, I offer an alternative account which attributes the 'inversion' to the fact that the postverbal subject is in Spec, VP. Adopting the VP-internal subject hypothesis (Fukui 1986, Koopman and Sportiche 1991, among others), I have argued elsewhere (Izvorski 1993) that subjects in Bulgarian do not need to raise out of the VP for reasons of case assignment or licensing of agreement.

3.1. Adverb placement and interpretation

The relative order of adverbs and the finite verb in *wh*-questions and their respective answers can serve as a diagnostic of verb-movement.² In Bulgarian, VP-modifying adverbs like *bǎrzo* 'quickly', *s neudovolstvie* 'reluctantly' can appear postverbally, adjoined to VP.³

- (5) Ivan podade *bǎrzo* / *s neudovolstvie* pismoto na Maria.
Ivan gave quickly reluctantly the-letter to Maria
'Ivan gave the letter to Maria quickly/reluctantly.'

If the obligatory inversion were due to raising of the finite verb to C⁰, we would expect the word order in the corresponding *wh*-question to be as in (6):

- (6) ??Kakvo podade Ivan *bǎrzo* / *s neudovolstvie* na Maria?
what gave Ivan quickly reluctantly to Maria
'What did Ivan quickly/reluctantly give to Maria?'

This is what happens in English: the subject in Spec, IP appears before the adverb, which stays adjoined to VP. However, in Bulgarian (6) is degraded. The question corresponding to (5) is (7) instead:

2. Negation cannot serve as a diagnostic for verb-movement, as *ne* 'not' is a clitic on the finite verb.
3. The verb has raised out of the VP and has left the adverb behind. The adverb can also appear preverbally, as in (i):
(i) Ivan *bǎrzo* / *s neudovolstvie* podade pismoto na Maria.
Ivan quickly/reluctantly gave the-letter to Maria
'Ivan quickly/reluctantly gave the letter to Maria.'
The preverbal VP-adverb is presumably in Spec of FP, the functional projection for whose existence this paper argues (see section 6). In this position the VP-adverb is necessarily stressed.

- (7) Kakvo podade *bǎrzo* / *s neudovolstvie* Ivan na Maria?
what gave quickly/reluctantly Ivan to Maria
'What did Ivan quickly/reluctantly give to Maria?'

The raising-to-C⁰ analysis of *wh*-extraction will have to explain, given (6) and (7), why the adverb also has to move. A non-raising analysis predicts exactly the word order in (7): the adverb is adjoined to VP, immediately following the finite verb as in the declarative (5), and the subject appears after the adverb in its base-generated position Spec, VP.

Further evidence against raising to C⁰ comes from adverb ambiguities. It is known that the interpretation of certain English adverbs changes as their position in the sentence varies. Sentence (8), in which the adverb precedes the verb, has two interpretations. When the adverb is postverbal, as in (9), the sentence loses interpretation (8a):

- (8) John carefully read the book.
a. John was careful (enough) to read the book.
b. John read the book in a careful manner.

- (9) John read the book carefully.

The adverb in (9) cannot be interpreted as subject-oriented but only as describing the predicate of the sentence. A number of Bulgarian adverbs exhibit similar behavior. In (10) *pravilno* 'correctly' is preverbal and allows for one additional interpretation, that is absent when the adverb is postverbal:

- (10) Ivan *pravilno* otgovori na vǎprosa im.
Ivan correctly answered to the-question their
'Ivan correctly answered their question.'
a. Ivan did the right thing when he answered their question.
b. Ivan gave a correct answer to their question.

- (11) Ivan otgovori *pravilno* na vǎprosa im.
Ivan answered correctly to the-question their
(12) Ivan otgovori na vǎprosa im *pravilno*.
Ivan answered to the-question their correctly

Sentences (11) and (12) have only one meaning, the one given in (10b).

One would expect that a *wh*-question would preserve the way in which the adverb is interpreted. This is what happens in English: in (13), the result of object extraction in (8), the adverb has the same two readings:

- (13) What did John carefully read?
a. What was John careful (enough) to read?
b. What did John read in a careful manner?

Now, if the obligatory subject-verb 'inversion' in questions was the result of I⁰-to-C⁰ movement, (14) should be the interrogative counterpart of (10):⁴

- (14) Na kakvo otgovori Ivan *pravilno*?
to what answered Ivan correctly
'What did Ivan correctly answer?'

As such, (14) should preserve the two readings of (10). However, the only interpretation (14) has is *What did Ivan give a correct answer to?* The sentence crucially lacks the high-attachment reading of *pravilno* 'correctly'. Therefore we have to conclude that (14) is not the question formed from (10). But the only other grammatical question with the verb immediately following the *wh*-word is (15) and it too has only the predicate-oriented meaning.

- (15) Na kakvo otgovori *pravilno* Ivan?
to what answered correctly Ivan
'What did Ivan answer correctly?'

Thus the verb-raising-to-C⁰ analysis runs into problems in having to account for the apparent loss of a reading. If, however, we accept that the verb does not move higher than I⁰ in questions, and that the subject can stay in Spec, VP, it will be obvious that (14) and (15) are the interrogative counterparts of (12) and (11), respectively. Then we would predict that (16) should be the question corresponding to (11):

- (16) Na kakvo *pravilno* otgovori Ivan?
to what correctly answered Ivan
'What did Ivan correctly answer?'

Indeed, (16) has two readings: *What did Ivan give a correct answer to?* and *What was Ivan right to answer?* Thus the interpretation of adverbs provides another piece of evidence that *wh*-questions do not involve verb raising to C⁰.

3.2. Word order in compound tenses

Consider example (17). The presence of the adverb shows that the finite verb is not clitic on the participle. Therefore, if the finite verb has raised to C⁰, the subject should be able to appear after it and precede the participle, exactly as it happens in English. Yet this is not a possible word order as seen in (18):

- (17) Za kakvo beše napáľno zabravlja Maria?
about what was completely forgotten-FEM.SG Maria
'What had Maria completely forgotten about?'

⁴ By I⁰-to-C⁰ movement I mean the raising of the highest head in a split-Inf. Rivero (1988) proposes the following nodes for Bulgarian: I for modal elements like *da* 'to' and *le* 'will', Agr^T 'T, Aspect, (in descending order)'. Since this articulated structure is not immediately relevant, I will continue to use I⁰ for all these functional heads.

- (18) *Za kakvo beše Maria zabravlja?
about what was Maria forgotten-FEM.SG
intended reading: 'What had Maria forgotten about?'

The fact that *Maria* has to follow the participle is problematic for the movement-to-C⁰ analysis. But its surface position in (17) doesn't seem to be Spec, VP either: if the participle is VP internal the subject in Spec, VP should be able to precede it. However, the participle agrees in gender and number with the subject (its morphology also distinguishes between active and passive voice). It makes sense to assume that it actually moves to its own AgrP to check agreement features, the same way the finite verb does. The participle AgrP is generated lower than AuxP. Since the participle raises out of VP, it will always precede the VP-internal subject. This assumption about participle movement does not affect the argument about finite verb raising to C⁰. If the latter were an option in Bulgarian we would still expect (18) to be grammatical.

The facts of adverb placement and word order in compound tenses lead to the conclusion that finite verbs do not raise to C⁰ in *wh*-questions. In fact, this claim has been made, for theory internal reasons, in Rivero (1993a) as well. It is still possible to try to account for the inversion facts by postulating some kind of prohibition against subject-raising when *wh*-movement has taken place.⁵ But to do this, we will still have to assume that interrogative *wh*-words land in Spec, CP, an account which, as I will show, is problematic.

4. Do interrogative *wh*-expressions land in Spec, CP?

4.1. Word order with respect to topicalized phrases

Bulgarian has a rule of Topicalization which moves XP's to a position adjoined to IP, as illustrated in (19):

- (19) Razbrah, če na Maria Ivan e posvetil tri ot knigite si.
learned-SC that to Maria Ivan is dedicated three of books REFL
'I learned that Ivan has dedicated three of his books to Maria.'

If interrogative *wh*-words were fronted to Spec, CP, we would expect them to precede topicalized XP's. This is not what is attested, though:

- (20) a. Popitah go *novata* si *kniga* na kogo šte posveti.
asked-1SG him the-new REFL book to whom will dedicate
'I asked him to whom he will dedicate his new book.'
b. *Popitah go na kogo *novata* si *kniga* šte posveti.

⁵ Kraskow (1990) has proposed that a non-movement chain is formed between a I+*wh*l C⁰ and a tensed I⁰. Interruption of this chain by a subject is prohibited.

The unacceptability of (20b) is unexpected if interrogative *wh*-words surfaced in Spec, CP.⁶

4.2. Relativization out of embedded questions

Because relative and interrogative pronouns in English are fronted to the same position, relativization out of indirect questions is prohibited. (21) violates Subadjacency: the Spec, CP of the most embedded clause is filled by *when* and the successive-cyclic movement of *when* into the higher clause is blocked.

- (21) *This is the child whom John doesn't know when he will see.

If interrogative *wh*-words in Bulgarian were moved to the same position as relative *wh*-pronouns, there is no reason to expect that relativization out of questions would be grammatical. Rizzi (1980) argues that non-Comp-to-Comp movement is possible in Italian as long as no more than one S'-boundary is crossed. But Bulgarian allows relativization out of more than one embedded questions. Rudin (1988) gives an example of extraction from two interrogative *wh*-clauses (her example (19)):

- (22) Vidjah edna kniga, koiato se cudja koj znae koj prodava
saw-1sg a book which REFL wonder-1sg who knows who sells
'I saw a book which I wonder who knows who sells it.'

If we accept that relative and interrogative *wh*-words have different landing sites, we would have an explanation of why relativization out of embedded questions is permitted. Indeed, if interrogative *wh*-words are fronted not as high as Spec, CP, this position will remain free and the relative pronoun could move through it on its way to the higher clause. Assuming relativized minimality (Rizzi 1990), the interrogative pronoun will not count as a potential governor of the trace left by the relative pronoun.

5. Hypothesis 2: *wh*-words move to Spec, IP?

In Izvorski (1993) I proposed that subjects appear in two different preverbal positions depending on their information status. Subjects-topics are adjoined to IP, subjects-foci are raised by Focus-movement to Spec, IP. If Spec, IP is the landing site for interrogative *wh*-movement, the 'inversion' facts would follow straightforwardly: the focused subject would compete with the *wh*-word for the same position and the subject-topic will necessarily precede it. In fact,

⁶ Again, heavy stress on *novata si kniga* 'this new book' and would improve the sentence but will result in the irrelevant for our purposes contrastive focus interpretation.

⁷ By Spec, IP I mean the Spec of the highest functional projection below CP.

the idea that Spec, IP can be a landing site for A'-movement has been previously proposed in the literature. Diesing (1990) analyzes *wh*-movement in Yiddish *matrix* questions as being to Spec, IP. Similarly, Pesetsky (1987) argues that Spec, IP can be a landing site for *wh*-movement in English *main* clauses. For Catalan, it is shown in Vallduví (1990) that *wh*-interrogatives invariably surface in Spec, IP. Campos (1986), Goodall (1991), and Fontana (1993), among others, have argued the same for Spanish.

It seems reasonable at this point to conclude that Spec, IP is the target of interrogative *wh*-movement. In the next section I argue that independent facts require the postulating of another functional projection below CP. In section 7 the Spec of this projection will be identified as the landing site of interrogative *wh*-movement.

6. Yes-no questions

In this section I argue that the unified treatment of Bulgarian yes-no questions requires positing of an additional functional projection, F(focus) P.

Yes-no questions in Bulgarian are typically formed with the question particle *li*, used in both *matrix* and embedded clauses:

- (23) Decata bjaħa li na kino?
the-children were Oat cinema
'Did the children go to the movies?'
(24) Ne znam decata bjaħa li hodili na kino.
not know-1sg the-children were Oone at cinema
'I don't know whether the children have been to the movies.'

Another way to form yes-no questions is with the help of *dali*, the interrogative complementizer (as argued in Rudin 1986). It also can appear in both embedded and *matrix* clauses.⁸ *Dali* always precedes the verb:

- (25) Dali decata bjaħa na kino?
whether the-children were at cinema
'Did the children go to the movies?'
(26) Ne znam dali decata bjaħa na kino.
not know-1sg whether the-children were at cinema
'I don't know whether the children went to the movies.'

I assume that *dali* and *li* are two ways to lexicalize the [+Q] feature and type the clause as a question.

When *li* follows the finite verb, as in (23) and (24), the sentence is interpreted

⁸ As Rudin (1986) notes, in *main* clauses *dali* adds the 'nuance of wondering out loud'. *Matrix dali*-questions can thus be interpreted as having a performative prefix clause like *I wonder*.

as 'neutral': what is questioned is the proposition of the corresponding canonical declarative. However, *li* does not necessarily have to appear after the verb; it can also follow other constituents in the sentence:⁹

- (27) Na kino *li* blaha decata?
at cinema O were the-children
'Was it to the movies that the children went?'

An XP is fronted to a preverbal position preceding *li*. The question is no longer 'neutral'. Rather, (27) is the equivalent of the English interrogative cleft construction. It presupposes *The children went to x* and questions the value of *x*. In this sense the scope of the question is limited to the fronted XP only.

6.1. Previous analyses of *li*

Rudin (1986) suggests that a *li*-questioned constituent is placed in Focus position. I will show that this is indeed the case, but will argue against her analysis that the Focus position is an adjunction to S. Rudin's account does not specify the exact position of *li* in the phrase structure.¹⁰

Rivero (1993b) proposes that *li* is a bound morpheme generated in C⁰, which triggers I⁰-to-C⁰ movement for morphological support. She notes that fronting of an XP to Spec, CP, as in (27), is another option for providing the clitic with a host. *Li* in her analysis has the option of lowering to the verb when verb-raising is not possible.

The pattern of occurrence of *li* is indeed suggestive of the presence of movement. *Li* either follows the verb, or when it cliticizes onto an XP, that constituent has to appear in a preverbal position. I do not, therefore argue against a movement analysis, but propose that *li* is generated as the head of a projection lower than CP. For reasons of space I cannot present here my arguments against *li*-lowering. The reader is referred to Izvorski (1994) where I argue that the apparent illusion of *li*-hopping is the effect of a phonologically determined movement that happens at PF and does not involve a syntactic reordering of the verb and the clitic.

6.2. Problems with the analysis of *li* in C⁰

The claim that *li* occupies C⁰ is initially challenged by the relative order of subjects with respect to the focused XP-*li* unit. The subject should be able to

follow *li* in C⁰ and still precede the verb, that is, appear adjoined to IP if a topic and in Spec, IP if focused but this is not what happens:¹¹

- (28) *Na kino *li* decata blaha?
at cinema o the-children were
'Was it to the movies that the children went?'

I⁰-to-C⁰ movement cannot be the reason for the 'inversion', because incorporation of the verb to C⁰, where *li* is supposed to be, will lead to the surface order V-*li*, as in (23) and (24), and not to the *li*-V order in (28). But if cliticization of *li* to an XP is not accompanied by verb-movement to C⁰, then it remains unclear why the subject is not allowed to appear preverbally and following the XP-*li*, that is adjoined to IP or in Spec, IP.

A way out may be sought in the possibility of CP-recursion: *li* will occupy the higher C⁰ and the verb will move to the lower one, leaving the subject behind adjoined to or in Spec of IP. Yet, as Iatridou and Kroch (1992) show, CP-recursion is allowed only in the complements of a limited type of verbs, an environment which (28) is not.

Still another attempt to defend the account of *li* in C⁰ may be to postulate a prohibition on the interruption of the chain between the [+Q] feature in C⁰ and the tensed verb in I⁰, as in (29):¹²

- (29) *I_{CP} C⁰ + Q_i I_{IP} XP_i V_i ... I

Since the subject agrees with the verb, the two will be coindexed in violation of (29). But if this was so, we would expect (29) to rule out a sentence like (30):

- (30) *Dali* te vidjaha knigata?
whether they saw the-book
'Did they see the book?'
'Was it the book that they saw?'

It is clear that in (30) the [+Q] feature in C⁰ and the verb in I⁰ do not form an uninterrupted head-chain. Therefore, the behavior of subjects in *li*-sentences is not due to any requirement on the relationship between the heads of CP and IP, and thus it remains an unexplained problem for the analysis of *li* as a complementizer.

Furthermore, sentences with *dali* also allow focused constituents and

⁹ *Li* can also appear sentence finally, with the whole sentence receiving an echo interpretation. For a discussion see Rudin (1986: 65).

¹⁰ After this paper was presented at CONSOLE 2 I became aware of two recent accounts of *li* in Rudin (1993) and King (to appear). Both treat *li* as a complementizer and describe its focusing function.

¹¹ In this respect the sentence is exactly parallel to the corresponding wh-question:

(i) *Kade decata blaha?
where the-children were
'Where were the children?'

Rudin (1993) also notes the ungrammaticality of sentences like (28).

¹² A variation of this requirement has been proposed by Kraskow (1990) for [+wh] and tensed I, as noted in footnote 5.

impose on them the requirement of fronting. Apart from the straightforward questioning of the proposition *They saw the book*, (30) has an additional cleft interpretation. And if we were to question the direct object, then fronting is as obligatory as with the *li*-questions:

- (31) a. *Dali knigata vidljaha te?*
 whether the-book saw they
 'Was it the book that they saw?'
 b. **Dali knigata te vidljaha?*

Obviously, in (31) *knigata* 'the book' has not raised as far as Spec, CP. Note also the position of the subject in (31a) and (31b). We see here again the pattern, exhibited by *li*-sentences with respect to subjects. Apparently these are manifestations of the same phenomenon, for which the analysis of *li* in C⁰ cannot offer an explanation. This analysis claims that the focused element in the two constructions is in different positions. And if fronting for morphological support seems to be reasonable as an explanation for the case of *li*, fronting in *dali*-constructions remains unexplained.

6.3. An alternative analysis

Since XP fronting for focus occurs even in *yes-no* questions with *dali* where there is no need for providing morphological support, I propose that the two are separate phenomena and are only indirectly related in the case of *li*. On Rivero's account *li* is generated in C⁰ to type the clause as a question; it then triggers movement of an X⁰ or an XP whose only purpose is to make a host available for the bound morpheme. I propose that it is the lexical realization projection, F(ocus)P. Crucially FP is lower than CP. Head-movement of the verb to F⁰ and fronting of XP to Spec, FP are ways to provide lexical support for [+Q]. The latter movement is motivated by the need to check a [+Focus] feature in a Spec-head agreement with F⁰.

The proposal that *li* occurs on a lower head than C⁰ allows us to treat *yes-no* questions with *li* and *dali* uniformly. They both allow focused XP constituents, preceding in the case of the former and following in the case of the latter. This is exactly what we expect if we accept the proposal that CP dominates a functional projection FP of which *li* can be a head.¹³ To illustrate:

- (32) a. [_{CP} C *dali* [_{FP} XP F [...]]] |||
 b. [_{FP} F [_{CP} C [...]]] ||

Apart from achieving a unified account of *li* and *dali* sentences as focusing constructions, my proposal explains the unacceptability of preverbal subjects.

¹³ *li* and *dali* cannot occur together, presumably because [+Q] feature may be introduced only once in the same clause.

following *li*, it is not in C⁰ but in F⁰, the highest head in the split-Infl and Spec, FP is the lowest preverbal position that subjects can appear in and only when they are focused. Topic-subjects are adjoined to FP, since this is the highest sentence-internal scope position. An example of such a construction is one of the readings of (30) where the subject follows the complementizer but is not interpreted as focused.

7. Wh-movement as Focus-movement

We concluded in section 5 that *wh*-interrogative pronouns are moved to the specifier of the highest functional projection in the split-Infl. In section 6 we saw that a new functional projection is motivated for the phrase structure of Bulgarian, F(ocus)P. FP is treated as IP related by Topicalization and verb-movement.¹⁴ Since FP is the highest functional projection in the split-Infl, is it the case that *wh*-interrogatives are moved to Spec, FP?

This is indeed what I propose. *Wh*-interrogatives typically bear the sentence stress, as claimed in Penčev (1980). They can cooccur with *li* as well. When this is the case, *li* has to follow the *wh*-word, nothing else can be focused.¹⁵

- (33) a. *Kakvo li dade Ivan na Maria?*
 what o gave Ivan to Maria
 'What did Ivan give to Maria?'
 b. **Kakvo dade li Ivan na Maria?*
 c. **Kakvo na Maria li dade Ivan?*

Wh-questions are also focus/presupposition structures. Sentence (33) has the presupposition *Ivan gave Maria x*, and asks for the value of *x*. *What* is *x*? My analysis also makes the prediction that the two movement rules will create islands for each other and this is indeed the case:

- (34) **Kogo kaza Ivan Petur li obica?*
 who said Ivan Petur o loves
 'Who is the person such that Ivan said whether it was Petur that loved that person?'
 (35) **Petur li kaza Ivan koga e celunala Ana?*
 Petur o said Ivan when is kissed Ana
 'Was Petur the person about whom Ivan said when Ana had kissed him?'

¹⁴ Note that the distinction in native speakers' intuitions about the acceptability of subjects following the *wh*-interrogative and the XP-*li* complex now has an explanation. Adjunction to FP is the canonical position for subjects-topics. Scrambling, however, can adjoin the subject to Agr/TP even though FP is projected. For those speakers that allow scrambling the word order *wh*-subject-verb and XP-*li*-subject-verb will not be impossible.

¹⁵ This was noted in Rudin (1986) as well.

Wh-movement therefore is an instance of Focus-movement. The difference between relativization and question-formation is reduced to a more general principle in the grammar of Bulgarian, that of Focus assignment. The phenomenon of subject-verb 'inversion' described in section 1 is shown to not be an independent rule but to have other correlates in the syntax.

Interestingly enough, multiple Focus-movement of quantified elements is allowed in Bulgarian.⁶ Sentence (36) is parallel to (37) and observes the same superiority effects:

- (36) a. *Nikoj na nikogo ništo ne beše kazal.*
nobody to nobody nothing not was said
'No one had said anything to anyone.'
b. **Ništo na nikogo nikoj ne beše kazal.*

- (37) a. *Koj na kogo kakvo beše kazal?*
who to whom what was said
'Who had said what to whom?'
b. **Kakvo na kogo koj beše kazal?*

The pattern in (36)–(37) reveals another aspect of the affinity between interrogative wh-movement and Focus-movement.

10. Summary

In this paper I presented arguments that the landing site of wh-movement in Bulgarian varies depending on whether it involves a relative or an interrogative pronoun. I showed that in this language relativization targets Spec, CP while interrogative wh-words are moved to a sentence-internal position. I argued that there is evidence independent of wh-movement to posit a Focus Projection in Bulgarian into whose specifier interrogative wh-words and focused constituents move. It was proposed that the question particle *it* is the head of FP and that fronting for focus also provides it with a host: an X^0 or an XP satisfying its prosodic requirements but also providing lexical support for the [+Q] feature that it introduces.

The present proposal revealed the affinity between wh-questions and focus constructions, a relation found in other languages as well (see Horvath (1986) for Hungarian). Since multiple wh-fronting is to the Spec, FP position, Spec of CP can receive a uniform treatment crosslinguistically as a node that prohibits multiple adjunction in the overt syntax.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank David Embick, Michael Hegarty, Sabine Iatridou, Tracy King, Tony Kroch, and Miriam Meyerhoff, as well as the audience of CONSOLE 2, for valuable discussion and comments. This work was partially supported by a William Penn fellowship from the University of Pennsylvania and by an Open Society Fund scholarship.

References

- Campos, G. (1986). *Inflectional elements in Romance*. [Diss. UCLA].
Diesing, M. (1990). Verb movement and the subject position in Yiddish. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 8, 41.
Goodall, G. (1991). On the status of Spec of IP. WCCFL 10.
Fontana, J. (1993). A residual A'-position in Spanish. WCCFL 12.
Fukui, N. (1986). *A theory of category projection and its applications*. [Diss. MIT].
Horvath, J. (1986). *Focus in the theory of grammar and the syntax of Hungarian*. Foris, Dordrecht.
Iatridou, S. and A. Kroch. (1992). CP-recursion and its relevance for the Germanic Verb 2 constraint. [Ms. University of Pennsylvania].
Izvorski, R. (1993). Preverbal and postverbal subjects. [Ms. University of Pennsylvania].
Izvorski, R. (1994). Yes-no questions in Bulgarian: Implications for phrase structure. [Paper to be presented at the Conference on Balkan and South Slavic Linguistics, Bloomington].
Kayne, R. and J.Y. Pollock. (1978). Stylistic inversion, successive cyclicity, and Move NP in French. *Linguistic Inquiry* 9, 595.
King, T.H. (to appear). Focus in Russian yes-no questions. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 2.
Koopman, H. and D. Sportiche. (1991). The position of subjects. *Lingua* 85, 211.
Krasnow, T. (1990). On multiple questions in Slavic. [Paper presented at the Workshop on Scrambling, Tilburg, October 1990].
Pencev, J. (1980). *Osnovni intonacionni konturi v bulgarskoto izrečenie*. Bulgarian Academy of Sciences Press, Sofia.
Pesetsky, D. (1987). Wh in situ: movement and unselective binding. *The Representation of (in)definiteness*, ed. by E. Reuland and A. ter Meulen. MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.
Rivero, M.L. (1988). The structure of IP and V-movement in the languages of the Balkans. Ms. University of Ottawa.
Rivero, M.L. (1993a). Finiteness and second position in Long Head Movement languages. Breton and Slavic. [Ms. University of Ottawa].
Rivero, M.L. (1993b). Bulgarian and Serbo-Croatian yes-no questions: V^0 raising to \bar{A} versus \bar{A} -hopping. *Linguistic Inquiry* 24, 567.
Rizzi, L. (1980). Violations of the wh Island Constraint in Italian and the Subadjacency Condition. *Journal of Italian Linguistics* 5, 157.
Rizzi, L. (1990). *Relativized Minimality*. MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.
Rudin, C. (1986). *Aspects of Bulgarian syntax: Complementizers and wh constructions*. Slavica, Columbus, Ohio.
Rudin, C. (1988). On multiple questions and multiple Wh fronting. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 6, 445.
Rudin, C. (1993). On focus position and focus marking in Bulgarian questions. [Paper presented at FLSM, April 1993].
Torrego, E. (1984). On inversion in Spanish and some of its effects. *Linguistic Inquiry* 15, 103.
Vallduví, E. (1990). *The informational component*. [Ph.D. Diss. University of Pennsylvania].

⁶ To my knowledge, this type of multiple fronting has not been discussed before.