

# **FACTIVE ISLANDS IN NANOSYNTAX**

Lena Baunaz ([lena.baunaz@gmail.com](mailto:lana.baunaz@gmail.com)) & Eric Lander ([eric.lander@su.se](mailto:eric.lander@su.se))

NELS 51, Nov 6-8, Université du Québec à Montréal

## FACTIVE ISLANDS

*Factive verb*  
**weak island**

- (1) a. ?[Which article]<sub>i</sub> did you **regret/understand/forget** that I had selected  $t_i$ ?  
b. \*How<sub>i</sub> did you **regret** that his son had fixed the car  $t_i$ ?  
(ex. from Rooryck 1992: 2, (1c,b))

*Non-factive verb*  
**no island**

- (2) a. What<sub>i</sub> do you know that he wrote  $t_i$  quickly?  
b. \*How<sub>i</sub> do you know that he wrote a new book  $t_i$ ?
- (3) a. [Which article]<sub>i</sub> did you **believe** that I had selected  $t_i$ ?  
b. How<sub>i</sub> do you **believe** that I had selected the article  $t_i$ ?

# FACTIVE ISLANDS

- Factive verbs (*regret, remember*) select complement clauses that are presupposed to be true; non-factive verbs (*say, believe, want*) do not. (Kiparsky & Kiparsky 1970)
- Long-distance extraction out of factive complements creates *weak islands* (WI).

(4) Argument extraction is possible

$Wh_{arg} \dots [factive\ complement \dots Wh_{arg}]$

(5) Adjunct extraction is not possible

$*Wh_{adj} \dots [factive\ complement \dots Wh_{adj}]$

(Rizzi 1990, Rooryck 1992)

# FACTIVE ISLANDS

Different approaches:

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

## OUR CLAIM

- We claim that the **matrix verb** itself also plays a role in creating islands.
- Data from Romance (French, Italian) and Balkan (Modern Greek, Serbian [Niš], Serbian [Belgrade], Croatian, Bulgarian).
  - In these language groups, factive constructions may involve *strong islands* (SI), when both arguments and adjuncts are banned for extraction.
- Three formal features are responsible for the island effects observed.
  - Normally these features are spelled out as a complementizer, but sometimes they can be spelled out on the matrix verb.

## BACKGROUND

- Nanosyntax
- Three main ingredients
  - Verbal fseq
  - Comp fseq
  - Featural RM

# NANOSYNTAX

- We adopt the nanosyntactic idea that morphemes are internally complex and composed of syntactico-semantic features which are hierarchically ordered according to a functional sequence (fseq).
- Crosslinguistic variation is understood in terms of different patterns of lexicalization.
  - Each language ‘packages’ the same underlying functional sequence into lexical entries in its own language-specific way (see Starke 2009, 2011, 2014; Caha 2009, Baunaz and Lander 2018).

## THREE MAIN INGREDIENTS

- (i) Verbal fseq (Ramchand 2008, Puskas 2013, Baunaz 2017, Baunaz and Puskas (submitted), a.o)
- (ii) Complementizer fseq (Baunaz 2015, 2016, 2018; Baunaz and Lander 2018, 2019, a.o)
- (iii) Featural Relativized Minimality (Starke 2001, Rizzi 2004, Baunaz 2015, 2016, 2018, a.o)



## THREE MAIN INGREDIENTS

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

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

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

$[\text{Wh}_{\text{arg}} / \text{Wh}_{\text{adj}}] \dots \text{Comp} \dots \cancel{\text{Wh}_{\text{arg}}} / \cancel{\text{Wh}_{\text{adj}}}$

## FACTS AND ANALYSIS

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

## COMPLEMENTIZERS CROSS- LINGUISTICALLY

- Romance
- Balkan
  - Direct vs. Indirect complementizers
  - Specific vs. partive complementizers

## COMPLEMENTIZERS CROSS-LINGUISTICALLY

(8) **French:** *que*

**Italian:** *che*

(9) **Modern Greek (MG):** *oti* , *pu* (and *pos*, not discussed here)

**Bulgarian:** *deto* and *če*

**Serbian/Croatian:** *što* and *da*

- In addition, some Balkan languages have a special mood particle to indicate the subjunctive mood (*na* in MG, *da* in Bulgarian, *da* in SC).
- The exact status of this particle will not be discussed today (is it a complementizer, T-particle, or both? see Giannakidou 2009, a.o).

## REMEMBER-TYPE PREDICATES: GREEK

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

- (10) a. O Janis paraponethike **pu/oti** ton ksexasa. (MG)  
the John complained.3SG that him forgot.1SG  
'John complained that I forgot him.' (Giannakidou 2011:3, (6))
- b. Thimame **pu/oti** ton sinandisa sto Parisi.  
remember.1SG that him met.1SG in.the Paris  
'I remember that I met him in Paris' (Giannakidou 2009:1887, (9))

## REMEMBER-TYPE PREDICATES: GREEK

### Christidis (1982)

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

- (11)
- a.        Idha **oti** efighe.  
            saw.1SG that left.3SG  
            ‘I saw that he left’
- b.        Ton idha **pu** efighe.  
            3SG.ACC saw.1SG that left.3SG  
            ‘I saw him leaving’                      (Angelopoulos 2019: 218, (61))

## REMEMBER-TYPE PREDICATES: GREEK

*pu* ≠ *oti*

- (12)
- a. Thinmithika (istera apo poli prospathia) **oti** ton icha sinadisi s-to Parisi.  
remembered.1SG after from a lot of effort that 3SG.ACC had.1SG met in.the P.  
'I remembered after a lot of effort that I had met him in Paris'
  - b. Thinmithika (\*istera apo poli prospathia) **pu** ton icha sinadisi s-to Parisi.  
remembered.1SG after from a lot of effort that 3SG.ACC had.1SG met in.the P.  
'I remembered after a lot of effort that I had met him in Paris'  
(Angelopoulos 2019: 218, (62))

## REMEMBER-TYPE PREDICATES: GREEK

“A verb like *thimame* (‘remember’) can take either *oti* or *pu* as its complement. A factive reading can be available with *oti* presumably due to the semantics of the matrix predicate (we remember/recall events that have somehow taken place). (...) In the context of a verb like *thimame*, the distinction between an *oti*- and a *pu*-complement can be viewed in terms of **weak vs. strong presupposition** respectively, in the sense of Terrell (1977).”

(Roussou 2010: 590, our bold)



## COMPLEMENTIZERS SO FAR

	DIRECT	INDIRECT
Modern Greek	<i>pu</i>	<i>oti</i>

## REMEMBER-TYPE PREDICATES: SERBIAN (NIŠ)

Factives like ‘know’ can select *da* or *što*

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

## REMEMBER-TYPE PREDICATES: SERBIAN (NIŠ)

Arsenijević (2015, 2020a,b)

- (14) a. Sećaš se **što** je Jovan imao sestru? Direct accessibility (familiar to speaker)  
remember.2SG REFL that AUX Jovan had sister  
'Remember the sister that John had?' (or: 'Remember the well-known fact that John had a sister?')  
(Arsenijević 2020a: 29, 2020b: 343)
- b. Sećaš se **da** je Jovan imao sestru? Indirect accessibility (ambiguous but tends to be indefinite)  
remember.2SG REFL that AUX Jovan had sister  
'Remember that John had a sister?'  
(Arsenijević 2020a: 29, (39))  
(Arsenijević 2020a: 29, 2020b: 343)

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

## COMPLEMENTIZERS SO FAR

	DIRECT	INDIRECT
Modern Greek	<i>pu</i>	<i>oti</i>
Serbian (Niš)	<i>što</i>	<i>da</i>

## REMEMBER-TYPE PREDICATES: BULGARIAN

Factives like ‘remember’ can select *deto* or *če*

- (15) Pomnja, %**deto/če** te sreštnax na pazara.  
‘I remember that I met you at the market/meeting you at the market’

(Baunaz 2016:72, (9b))

## REGRET-TYPE PREDICATES: BULGARIAN

Factives like ‘regret’ can select *deto* or *če*

(16) Naistina sažljam, **deto/če** ne otedlix poveče vnanie na postrojkata.

‘I really regret that I did not devote greater attention to the construction’

(Krapova 2010, 26, (56a))

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

## COMPLEMENTIZERS: BULGARIAN

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

## COMPLEMENTIZERS SO FAR

	DIRECT	INDIRECT
Modern Greek	<i>pu</i>	<i>oti</i>
Serbian (Niš)	<i>što</i>	<i>da</i>
Bulgarian	<i>deto</i>	<i>če</i>



## DIRECT = SPECIFIC INDIRECT = PARTITIVE

- Baunaz (2015, 2016, 2018) interprets the facts discussed above in terms of existential presupposition. Using a terminology developed independently to account for *wh*-extraction (see Baunaz 2008, 2011, 2016; Starke 2001), she argues that *pu/deto/što* are specific complementizers and *oti/če/da* – when embedded under factive verbs – are partitive complementizers.
- Verbs like ‘remember’ may select for partitive *oti/če/da* that range over (a given set of) propositional variables (either true or false).
- ‘remember’ may also select for specific *pu/deto/što* that locate the complement proposition with respect to a given point of reference, binding a single propositional variable, which corresponds to a single truth value (true) (see also Roussou 2010).

## ... AND NON-PRESUPPOSED

- Some verbs select for non-presupposed complementizers (typically non-factive verbs). This type of complementizer ranges over non-finite sets of propositional variables (neither true nor false); it is neither specific nor partitive.
- Structurally speaking, non-presupposed complementizers are the least marked (have the least structure).
- Modern Greek and Bulgarian use *oti* and *če* here, Serbian and Croatian *da*.
- **The Comp fseq:** Specific > Partitive > *c*

## COMPLEMENTIZERS SO FAR

	<i>Specific</i> [Spec [Part [c]]]	<i>Partitive</i> [Part [c]]	<i>Non-presupposed</i> [c]
Modern Greek	<i>pu</i>	<i>oti</i>	<i>oti</i>
Bulgarian	<i>deto</i>	<i>če</i>	<i>če</i>

- Non-factive matrix verbs select for the non-presupposed Comp
- Factive matrix verbs select either for the specific or partitive Comp

# ISLANDHOOD

- Modern Greek
  - Well-behaved
- Bulgarian
  - Well-behaved
- Serbian/Croatian
  - Not well-behaved, with variation among speakers of different areas
    - Serbian (Niš)
    - Croatian
    - Serbian (Belgrade)

# FACTIVE ISLANDS ARE CONDITIONED BY THE COMPLEMENTIZER

## Modern Greek

- (17)
- a. \*Pjon<sub>i</sub> thimase **pu** sinandises *t<sub>i</sub>*?  
who remember.2SG that met.2SG
  - b. \*Pote<sub>i</sub> thimase **pu** sinandises Maria *t<sub>i</sub>*?  
when remember.2SG that met.2SG Mary
  - c. Pjon<sub>i</sub> thimase **oti** sinandises *t<sub>i</sub>*?  
who remember.2SG that met.2SG
  - d. ??Pote<sub>i</sub> thimase **oti** sinandises Maria *t<sub>i</sub>*?  
when remember.2SG that met.2SG Mary

*pu* → strong island

*oti* → weak island

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

## FACTIVE ISLANDS ARE CONDITIONED BY THE COMPLEMENTIZER

### Bulgarian

- (18) a. \* Kakvo si spomnjash, **deto** Ivan e napisal?  
what remember.2SG that I. has written
- b. \* Kade si spomnjash, **deto** Ivan e napisal pismoto.  
where remember.2SG that I. has written letter.the
- (19) a. Kakvo si spomnjash, **če** Ivan e napisal?  
what remember.2SG that I. has written
- b. \* Kade si spomnjash, **če** Ivan e napisal pismoto.  
where remember.2SG that I. has written letter.the

**deto** → Strong island

**če** → Weak island

## COMPLEMENTIZERS AND ISLANDHOOD

	<i>Specific</i> [Spec [Part [c]]]	<i>Partitive</i> [Part [c]]	<i>Non-presupposed</i> [c]
Modern Greek	<i>pu</i>	<i>oti</i>	<i>oti</i>
Bulgarian	<i>deto</i>	<i>če</i>	<i>če</i>
Islandhood	<b>STRONG</b>	<b>WEAK</b>	<b>NONE</b>

## SERBIAN (NIŠ)

- Serbian/Croatian present less clear-cut patterns.
- Serbian (Niš)

‘know’, ‘remember’

*znati / sećati se + što*

**Strong island**

‘know’, ‘remember’

*znati / sećati se + da*

**Weak island**

‘say’, ‘think’

*reći / misliti + da*

**No island**

So far so good...

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



## SERBIAN (NIŠ)

‘regret’

*žaliti + da*

Weak island

(expected, *da* = [Part [c]])

*žaliti + što*

Weak(!) island

(unexpected, *što* = [Spec [Part [c]]])

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

See Appendix, ex. (vi)-(v)

# SERBIAN (NIŠ)

- Different kinds of *što* (syncretism): emotive and non-emotive
  - [c] (reći +) *da* (verb of saying with non-presupposed Comp) **NI**
  - [Part [c]] (žaliti +) *da* (non-emotive reading of ‘regret’) **WI**
  - [Emo [Part [c]]] (žaliti +) *što* (emotive ‘regret’; not *da* because *da* lacks [Emo]) **WI**
  - [Spec [Part [c]]] (sećati se +) *što* (cognitive reading of ‘remember’) **SI**
  - [Emo [Spec [Part [c]]]] (sećati se +) *što* (emotive reading of ‘remember’) **SI**

	<b>Emotive Specific</b>	<b>Specific</b>	<b>Emotive Partitive</b>	<b>Partitive</b>	<b>Non- presupposed</b>
<b>Serbian (Niš)</b>	<i>što</i>	<i>što</i>	<i>što</i>	<i>da</i>	<i>da</i>

# COMPLEMENTIZERS AND ISLANDHOOD

	<i>Specific</i> [Spec [Part [c]]]	<i>Partitive</i> [Part [c]]	<i>Non-presupposed</i> [c]
Modern Greek	<i>pu</i>	<i>oti</i>	<i>oti</i>
Bulgarian	<i>deto</i>	<i>če</i>	<i>če</i>
Serbian (Niš)	<i>što</i>	<i>da</i>	<i>da</i>
Islandhood	<b>STRONG</b>	<b>WEAK</b>	<b>NONE</b>

# CROATIAN

- Croatian has NO strong islands, except when complement clause is coindexed with a pronoun 'it'

(20)      Žalim      to što je otišao      →    'regret' + [Spec [D]] + [Part [c]]  
                 regret.1SG it    that he left

'regret'                      *žaliti* + *to* + *što*

'regret'                      *žaliti* + *što*

'say', 'think'              *reći* / *misliti* + *da*

**Strong island** → Cf. \*Which article do you regret *it that* I selected?

**Weak Island**

**No island**

See Appendix, ex. (vi)

# COMPLEMENTIZERS AND ISLANDHOOD

	<i>Specific</i> [Spec [Part [c]]]	<i>Partitive</i> [Part [c]]	<i>Non-presupposed</i> [c]
Modern Greek	<i>pu</i>	<i>oti</i>	<i>oti</i>
Bulgarian	<i>deto</i>	<i>če</i>	<i>če</i>
Serbian (Niš)	<i>što</i>	<i>da</i>	<i>da</i>
Croatian	<i>to + što</i>	<i>što</i>	<i>da</i>
<b>Islandhood</b>	<b>STRONG</b>	<b>WEAK</b>	<b>NONE</b>

## PROBLEM IN CROATIAN

- However, also *da* with weak islands:

‘remember’

*sjećati se + da*

Weak Island

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

# SOLUTION

- If these verbs can spell out the feature Part, then only *c* is left over to be lexicalized as *da*.
- well-behaved situation (e.g. Greek): [REMEMBER...] + [Part *c*]  
*oti* (→ **weak island**)
- ‘remember’ in Croatian: [REMEMBER... [Part]] + [*c*]  
*da*  
 → **weak island** because extraction has to cross verb (with Part) too

## LEXICAL ENTRIES IN CROATIAN

- ‘regret’ [REGRET ...]
  - Selects the partitive complementizer *što*.
- ‘remember’ [REMEMBER ... [Part]]
  - Such an entry **forces** the complementizer to shrink to *da*, since Part can be – in fact must be (Anchor Condition) – spelled out on the verb.



## SERBIAN (BELGRADE)

- Like Croatian, this variety has:

‘regret’

*žaliti* + *što*

**Weak Island** (well-behaved)

‘remember’

*sećati se* + *da*

**Weak Island** (Part on verb)

See Appendix, ex. (viii)-(xix)

## SERBIAN (BELGRADE)

- But ‘know’ selects *da* and creates a strong island

‘know’    *znati* + *da*                      **Strong island**

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

[KNOW... [Spec [Part]]]    +    [c]

- *c* has to be realized as *da*
- The verb contains the features problematic for extraction.

# BULGARIAN

- **Bulgarian** is just like Serbian (Belgrade) on this point:
- Bg. 'know' takes *če* and creates a strong island

'know'     *znam + če*

**Strong Island**

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

[KNOW... [Spec [Part]]] + [c]

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

# ENGLISH AND ROMANCE 'KNOW' TYPE

## English (WI) vs Romance (SI)

- |      |    |      |  |                |
|------|----|------|--|----------------|
| (21) | a. |      | What do you know that he wrote <del>what</del> quickly?    | Eng. <b>WI</b> |
|      | b. | *    | How do you know that he wrote a new book <del>how</del> ?  |                |
| (22) | a. | */?? | Qu'est-ce que tu sais qu'il a écrit rapidement?            | Fr. <b>SI</b>  |
|      | b. | *    | Comment est-ce que tu sais qu'il a écrit un nouveau livre? |                |
| (23) | a. | ??/* | (Che) Cosa sai che (lui) ha scritto velocemente?           | It. <b>SI</b>  |
|      | b. | *    | Come sai che (lui) ha scritto un libro?                    |                |

The English data are expected, the Romance data are unexpected.

# ENGLISH AND ROMANCE 'KNOW' TYPE

## English

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

- Simplest analysis: [KNOW...] + [Part [c]]  
que (→ **Weak island**)
- But could also be: [KNOW... [Part]] + [c]  
que → **Weak island** because  
extraction has to cross verb  
(with Part) too

# ENGLISH AND ROMANCE 'KNOW' TYPE

## Romance

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

- Simplest analysis: [KNOW...] + [Spec [Part [c]]]  
*que* (→ **Strong island**)
- But could also be: [KNOW... [Spec [Part]]] + [c]  
*que* (→ **Strong island**)

# CONCLUSION

- Individual verbs can show variation between them because each verb has its own lexical entry, allowing for verb-specific packaging.
- Some verbs do not package Comp features, others package either Part or both Spec and Part in their lexical structure.
- Greek and (for the most part) Bulgarian are well-behaved in that distinctions made in their complementizer systems tell us what kind of islandhood patterns to expect.
- Serbo-Croatian varieties show more variation, with different lexical packaging strategies available.
- Our analysis shows that verbs can also be considered interveners, which is a brand-new insight.

## Serbian (Niš)

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

GREEK	[VERB...]	[Spec	[Part	[c]]	(pu)	SI
			[Part	[c]]	(oti)	WI
CROATIAN	[REGRET...]	[Spec] <sub>IT</sub>	[Part	[c]]	(to što)	SI
	[BE SAD...]		[Part	[c]]	(što)	WI
	[SAY...]			[c]	(da)	NI
	[REMEMBER... [Part]]			[c]	(da)	WI

## SERBIAN (BELGRADE)

	[REGRET...]		[Part	[c]]	(što)	WI
	[REMEMBER... [Part]]			[c]	(da)	WI
	[KNOW... [Spec [Part]]]			[c]	(da)	SI
BULGARIAN	[REMEMBER...]	[Spec	[Part	[c]]	(deto)	SI
			[Part	[c]]	(če)	WI
	[KNOW... [Spec [Part]]]			[c]	(da)	SI
	[SAY...]			[c]	(da)	NI



## APPENDIX

## SERBIAN (NIŠ) (EXAMPLES)

**‘know’, ‘remember’: *znati* / *sećati se* + *što/da***

- (i) a. \* Koga<sub>i</sub> se sećas što si upoznao t<sub>i</sub>?  
who remember.2SG that AUX meet.PAST.PART  
‘Who do you remember that you met?’
- b. \* Kad<sub>i</sub> se sećas što si upoznao Mariju t<sub>i</sub>?  
when remember.2SG that AUX meet.PAST.PART Maria  
\* ‘When do you remember that you met Maria?’
- (ii) a. ? Koga<sub>i</sub> se sećas da si upoznao t<sub>i</sub>?  
who remember.2SG that AUX meet.PAST.PART  
‘Who do you remember that you met?’
- b. \* Kad<sub>i</sub> se sećas da si upoznao Mariju t<sub>i</sub>?  
when remember.2SG that AUX meet.PAST.PART Maria  
\* ‘When do you remember that you met Maria?’

Strong island

Weak Island

## SERBIAN (NIŠ) (EXAMPLES)

**‘say’, ‘think’** *reći / misliti + da*

- (iii)
- a. Koga je Pavao rekao **da** je vidio?  
who aux. Paul say.PAST.PART that AUX see.PAST.PART  
‘Who did Paul say that he saw?’
  - b. Kad si rekao **da** si vidio Pavla?  
when AUX say.PAST.PART that AUX see.PAST.PART Paul  
‘When did you say that you saw Paul?’

**No island**

## SERBIAN (NIŠ) (EXAMPLES)

### ‘regret’ : *žaliti* + *da* / *što*

- (iv) a. Koga<sub>i</sub> žališ **što** si povrijedio t<sub>i</sub> ?  
Who regret.2SG that AUX hurt.PAST.PART  
‘Who do you regret that you hurt?’
- b. \* Kad<sub>i</sub> žališ **što** si otišao t<sub>i</sub>?  
when regret.2SG that AUX leave.PAST.PART  
‘When do you regret that you left?’
- (v) a. Koga<sub>i</sub> žališ **da** si povrijedio t<sub>i</sub> ?
- b. \* Kad<sub>i</sub> žališ **da** si otišao t<sub>i</sub>?

Weak island

Weak island

## CROATIAN (EXAMPLES)

- (vi)
- a. Koga<sub>i</sub> žališ **što** si povrijedio t<sub>i</sub> ?  
Who regret.2SG that AUX hurt.PAST.PART  
'Who do you regret that you hurt?'
- b. \* Kad<sub>i</sub> žališ **što** si otišao t<sub>i</sub>?  
when regret.2SG that AUX leave.PAST.PART  
'When do you regret that you left?'

Weak island

## CROATIAN (EXAMPLE)

- (vii) a. Što se sjećaš da je Ivan napisao u Berlinu?  
what remember.2SG that has I. written in Berlin
- b. \* Kad se sjećaš da je Ivan napisao knjigu u Berlinu?  
when remember.2SG that has I. written book in Berlin

Weak island

## SERBIAN (BELGRADE) (EXAMPLES)

(viii)

- a. Koga<sub>i</sub> žališ **što** si povrijedio  $t_i$ ?  
Who regret.2SG that AUX hurt.PAST.PART  
'Who do you regret that you hurt?'
- b. \* Kad<sub>i</sub> žališ **što** si otišao  $t_i$ ?  
when regret.2SG that AUX leave.PAST.PART  
'When do you regret that you left?'

Weak island

(xix)

- a. Koga<sub>i</sub> se sećas **da** si upoznao  $t_i$ ?  
who remember.2SG that AUX meet.PAST.PART  
'Who do you remember that you met?'
- b. ?? Kad<sub>i</sub> se sećas **da** si upoznao Mariju  $t_i$ ?  
when remember.2SG that AUX meet.PAST.PART Maria  
'When do you remember that you met Maria?'

Weak island

## SERBIAN (BELGRADE) (EXAMPLES)

*znati + da*

- (x)      a.      Znaš da je Ivan prevario nekoga  
                 know.2SG that AUX Ivan cheat.PAST.PART someone  
                 ‘You know Ivan cheated on someone’
- b.      Znaš da je Ivan stigao tad  
                 know.2SG that AUX Ivan arrived then  
                 ‘You know Ivan arrived then’

- (xi)      a.      \* Koga<sub>i</sub> znaš **da** je Ivan prevario t<sub>i</sub>?  
                 Who know.2SG that AUX Ivan cheat.PAST.PART
- b.      \* Kad<sub>i</sub> znaš **da** je Ivan stigao t<sub>i</sub>?  
                 When know.2SG that AUX Ivan arrived

Strong island



## BULGARIAN (EXAMPLES)

**znam + če**

- (xii)      a.      \*Kakvo znaesh, če toj e napisal v Berlin?  
                      what know.2SG that he has written in Berlin
- b.      \*Kade znaesh, če toj e napisal nova kniga?  
                      where know.2SG that he has written new book

Strong island

We thank Tomislav Sočanac and Iliana Krapova for these data.