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INTRODUCTION

This dissertation is, essentially, an attempt to study the structure of the adnominal modification in Bulgarian – a Balkan, Slavic language. Basically, two phenomena will be in the centre of our attention – the possible co-occurrence of two definite elements in the colloquial Bulgarian noun phrase, something which is not allowed in standard Bulgarian, and the nature, the position and the order of the prenominal participles. Thus, our immediate objects of study will be adjectives and participles.

The study of adjectives has proved to be of a particular interest not only for the linguists who study the nature of this word class but also for those who are interested in the structure of the noun phrase in general. The latest studies unequivocally show that adjectives, as modifiers in the extended projection of the noun, are one of the main building blocks of the functional structure of the noun phrase. Their being quite similar to adverbs, which are modifiers in the extended projection of the verb, suggests that the structure of the noun phrase and that of the clause are, after all, not so different. Cinque (1999) sheds light on the universal clause structure, presenting clear evidence that adverbs occur in strictly ordered projections. Pursuing the idea that the structure of the DP should correspond to that of the clause, linguists expect that the cartography of the DP is much to the same extent elaborate and thus the adjectives, being the nominal counterparts of adverbs, should also obey some ordering restrictions (Valois, 1991, Cinque, 1999, Scott, 2002). As proposed in Cinque (2003), and as we will see in more detail later on, adjectives can be of an attributive or of a predicative source. As far as attributive adjectives are concerned, a number of proposals have been made regarding their universal order (Dixon 1982, Hetzron, 1978, Sproat and Shih, 1991, Scott, 2002). Scott (2002) proposes the following hierarchy:

(1) subjective > comment > ?evidential > size > length > height > speed > ?depth > width > weight > temperature > ?wetness > age > shape > colour > nationality/origin > material > compound element > NP

Valois (1991) presents another similarity between the clause and the DP discussing those adjectives that have adverbial correspondences. He states that there exists a correspondence
between the order in which the adverbs occur in the clause and the order in which the corresponding adjectives occur within their event nominal projections.

Cinque (1994) argues against the adjunction approach to adjectives and presents evidence that they are rather situated in the specifiers of functional projections, which are strictly ordered. As Scott (2002) says, however, the poor morphology on the noun, which should signal a possible upward movement in the tree (parallel to that of the verb), makes the task of determining the nature of the adjectival functional projections very difficult. Thus, as far as adjectives are concerned, we have to content ourselves with leaving the functional heads of the adjectival specifiers, at least for the moment, unspecified.

As to the semantic ordering of the adjectives, the data are unequivocal – as shown in (1), despite the poor syntactic evidence on the functional nature of the adjectival functional heads, there seems to be a semantic ordering of adjectives, as there is one of adverbs, which is the same across languages.

How should we account for the universal semantic ordering?

As shown by Cinque (1999), the verb is merged in a low position in the clause and in some languages it makes consecutive moves upwards in the tree, attaching to its base the suffixes occurring as heads of the functional projections, whose specifiers host the adverbs. Since, as already mentioned above, various reports confirm the similarity between the clause and the DP, it is natural to expect that adjectives, which are the nominal counterpart of adverbs, obey similar ordering restrictions.

In more concrete terms, the adjectives of which we expect to exhibit ordering restrictions are the attributive ones. Following Cinque’s (2005a) idea of the dual source of adjective, we have to isolate only the cases in which two adjectives are used attributively, in order to determine their order.

Not all languages, however, make a clear distinction between attributive and predicative adjectives. Unfortunately, Bulgarian is one of the languages in which all adjectives occur prenominally, hence the distinction between the predicative and the attributive use of the adjectives is blurred. Bulgarian adjectives are practically ambiguous in terms of their attributive and predicative meanings.

Nevertheless, there is one possibility, which seems to be unexploited so far, at least as far as Bulgarian adjectives are concerned. Though the most part of the Bulgarian
adjectives exhibit a systematic ambiguity in terms of their predicative or attributive use, there are adjectives which are unambiguously attributive in nature. Such an adjective is *eventualen/possible*. Fortunately, adjectives of this kind seem to be very high in the semantic hierarchy. Since attributive adjectives are always closer to the noun than predicative adjectives and it is impossible to have a predicative adjective following an attributive adjective, what we could expect is that all adjectives that follow an adjective like *eventualen* are unequivocally used only attributively. Interestingly, it seems possible to place more than one adjective after adjectives like *eventualen*. This offers us a nice possibility to study the universal order of adjectives using data form Bulgarian. Since this thesis, however, has a different objective, we will leave the semantic ordering of Bulgarian adjectives for further research.

Traditionally, Bulgarian adjectives are divided into two large groups – qualitative and relational. This, rather general distinction, common also to other Slavic languages, is of a semantic, not so much of a syntactic nature. It takes into consideration the possibility of the adjective to take the degree quantifier, saying that the adjectives of the first group are gradable while those from the second group are not. Further on, traditional grammars divide adjectives into various groups on the basis of their formation, listing the various affixes they take and different word-formation rules that operate in transforming the adjective into another part of speech and vice versa.

In this dissertation we will try to focus on the syntactic properties of Bulgarian adjectives, on their place in the Bulgarian noun phrase and, possibly, on the syntactic factors that govern their occurrence in a particular position.

The first problem we will look at are three double definiteness constructions. The issue will be considered in the light of Cinque's (2005a) structural hierarchy of the adnominal modification area. First and foremost, we will be aiming at the correct description of the phenomenon – an essential premise for giving a correct theoretical account. In the course of the discussion, a phonological, a semantic and a syntactic account will be proposed, the tricky part being the semantic analysis, due to the subtle differences in interpretation, often easily escaping our notice. The syntactic analysis of these constructions will be proposed on the basis of the semantic and phonological analyses and also on the basis of a study of the types of adjectives which can be used in the these
constructions. We are going to propose that the double definiteness phenomena observed in colloquial Bulgarian are a case of a predicative structure in prenominal position. In particular, we are going to argue that the articulated second element of the constructions at issue is a part of a DP predicate of a prenominal reduced relative clause. Standard Bulgarian makes no distinction between predicative and attributive adjectives. Bulgarian places all adjectives in prenominal position and makes no morphological distinction between predicatively used and attributive-only adjectives. Colloquial Bulgarian, on the other hand, allows for unambiguous predicative structures in front of the noun. This, of course, does not sound surprising, since colloquial language, in general, is more permissive and often offers a larger variety of possibilities. Standard Bulgarian, on the other hand, is, as we mentioned above, ambiguous, as far as the predicative nature of adjectives is concerned, since the standard, non-articulated form is ambiguous between the predicative and the attributive reading.

Having proposed an analysis for the double definiteness phenomenon in colloquial Bulgarian, we will look at similar phenomenon in other languages as well. We will see that, of all phenomena that have been analysed so far, only the structures introduced by the colloquial Slovenian TA seem similar to the double definiteness phenomenon in Bulgarian.

At the end of the chapter, we will show that the analysed double definiteness constructions are not the only cases of predicatively used adjectives in prenominal position in Bulgarian. On the basis of some semantic tests, extensively discussed in Cinque (2005a) in relation to Romance and Germanic languages, we will show that when an adjective occurs higher than the numeral or the possessive it necessarily exploits a relative clause source. On the basis of these considerations, we are going to build a more detailed picture of the adnominal modification in Bulgarian.

In chapter three, we will look at the modification layers hosting the prenominal participles. Several issues will be discussed in this relation. Our main goal will be to show that the prenominal participles exhibit certain ordering restrictions. In particular, we will see that, as discussed in the works of Larson and Takahashi (in press) and Cinque (2005a), individual-level participles follow stage-level participles. Any other orderings prove to be unacceptable. In order to be able to order the prenominal verbal participles, we will have to isolate at least two groups of real verbal participles. In the course of the analysis, we will
have a closer look at one particular group of participial expressions, namely, those which are postmodified by an adverb which cannot be used with adjectives. We will argue that the postmodified participles of this type are real verbal participles, since they cannot be placed in an adjectival environment. We will present evidence that this type of participles display verbal properties both in Bulgarian and in English.

The discussion in chapter three will help us to complete the picture of the structure of the adnominal modification in Bulgarian. We will try to delineate the layers hosting only attributive adjectives as well as those hosting adjectives from a predicative origin.
CHAPTER ONE  
Theoretical Background

Introduction.
It is an interesting and a well-known fact that in some languages adjectives appear only in front of the noun and in others only after the noun. There is a third group of languages in which both possibilities are exploited. The position and the properties of adjectives have been in the focus of many interesting studies. One of the main challenges has been to account for the difference between Germanic languages, on the one hand, which allow adjectives to appear only in front of the noun, and Romance languages, on the other hand, which allow adjectives to occur both prenominally and postnominally. In this chapter we are going to present the basics of a theory elaborated by Cinque, which offers a typological approach to the nature and the position and the adjectives inside the noun phrase. Actually, the main goal is to draw a very detailed picture of the functional structure of the noun phrase, going far beyond the study of adjectives. The structure of adnominal modification turns out to be much more elaborated than that. It hosts not only adjectives but also elements of a relative clause origin and, in some languages, entire relative clauses as well. The theory is tightly related to the antisymmetric proposal, which we will dwell upon first. This chapter will serve as a theoretical background into which we will try to insert the structure of the Bulgarian noun phrase.

The chapter is organized as follows. In the first section, we introduce Kayne’s antisymmetric proposal. In section 2, we discuss Cinque’s approach to the functional structure of phrasal units and in particular the type of movement which applies and the position and the nature of adnominal adjectives. In section 3, we introduce the discussion on relative clauses.

Our walk through the mysteries of phrase structure will begin with Kayne’s Antisymmetric proposal.

1. Kayne’s Antisymmetry of syntax.
The theoretical framework which this dissertation is based on, has as a main building block the right/left asymmetry observed in natural languages. This asymmetry is, actually, one of
the important consequences of Kayne’s antisymmetric theory and one of the main objects of study of Cinque’s theory of the structure of phrases and sentences.

In this section, we will have a closer look at Kayne’s (1994) hypothesis and we will delineate some of the main predictions it makes.

Traditionally, the theory of syntax places the focus mainly on hierarchical syntactic relations. The linear ordering was not in the center of the attention. Therefore, this approach, needed a stipulation, namely, to add an explanation of the way in which the two-dimensional syntactic objects were converted into a one-dimensional speech product. An attempt to account for certain word order differences was the so called directionality parameter. We had to assume that languages like English and Japanese have absolutely the same structure, the only difference lying in the direction of projection. Though appealing at first sight, this explanation turned out to be unsatisfactory since, apart from being stipulative, it makes wrong predictions. Accepting this solution, we would expect that whatever (movement) operations we observe in English (from the right to the left), we must observe also in Japanese, but, necessarily, from the left to the right. Such symmetry among the grammatical operations is not attested. This fact is already quite suspicious. What we observe is a strange asymmetry. This, added to the fact that speech is also asymmetrical, is a good reason to look for a different approach.

Kayne’s (1994) response to this challenge was, and still is, the most coherent approach to the linearization problem which, with its far reaching consequences, offers a totally new perspective on the nature of syntactic relations. The elegance of his proposal lies in the fact that it (its strongest version) is a smart mathematical account of syntactic structure, organized around a simple idea: the asymmetry of linear ordering must be rooted in the hierarchical syntactic structure. In other words, syntactic structure should contain an asymmetric relation which poses certain restrictions, with the effect of excluding symmetrical structures, which are incompatible with the asymmetrical linear ordering. For Kayne, the relation which has these requisites is asymmetric c-command. We present below Kayne’s idea in some detail.

Kayne shows that it is the asymmetric c-command that determines the word order variations and not some parametric variation. He claims that only one type of X-bar structure is allowed and all orders, which differ from it, are derived via movement.
In order to match hierarchical structure with linear ordering, we have to know what properties linear ordering has. According to Kayne, they are the following.

- **transitivity** – if x, y and z are terminal nodes, if x precedes y and y precedes z then x precedes z.
- **totality** – if x and y are terminal nodes, either x precedes y or y precedes x. Linear ordering must include all elements.
- **antisymmetry** – if x and y are terminal nodes, it is not possible to have the case in which both x precedes y and y precedes x.

Kayne states that any group of elements which have these three properties are linearly ordered.

Next, Kayne exploits the properties of structural relations in order to see which structural relation could possess all three properties at the same time. This relation definitely is not the relation of dominance because, as he says, it is transitive, it is antisymmetric but it is not total. This means that the dominance relation does not have a linear dimension.

The next relation Kayne exploits is the relation of c-command. He states that c-command is transitive. It is, however, neither total nor antisymmetric. Traditionally, c-command is symmetrical. Furthermore, it may not involve all the elements. This incompatibility with the linear ordering requirements, however, could be avoided. For this purpose, Kayne reformulates the notion of c-command and states that there is a so called asymmetric c-command, which has all three properties. Kayne formulates asymmetric c-command in the following way:

\[(1) \quad x \text{ asymmetrically c-commands } y \iff x \text{ c-commands } y \text{ and } y \text{ does not c-command } x.\]

Notice, however, that the asymmetric c-command is not total, it is rather locally total. This would mean that this relation is linear but just in local terms.
The dominance relation holds between terminal nodes and among non-terminal nodes. If we label with d the relation among non-terminal and terminal nodes and with D the relation of dominance among non-terminal nodes only, then we could have the multitude of elements d(X), which is a group of terminal nodes that a non-terminal node dominates. The crucial point is that the asymmetric c-command allows us to form pairs of linearly ordered non-terminal nodes, in which the first element asymmetrically c-commands the second. We can label with A the group of these non-terminal nodes. We, then, could label with d the image under D of the group of linearly ordered pairs A. Thus, if T represents all terminal nodes, the following axiom could be formulated:

\[(2) \quad d(A) \text{ is a linear ordering of } T \quad \text{(Kayne, 1994)}\]

Kayne calls (2) the “Linear Correspondence Axiom” (LCA).

The LCA has very important consequences. One of these is that only binary branching is allowed. Otherwise, no linear ordering can be specified. Another one is that a complement of a head can never be a head itself. Moreover, Kayne’s antisymmetric proposal actually derives the properties of the otherwise stipulative X-bar theory. What directly follows from this framework is that no phrase can dominate two (or more) phrases, a phrase can have one and only one head and to one head corresponds only one complement. In formulating X-bar theory, Kayne applies only the notion of category and not that of a segment. His formulation is presented below:

\[(3) \quad X \text{ c-commands } Y \iff X \text{ and } Y \text{ are categories, } X \text{ excludes } Y \text{ and every category that dominates } X \text{ dominates } Y.\]

What follows from this reformulation of X-bar theory is that there can be only one adjunct per phrase. The adjunct of a phrase is actually its Specifier. Another consequence is that it is impossible to have a non-head adjoining to a head. Yet another consequence is that no X’ constituent can be moved as such.

Kayne’s theory forces a rigid Specifier > Head > Complement order. This would mean that if a language allows for a complement to appear to the left of the head, the only
possible scenario is that this complement has moved to that position and has not been merged there. This is how it comes that OV languages are no longer the mirror image of VO languages. Now we know why, in OV languages, we cannot observe the same movement operations we can observe in VO languages.

One of the most widely discussed consequences of the Antisymmetric proposal is the raising analysis of relative clauses, which we will discuss later on. Now, we will return to that consequence of Kayne’s theory which is particularly relevant to our discussion, namely, the above mentioned right/left asymmetry. In what follows, we are going to look at the most extensive study of this asymmetry, a theory of the structure of phrasal units based on typological evidence.

2. Cinque’s theory of the functional structure of phrasal units.
In this subsection, we are going to present a remarkable insight into the functional structure of natural languages. Cinque’s hypothesis of the universal order of functional elements, on the one hand, presents evidence in favour of Kayne’s Antisymmetry and, on the other hand, appears to be a direct consequence following from it. The idea that all languages share the same structure, pieces of which are present overtly in some languages and covertly (as silent elements) in others, reveals itself as a powerful and well-grounded assertion. Cinque believes that the functional structure of natural languages has to be discussed on a par with other universal modules of grammar. In his words, “Just as we would not expect a language to differ from another in terms of the presence versus absence of Case chains, or in terms of a top-down versus bottom-up construction of its constituents, […] I think we should not expect languages to differ in their inventory of functional projections.” (Cinque (2006a), p. 6) This entails that children do not have to discover what notions are represented in a given language as functional and what other notions are presented as lexical – a very appealing consequence. As Cinque puts it:

“The task of discovering what is functional would already be formidable for someone having at his/her disposal all the cross-linguistic evidence that bears on the issue (which the child does not have). Perhaps more plausibly the child’s task, in addition to that of acquiring the lexical items of the language, should be taken to consist in recognizing which elements, if any, correspond to each of the different functional projections that
UG makes available as the rigidly ordered extended projections of the various lexical categories.” (Cinque 2006a, p. 6)

The research into the nature of the language functional notions is one of Cinque’s main fields of interest. The focus falls particularly on the study of adjectives and adverbs. The general idea is that adjectives and adverbs constitute two classes of functional elements which, despite slight differences, appear to be very similar in nature. Since these two groups of elements are modifiers, as parts of the two main phrasal units of language, the clause and the nominal phrase, what we could expect is that the structure of these units must be very similar as well. Actually, this is a substantial part of the so called cartographic approach to language – an attempt to map the universal functional structure of natural languages.

The functional nature of a class of elements, say, of the class of adverbs, is determined on the basis of their being a closed class of elements – there are languages in which adverbs are expressed as verbal affixes. Notice that adverbs have the only function of being modifiers in the extended projection of another category. Adjectives, on their turn, appear to be modifiers in the extended projection of the noun. There are languages in which adjectives are a closed class. Thus, there is a good reason to consider them functional elements as well. Notice, however, that adjectives, differently form adverbs, could be derived from two different sources. It has been noticed that the adjectives occurring in adnominal position are not a homogeneous group. There are adjectives which directly modify the noun, called direct modification adjectives by Sproat and Shih, and adjectives which are derived from relative clauses (which originate as predicates of relative clauses.) In other words, the crucial difference between adjectives and adverbs lies in the possibility of adjectives to be predicates. Those adjectives which are predicates and are derived from a predicative source do not share the properties of the so called attributive-only adjectives. It has been noticed that it is the attributive-only or the direct modification adjectives that form a closed class in some languages. More precisely, it is only in those languages in which adjectives can only be attributes and not predicates, that adjectives are a closed class. On the other hand, in the languages in which adjectives can be derived also from a relative clause source, they appear to be an open class. The distinction between the direct
modification adjectives and the indirect modification adjectives has both semantic and syntactic dimensions, as we will see later on in this chapter.

2.1. The prenominal vs. postnominal position of the adjectives in Germanic and in Romance.

There is one issue which proved to be particularly revealing as far as the nature of adjectives is concerned, namely, the different surface position of the adjectives in Germanic and in Romance. It has been proposed by Cinque (1990, 1994) that the word order differences exhibited by these two language groups are to be attributed to the movement of the noun across some adjectives and not to the different base generation position. This claim opens a hot debate on the nature of adjectives and their position inside the noun phrase, due to its enormous theoretical consequences. We are going to briefly present the idea about the N-movement together with the main arguments in favour of it and its revised version.

The first piece of data which suggests that the noun moves up in Romance languages concerns thematic adjectives. It has been noticed by Cinque that the latter occupy a very particular and rather unexpected position, namely, it is found between the noun and its complement.

(4) L’invasione Italiana dell’Albania.
the invasion Italian of Albania

Of the two possible ways in which this position of the thematic noun can be accounted for (heavy-NP-shift or noun raising), Cinque suggests that noun raising is the more plausible solution because the movement is obligatory (the observed order is the only possible order). In fact, some apparent counterevidence against the obligatory nature of N-movement in Italian proves to be particularly revealing also as far as the different sources of adjectival derivation is concerned. For example, the fact that both (5) and (6) are possible in Italian might be taken as evidence suggesting that N-movement is optional.

(5) La loro brutale aggressione all’Albania.
Already in (1994), however, Cinque notices that the prenominal and the postnominal attributive adjectives receive two different interpretations (a piece of evidence that will prove to be crucial when advocating the phrasal nature of the movement occurring in the DP.) The postnominal attributive adjective has a manner interpretation while the prenominal one has a subject-oriented interpretation. This, actually, suggests that the N-head obligatorily moves across the manner AP. Also, Cinque presents evidence that the adjectives occurring after the complement of the noun (with a sharp intonational break this is not impossible) constitute a different type of modification, namely, predicative modification. Adjectives which cannot be used predicatively cannot occur in this position. This generalization holds true also for Germanic languages, instantiated here by English.

(7) * the indignity, utter and simple
    * the indignity was utter

The N-raising account of Romance languages recalls the N-movement occurring in various other languages, where N moves to D.

This account has far-reaching (desirable) consequences. First, it assigns the same deep structure both to Romance and Germanic languages, something which the adjunction analysis fails to do. The adjunction hypothesis fails to predict that there is a limit on the number of the non-coordinated attributive APs within the DP. The number of the functional projections that are independently available between D and NP, on the other hand is limited, so this account seems more plausible. The serialization of adjectives is another problem for the adjunction analysis, since it does not predicts such a serialization. Adjuncts are not expected to appear ordered. Another theoretical reason for which the generation-in-Spec hypothesis is preferred is that once we adopt it, it is no longer necessary to stipulate the fact that adjectives appear to the left of the head. The position of the specifier is what determines it.

As noted by Hetzron (1978) and Sproat and Shih (1988, 1990), there is a relative ordering of the classes of adjectives, which seems to be the same cross-linguistically. At
first sight, it might seem that the principle on which adjectives are ordered is the relative distance from the noun, since what we find in consistent AN languages is exactly the mirror image of what we find in consistent NA languages. The crucial piece of evidence, however, is provided by Romance languages, which are ANA languages. Interestingly, the unmarked order prenominal Italian adjectives exhibit is equal to the one in AN languages. Besides, in Maltese and in Celtic languages, which are NA languages, the order of adjectives is equal to the order exhibited in AN languages. This shows that the apparent different positions of the adjectives with respect to the noun, in Romance and Germanic, is a result of some movement that has taken place in Romance (the unmarked order being the one of the Germanic noun phrase).

2.2. The right/left asymmetry and the phrasal nature of the moved element.

The idea that the basic position of adjectives is the prenominal position and that the postnominal position is derived finds further support in Kayne’s theory. As was mentioned above, one particularly relevant consequence from his work is that the pre-positional order is the order of merge. Cinque largely exploits this consequence showing clearly that the head is cross-categorically, language-universally, the rightmost element in the syntactic structure.

Cinque provides very strong empirical arguments in favour of the left/right asymmetry hypothesis building on Greenberg’s (1963) typological findings, according to which, as far as the elements Dem, Num, and A are concerned, in prenominal position, the order is unique, as no variation is allowed. Variations are possible in postnominal position only. Not everything, however, is allowed. What Cinque shows is that the only way to derive Greenberg’s universal 20 is by assuming that the prenominal order reported by Greenberg is the order of merge and all other orders are obtained by movement. The fact that, prenominally, only a single order is attested is quite telling in this respect. The postnominal variation is obtained by moving the lexical part of the DP across the adjectival functional projections. One crucial modification of the N-movement idea is made. The movement which obtains inside the DP should be an XP-type of movement and not an X-type of movement, as previously thought. What moves is the whole NP and not the N-head only. Cinque establishes the following parameters of movement, which, as we will see later
on, are valid also for the XP movement which occurs within the clause. The movement is carried out by moving the NP to an Agr projection above the functional projection of an adjective, as shown below (it is assumed that every adjectival functional projection is preceded by an Agr projection, whose Specifier can host the moved NP.)

\[(8)\]
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Agr}_w P \\
\text{WP} \\
\text{Agr}_w \\
\text{DemP} \\
\text{W} \\
\text{XP} \\
\text{Agr}_x \\
\text{NumP} \\
\text{X} \\
\text{Agr}_y \\
\text{AP} \\
\text{Y} \\
\text{NP}
\end{array}
\]

\text{(Cinque, 2005b)}

Notice that the NP can move upwards not only by itself but also pied-piping another category. Two types of pied-piping are observed, one of the type \textit{whose picture} and one of the type \textit{picture of who}. It is pied-piping that is responsible for the reversal of the postnominal order. We present below the parameters of movement.

\[(9)\] Parameters of movement:

a. No movement (unmarked), or
b. Movement of NP plus pied-piping of the \textit{whose picture} type (unmarked), or
c. Movement of NP without pied-piping (marked), or
d. Movement of NP plus pied-piping of the \textit{picture of who} type (more marked still).
e. Total (unmarked) versus partial (marked) movement of NP with or without pied-piping (in other words, NP raises all the way up or just partially, around its modifiers).

f. Neither head movement nor movement of a phrase not containing the (overt) NP is possible (except perhaps for focus-related movements of phrases to a DP-initial position).

(Cinque, 2005b)

The empirical evidence supporting the NP-movement approach actually shows that, accepting the parameters of movement presented above, we can derive the existing orders and, what is even more crucial, we cannot derive the non-existent orders.

Let us see, in more detail, what possibilities exist. The four elements Dem, Num, A and N give rise to twenty four possible orders. The data below are adapted from Cinque (2005b). The existing orders are presented in bold and the non-existing ones in italics.

(10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dem Num A N</th>
<th>Num Dem A N</th>
<th>A Dem Num N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dem Num N A</td>
<td>Num Dem N A</td>
<td>A Dem N Num</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dem N Num A</td>
<td>Num N Dem A</td>
<td>A N Dem Num</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Dem Num A</td>
<td>N Num Dem A</td>
<td>N A Dem Num</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dem A Num N</td>
<td>Num A Dem N</td>
<td>A Num Dem N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dem A N Num</td>
<td>Num A N Dem</td>
<td>A Num N Dem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dem N A Num</td>
<td>Num N A Dem</td>
<td>A N Num Dem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N Dem A Num</td>
<td>N Num A Dem</td>
<td>N A Num Dem</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Just to give an example, the first order in the first column is derived if no movement occurs. All the other orders are derived via movement. The other three orders in the same box are derived by movement of the NP one, two or three notches respectively, without any pied-piping. As we see, none of the orders in the second box are attested. This is what the movement parameter predicts as well. In the first order in the second box, we see that N remains in situ. So, there is no way in which the order of the other elements can change.
The problem with the second order is that it is not obtainable with either type of pied-piping. Whatever movement operation is applied, it implies a wrong merge order. The same is true also for the rest of the unattested orders. The attested orders, on the other hand are all explicable in terms of (9).

The proposal discussed above presents itself as a still more powerful theoretical framework, in being able to explain not only the structure of the noun phrase but also the structure of the clause, an ideal result for those who are engaged in studying the similarities between the noun phrase and the verb phrase. Interestingly, the following four elements building the clausal structure: Mood Tns Asp and V display a distribution very similar to that of the Dem Num A and N, discussed above. But what is crucial here is that the possible and the unattested orders of these four elements seem to be explicable just by applying the same movement parameters. Thus, we have one and only one set of rules for the two major phrasal linguistic units. Moreover, notice that the distribution of the clausal elements is very similar to that of the elements of the nominal extended projection. This can be seen if we compare the two tables. Here again, the unattested orders are those that are impossible to derive by the movement parameters. The attested orders are all explicable once (9) is applied.

(11)

| Mood Tns Asp V | ?Tns Mood Asp V | Asp Mood Tns V |
| Mood Tns V Asp | Asp Mood Tns V | ?Asp Mood V Tns |
| Mood V Tns Asp | Asp V Mood Tns | Asp V Mood Tns |
| V Mood Tns Asp | V Asp Mood Tns | V Asp Mood Tns |

Mood Asp Tns V

| Mood Asp V Tns | Tns Asp V Mood |
| Mood V Asp Tns | Tns V Asp Mood |
| V Mood Asp Tns | V Tns Asp Mood |

Asp Tns Mood V

| Asp Tns V Mood |
| Asp V Tns Mood |
| V Asp Tns Mood |

(adapted from Cinque, 2006b, Paper presented at the 3rd LPIA-Meeting, April 1-2 2006)
One of the basic consequences of the theoretical proposal presented above is that head movement probably does not exist. It follows also that Baker’s Mirror principle, which was originally believed to follow from the head-movement constraint, does not seem to be a universal principle, in the above sense. As stated by Cinque, it probably follows (where it holds) from the interaction of other, deeper principles and the actual state of affairs is simply the unmarked situation.

Notice also that that there are several other cases of right/left asymmetry studied by Cinque, which we are not going to dwell upon in detail here – the order of adverbs, the order of the circumstantial prepositional phrases as well as the order of auxiliaries. What we observe is, again, one single order in pre-position and more than one order in post-position.

The substitution of X-movement with XP-movement appears to be crucial also as far as the order of adjectives is concerned. We will see below that this new theory manages to explain not only the differences in the syntactic position of the adjectives in Romance and in Germanic (something which was already done, in Cinque, (1994), although a few problems remained undiscussed) but also some crucial semantic distinctions, namely those between the predicative and the attributive adjectives, only partially discussed in (Cinque, 1994).

2.3. Problems with the N-movement approach.

We now turn to the issue of prenominal and the postnominal occurrence of the adjectives in Germanic and in Romance. In terms of the theory presented above, the case of the Germanic languages is presented by the first order in the first box. As we saw above, this is the unmarked case, where nothing moves. The case of Romance languages is the second. In Romance languages, just few steps of movement apply, namely the movements of the NP across some of the adjectival functional projections (the NP does not move higher up, across the Numeral.)

Under the previous analysis (according to which N-movement operates), the noun could move across the adjectives leaving them behind, but strange cases were noticed, in which some adjectives could remain in post-position but only in case no other adjective was present there (though the other adjective could freely occur in postposition, being
alone). In other words a strange restriction on the number of the adjectives in postposition was noticed. This problem is presented in the examples below (The examples are taken from Cinque, 2005a).

(12) La sola possibile invasione romanə della Tracia
    the only possible invasion Roman of Thrace

(13) La sola invasione possibile della Tracia
    the only invasion possible of Thrace

but still:

(14) *? La sola invasione possibile romana della Tracia
    the only invasion possible Roman of Thrace

Furthermore, various authors observe that, in postposition, Romance languages typically display orders which are the mirror image of the order of the prenominal adjectives in Germanic languages. (Lamarche, 1991; Bosque and Picallo, 1996; Bouchard, 1998, 2002; Laenzlinger, 2000, 2005a, b; Dimitrova-Vulchanova, 2003). The examples are taken from Cinque (2005a).

(15) The most probable main cause of his death (is this)

(16) a) La causa prima più probabile della sua morte (è questa)
    b) * La causa più probabile prima della sua morte (è questa)

Example (16a) actually illustrates the reason why (14) is ungrammatical. The reason is not the number but the order of the adjectives which Romance languages display. Simply, the order that we must observe is the reverse order of the one found in Germanic and what we find in postposition in (14) is the Germanic order.

Another problem noticed in the literature concerns some scope effects. If a non-predicative adjective occurs in postposition after the head movement of the noun has
occurred, we expect that the postnominal adjective will not be able to take scope over the prenominal one. And yet, cases of scope of the former over the latter are registered in the literature. The following example is taken from Cinque (2005a).

(17) E’ una giovane promessa sicura.
He is a sure young promise

In the above example the attributive-only postnominal adjective takes scope over the whole complex of the prenominal adjective and the noun.

Yet another problem for the head movement analysis is that it does not manage to explain various very clear semantic distinctions between the interpretations of the prenominal and the postnominal adjectives in Romance and in Germanic. We present these distinctions below.

2.4. Systematic semantic distinctions between prenominal and postnominal adjectives in Germanic and in Romance.
Building on other authors, Cinque (2005a) presents various systematic differences in meaning holding between prenominal and postnominal adjectives in Germanic and Romance; the interesting point being that the position where we find ambiguity in meaning in Romance, i.e. the postnominal position is unambiguous in English and the opposite is true as well – the unambiguous position in English is the postnominal position while, in Romance, this is the prenominal position. One more curiosity is to be added here. The unambiguous prenominal position in Romance is just an attributive position (it hosts only attributive adjectives), while the unambiguous predicative position in English (Germanic) is only predicative (it hosts only predicatively used adjectives.) In what follows, we will present the way Cinque (2005a) proposes to account for these contrasts. The account he develops will be the next piece in the puzzle, which, step by step, unravels the mystery of adjectives.

We present below the curious, very systematic, semantic contrasts between Romance and Germanic adjectives, which we are going to apply, in the next chapter, also to the structure of the Bulgarian noun phrase.
2.4.1. Individual-level vs. Stage-level

Building on Bolinger (1967) and a number of other authors, Cinque (2005a) reports that prenominal English adjectives are systematically ambiguous between the following two readings. They can denote either an enduring state, or a temporary state. This distinction can be expressed in terms of the stage-level – individual-level distinction. The postnominal position, on the other hand, characteristically lacks ambiguity. The adjectives occurring there typically express only a temporary state.

In Italian (as well as in the rest of the Romance languages), the picture seems to be just the opposite. The prenominal position is the unambiguous one. The postnominal, instead, hosts adjectives which can be interpreted ambiguously. Notice that the unambiguous prenominal position in Romance carries just the opposite interpretation (the individual-level one) of the unambiguous Germanic postnominal position (which carries just the stage-level interpretation). The examples illustrating the distinctions at issue are presented below. The examples are taken from Cinque (2005a).

**English**

(18)  
(a) The **visible** stars include Aldebaran and Sirius (*ambiguous*)
(b) “The stars that are generally visible include…” (individual-level)
(c) “The stars that happen to be visible now include…” (stage-level)

(19)  
(a) The (only) stars **visible** are Aldebaran and Sirius (*unambiguous*)
(b) # “The (only) stars that are generally visible are…” (individual-level)
(c) “The (only) stars which happen to be visible now are…” (stage-level)

**Italian**

(20)  
(a) Le **noiose** lezioni di Ferri se le ricordano tutti (*unambiguous*)
(b) “Everybody remembers Ferri’s classes, all of which were boring” (non-restrictive)
(c) # “Everybody remembers just those classes by Ferri which were boring. (restrictive)”
(21)  a) Le lezioni noiose di Ferri se le ricordano tutti (ambiguous)
    b) “Everybody remembers Ferri’s classes, all of which were boring” (non-restrictive)
    c) “Everybody remembers just those classes by Ferri which were boring” (restrictive)

2.4.2. Modal vs. Implicit relative reading.
The same difference in interpretation between the pre- and postnominal position in Romance and Germanic that we have discussed above, can be detected with other semantic distinctions. In a similar fashion, we find the distinction Modal reading vs. Implicit relative reading. We will simply present the relevant examples below.

**English**
(22)  a) Mary interviewed every possible candidato (ambiguous)
    b) “Mary interviewed every potential candidate” (modal reading)
    c) “Mary interviewed every candidate that it was possible for her to interview” (implicit relative reading)

(23)  a) Mary interviewed every candidate possible (unambiguous)
    b) # “Mary interviewed every potential candidate” (modal reading)
    c) “Mary interviewed every candidate that it was possible for her to interview” (implicit relative reading)

**Italian**
(24)  a) Maria ha intervistato ogni possibile candidate (unambiguous)
    b) “Maria interviewed every potential candidate” (modal reading)
    c) # “Maria interviewed every candidate that it was possible for her to interview” (implicit relative reading)
(25)  a) Maria ha intervistato ogni candidato possibile (*ambiguous*)
     b) “Maria interviewed every potential candidate” (modal reading)
     c) “Maria interviewed every candidate that it was possible for her to interview.”
        (implicit relative reading)

The important thing to notice is that in all these cases the prenominal position in English and the postnominal position in Italian are equally ambiguous. The postnominal English adjectives, on the other hand, as well as the prenominal Italian adjectives, are always unambiguous.

2.4.3. Intersective vs. Non-intersective interpretation.
Another semantic distinction is presented by the pair Intersective – Non-intersective (adverbial meaning). This distinction was originally noted by Vendler (1968) (also see Larson (1995, 1998).) The examples below are taken from Cinque (2005a).

*English*

(26)  a) Olga is a beautiful dancer (*ambiguous*)
     b) “Olga is a dancer who is also a beautiful person” (intersective)
     c) “Olga dances beautifully” (nonintersective)

(27)  a) Olga is a dancer more beautiful than her instructor. (*unambiguous*)
     b) “Olga is a dancer who is a more beautiful person than her instructor”
        (intersective)
     c) # “Olga dances more beautifully than her instructor” (nonintersective)

*Italian*

(28)  a) Un buon attaccante non farebbe mai una cosa del genere. (*unambiguous*)
     b) “A forward good at playing forward would never do such a thing”
        (nonintersective)
     c) # “A good-hearted forward would never do such a thing” (intersective)
(29) a) Un attaccante *buono* non farebbe mai una cosa del genere (*ambiguous*)
    b) “A forward good at playing forward would never do such a thing”
       (nonintersective)
    c) “A good-hearted forward would never do such a thing” (intersective)

2.4.4. Relative vs. Absolute.
The next semantic distinction between the postnominal and the prenominal readings is the following contrast: Relative (to a comparison class) vs. Absolute. This distinction is widely discussed in the literature. Here are some examples. (taken from Cinque, 2005a)

*English*

(30) a) Himalaya’s *very high* mountains are a truly wonderful sight. (*ambiguous*)
    b) “Himalaya’s mountains, which are very high objects,…” (absolute)
    c) “Himalaya’s mountains, which are high compared to the average height of mountains,…” (relative)

(31) [the postnominal position of the adjective cannot be tested in English]

*Italian*

(32) a) Le *altissime* montagne dell’Himalaya sono un vero spettacolo (*unambiguous*)
    b) “Himalaya’s mountains, which are very high objects,…” (absolute)
    c) # “Himalaya’s mountains, which are high compared to the average height of mountains,…” (relative)

(33) a) Le montagne *altissime* dell’Himalaya sono un vero spettacolo (*ambiguous*)
    b) “Himalaya’s mountains, which are very high objects,…” (absolute)
    c) “Himalaya’s mountains, which are high compared to the average height of mountains,…” (relative)
Three more distinctions of this kind are found, namely, Relative vs. Absolute interpretation of the superlative form, Specificity-inducing vs. non-specificity-inducing interpretation and Evaluative vs. Propositional interpretation. All examples instantiating them are taken from (Cinque, 2005a).

2.4.5. Relative vs. Absolute interpretation of the superlative form.

English

(34) a) Who climbed the highest mountain? (*ambiguous*)
    b) Who climbed mount Everest? (absolute)
    c) Who climbed the highest mountain among those which were climbed?
       (relative)

(35) a) Who climbed the mountain highest of all? (*unambiguous*)
    b) # Who climbed mount Everest? (absolute)
    c) Who climbed the highest mountain among those which were climbed?
       (relative)

Italian

(36) a) Chi ha scalato la più alta montagna? (*unambiguous*)
    b) Who climbed mount Everest? (absolute)
    c) # Who climbed the highest mountain among those which were climbed?
       (relative)

(37) a) Chi ha scalato la montagna più alta? (*ambiguous*)
    b) Who climbed mount Everest? (absolute)
    c) Who climbed the highest mountain among those which were climbed?
       (relative)
2.4.6. Specificity-inducing vs. non-specificity-inducing

English

(38) a) John wants to burn a nearby house (*ambiguous*)
    b) “John wants to burn some specific house which is near his” (specific)
    c) “John wants to burn some house or other among those which are near his” (non-specific)

(39) a) John wants to burn a house nearby (*unambiguous*)
    b) “John wants to burn some specific house which is near his” (specific)
    c) # “John wants to burn some house or other among those which are near his” (non-specific)

Italian

(40) a) Mi hanno detto che alla festa interverrà un famoso attore (*unambiguous*)
    b) “They told me that a certain famous actor will come to the party” (specific)
    c) # “They told me that some famous actor will come to the party” (non-specific)

(41) a) Mi hanno detto che alla festa interverrà un attore famoso (*ambiguous*)
    b) “They told me that a certain famous actor will come to the party” (specific)
    c) “They told me that some famous actor will come to the party” (non-specific)

2.4.7. Evaluative vs. Propositional

English

(42) a) Maria lives in some unknown village in the South of France (*ambiguous*)
    b) “Maria lives in some village in the South of France which is not well-known” (evaluative)
    c) “Maria lives in some village in the South of France, but it is not known which one” (propositional)
(43) [the postnominal positioning of the adjective cannot be tested in English]

**Italian**

(44) a) Maria vive in uno sconosciuto villaggio del sud della Francia (*unambiguous*)
   b) “Maria lives in some village in the South of France which is not well-known” (evaluative)
   c) # “Maria lives in some village in the South of France, but it is not known which one” (propositional)

(45) a) Maria vive in un villaggio sconosciuto del sud della Francia (*ambiguous*)
   b) “Maria lives in some village in the South of France which is not a well-known one” (evaluative)
   c) “Maria lives in some village in the South of France, but it is not known which one” (propositional)

The above discussed distinctions are summarized in the following tables:

**Germanic**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prenominal adjectives</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Postnominal adjectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage-level or Individual-level</td>
<td></td>
<td>Stage-level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrictive or non-restrictive</td>
<td></td>
<td>Restrictive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implicit relative reading or modal reading</td>
<td></td>
<td>Implicit relative reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intersective or nonintersective</td>
<td></td>
<td>Intersective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative or absolute</td>
<td></td>
<td>[cannot be tested]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative or absolute reading with superlatives</td>
<td></td>
<td>Relative or absolute reading with superl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specificity-inducing or non-specificity inducing</td>
<td></td>
<td>Specificity-inducing or non-specificity inducing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluative or prepositional</td>
<td></td>
<td>[cannot be tested]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Cinque, 2005a)
### Romance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prenominal adjectives</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual-level</td>
<td>Postnominal adjectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonrestrictive</td>
<td>Stage-level or Individual-level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modal reading</td>
<td>Restrictive or non-restrictive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonintersective</td>
<td>Implicit relative reading or modal reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolute</td>
<td>Intersective or nonintersective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolute reading with superlatives</td>
<td>Relative or absolute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specificity-inducing</td>
<td>Relative or absolute reading with superlatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluative</td>
<td>Specificity-inducing or non-specificity inducing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We now return to the question of why N-movement does not give good results. It simply cannot derive the correct orders. If the ambiguous readings correspond to reduced relative clauses (RRC) and the unambiguous readings correspond to the attributive-only adjectives then what we get in Germanic and in Romance is presented below.

**English (Germanic)**

\[
(46) \quad \text{RRC} > \text{direct modification adjectives} > N > \text{RRC}
\]

**Italian (Romance)**

\[
(47) \quad \text{direct modification adjectives} > N > \text{direct modification adjectives} > \text{RRC}
\]
(The order in (46) assumes that there are two adjectives used prenominally and the order in (47) assumes that there are two adjectives in postnominal position.)

2.5. Deriving the Romance and the Germanic orders.
As to the N-movement approach, it is problematic because it cannot be delivered from a common structure of merge. If, instead, we assume that adjectives have two sources, it works perfectly. As we mentioned above, adjectives, unlike adverbs, can either be modifiers of another category or predicates. In Cinque (2005a), exactly this possibility is exploited. How does it work? It is assumed that those adjectives that can occur as predicates of relative clauses, actually, have a predicative source. The ones which cannot be predicates of relative clauses are simply modifiers in the extended projection of the noun. Accepting the terminology of Sproat and Shih (1988, 1991), we can call the first group Indirect modification (adjectives) and the second group Direct modification (adjectives).

How can we derive the Germanic and the Romance orders?
Anticipating the discussion on relative clauses, we will briefly mention that Cinque (2003) assumes that relative clauses are merged prenominally. Thus, what actually happens is the following.

As to the Germanic order, it actually corresponds to the order of merge. That is, the Germanic order is the order which we see if no movement operations have taken place (we abstract away from the possibility to have a predicative adjective in postposition).

As to the Romance order, it is a result of various movements. If the relative clauses are merged prenominally, the postnominal position of the indirect modification adjective will be achieved by the movement of the noun plusr the whole chunk of the direct modification adjectives across an indirect modification adjective. Notice that, in Romance languages, no reduced relative clauses can occur in prenominal position. Thus, all kinds of relative clauses are only found postnominally. The movements responsible for the postnominal position of the relative clauses in Romance languages are presented below.
(The example is taken form Cinque (2005a).)
We have seen above that not only predicative but also attributive adjectives can occur after the noun. This is due to the NP movement of the lexical part of the DP, the one that we have been discussing before. Thus, in Romance two movement operations take place – one movement of the lexical part of the noun phrase, across some attributive adjectives and another one – a movement of all attributive adjectives across the relative clause.

Returning to the structure of merge of the DP, we have already mentioned that the structure of merge corresponds to the structure of the Germanic noun phrase. The attributive-only adjectives are what immediately precedes the noun. What we find higher up is a layer of predicative adjectives. The evidence in favour of this come from English:

(49) two big black dog

(50) two black big dogs

The unmarked word order is the one in (49). The word order in (50), instead, is the marked one. The “lower” adjective is merged above in that it is merged as a reduced relative clause. This is taken as evidence to show that above the direct modification layer and below the position of the numeral there is a predicative layer, hosting adjectives derived from a predicative source.
We mentioned above that all elements derived from a predicative source (participles, complex AP reduced relative clauses as well as full relative clauses), are merged prenominally. Their postnominal occurrence should be a result of the movement of the NP and the direct modification layer across these elements. One interesting thing to notice is that it is only the full relative clauses that are obligatorily extraposed (we never find them in prenominal position). As to the participles and the adjectival relative clauses, their extraposition is optional. Cinque (2005a) relates this fact to the work of Larson and Takahashi (in press), who, discussing data from Japanese, Korean, Chinese and Turkish, suggest that the adnominal modification area is divided into two large layers – an individual-level layer, closer to the noun, governed by a generic operator and a stage-level layer, higher than the previous one and governed by an existential operator. What Cinque suggests is that the predicative elements under the scope of the existential quantifier are those which can optionally extrapose, while those which cannot at all appear in postnominal position appear under the scope of the generic operator. The full relative clauses are outside the scope of either quantifier. We will return to this point later on, when discussing the data from Bulgarian.

We have analyzed above the adjectival layer of the noun phrase. In the next section, we will turn to relative clauses, the next large piece of our discussion.

3. Relative clauses

Having seen that the layers of the nominal projection that immediately precede the noun are occupied by attributive-only adjectives and adjectives from a predicative source, we continue looking at the adnominal modification, also in this subsection, this time focusing on the layers higher up in the tree.

It was mentioned earlier that according to Cinque’s (2003) analysis the merge position of relative clauses is the prenominal position. One big issue, which has been broadly discussed in the literature, concerns the merge position of the head of the relative clause. Two types of analyses have been proposed. One of them is called the “Matching analysis”, proposed by Ross (1967), which works in the following way: one copy of the head of the relative clause is merged inside the relative clause and another one outside it. Then, through an operation of movement and a relation of identification, the internal head
is identified (matched) with the external head. The second analysis, called the “Raising analysis” was proposed in Brame (1967) and is most extensively discussed in Kayne (1994). According to this analysis, the head is merged inside the relative clause from where it moves toward the Spec, C position of the relative clause. Various arguments are presented in favour of both analyses, which we are going to discuss below. In this subsection, we are going to look at a unifying approach, elaborated in Cinque (2003a), who assumes the correctness of both a matching and a raising derivation. He offers a detailed theory of relative clauses, adopting Kayne’s proposal concerning the insertion of complementizers.

In the next subsection, we are going to present the matching and raising analyses.

3.1. The Matching analysis.
The matching analysis of relative clauses was originally proposed by Ross (1967). What Ross assumed was that the relative clauses are adjoined to the noun phrase. The noun phrase contains a head, which is external to the relative clause and the relative clause contains an identical NP constituent, which matches the external head. The structure that has been suggests is shown on the tree diagram below.

![Tree Diagram](image)

Two basic relations are involved in the matching analysis. One is the relation between the position of the identical copy of the head and the position to which the relativized head moves. This is a relation of movement. The second important relation is the one which
connects the external head to the head inside the relative clause. This relation is a relation of identification of indices. It is important to state that the two DPs are independent.

3.1.1. Problems with the matching analysis.
The matching analysis, as formulated above, presents both empirical and conceptual problems, which we will only briefly mention here. First, it is incompatible with Kayne’s antisymmetry (in the analysis above, the highest maximal projection N/DP dominates two phrases). Second, Ross’s analysis makes some wrong predictions as far as some quantifiers are concerned. Later, this analysis was reformulated and an intermediate constituent between the DP and the relative clause was added (the so-called Nom-S analysis).

Kayne’s antisymmetry, however, forces the adoption of another analysis, namely the raising analysis, also known as the promotion analysis.

3.2. The raising analysis.
For Kayne (1994), the relative clause consists of an external determiner taking a CP as complement. According to the raising analysis the head is generated inside the relative clause and is made “external” by the raising of the internal head to Spec, CP. There are data which suggest that this, apparently counterintuitive analysis, is not only viable but quite plausible.

The first piece of evidence comes from picture-noun reflexivization. The data below show that the head if the relative clause is reconstructed inside the relative clause itself.

(52) the picture of himself, that I think John; likes

It is clear that the antecedent of himself is John. However, we see from the example that the anaphor is higher that the element which is supposed to c-command it. The only reasonable explanation is that what is c-commanded is the position inside the relative clause, which means, actually, that the head of the relative clause which picture of himself is base-generated inside the relative clause. What happens is that the head moves and a copy of this head remains inside the relative clause so that the rules of anaphor interpretation to apply correctly.
The second piece of evidence comes from idiom chunks.

(53) the headway that he made was satisfactory

The expression to make headway is an idiom. The only correct position in which headway can be interpreted is as a complement of the verb make. Though, as we see in the above example, this noun has been moved and in spite of that the idiom is interpreted correctly. This suggests that, again, in the position after make a copy of headway has remained, which forces the correct interpretation of the idiom. The matching analysis cannot explain examples like this one because it assumes that the external head is generated outside and what we have inside is just a copy of this head. So, the internal head is an object of make but the external head is not. Thus, we would expect wrong examples like the following to be correct.

(54) * The headway that he laughed at was satisfactory.

Quantifier scope presents additional evidence in favour of the raising analysis.

(55) I met the two students that each professor invited.

The point, here, is that each professor can take the numeral in its scope (i.e. one of the possible interpretations is that each professor invited two different students). This is only possible if the head of the relative clause two students is reconstructed inside the relative clause, in a position c-commanded by each professor.

Despite the vast number of examples supporting Kayne’s promotion analysis, there seem to be data which show that, in some cases, this analysis makes wrong predictions. We present below some evidence showing that, with some sentences the matching analysis seems to be the better solution.
3.3. Evidence in favour of the Matching analysis.

We know that if a pronoun c-commands a proper name, no co-indexation is possible between them, according to principle C of the Binding theory. This means that Bob in (56) is never reconstructed under the scope of he in the relative clause. It must be generated directly outside.

(56) I have a report on Bob’s division that he, won’t like.

In (56), the co-indexation is possible. This shows an impossibility of the head to be reconstructed as part of the relative clause. It is generated directly outside.

There are examples with negative polarity items, like (57), again showing that the raising analysis cannot be the only possible account.

(57) I don’t trust anyone.

The example above is correct, but, notice, that if there is a quantifier intervening between the negation marker and the negative polarity item, the example is no longer grammatical.

(58) * I don’t think everyone can trust anyone.

Now let us analyse the following example.

(59) Nobody found [a picture of anyone] which everybody liked.

On the basis of what we said about (58), we cannot have reconstruction since once we reconstruct the head, everybody will block anyone.

Summing up, we can say that some sentences need reconstruction and others do not. Both analyses seem to be necessary in order to cover all cases.

Before proceeding with Cinque’s analysis, which unifies both approaches, we are going to look at some empirical generalizations which seem to have important theoretical implications. Greenberg noticed that there is a relation between the position of the object and that of the noun. Dryer (1992) shows that OV languages are not uniform in terms of the
position of the relative clause with respect to the noun. Indeed, the case is that if the language is VO then the relative clause necessarily follows the noun, with exceedingly few exceptions. If the RC follows the noun, however, it does not follow necessarily that the language is VO. But it is true that if the RC precedes the noun the language can only be OV. Thus, OV languages have no preferences as to the position of the relative clause. Mallinson and Blake (1988) notice something very important, namely, that in rigid OV languages, the relative clause can only precede the noun and never follow it. In those languages, almost nothing can occur in postnominal position. Another interesting finding is that, in VO languages, C occurs always in preposition with respect to the following clause. In OV languages, again, two possibilities are found. Rigid OV languages have the order [IP C]. The conclusion is that there seems to be a correlation also between the position of the complement and that of the clause.

According to Kayne (1999, 2000, 2005), the complementizer is responsible for the position of the nominal elements. In fact, what he claims is that a direct object is licensed by means of raising to a specifier of a functional projection. If a CP argument has to be licensed, it should be nominalized. The actual argument is not a CP but an IP (containing the verb and its arguments), since the complementizer is inserted on its own, higher up. The IP has to be moved as a DP, in order to be licensed. Kayne claims that there are different positions, higher in the tree than the relative clause, in which the complement can be inserted. What actually happens, according to Cinque (2005c), in languages which display complement final position (OV languages) is that they realize the lowest complement, the one which attracts the IP. In VO languages, instead, the lowest complementizer is not realized overtly, it is silent. Nevertheless this complementizer attracts the IP, its specifier functions as a licensing position for the IP. Then a higher one is realized, which is finite. Notice that finite complements tend to always attract, while the non-finite complements may attract or not. After the first movement has taken place the higher complementizer attracts the remnant. In the case of relative clauses in VO languages, however, what is moved to the Spec of the finite complement is not the entire remnant but just the dp. This movement has to do with the existence of an exact copy of the dp along the main DP branch. Thus, the internal dp head is pronominalized and moved up.
In what follows, we will look at Cinque’s approach, the way in which he combines the matching and the raising analyses to relative clauses.

4. Cinque’s analysis of relative clauses.

As we mentioned above, the merge position of the relative clause is the prenominal position (the position in which relative clauses occur in OV languages) and the postnominal position is a derived position. The question arises, also, where prenominally do relative clauses occur. This must be the position in which they are found in OV languages, namely, between the numeral and the demonstrative. Thus, the order we must have is the following: Dem > RC > Num > A > N.

Another issue which Cinque (2003) raises is the issue about the head of the relative clause. As we silently took for granted in the discussion above, the head of the relative clause is claimed to be not a single noun but a larger chunk of material. Cinque claims that the head of the relative clause is an indefinite phrase including the numeral (but no determiners, universal quantifiers or other case holders). Evidence for the existence of an indefinite chunk below the numeral is given by an Italian dialect, which realizes an indefinite article lower than the numeral.

(60) Una na rama

one (Num) indef. art. branch

“a branch”

In any case, the head of the relative clause can include only material which is lower than the position of the RC itself. The head is labeled in the tree as a small dp.

Here is the analysis of relative clauses suggested by Cinque (2003).
In (61) above, we see the position of merge of the relative clause (which is an IP: according to Kayne, the C is inserted later). It is a position higher than the position of the small dp (we have not specified how further up in the tree it is). One very important point is that the main branch of the tree, i.e. the main DP, contains an exact copy of the head of the relative clause. We will see later why the existence of this copy is so crucial. In accordance with Kayne’s analysis, which says that a silent complementizer is merged above the relative clause and attracts it to its Spec, the IP has to move in the manner indicated by the arrow.

Once the IP moves to the Spec of the silent complementizer, a second movement takes place. When we talked about the properties of the matching analysis, we mentioned
that there are two main relations involved. One is the relation between the copy of the external head, which is inside the relative clause and the position of Spec, CP, to which it moves, which is clearly a relation of movement. As a result of this relation the internal copy of the relative clause is moved to the Spec of C. The second relation is the relation between the internal head of the relative clause and the external copy of this head. Thanks to this relation, the internal head is matched with the external copy and then gets relativized, i.e. turns into a relative pronoun (which).

What happens according to Cinque’s analysis is that the head of the relative clause gets relativized and turns into a relative pronoun. It then moves to the Spec of a higher complementizer, which is inserted after the first movement has taken place.

(62)

At this moment of the derivation we end up with the phrase: \([\text{CP which}_i [\text{CP IP}_k \text{John bought } t_i] [\text{DP an t}_k \text{ expensive book }]]\).

The last step of the derivation is the one at which yet another C head is merged at the top of the whole projection attracting the external copy of the head of the relative clause.
After this last movement operation, the only step missing is the insertion of D. The result is that we derive the correct English phrase: *the expensive book which John bought.*
We will just mention that, in case the relative clause has no relative pronoun but an overt or a covert complementizer, what we observe is that the internal head moves and then the external copy moves as well. The whole clause which, in the case of the relative pronoun is pronominalized, is deleted and what is pronounced is just that in C. Actually, the external copy of the head, being higher, controls the internal head and deletes it. For the rest, the analysis remains the same.

4.1. Summary.
In this section, we have presented a unifying analysis of relative clauses, which exploits both the raising and the matching hypothesis. We have looked only at the derivation of postnominal relative clauses and we have seen that these relative clauses are derived by means of a series of movements to the specifiers of complementizer projections, whose existence is predicted by Kayne’s analysis. While, so far, we have been exploring the derivation of full relative clauses, in the next section, we will briefly turn to reduced relative clauses.
4.2. Reduced relative clauses.

Reduced relative clauses are one of the main object of the dissertation. Therefore, we will discuss them mainly in the following chapters. Here, we are going to mention just some of their general properties.

The structure of reduced relative clauses (RRC) differs a little bit from that of full relative clauses. First, the head of the RRC is smaller than the head of the full relative clause. We will see in the next chapter that the subject of the RRC is a PRO and we will present some evidence in favour of this claim. One very substantial difference in the distribution between the full and the reduced relative clauses in VO languages like English, Bulgarian, etc. is that full relative clauses can never be prenominal but reduced relative clauses can. This can be explained with the fact that no finite complementizer is inserted and, thus, the head of the relative clause is not attracted.
CHAPTER TWO
Double definiteness constructions in Bulgarian

Introduction.
In this chapter we look at the possibility of placing two definite determiners within the same noun phrase in Bulgarian. In particular, we will analyse the following three patterns. First, we look at the co-occurrence between the demonstrative and the definite article. Second, we will consider the possibility of the article to occur twice in the noun phrase – once on the possessive and once on the adjective. Third, this same pattern will be looked at once more, with the article occurring on the numeral and on the adjective. We will refer to the three constructions mentioned above as double definiteness constructions. We are using this as an umbrella term covering all three constructions, rather than as a technical term.

We will argue that the co-occurrence of two definite determiners (a demonstrative and a definite article, or two definite articles) is not simply an instance of a second occurrence of a definiteness marker within the same phrase but rather an occurrence of a reduced relative clause in prenominal position. We will provide both semantic and syntactic evidence in favour of this claim. Our purpose will be to show that the second articulated element appears to be the DP predicate of a prenominal relative clause.

Another objective will be to compare the double definiteness constructions in Bulgarian with similar phenomena in other languages – Greek, Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian, Russian and Slovenian.

Another objective will be to show that apart from the co-occurrence of the demonstrative and the definite article (or of two definite articles), Bulgarian has also other means of isolating predicative adjectives in prenominal position, namely, by generating them higher than the numeral and the possessive.

The chapter is organized as follows. Section one is an introduction to the Bulgarian noun phrase. Section two presents the data we are going to analyse, namely, the three colloquial double definiteness constructions. In section three, we offer a semantic analysis of the double definiteness constructions. Section four presents the phonological characteristics of the constructions in question. In section five, we present the syntactic analysis of the double definiteness constructions and we have a look at similar phenomena.
from other languages. We will claim that, though being quite similar to the double
definiteness constructions in Bulgarian, all of these phenomena differ from what we
observe in Bulgarian. In section six, we present data from Slovenian suggesting that the
colloquial Slovenian TA constructions, at least some occurrences of these, seem to be much
more similar to the Bulgarian double definiteness constructions. We conclude this chapter
with section seven, in which we present some data showing that, apart from the discussed
double definiteness constructions, which contain articulated adjectives, ordinary (i.e. non-
articulated) adjectives also can exploit a relative clause source.

1. Introduction to the noun phrase in Bulgarian.

Bulgarian is a Slavic language which belongs to the group of the Balkan languages. One
typically Balkan feature distinguishes it from all other Slavic languages, namely, the fact
that it has a definite article and, as in other Balkan languages, this article is an affix.

As reported by Dimitrova-Vulchanova & Giusti (1996, 1998 & 1999), the definite
article is attached onto the first adjective in the noun phrase through incorporation.

(1) goliamoto momche Dimitrova-Vulchanova & Giusti (1996)
    big-the boy

If the noun phrase contains just a noun the article is incorporated onto the noun.

(2) momche-to Dimitrova-Vulchanova & Giusti (1996)
    boy-the

Linguists adopt different approaches to the definite article in Bulgarian. Its enclitic nature is
the reason why some of them suggest an N-to-D movement approach. (Arnaudova, 1996).
in Bulgarian. Analysing three Balkan languages, Bulgarian, Albanian and Rumanian, they
conclude that the N-to-D movement is necessarily related to the N-movement to an
intermediate functional head, in the sense of Cinque (1994). That is, a language which has
the former characteristic should be expected to have also the latter. Bulgarian does not
exhibit a movement to an intermediate functional projection, and this is the reason why, according to the authors, the language disallows the N-to-D movement. In our analysis we are going to follow this latter approach.

As far as the demonstrative is concerned, Dimitrova-Vulchanova & Giusti (1996) suggest that it is merged in Spec, DP and marks the boundary of the DP. Above the demonstrative we can find only quantifiers. In the cases in which the quantifier follows the demonstrative the analysis predicts that the demonstrative moves up, to Spec, QP. (The adjectival analysis of the quantifier is discarded because of the obligatory occurrence of the definite article on the quantifier following the demonstrative.) In standard Bulgarian the demonstrative and the definite article never occur together in the noun phrase. Their co-occurrence is considered colloquial (Dimitrova-Vulchanova & Giusti, 1996, Dimitrova-Vulchanova & Valentin Vulchanov, ms).

Another relevant issue is the incorporation of the definite article on the adjectives. As proposed by Dimitrova-Vulchanova & Giusti (1996), the article is inserted already in the specifier of the functional projection where the adjective is merged. Thus the adjective checks the article in its own functional projection. The adjective, already inflected for the article, moves to the Spec, DP. Features are checked there through Spec-Head agreement. We present below the structure for an adjective modified by a quantifier, as proposed in Dimitrova-Vulchanova & Giusti (1996).
2. The co-occurrence of two definite elements in the Bulgarian noun phrase. Data.

The structures we will discuss in this chapter do not occur in Standard Bulgarian (Dimitrova-Vulchanova & Giusti, 1996, Dimitrova-Vulchanova & Giusti, 1998). They are, however, very frequent in colloquial speech. We are going to make a semantic and a syntactic analysis of the occurrences at issue and to propose a syntactic structure.

2.1. The Dem+Art construction.

First, we will look at the co-occurrence of the demonstrative and the definite article (henceforth Dem+Art construction).

The definite article co-occurring with the demonstrative can appear on adjectives, as shown by the examples below:

(4) onaia zelenata bluza
that green-the blouse

(5) onia novite pantaloni
those new-the trousers

The definite article can also occur on a possessor and on a numeral.
There are native speakers who accept the definite article also on quantifiers like *niakolko/some, mnogo/many.*

(8) Onia mnogoto knigi (tam)
those many-the books there

(9) Onia niakolkoto knigi
those some-the books

The occurrence of the article on the quantifier vsichki/all is analysed in a different way (see Dimitrova-Vulchanova & Giusti, 1996) and we will not dwell upon this here.

The adjective carrying the definite article can (probably rather marginally) be followed by the possessive clitic.

(10) onia zelenite mu obuvki
those gree-the his-CL shoes

The Bulgarian correspondence of the English indefinite article - *edin/one* cannot appear in the Dem+Art construction. (It is quite a controversial issue whether this element is a real indefinite article or something else. I will leave this issue open here.)

(11) *onia ediniat stol
that one-the chair
(12) *onia ednite stolove
    those ones-the chairs

The adjective holding the article in the Dem+Art construction can be modified by the degree quantifier, the comparative degree seems to be more admissible.

(13) onaia po-visokata kushta
    that  more high-the house

(14) ?onaia nai-visokata kushta
    that  most high-the house

Some adjectives modified by adverbs can appear in the Dem+Art construction.

(15) onaia tumno zelenata kushta
    that dark green-the house

It seems that adjectives with a complement cannot enter the Dem+Art construction.

(16) *onaia gordata s dushteria si maika
    that  proud with daughter her mother

All examples with the asterisk above are perfectly possible in prenominal position out of the Dem+Art construction. Unlike English, Bulgarian allows for adjectival complements in prenominal position.

    The modifiers *mnogo/*many, very, *tolkova/*so are unacceptable either in the Dem+Art construction or as simple prenominal modifiers.

(17) *onova mnogo krasivoto momiche
    that  very beautiful-the girl
(18) *mnogo krasivoto momiche
    very beautiful-the girl

(19) *onova mnogo krasivo momiche
    that very beautiful girl

2.2. The Co-occurrence of two definite articles.
Two definite articles can co-occur if the first word which holds the article is a possessive or
a numeral and the second is an adjective or another kind of element. We will look at both of
these cases here, in order to see what combinations this type of structure allows for.

    If the place of the demonstrative, in the above examples, is occupied by a
possessive, the following element, as we said, can be a simple adjective:

    (20) negovite starite obuvki
        his-the old-the shoes

If the possessive is followed by the numeral the examples seem more marginal:

    (21) ? neinite dvete knigi
        her-the two-the books

Unlike the demonstrative, the possessive cannot be followed by quantifiers like
niakolko/some, mnogo/many.

    (22) * neinite mnogoto knigi tam
        her-the many-the books there

    (23) * neinite niakolkoto knigi
        her-the some-the books

Examples in which the possessive is followed by edin seem more marginal.
Neither is it possible to combine the possessive with an adjective followed by the possessive clitic.

(25) *neinia zelenia I pantaloon
     sher-the green-the her-CL trousers

The possessive can (probably marginally) be followed by a comparative degree adjective.

(26) ??moita po-dulgata pola
     my-the more long-the skirt

An adjective modified by an adverb can enter the double definiteness construction:

(27) moita tumno siniata pola
     my-the dark blue-the skirt

The rest of the cases we mentioned in relation to the demonstrative – the superlative degree adjective, the adjective followed by a complement, the adjectives modified by *mnogo/very, many, tolkova/so* are impossible with a possessive.

If the first articulated position is occupied by a numeral, the second one can be occupied only by an adjective, marginally by a simple adjective modified by the comparative form of the degree modifier and also marginally by an adjective modified by an adverb.

(28) dvete niskite kushti
     two-the low-the houses
2.3. Dislocation of the second element of the double definite construction.

An important characteristic of the Bulgarian adjectives is that they can occur only prenominally. Normally no adjective is allowed to appear after the noun. Interestingly, this rule does not hold for the second articulated element in the double definite construction.

(31) Predpochitam da si kupia onaia roklia, zelenata. (Dem+Art)
    prefer (I) to buy that dress green-the

(32) Poveche mi haresva neinata roklia, zelenata. (Poss+Adj)
    more to me appeals her dress green-the

(33) Bihte li mi pokazali dvete kutii ot vitrinara, zelenite. (Num+Adj)
    would (You) me show two-the boxes from shop window-the green-the
    “Would You show me the two boxes from the shop window, the green ones.”

(34) Onaia roklia mi haresva nai-mnogo, zelenata.
    that dress to me appeals most green-the
    “That dress I like mostly, the green one.”

The articulated element from the Dem+Art construction could be also fronted to a DP initial position, an option not available for the normal adjective.

(35) zelenata onaia roklia (Dem+Art)
    green-the that dress
This dislocation is not allowed in the constructions containing two definite articles and no demonstrative.

(36) *zelenata neinata bluza  
green-the her-the blouse

(37) *sinite dvete bluzi  
blue-the two-the blouses

2.4. The standard Bulgarian noun phrase.

Here we would like to recall that the standard Bulgarian noun phrase does not allow the co-occurrence of two definite elements, be it a co-occurrence of the demonstrative and the definite article or a co-occurrence of two definite articles within the same phrase.

(38) onazi zelena bluza  
that green blouse  
(A normal standard Bulgarian phrase containing a demonstrative)

(39) zelenata bluza  
green-the blouse  
(A normal standard Bulgarian phrase containing a definite article)

2.5. Summary.

Of the three double definiteness constructions the Dem+Art construction is the most productive one. The demonstrative combines with various other elements and allows both DP initial and DP final positions. The possibility of the possessive and the numeral to combine with other words, forming a double definite construction is more limited. The constructions introduced by these elements do not allow fronting of the second element.

In standard Bulgarian noun phrases the co-occurrence of two definite elements is excluded, as demonstrated above.
3. Semantic analysis
In this section we will dwell upon the possible semantic interpretations of the different types of double definiteness constructions, which will be the basis for the syntactic analysis which we present later on. Before going into more detail about each of the constructions we will provide a more general analysis concerning the common characteristics of all constructions.

The constructions at issue are unified under the same title not only for the structural similarity they exhibit but also because they have very similar semantic interpretations. What these structures have in common is the interpretation of the second element. In all three constructions this element holds the definite article and, notice, has a restrictive interpretation. In other words, by means of the articulated, second element, all three constructions convey the meaning of selecting one concrete referent. In the following subsections we will see what particular meanings each of the three constructions conveys.

First, we will dwell upon the co-occurrence of the demonstrative and the definite article exemplified in (4). This structure has two general interpretations, which can be used depending on the situation in which the phrase is uttered.

3.1. The Dem+Art construction.
Depending on the context, the Dem+Art construction could refer to an entity either anaphorically or deictically. In the first case the entity in question is not in front of the speaker, while in the second it is. That is, in the second case, the speaker points to the entity and selects it in this way. As we will see below, the entity is not necessarily selected from among other entities. Neither is it isolated necessarily on the basis of the quality denoted by the adjective. It is described as unique just by the deictic or by the anaphoric use of the definite article.

3.1.1. Anaphoric interpretation.
For the purposes of the semantic analysis we will compare the following two phrases:
(40) Onaia zelena bluza, koiato prodavachkata izvadi ot shkafa, ne beshe losha.
That green blouse which shop assistant-the took out of the wardrobe was not bad.

(41) Onaia zelenata bluza, koiato prodavachkata izvadi ot shkafa, ne beshe losha.
That green-the blouse which shop assistant-the took out of the wardrobe was not bad.

The first example contains a non-articulated adjective and the second one contains a Dem+Art construction. We would like to analyse the differences in meaning between the two constructions in order to provide later the suitable syntactic structure for the double definiteness construction.

In order to get the anaphoric meaning we have to introduce a suitable context. We might have a situation in which two women walk out of a shop, discussing the goods they have seen. One of them is referring to a blouse. The woman can use either sentence (40) or sentence (41). What difference does it make if we use one of the sentences instead of the other?

Neither in sentence (40) nor in sentence (41) is the green blouse necessarily the only blouse of this colour. The difference is that in sentence (41) the blouse is identified as unique, anaphorically, not on the basis of the meaning carried by the adjective, i.e. the colour, in this case. In other words, the restriction signaled by the definite article in this sentence is understood as that blouse which I showed you when we were in the shop. The quality denoted by the adjective can, but does not necessarily take part in the restriction. Thus, to identify the entity, the hearer receives the information about the quality of the adjective. If this quality is unique the hearer identifies the object on the basis of it. If this quality is not unique in the situation, the hearer searches for an object which is common knowledge to him/her and the speaker. In a concrete situation the speaker can already in the

\[\text{The meaning of the adjective could also play a role in identifying the entity. This is not excluded. Our purpose is to say that this is not the crucial element which creates the contrast on the basis of which the entity is selected.}\]
beginning identify the entity on the basis of the anaphoric reference (what we called common knowledge) without using the quality of the adjective as a cue.

Thus, the adjective carrying the article, in sentence (41), is interpreted as restrictive. Sentence (40) is an example of a normal standard Bulgarian sentence. It does not necessarily express restriction. To be more precise, in this sentence the adjective is ambiguous between the restrictive and the non-restrictive reading.

Another interesting observation is that, in sentence (40), the relative clause introduced by the relative pronoun koiato could be either restrictive or non-restrictive. In sentence (41), the relative clause introduced by the same relative pronoun can only be non-restrictive. This is another piece of evidence showing that there is already one restrictive element inside the matrix clause of sentence (41).

3.1.2. Deictic interpretation.
The following example expresses the deictic meaning of the phrase containing the demonstrative and the definite article.

(42) Onaia zelenata bluza kolko struva?
That green-the blouse how much costs
“How much does the green blouse over there cost?”

To facilitate the interpretation we have to imagine again that we are in a shop. This time we are pointing at a blouse asking about its price. Again, the blouse we are pointing to is singled out as unique and again it is not obligatorily the case that this blouse is the only green blouse in the shop. The adjective holding the definite article is restrictive. The restrictive meaning is interpreted here as the blouse I am pointing at. If we introduce a full relative clause after the noun phrase, it would again be non-restrictive.

(43) Onaia zelenata bluza, koiato e ot liavo na manekena, pamuchna li e?
that gree-the blouse which is on left of window doll-the cotton LI is
“I the green blouse on the left of the window doll made of cotton?”
Another relevant piece of evidence can be observed in the following two examples:

(44) Onaia visokata zhena mi kaza, che magazinut niama da otvaria dnes.
    That tall woman me told that shop not to open today
    “That tall woman told me that the shop will not open today.”

(45) ? Onaia visoka zhena mi kaza, che magazinut niama da otvaria dnes.
    that tall woman me told that shop-the not to open today.
    “That tall woman told me that the shop will not open today.”

Let us imagine a situation in which to place examples (44) and (45). We have just seen that
the shop we wanted to enter in is closed and have asked a woman whether the shop will
open later today. Then we tell about our conversation to a friend who has not heard it. In
sentence (44) the woman whom we talked to is isolated out of the other people near the
shop, who may be both men and women. We have picked out the entity, in our case the
woman, on the basis of her characteristic of being tall (in this case the adjective plays a
more crucial role in identifying the entity). Notice that, in this example, the fact that the
woman is tall is not relevant to the rest of the information we give about her – that she told
us that the shop will not open today. The quality tall serves simply to isolate the person out
of all the other people near the shop. Thus, in this situation the entity is isolated also on the
basis of the quality of the adjective but this quality has no informational value, as regards
the rest of the information the sentence provides (namely the information about the shop).
Anyway, the fact that we insert in the sentence a quality which is not related to the rest of
the information does not seem to cause semantic difficulty.

If we use the non-articulated adjective, as in (45), the sentence is interpreted
differently. In a phrase which contains no article, the adjective does contribute to the
meaning of the phrase and is related to the meaning of the other elements of the sentence.
That is the information that the woman is tall is normally understood as related to the
information the rest of the sentence gives about her, namely that she told our protagonist
that the shop will not open. And indeed, sentence (44) sounds odd because the fact that the
woman is tall has nothing to do with what we say about her after that. When presented with
the two possibilities – (44) and (45) – the speakers of Bulgarian prefer (44). They are more willing to do away with the adjective instead of using it as in (45).

A note of clarification is needed here. We have to keep in mind that the sentences above are considered as part of a colloquial conversation. We compare the viability of both of them only placing them in a colloquial context. This needs to be said because, since the co-occurrence of two definite markers is not found in formal speech, in certain cases the adjective without the article could be used to convey the information expressed by sentence (44). Since in colloquial speech two definite markers *can* co-occur, this way of expressing is preferred when the situation allows for it.

Here we add some more examples to demonstrate that the articulated adjective and the non-articulated one are interpreted differently.

(46) Onaia rusa zhena e mnogo hubava.

That blonde woman is very nice

The non-articulated adjective in (46) could be interpreted in the following ways:

1) This representative of the class of blonde women is very nice.

2) The woman is beautiful because she is blonde (in a suitable context).

The interpretation under 1) is typical of attributive only adjectives, like *atmnoto iadro/the atomic curnel*. The second interpretation is the one we saw with the example about the gloves. The articulated adjective does not have either of these interpretations. As we already wrote above it simply selects the entity by isolating it on the basis of the anaphoric or deictic information. The quality of the adjective may or may not help in selecting the entity. The meaning of the adjective, as we said, is not necessarily related to the information we give about that entity. We can see this also comparing the two examples below:
Onia bedni detsa niama ot kude da vzemat pari za shokolad.
Those poor children have not from where to take money for chocolate.
“There those poor children have no way of finding money to buy chocolate.”

What is understood from this example is that the children cannot buy chocolate because they are poor. Notice that the sentence that follows is not a good way to express the same thing.

Onia bedni-te detsa niama ot kade da vzemat pari za shokolad.
Those poor-the children have not from where to take money for chocolate.

As we saw above, in order to select an entity by means of a Dem+Art construction, it is not necessary to identify it from among other elements with similar or different characteristics. The following examples come in support of this analysis. It is perfectly possible to pronounce the following sentences out of the blue.

Onia neinite statii kude gi slozhihme?
those her-the articles where CL place
“We Where did we place those articles of hers?”

Onezi dvata stola shte ni triabvat li za neshto?
those two-the chairs will CL-to us serve for something
“Will those two chairs serve us for something?”

In (49) it is not the case that her articles are selected from among other people’s articles. They are simply pointed out and selected as unique in the sense “exactly those her articles which I am saying about and no other articles.” The same holds true for (50). There are no groups containing, say, different number of chairs. There may be just one group of chairs, the one we are pointing at, and we select it, saying actually “exactly those two chairs I am pointing at, and no other two chairs.” In this sense, we can say that the meaning conveyed by the Dem+Art construction is restrictive – because, mentioning the relevant set, we exclude all other possible sets.
Thus, we conclude that the Dem+Art construction selects an entity not necessarily on the basis of the property which is denoted by the articulated adjective and not necessarily out of other entities of the same or a different quality. The entity is selected thanks to the deictic or anaphoric function of the definite article on the articulated second element of the Dem+Art construction.

3.2. The semantic analysis of phrases containing two occurrences of the definite article.

Example (20) repeated here as (51), i.e. the possessor followed by another articulated element, presents the second instance of the co-occurrence of two definite elements within the same phrase.

(51) negovite starite obuvki
    his-the old-the shoes

The semantic analysis of this phrase is very similar to the analysis of the Dem+Art construction. There is just one difference. We interpret example (51) as *that precise pair of shoes of his which are old shoes*. The difference lies in the interpretation of the first element – the possessive. In the double definiteness constructions of the type presented in (51), the first element introduces a set of entities out of which we identify the concrete element referred to by the speaker. The possessive introduces a closed set of all entities which belong to him. We have to select the entity referred to by the speaker from this set. In this case the only reasonable thing to do is to wait for a second characteristic, the characteristic *old* in this case, and the intersection of the two characteristics is already enough to identify an entity. The role of the article then is to restrict the set of elements to only those old shoes we are pointing at or talking about. Thus the meaning of the whole phrase is: *out of all objects which belong to him we select that pair of old shoes and not any other pair*. Again, it is not necessarily the fact that he has just one pair of old shoes. In other words the selection is not done only on the basis of the meaning of the adjective (the second element). Even if the person has more than one pair of old shoes, there is a restriction, implicated by the definite article on the second element.
Returning to the Dem+Art construction, since the demonstrative does not carry a precise semantic meaning, as the possessive does, it cannot introduce a set of elements. It rather refers, either deictically or anaphorically, to one or more entities. Since this reference is rather vague, we cannot easily isolate a group of referents and make the intersection between the group of elements referred to by the demonstrative and those, referred to by the second element. The demonstrative carries the features [+Deictic/+Referential; +Definite]. This is precisely what the hearer interprets, according to what we wrote above. Then the hearer is told what other characteristic the entity has (by the meaning of the second element) and finally the article on the second element indicates that the speaker refers precisely and only to the element which is the intersection of the meaning of the demonstrative ([+Deictic/+Referential; +Definite]) plus the meaning of the adjective. We recall that the entity is not selected on the basis of the meaning carried by the adjective that is, the green blouse we are referring to may not be only green blouse in that situation. The restriction is done by the meaning of the definite article, which, again, isolates only that entity the first and the second element are pointing at, and no other element.

To sum up, in the construction introduced by the possessive, the adjective following the possessive is again interpreted restrictively. This is further supported by the fact that if we add a relative clause after the noun it could be only appositive and not restrictive, as is demonstrated by the following examples:

(52) negovite starite obuvki, koito e ostavil v koridora

his old-the shoes, which he has left in the corridor

The second instance of two definite articles within the same phrase is presented by the construction introduced by a numeral, as in example (28), repeated here as (53).

(53) dvete niskite kushti

two-the low-the houses

The interpretation of this construction is closer to that of the Dem+Art construction than to the interpretation of the construction introduced by the possessive. The reason is that the
construction at issue is again introduced by an element which does not delineate a closed group of elements, in contrast to the possessive. The numeral carries the feature [+Definite] and the semantic meaning of number. However, it does not isolate a closed class of elements. The intersection of the meanings of the first and the second element would be a group of elements which are two and which have the characteristic of being low. The definite article of the second element tells us that we are selecting the two elements the phrase is referring to and no other two elements.

3.3. Summary.

Summing up the semantic characteristic of the double-definiteness constructions, their central peculiarity consists in their being able to select a referent or referents, thanks to the restrictive properties of the definite article in combination with the information conveyed by the other two elements of the phrase. The meaning of the phrase is restrictive in the sense that it refers to one particular element or group of elements, excluding all other possible referents. The Dem+Art construction seems more similar to the construction introduced by the numeral, since in neither of these does the first element refer to a closed group of elements. In the construction introduced by the possessor, in contrast, the first element isolates a closed class of elements and intersects this class with the one delineated by the second element.

4. Phonological characteristics.

There is one peculiarity by which the constructions at issue differ with respect to a normal standard Bulgarian noun phrase. As noticed also by Vulchanova and Vulchanov, when we pronounce the double definiteness construction, we need to make a short pause after the first element of the construction. A slight resuming of the intonation is needed in the colloquial construction so that it would sound good. No such pause and resuming of the intonation are noticed with the pronunciation of a standard Bulgarian phrase, as shown by the example below:

(54) onazi zelena bluza (Standard Bulgarian phrase – no pause, no resuming that green blouse of the intonation)
The differences in the pronunciation, as we will see below, will be interpreted as a signal for the different syntactic status of the two constructions.

5. Syntactic analysis.

In this section we look at the syntactic analysis of the double definiteness constructions. We mentioned earlier that Bulgarian adjectives are ambiguous in terms of a predicative and an attributive interpretation. The objective of this section will be to provide syntactic evidence that the double definiteness constructions serve as a mode of introducing a predicatively used construction in prenominal position. First, we will briefly present the structure of the Bulgarian noun phrase. The next step will be to present the evidence provided by Cinque (2005a) about how other languages distinguish between the predicative and the attributive use of the adjectives in prenominal position. We will discuss Greek, Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian, Russian and Slovenian.

5.1. On the structure of the Bulgarian adnominal modification.

Giusti presents interesting evidence that demonstratives are not heads, as previously thought, but have phrasal status. In consequence to this claim, she suggests that the demonstrative is hosted not by D but by a high specifier. Dimitrova-Vulchanova and Giusti, (1996) apply this claim to Bulgarian and propose that, in this language, the demonstrative is situated in Spec, DP.
As it was already mentioned above, the article in Bulgarian is a bound morpheme. This being so, it is incorporated onto the first adjective in the noun phrase. After the incorporation the adjective moves to Spec, DP to check features. The crucial point in our analysis is the fact that the articulated adjective and the demonstrative compete for the same position, the Spec, DP. It is for this reason that these two elements do not co-occur in Standard Bulgarian. As to the colloquial Dem+Art construction, we will argue that the adjective holding the article does not hold the article of the whole DP. While the demonstrative is situated, as argued by Dimitrova-Vulchanova and Giusti (1996), in Spec, DP, the adjective holding the article, in the Dem+Art construction, stays in a different position, namely, the position reserved for the prenominal reduced relative closes.

In Bulgarian, the demonstrative can move even higher than the quantifier, which, in this case, takes obligatorily the definite article.

\[(58)\] tezi vsichkite knigi
these all-the books

We could say that the noun is the lowest and the demonstrative is the highest position of the DP. The quantifier is situated out of the DP, immediately higher than the demonstrative, as shown below:

\[(59)\]

Lower than the demonstrative we find the projections of the numeral. Still lower in the tree are situated the projections of various types of possessives, as reported by Dimitrova-Vulchanova and Giusti (1999).
In the next section, we will focus particularly on the relation between the demonstrative and the adjectives.

5.2. Attributive versus predicative adjectives. A cross-linguistic perspective.
In support of the argument about the two different sources of adnominal modification, Cinque (2005a) points out that there are languages which overtly distinguish between adjectives that come from a predicative source and those that are from an attributive source. What is of interest for us here is to find a similarity between the languages which, as Cinque (2005a) demonstrates, overtly distinguish the two sources of adjectives and the case of Bulgarian. Since our purpose is to study the ways of distinguishing between direct and indirect modification in adnominal position, of a particular interest to us will be those languages which exhibit the difference between attributive and predicative adjectives within the nominal phrase.

To begin, we will make an overview of Greek, Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian and Russian and will mention some other languages which exhibit the distinction in question and then we will try to relate the characteristics of these languages to Bulgarian.

5.2.1. The case of Greek. Determiner Spreading.
Greek is similar to Bulgarian in that all adjectives are used prenominally, when definite and non-articulated. The adjectives in the Greek definite noun phrase can either occur articulated or without the article. When preceded by the definite article they can either precede or follow the noun, while, if articleless, they can only appear prenominally.

(60) to megalo vivlio
    the big book

(Campos & Stavrou. 2004)

(61) * to vivlio megalo
    the book big

(62) to megalo to vivlio
    the big the book
Building on other authors, Cinque (2005a) argues that the articulated adjectives, to which is applied the notion of “Determiner Spreading”, are from a predicative source. This would mean that these adjectives originate as predicates of relative clauses. In adnominal position these adjectives occur, according to Cinque (2005a), as reduced relative clauses. Cinque’s claim is supported by the following arguments.

Only those adjectives which can be used as predicates can occur articulated. Non-predicative adjectives cannot occur articulated, as shown below.

(63) o ipotithemenos (*o) dolofonos (Alexiadou and Wilder 1998; Kolliakou 2004, cited the aledged (the) murderer in Cinque 2005) “the alleged murderer”

Moreover, the adjectives preceded by the definite article are always restrictive, which, as we saw in the introduction, is a characteristic of the predicative source adjectives. If an adjective is non-restrictive it cannot be preceded by an article.

(64) I gigandeia (*i) gafa (Manolessou 2000) the gigantic (the) blunder “the gigantic blunder”

The adjectives preceded by the article have an intersective interpretation while the non-articulated adjectives are ambiguous between an intersective interpretation and a non-intersective interpretation. Also, the articulated adjectives do not show ordering restrictions while the non-articulated ones are rigidly ordered. Articulated adjectives are always situated higher than non-articulated ones. The predicative form is supposed to appear outside the attributive adjective.

(65) I megali kenuria [i kokini] valitsa the big new the red suitcase “the big new red suitcase”
From the data presented above it follows that the articulated adjectives in Greek are, unambiguously, adjectives from a predicative source, while non-articulated adjectives are practically ambiguous.

5.2.2. Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian.
Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian is another instance of a language which overtly distinguishes between the two sources. Differently from Greek, this language exploits the opposition between a long and a short form of the adjective. The point is that, in the case of Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian, the short form is only predicative, while the long form is only attributive. We present now the considerations that lead to this conclusion.

Both the long and the short forms can occur prenominally but in predicate position only the short form is possible. This is taken to mean that the short form is of a predicative source. We present below the examples Cinque (2005a) provides.

(67) nov kaput
    new (short form) coat
    “a new coat”

(68) novi kaput
    new (long form) coat
    “the/a new coat”

(69) Njegov kaput je nov/*novi.
    his coat is new (short form)/new* (long form)

The short-form adjectives used in adnominal position can be interpreted only intersectively, they cannot have idiomatic meaning, unlike long-form adjectives which can.
Apart from that, long-form adjectives are strictly ordered while short-form adjectives in adnominal position do not display any order, as we see in the examples below.

(72) pouzdano_short malo_short crno_short auto  (Aljović, 2000, cited in Cinque 2005a)
“a reliable small black car”

(73) crno_short pouzdano_short malo_short auto  (Aljović, 2000, cited in Cinque 2005a)
“a black reliable small car”

Adjectives that do not have a predicative use do not have a short-form either.

(74) navodni/*navodan komunista  (Aljović, 2000, cited in Cinque 2005a)
an alleged (long-form)/*(short-form) communist

(75) budući/*buduć predsjednik  (Aljović 2000, cited in Cinque 2005a)
the future (long-form)/(short-form) president

Finally, if both a short-form and a long-form adjective co-occur prenominally, the short-form adjective necessarily precedes the long-form adjective.

(76) siromašan bolesni dječak  (Leko 1988, cited in Cinque 2005a)
a/the poor (short-form) sick (long-form) boy
5.2.3. Russian.

Russian makes use of a similar distinction. This language also uses short-form and long-form adjectives. It exhibits, however, some significant differences, in comparison with Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian. First of all, Russian short-form adjectives cannot be used in adnominal position. Long-form adjectives, on the other hand, can be used either in adnominal position or in predicate position.

(78) * nov/novi dom stoit na gore (Pereltsvaig 2000, cited in Cinque 2005a)
new:nom (*short-form/long-form) house:nom stands on hill
“The new house stands on a/the hill.”

(79) Dom nov/novyj (Pereltsvaig 2000, cited in Cinque 2005a)
house:nom new:nom (short-form/long-form)
“The house is new.”

Building on Siegel, Cinque (2005a) analyses Russian adjectival occurrences in the following way. Long-form adjectives can be derived not only from an attributive but also from a predicative source. In other words, if a predicative adjective occurs in adnominal position it necessarily takes the long form. Cinque supports this analysis with the fact that adnominal participles, which for sure derive from relative clauses, take on the long-form as well.

(80) Ivan byl ubit (Bailyn 1994, cited in Cinque 2005a)
Ivan was killed (short-form)
Since all prenominal adjectives in Russian take on the long form, this language does not exhibit the difference between attributive and predicative adjectives in prenominal position. In this respect Russian patterns with German, where all prenominal adjectives show overt agreement with the head noun, while those in predicate position are invariant. Also in German, participles in adnominal position show agreement with the head noun. This is interpreted as evidence in favour of the ambiguous nature of the long form in German.

Other two languages, which we will only briefly mention here, are Maltese and Chinese. Similarly to Greek, Maltese distinguishes direct from indirect modification adjectives, making use of an adjectival determiner which signals the predicative nature of the adjective. Also in this language articulated adjectives have the properties of indirect modification adjectives.

(Mandarin) Chinese, as reported by Sproat and Shih (1988, 1990), makes use of a marker de, which, when placed in front of and adjective signals its predicative nature. The adjectives preceded by this marker do not display any rigid ordering. Sproat and Shih (1988, 1991) suggest that these adjectives are actually reduced relative clauses.
5.2.4. The case of Bulgarian.

We will start the syntactic analysis by looking at the position of the highest element of the double definiteness constructions. In the Dem+Art constructions this is the demonstrative and in the other two constructions the position of the highest element is occupied by the possessive and the numeral.

As we have already mentioned above, the demonstrative in Bulgarian occupies the highest position in the DP – the Spec, DP. It was also mentioned earlier that the articulated adjectives in Bulgarian also occupy the Spec, DP position. This would mean that the demonstrative cannot co-occur with an element holding the definite article of the whole DP, unless that element occupies some other position in the phrase.

As to the other two constructions, the highest element would also occupy the Spec, DP position, according to the analysis of Dimitrova-Vulchanova & Giusti, since it holds the definite article of the whole DP. Hence, no place remains, under the Spec DP, for a second articulated element. From this it follows that it must occupy a position reserved for some other function.

Going back to the semantic analysis of the constructions at issue, we see that the meaning of the second element in all three constructions corresponds to the semantics of the indirect modification adjectives of Cinque’s (2005a) classification. To recall the main points, the basic characteristic of the Dem+Art construction is the restrictive meaning of the second element. The adjective (we take the cases in which the second element is an adjective) which follows the demonstrative, in the Dem+Art construction, plays a different role with respect to the adjectives which hold the article in a standard Bulgarian DP. Apart from the fact that the adjective in the Dem+Art construction is always interpreted restrictively, it is not related to the information conveyed by the whole sentence in the way an ordinary articulated adjective is. Its role is just to select the entity and the article on the adjective restricts its meaning to refer only to that element and to no other elements.

In the construction introduced by the possessive, the adjective following the possessive (again we take the second elements to be an adjective) restricts the reference of the possessive. The article plays the same role as in the Dem+Art construction in directing the reference of the phrase only to the referents selected by the phrase and to no other referents.
The meaning of the Num>Adj construction consists also in isolating one concrete element or group of elements, the adjective being again restrictive thanks to the presence of the definite article.

The properties mentioned above make the double definiteness constructions similar in meaning to the restrictive predicative adjectives. In other words, the second element in the analysed constructions is an example of a predicative element in adnominal position.

The phonological analysis of the construction at issue also demonstrates a significant difference between the double definiteness construction and the standard Bulgarian noun phrase. The pause, which is made after the demonstrative, and the resuming of the intonation suggest that the adjective following the demonstrative performs a function different from that of the adjective in the standard Bulgarian noun phrase.

5.3. A reduced relative clause analysis.

We have seen that the articulated adjective in the double definiteness constructions does not have the characteristics of an ordinary adjective but rather corresponds in meaning to those adjectives which, according to Cinque (2005a), have a relative clause origin. Following this analysis, we assign to the articulated adjective the status of a reduced relative clause in adnominal position.

5.3.1. The syntactic structure of the Dem+Art construction.

It was mentioned in the first chapter that, according to the analysis of Kayne (1994), the relative clause is merged in front of the noun. It follows from this that the prenominal position is the merge position of the relative clause (be it a full clause of a reduced relative clause) and not a position reached by movement.

For reasons we present later on, we would like to claim that the element carrying the article in the Bulgarian double definiteness constructions does not occur prenominally as a main predicate of a relative clause but as a modifier of a null N, in a DP itself the predicate of a reduced relative clause.

We present below the tree diagram which illustrates the syntactic structure of the Dem+Art construction (following Cinque 2003, 2005a, Dimitrova-Vulchanova & Giusti, 1996 1998 & 1999) and then we set out our arguments in favour of this particular structure.
(84) onaia zelenata bluza
    that green-the blouse

In the tree diagram above, D takes as a complement a functional projection whose specifier hosts the relative clause. The reduced relative clause (which is relevant to our discussion) is situated still lower. It is, actually, an IP with a PRO as a subject. One might ask for what reason we postulate a PRO. The evidence comes from German and is provided by Cinque (2006), class lectures, university of Venice.

(85) Wir haben Maria einer nach dem anderen geküsst.
    we have Maria one:nom after the other kissed

The floating quantifier in (85) takes Nominative case. Thus it seems that it is controlled by its antecedent, which, in this case, is wir. Consider now the following example.

(86) Maria hat die Männer einen nach dem anderen geküsst.
    Marian has the men one:acc after the other kissed
Here, the quantifier takes the case of its immediate antecedent – *die Männer*. Thus the case it takes is accusative. Notice, however, what happens in the reduced relative clause within the brackets.

(87)  Weil ich die Männer überzeugte, [Renate einer nach dem anderen zu küssen].
      because I the men convinced Renate one:nom after the other to kiss
      “…because I convinced the men to kiss Renate one after the other”

In the last example, the immediate antecedent of the floating quantifier has accusative case. Nevertheless, the quantifier takes nominative. We can make sense of this situation only postulating that the reduced relative clause contains a nominative PRO subject which controls the quantifier.

(88)  Weil ich die Männer überzeugte, [PRO Renate einer nach dem anderen zu küssen].
      because I the men convinced Renate one:nom after the other to kiss
      “…because I convinced the men to kiss Renate one after the other”

The reduced relative clause, in our tree diagram, contains a DP predicate. The adjectives within this DP obey the same rule of raising to Spec, DP when taking the article (we will see below what restrictions there are on the types of adjectives which can enter the reduced relative clause). Going down the tree we notice also the small dP present both in the reduced relative clause and in the structure of the phrase. In chapter one we introduced the structure of the relative clauses and mentioned that the small dP corresponds to the head of the relative clause. Since our construction contains a reduced relative clause, its head contains a smaller portion of material. The small dP on the main brunch of the tree contains the main head. The reduced relative clause contains an exact copy of the main head. Cross-linguistic evidence suggests that the reduced relative clause is lower in the structure than the Num node and higher than the adjectives. The head of the full relative clause, as we wrote in chapter one, includes the reduced relative clause, thus, its head contains a larger
portion of material. The head of the reduced relative clause contains just what is below it – at least the adjectives.

5.3.2. The empty category inside the DP predicate.

Now we return to the argument about the empty noun in the DP predicate of the reduced relative clause. In this subsection we will try to show that the articulated form of the adjective in the double definiteness constructions in Bulgarian is not a main predicate but an adjective followed by an empty N.

As we can see from the tree, and, as we will see in more detail below, we have not imposed any restrictions on what adjectives can take the article. The general rules these adjectives obey are the same as those in the main DP – when taking the article the adjectives move up to Spec, DP. Still, not all adjectives can be used in the double definiteness constructions. The restriction follows simply from the assumption that all adjectives used in the double definiteness constructions are followed by an empty nominal head. Thus only those Bulgarian adjectives which allow an empty N can be used in the constructions at issue. We are showing later on that all adjectives that can be used in the double definiteness constructions can be used without an overt noun. The problem here is how to demonstrate that the articulated noun is not a main predicate in itself but is part of a DP with a null noun. Anticipating the discussion on the types of adjectives, we will mention that the articulated adjective in the double definiteness constructions could be either an adjective which has a predicative use or an attributive-only adjective. The fact that an attributive-only adjective can enter a predicative structure already suggests that this adjective cannot be the main predicate of the IP. One could suggest that the articulated attributive adjective has already different properties. To show that this is not the case we can look at the following examples:

(89) Tazi stranitsa e sledvashtata.
    this page is next-the
    “This page is the previous one.”

The adjective *sledvasht/next* is an attributive-only adjective. It has no predicative use.
As we have seen above, however, if the article attaches to the adjective the Adj+Art complex can be used as a predicative element. To see what causes this change we have to exploit some semantic characteristics of the articulated adjective.

One important characteristic of the articulated adjective is that it places the entity in relation to other entities. The page example (89) refers to the preceding page with respect to another page. This is a test first proposed by Babby (1970), used also by Siegel, quoted also in Cinque (2005a).

If we apply the test to an adjective which has also a predicative use the result we get is the same.

(91) Neinata roklia e zelena
Her dress is green

(92) Neinata roklia e zelenata
her dress is green-the
“Her dress is the green one.”

The two examples above form a minimal pair. The adjective in the first example is a real predicate. It says that dress is green in absolute terms. The second example has a different meaning. It selects a dress from among other dresses. This is exactly the meaning we get when the adjective is used prenominally, within the double definite construction. A note of clarification is in order here. We mentioned in the semantic analysis that the entity selected by the articulated adjective could be selected even if there is not other similar or different entity present. However, we mentioned also that the articulated element restricts the selection to one element (group of elements) only. In other words, even if there are no other entities present, the fact that all other entities of this type (all other dresses) are excluded means that the entity is still isolated out of a larger group of entities of this type.
Another piece of evidence comes from the possibility of the articulated adjective to move freely out of the DP. We repeat here one of the examples of dislocation, presented above.

(93) Onaia roklija mi haresva nai-mnogo, zelenata.
     that dress to me appeals most green-the
     “That dress I like mostly, the green one.”

If the predicate were a simple adjective it would be able to appear alone, as is shown by the following example.

(94) Edna roklija mi haresa mnogo, zelena.
     one dress to me appealed much, green

The speaker would prefer to use a whole DP, instead of an adjective.

(95) Edna roklija mi haresa mnogo, edna zelena.
     one dress to me appealed much, one green
     “One dress appealed to me a lot, a green one.”

With the discussion above we demonstrated that the predicate of the reduced relative clause is a whole DP containing the articulated adjective and an empty noun.

5.3.3. Types of adjectives that can be used in the Dem+Art construction.
As we show in the table below, all adjectives that take part in the Dem+Art construction allow for an empty N. Table 1 lists the Bulgarian adjectives beginning with H/N and forming a Dem+Art construction. Not all adjectives that allow for an empty N, however, could be used in a Dem+Art construction. Of course, this is not unexpected since the double definiteness construction poses additional requirements on adjectives, namely, possibility for selective reference. We assume that the mentioned properties have a more idiosyncratic than syntactic nature.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjs used in the Dem+Art construction</th>
<th>Possibility to take an empty N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iskam da hapna ot onia maznate banichki. (I) want to eat from those fat-the-banichki</td>
<td>Predpochitam ot maznite (I) prefer from fat-the (ones)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onova malinovoto sokche beshe hubavo That raspberry-the (adj) juice was good</td>
<td>Az pih ot malinovoto. I drank from raspberry-the(adj) (one)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onia masivnata vrata ima spetsialni kliuchalki. That solid-the door has very special locks.</td>
<td>Koia ot dvete masivnata ili drugata? Which of two-the, solid-the or the other-the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onia maslenite biskviti imaha stranen pulnezh. Those butter-the cookies had a strange filling.</td>
<td>Maslenite ili plodovite? Butter-the or fruit-flavoured-the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onia mentovite bonboni sa mnogo hubavi. Those mint-the sweets are very nice</td>
<td>Mentovite sap po-hubavi Mint-the (adj) (ones) are better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onia metalnata ramka tezhka li e? That metal-the frame heavy is it</td>
<td>Metalnata li? Metal-the QUEST.PART</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onia metaforichnia izraz kakvo znacheshe? That metaphoric-the expression what ment?</td>
<td>Metaforicnhiat ili drugiat imash pred vid? Metaforic-the or other-the have (you) in mind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onova mirizlivoto nasekomo. That smelly-the insect</td>
<td>Onova mirizlivoto, nail? That smelly-the isn’t it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onova mladoto zhivotno izglezhda raneno. That young-the animal seems wounded</td>
<td>Mladoto, nail? Young-the, isn’t it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onia mladozhenskite/bulchinskite aksesvoari sa… Those wedding-the/bridal-the accessories are…</td>
<td>Koi, mladozhenskite li? Which (ones) bridal-the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onia modernistichnite proizvedenia sa stranni. Those modernist-the works are strange</td>
<td>Vidiah gi modernistichnite, interesni sa Saw (I) them modernist-the interesting are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onova mokroto cherdzhe ne go ostavian navun That wet-the rag not it leave outside</td>
<td>Mokroto go ostaviah navun. Wet-the it left (I) outside</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The adjectives which can be followed by an empty noun in Bulgarian are mainly adjectives which have a predicative source. We can check this by placing them in predicative position.

(96) Tova e zelena bluza.  
     (Adnominal position)  
     this is a green blouse

(97) Tazi bluza e zelena.  
     (Predicative position)  
     this blouse is green

There is, however, a small group of attributive-only adjectives which, when articulated, can be followed by an empty noun as well. We provide below the masculine forms of some of these adjectives:

(98) predishniat/previous-the/”the previous”  
     sledvashtiat/following-the/”the previous”
bivshiat/ex- “the former”
doluspodpisaniat/undersigned/”the subscriber”
doluspomenatiat/undermentioned/mentioned below
noviat/latest-the/”the latest”
stariat/previous-the/”the previous”

The adjectives from this group can be used in predicative position only when articulated. Here are some examples.

(99) *…..e predishen/….is previous
…..e predishniat/….is previous-the
*…..e sledvasht/….is next  (could be used predicatively with a different meaning)
…..e sledvashtiat/ ….is next-the
*…..e bivsh/….is ex-……
…..bivshiat/….is ex-the…
*…..e stara/….e starata (=predishna/previous)
…..e starata/…..is old-the (=predishnata/previous-the)

Some of the adjectives from the above list could be used in the Dem+Art construction.

(100) Onaia predishnata magazinerka raboteshe po-dobre.
that previous-the shop assistent worked better

(101) Onia bivshia sobstvevnik ni prodavashe stokata na po-dobra tsena.
that ex-the owner us-CL sold the goods at a better prize

(102) tia novite razporedbi sa po-prakticheski nasocheni.
those new-the (=latest) decrees are more practically oriented
The adjective *nov/new*, *latest* could have both an attributive and a predicative meaning. Notice that in the Dem+Art construction in (102) it is used with its attributive meaning, not with its predicative meaning. The meaning *latest* cannot be realized if the adjective takes the place of a predicate.

(103) * tia razporedbi sa novi (=latest)
    these decrees are new

There is also a group of adjectives which could have both an attributive meaning and a predicative meaning. Those adjectives could take part in the Dem+Art construction only with the predicative meaning, not with the attributive meaning. In table 2 we provide a list of adjectives of this group. (For more exhaustive lists of the various groups of adjectives, see the indexes.)

**table 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributive-only uses</th>
<th>Predicative uses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bednoto dete</td>
<td>Tozi chovek e beden.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“The poor (wicked) child”</td>
<td>“This person is poor.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bukvalen idiot</td>
<td>Bukvalen prevod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“a true idiot”</td>
<td>Literal translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dramatichen aktior</td>
<td>Dramatichna sluchka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Drama actor”</td>
<td>“Dramatic event”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dreben turgovets</td>
<td>Dreбno zurno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small merchant</td>
<td>Small corn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezheдnevni usilia</td>
<td>Ezheдneven pantalon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily efforts</td>
<td>Daily trousers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zarazno otdelenie</td>
<td>Zarazna bolest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A contagious ward</td>
<td>Contagious disease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Izvestno kolichestvo</td>
<td>Izvesten chovek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certain amount</td>
<td>Famous person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krugul glupak</td>
<td>Krugla topka</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It must be surprising, though, that we relate the possibility of an adjective to enter the Dem+Art construction to its predicative use. As we have seen for Russian, when used with empty categories, attributive adjectives can perfectly take a predicative position. The reason is, actually, that an attributive adjective in combination with an empty noun forms a DP, which is more autonomous. The fact is that the attributive uses we noticed above in the table are idiomatic, and none of these phrases can be followed by an empty noun preserving the same meaning. Still, we saw above that some attributive adjectives, when taking the article, can be used with an empty category and the meaning preserved in the Dem+Art construction is the attributive one. Thus, for the sake of clarity, we repeat that the analysis of the adjectives that can and that cannot enter the double definiteness constructions is not based on their characteristic of being attributive-only adjectives or adjectives of a predicative source. What counts is that the adjective may occur with an empty N.

5.3.4. The syntactic structure of the other two double definiteness constructions.
In the Dem+Art construction, the demonstrative occupies Spec, DP and is responsible for the definiteness of the whole phrase. The syntactic structure of the other two double definiteness constructions is not that different. The only difference would be that the place of the demonstrative would be occupied by an articulated adjective. In accordance with the
fact that the articulated adjectives in Bulgarian move to Spec, DP, the latter position will be occupied by the first articulated element in a construction with two articles. Thus there is not space for the second articulated element unless it is hosted in a different position. We present below the structure of one such phrase.

(104)

The higher adjective holds the definite article of the whole DP. The second articulated adjective is a reduced relative clause [[which is ] the green [one]].

5.3.5. The adjectives that can be used in the other two double definiteness constructions.

As we can see from the tree diagram, the restriction posed on the adjectives inside the reduced relative clause is the same, namely, to allow for an empty category. Thus we would refer to the groups of adjectives enumerated in relation to the Dem+Art construction as adjectives entering also these two double definiteness constructions. The combinations could be further restricted only by the semantics and the idiosyncratic properties of the adjectives which have to be used in combination with the first element.
5.4. **Summary of the role of the double definiteness constructions in Bulgarian.**

We have tried to show above that the Dem+Art construction and the other two double definiteness constructions are structures which contain a reduced relative clause consisting of a DP predicate and a null noun. As we have seen above, Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian has a morphological marker to distinguish between predicative and attributive adjectives. Russian, despite of the ambiguity of the long form, has the short form which is only predicative. Greek has a mode of turning certain adjectives in predicatively used adjectives (making use of the definite article). Romance languages distinguish between the prenominal and postnominal position of the adjective and in this way distinguish between predicative and attributive adjectives. English partially uses this mode but relies also on another strategy. In English, predicative adjectives can be formed by placing a lower adjective in front of another adjective, which in the hierarchy stays higher than it. These are cases like *a brown big dog*, in which the COLOUR adjective has occurs in front of the SIZE adjective.

Bulgarian has no morphological marker to distinguish between predicative and attributive adjectives, all adjectives in this language appear obligatorily in front of the noun, this language does not make use of the disambiguation technique which English utilizes. (We will see below, however, that the numeral and the possessive play a special role in this respect, namely, when an adjective occurs higher than one of these elements, it displays predicative properties.) The colloquial language, however, has developed a mode of inserting a predicative element in adnominal position by the second occurrence of a definite element, something which cannot occur in standard Bulgarian. Differently from the languages enumerated above, with the double definiteness constructions, Bulgarian introduces in adnominal position not an adjective of a predicative type but a DP predicate of a reduced IP. As was already mentioned above, the adjective in the double definiteness constructions is necessarily followed by an empty category.

In the next section we look at another Slavic language which uses the same technique, namely, Slovenian.
6. TA in colloquial Slovenian.

Slovenian, at least standard Slovenian, is a Slavic language which has no articles. The colloquial language, however, makes use of an article-like element (as Marušič and Žaucer, 2006 call it) TA. To begin, we will look at the structures TA can participate in.

6.1. The use of the colloquial TA in Slovenian.

In the sections above we have seen that the adjectives in Bulgarian, being all in prenominal position, are ambiguous between attributive and predicative source. We have seen that colloquial Bulgarian and Slovenian have the option of introducing a predicative construction in prenominal position.

Slovenian makes use of the element TA, which is homophonous with the demonstrative but still differs from it, as demonstrated in Marušič and Žaucer (2006). First, the demonstrative is stressed while TA is not. The demonstrative occurs with bare nouns while TA does not. TA’s use is restricted to noun phrases containing adjectives. The demonstrative is marked for case, gender and number while TA is not. Finally, TA can co-occur with the demonstrative.

(105) tá TA zelen svinčnik  
thisNOM TA greenNOM pencilNOM  
(Marušič and Žaucer (2006)).

TA is not used in standard Slovenian. This holds true also for the double definiteness construction in Bulgarian. Though TA is used only in those noun phrases which contain adjectives, it is not absolutely impossible with “bare” nouns and with noun phrases modified not by adjectives but by other elements, according to Marušič and Žaucer (2006). In their words “TA can be forced on apparently bare nouns and on non-adjective-modified nouns when the expression is used descriptively, that is when it is used to pick out a referent from a set, when a particular referent differs from the others in the descriptive meaning of the expression.”
(106) ta nebencinar, ne ta ja-bencinar Marušič and Žaucer (2006)
TA non-gas-er not TA yes-gas-er
“the non-gas-fueled car, not the gas fueled one”

(107) TA človk človk
TA man man
“the man who is a man (e.g. not the robot dressed like a man)”

According to Marušič and Žaucer (2006), the modifiers in the above constructions can be analyzed as adjectives. In cases like these, one needs a strong emphasis on the contrastive element, in this case the yes/no prefixation.

There are elements which obligatorily require the use of TA. These are the demonstrative, the possessive adjective and the possessive pronoun. The adjective which follows one of these elements must be necessarily preceded by TA (Marušič and Žaucer (2006)). The examples are provided by Marušič and Žaucer (2006).

(108) moj *(TA) star bicikl
my TA old bike
“my old bike”

(109) Brekljev *(TA) dolg komad
Brecelj’s TA long piece
“Brecelj’s TA long song”

After numerals and quantifiers TA is allowed but not required. Examples are taken from Marušič and Žaucer (2006).

(110) vse/tri (TA) bele knjige
all/three (TA) white books
“all/three (of the) white books”
The general semantic nuance which the TA introduces into the phrase is the “type” interpretation. (Marušič, p.c.). A noun phrase containing TA picks an individual from a set, most generally, saying that the entity belongs to a certain type. Interestingly, it is possible to use TA also in indefinite noun phrases.

(111) kšn TA hitr avto
    some TA fast car

(112) eni TA hitri avti
    onePl TA fast cars

TA introduces a “type” interpretation in the above examples – “some car of the fast type” and “cars of the fast type”, respectively.

An interesting case are some attributive-only adjectives, which also allow for a selective interpretation when used with TA.

    my former husband is drunkard
    “My former husband is a drunkard.”

    my TA former husband is drunkard
    “My TA former husband is a drunkard.”

In the first example above, it is not presupposed that the speaker has married again. In the second example it is clear that the speaker has another husband at the moment of uttering the phrase. Very similar is the case of the following two examples:

(115) Poklical smo TA gorskega reševalca (ne TA pomorskega.)
    called AUX TA mountain rescuer (not TA coastal).
    “We called the mountain rescuer (not the coastal one.)”
Obviously, in Slovenian, like in Bulgarian, not only predicative adjectives but also adjectives having only an attributive use can enter in a construction with TA.

If we look at a noun phrase in which the use of TA is optional and compare the two uses the following difference in interpretation is observed:

(116) daj mi bele knjige
    give me white books
    “Give me the white books.”

(117) daj mi TA bele knjige
    give me TA white books
    “Give me the books that are white/of the white type.”

The two examples above differ in the following respect: in the second example the books are selected by “belonging to the type of white books”. Note that it is not necessary that these be the only white books in the room. In any case, the native speakers agree that the second example expresses selection of some kind. In fact, according to the judgments of the native speakers of Slovenian, there is always a difference between the cases in which TA is used and those in which it is not used. The latter cases being, as we said, generally interpreted as cases of selection.

In certain cases there is disagreement among native speakers as to whether TA really carries the “selection” meaning or not. For example, as we have already mentioned, the demonstrative requires the obligatory occurrence of TA before the adjective following it.

(118) daj mi TA belo knigo
    give me that TA white book
    “Give me that white book.”

In cases like this there is disagreement as to whether these examples express selection or not. Notice, however that these are cases in which the use of TA is obligatory. Therefore, it
might be assumed that in these cases, the selection interpretation is present but is not so obvious because of the lack of opposition (it is impossible to form phrases of this kind without TA). It might be for this reason that some native speakers do not feel the selective meaning of those examples. There exist also examples containing elements requiring obligatorily the presence of TA in which the “selection” interpretation is quite obvious.

(119) Ukradli so mi moj ta rdeč bicikel
They stole me my TA red bike.
“They stole my red bike.”

The example above presupposes that I have also another bike, which is not red.

Apart from the “selection” interpretation, one very important piece of evidence which demonstrates the predicative nature of the TA construction is the fact that the order of the adjectives preceded by TA seems free (though it is not so easy to combine two adjectives with TA), while otherwise the order of the adjectives seems more or less fixed.

Marušič and Žaucer (2006) present evidence suggesting that the adjective following TA is a modifier of a null N.

First of all the authors show that if an adjective preceded by TA is used in a predicative position, its interpretation suggests that it is followed by a null noun (a test applied also in relation to the long-form adjectives in Russian.) Namely, the entity is not simply understood as carrying the suggested quality but is understood as one of a group of elements carrying that quality. (Remember that we applied the same test to the Bulgarian articulated adjective.)

(120) Ta kniga je TA debela
this book is TA thick
“This book is a thick one/ one of (the) thick ones”

Another piece of evidence comes from complex adjectives. When a complex adjective occurs in prenominal position, the argument/adjunct/etc. occurs in front of the adjective:
(121) a) *podoben fotru fantič
     similar dad boy

     b) fotru podoben fantič
     dad similar boy

If the adjective is used predicatively, the argument/adjunct/etc. follows the adjective.

(122) a) Peter je podoben fotru.
     Peter is similar dad
     “Peter is like his dad.”

     b) *Peter je fotru podoben.
     Peter is dad similar

Crucially, when TA precedes an adjective in predicative position, the attributive order is preserved. This means that the adjective used in the predicative position actually modifies a null noun.

(123) a) * Peter je TA podobn fotru.
     Peter is TA similar dad

     b) Peter je TA fotru podobn.
     Petr is TA dad similar
     “Peter is the one who is like his dad.”

Marušič and Žaucer (2006) suggest that the null noun is not present in all of the cases in which the presence of TA is attested. The authors distinguish, basically, between two interpretations in the TA. One is called simply contrastive interpretation. In cases like (114), in which there is what they call “contrastive reading”, the adjective necessarily precedes a null noun. This reading is possible with only with attributive adjectives, they
say. All other adjectives have both the definite interpretation, which, according to the authors, does not presuppose the presence of a null noun, and the contrastive interpretation.

The data from Slovenian show that this language seems more similar to Bulgarian than all the other examples of similar phenomena, which we enumerated earlier. In both languages, the colloquial language makes use of a predicative structure in prenominal position, an option not allowed for in the standard language. Furthermore, both languages make use of a construction, whose adjective modifies a null noun.

7. Obtaining predicative adjectives in adnominal position in Bulgarian.

We saw in the above sections that Bulgarian differs from Greek, Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian and Russian in that the articulated adjective we find in prenominal position is not in itself a predicate of a relative clause but is rather a modifier of a null N. Thus, what we find in prenominal position in Bulgarian is a whole DP predicate of a reduced relative clause. We mentioned, also, that in English we could obtain real predicative adjectives in prenominal position by placing an adjective higher than another adjective (i.e. by changing the neutral order in the adjectival hierarchy). It seems that in Bulgarian this is not possible. In many cases it is not possible to change the order between two adjectives, since the combination does not sound acceptable. In some cases this is allowed but one could hardly argue in favour of the predicative properties of the adjective which accrues in the higher position. It seems, however, that a very similar phenomenon can be observed also in Bulgarian, the difference being that, instead of placing a lower adjective higher than another one, we have to place an adjective (a non-attributive-only adjective) higher than the numeral or the possessive. In this section we will exploit exactly this phenomenon.

In order to show that the adjectives occurring higher than the possessive and the numeral are no longer ambiguous (in the sense that they are no longer ambiguous between the attributive and the predicative interpretation), we have to show that they display some predicative properties. We are going to check this by applying the semantic tests Cinque (2005a) discusses, analyzing Romance and Germanic adjectives, which we introduced in chapter one. First, we will explore the behaviour of the adjectives with respect to the numeral and then with respect to the possessive. Out of all eight criteria which Cinque
(2005a) applies, six are applicable to the Bulgarian adjectives when occurring higher than the possessive.

### 7.1. The behaviour of the adjectives with respect to the numeral.

The first distinction we will look at is the Stage-level vs. Individual-level difference in the interpretation of the adjectives. When in prenominal position, Bulgarian adjectives show systematic ambiguity between the stage-level and the individual-level interpretation. When occurring higher than the numeral, however, as we see in the examples below, the adjectives may be no longer ambiguous and the interpretation they have is the stage-level interpretation.

#### 7.1.1. Stage-level vs. Individual-level

(124) V momenta dvizheshtiat se mechanizum otchita deistvieto na dvete treptiashti membrani.

At moment-the, moving-the mechanism registers work-the of two-the trembling membranes

“At the moment the moving mechanism registers the work of the two trembling membranes.”

**Ambiguous:** The membranes tremble always or at the moment

(125) V momenta dvizheshtiat se mehanizum otchita deistvieto na treptiashtite dve membrani.

At moment-the, moving-the mechanism registers work-the of trembling-the two membranes

“At the moment the moving mechanism registers the work of the two trembling membranes.”

**Unambiguous:** Reference to the membranes trembling at the moment.

The interpretation of the adjectives following the possessive is ambiguous between the stage-level and the individual-level interpretation, i.e. it is not clear whether the membranes tremble at the moment when the phrase is pronounced or constantly tremble. In
the second example it is clear that the membranes tremble at the moment at which the phrase is pronounced.

The next semantic contrast is represented by the restrictive versus non-restrictive opposition. Again, there is a difference in the interpretation depending on whether the adjective follows the numeral of precedes it.

7.1.2. Restrictive vs Non-restrictive

(126) Toi kupi dvete zeleni rizi.
    he bought two-the green shirts.
    “He bought the two green shirts.”

Ambiguous: there may or may not be shirts of other colours. Maybe the shirts he bought are all the shirts.

(127) Toi kupi zelenite dve rizi.
    he bought green-the two shirts
    “He bought the green two shirts.”

Unambiguous: There are shirts of other colours as well. He bought only the two shirts which were green.

In the first case, it might be that the two green shirts are all the shirts. In the restrictive second example, on the other hand, it is clear that apart from the two green shirts there are other shirts. In other words, out of all shirts we select the two green shirts.

When following the numeral, the adjectives in Bulgarian also exhibit systematic ambiguity between an intersective and a non-intersective reading. When preceding the numeral, on the other hand, the adjective has only an intersective interpretation.
7.1.3. Intersective vs Non-intersective (adverbial meaning)

(128) Dvete dobri uchitelki poluchiha nagrada ot ministerstvoto na obrazovanieto.

two-the good teachers were given an award by the ministry of education

“The two good teachers received an award by the ministry of education.”

Ambiguous: good as teachers or good as people

(129) Dobrite dve uchitelki pomognaha na deteto da preodolee krizata.

good-the two teachers helped to child-the to overcome crisis-the

“The two teachers, who are good people, helped the child to overcome the crisis.”

Unambiguous: good as people

Sentence (128) is ambiguous between the following two meanings – it is not clear whether the teachers are good as teachers (adverbial meaning) or are good as people (intersective meaning). In (129), the referents are rather good as people, not as teachers, which is the intersective interpretation of the phrase, the only interpretation available in this case.

The following distinction concerns the adjectival reference to a certain quality of an object in general/absolute terms or relative to the same quality of other objects. Again, if occurring after the numeral, the adjective exhibits ambiguity between these two senses. Preceding the numeral, however, it unambiguously holds the relative interpretation.

7.1.4. Relative vs Absolute

(130) Vizhdat se samo dvata visoki vurha na planinata.

can be seen only two-the high peaks of mountain-the

“One can see only the two high peaks of the mountain.”

Ambiguous: high in absolute or high in relation to the other peaks of the mountain

(131) Vizhdat se samo visokite dva vurha na planinata.

can be seen only high-the two peaks of the mountain.

“One can see only the two high peaks of this mountain.”

Unambiguous: high in relation to the other peaks of the mountain
In the first example, the mountain peaks maybe high either in relation to the other peaks of the same mountain or in general (i.e. this mountain contains two peaks which are very high as mountain peaks in general), wither the relative or the absolute interpretation is possible. The second sentence refers to the two highest peaks of this mountain. In this case only the relative interpretation is possible.

The following distinction is very similar. The difference is that it concerns the superlative forms.

7.1.5. Relative vs Absolute reading of the superlative

(132) Koi izkachi dvata nai-visoki vurha?
Who climbed two-the most high peaks
“Who climbed the two highest peaks?”

Ambiguous: highest in absolute or in relation to other peaks

(133) Koi izkazhi nai-visokite dva vurha?
who climbed most high-the two peaks
“Who climbed the highest two of the peakes?”

Unambiguous: highest in relation to other peaks

In the first case the reference maybe either to the two highest peaks on the planet (absolute interpretation) or to the two highest peaks of given mountain or a route (relative interpretation). The second example unambiguously refers to the highest peaks from among other peaks we have in mind. In this case only the relative interpretation is possible.

The last distinction which we will dwell upon is the one between the evaluative and the propositional meaning of the adjective.
7.1.6. Evaluative vs Propositional

(134) Dve neizvestni rockbandi sa predizvikali poboi na edna ot spirkite na metroto v grada.
   two unknown rock bands have provoked thrashing at one of the stations of metro-the in town-the
   “Two unidentified/not very famous rock bands have provoked thrashing at one of the metro stations in the town.”

**Ambiguous**: rock bands which are not very famous or people of whom nobody knows who they are

(135) Neizvestni dve rockbandi sa predizvikali poboi na edna ot spirkite na metroto v grada.
   unknown two rock bands have provoked thrashing at one of the stops of metro-the in town-the
   “Two unidentified rock bands have provoked thrashing at one of the metro stations in the town”

**Unambiguous**: people of whom nobody knows who they are

In the first example the adjective *neizvesten/unknown* is ambiguous and could mean either two rock bands which are not very famous or two rock bands that are not identified (ambiguity between the evaluative meanings and the propositional meanings). The second example has only the second meaning – that the rock bands are not identified. This is namely the propositional meaning.

The conclusion we can draw on the basis of the examples above is that when an adjective is found higher than the numeral, it only has a predicative meaning. In other words, it exploits a relative clause source. The following examples will show that there is one more element which behaves like the numeral with respect to the adjectives, namely the possessive. The only difference is that, with the possessive, we can demonstrate just the oppositions between the stage-level and the individual-level interpretations and between the restrictive – non restrictive interpretations.
7.2. The behaviour of the adjectives with respect to the possessive.

7.2.1. Stage-level vs. Individual-level.

(Looking at the moon):

(136) Neinite vidimi oblasti izglezhdat kato ochertania na choveshko litse.
her-the visible areas seem like features of human face
“Its visible area visible resemble the features of a human face.”

Ambiguous: visible at the moment or visible in general

(137) Vidimite neini oblasti izglezhdat kato ochertania na choveshko litse.
visible-the her areas seem like outlines of human face
“Its areas visible resemble the features of a human face.”

Unambiguous: visible only at the moment

The first example refers to those areas of the moon which are either visible at the moment or visible in general. As in the cases with the numeral, the adjectives which follow the possessive are ambiguous between a stage-level and an individual-level interpretation. In the second example, only the stage-level interpretation is available. It is clear that the phrase refers to the adjectives which are visible at the moment of speech.

With the possessive we can observe also the opposition between the restrictive and the non-restrictive interpretation. It is exemplified by the sentences below.

7.2.2. Restrictive vs. Non-restrictive

(138) Neinite polozhitelni hodove uspiaha da oburnat igrata.
her-the positive moves managed to turn game-the (to her own advantage)
Her positive moves managed to turn the game to her own advantage.

Ambiguous: only some of the actions have been positive or all of their actions have been positive
(139) Polozhitelnite neini hodove ne biaha dostatuchni, za da oburnat igrata.

positive-the her moves were not sufficient to turn game-the (to her own advantage)

“The positive moves she made were not sufficient to turn the game to her own advantage.”

**Unambiguous**: She has done also negative actions apart from the positive ones.

The meaning of the adjective *polozhitelni/positive* in the first example is ambiguous between a restrictive and a non-restrictive interpretation. It might be that all her moves are positive. It might also be that only one part of her moves have been positive. In the second example, however, it is clear that the speaker is referring only to the positive moves and, apart from them, there have been other non-positive moves. The second example has a restrictive interpretation.

The same generalization holds also as far as the possessive is concerned. Adjectives which are generated higher than this element are actually in a position within the predicative area of the noun phrase and exploit a relative clause source. As expected, the difference in meaning we are exploring does not depend on the presence or the absence of the article. This can be seen in examples (134) and (135) above, which do not contain the definite article.

Another thing we will only register here is that some of the adjectives, when occurring higher than the numeral or the possessive, could also be focalized. We assume that there exists a higher Topic/Focus projection.

(140) Zelenite dve rizi shte kupia, a ne chervenite.

green-the two shirts will buy (I) and not red-the

“It is the green two shirts that I will buy, not the red ones.”

(141) Golemiat negov prinos v nashata literatura…

big-the his contribution in our literature...

“His great contribution to our literature…”
Dimitrova-Vulchanova and Giusti (1998 and 1999) suggest that, in Bulgarian, there are higher projections, above the DP, which host the topicalized and the focalized elements. We will limit ourselves only to mentioning this since these topics are beyond the scope of this dissertation.

To sum up, we have tried to show, in this section, that despite being systematically ambiguous between an attributive and a predicative interpretation, Bulgarian adjectives can occur also in unambiguously predicative positions, namely, higher than the possessive or the numeral. In the next chapter, we will try to see which is the exact position of the numeral. Here we will conclude that it is in the predicative area. Data from English show that the numeral seems to form the boundary between a lower predicative area and a higher predicative area because it can be followed by adjectives exploiting a predicative source.

8. Summary.
In this chapter, we discussed the adjectival adnominal modification in Bulgarian. We paid special attention to those elements in the Bulgarian DP which seem to occupy a relative clause position. We accounted for the double definiteness phenomenon in Bulgarian by claiming that the articulated adjective following the demonstrative or the first articulated element does not hold the article of the whole DP. On the basis of the semantic, syntactic and phonological considerations we concluded that the second definite element occurs inside a reduced relative clause in prenominal position. We showed, however, that the articulated adjective does not seem to be the main predicate of the reduced relative clause. The predicate is rather a whole DP in which the articulated adjective is a modifier of a null noun. Comparing Bulgarian to other languages which display similar predicative constructions, we concluded that Bulgarian differs from those languages in that it uses the prenominal articulated adjective as a modifier in a DP predicate, in which it modifies a null noun. We have seen that another Slavic language – Slovenian displays a very similar phenomenon. In the end, we provided some data showing that Bulgarian allows for an adjective to appear higher than the possessive or the numeral in which case the adjective has a predicative interpretation in prenominal position, rather than being ambiguous.
CHAPTER THREE
Participles

Introduction.

In the previous chapter, we saw that colloquial Bulgarian exhibits an overt DP predicate of a reduced relative clause in prenominal position. We showed also that an attributive adjective could become predicative if it occurs higher than the numeral or the possessive. This adjective actually occupies a position in the higher predicative area. In this chapter, we will place the focus on the predicative area. In particular we will examine the distribution of the Bulgarian participles in prenominal position. The discussion centers around two main arguments. First, it is argued that verbal participles (as opposed to adjectival participial expressions) do occur in prenominal position in Bulgarian and, second, that, when co-occurring, participles exhibit certain ordering restrictions, namely stage-level participles precede individual-level participles, as predicted by Larson and Takahashi’s (in press) and Cinque’s (2005a) theory of adnominal modification. A number of very well-known tests for distinguishing between participles and adjectives are reanalyzed in view of the Bulgarian data, and are then used as diagnostics showing the verbal status of the participial expressions used in front of the noun. The possibility for placing two verbal participles in prenominal position comes as supporting evidence to what Cinque (2005a), building on Larson and Takahashi (in press), predicts, namely, that the adnominal modification area contains two layers – an individual-level layer, closer to the noun, including not only all attributive-only adjectives but also part of the indirect modification area, and a stage-level layer, situated higher up and including the rest of the indirect modification area.

The chapter is organized as follows. In section one we present an overview of the types of participles that are found in prenominal position in Bulgarian. Section two introduces the tests and methods, already established in the literature, distinguishing between verbal participles and adjectives. In section three, we give a comment on these tests in view of the data from Bulgarian. In section four, we present data from Bulgarian and English showing that those participial expressions which are postmodified by adverbs are real verbal participles and do not exhibit verbal properties. In section five, we dwell
upon the order of the prenominal verbal participles and upon the fine structure of the adnominal modification of the Bulgarian noun phrase.

1. Overview of the participles in Bulgarian.

Bulgarian has three types of participles, which can occur in prenominal position and which are exemplified below – passive participles (traditionally called past passive participles), past perfect participles (traditionally called past active participles) and what can be called progressive participles or present participles (traditionally named present active participles).

(1) otvoreniat vchera magazin  (Passive participle)
    opened-the yesterday shop
    “the shop that was opened yesterday”

(2) pristignaliat vchera turgovets  (Past perfect participle)
    arrived-the yesterday merchant
    “the merchant who arrived yesterday”

(3) izuchavashtiat fizika student  (Present participle)
    studying-the physics student
    “the student who studies physics”

The passive participle form is quite common across languages and is widely discussed in the literature. The perfect participle is in many languages homonymous to the passive one (English, Italian, German, etc.). Bulgarian and Slovenian, for example, have a separate form for this participle, distinct from the form for the passive participle, as reported by Marvin, (2002). The progressive participle is not uncommon across languages.

An important peculiarity of the Bulgarian perfect and progressive participles is that they can take a direct object also in prenominal position, as shown bellow.
There is a group of participles in Bulgarian which obligatorily require a direct object complement.

(4) zashtitiloto sestra si momche (Perfect)
defended-the sister his boy
“the boy who defended his sister”

(5) chetiashtiat doklada professor (Progressive)
reading-the report-the professor
“the professor who is reading the report”

(6) skrivam *(tsennite predmeti)
hide precious-the objects
“hide the precious objects”

(7) nabezhdavam *(priatelkata si)
accuse (falsely) friend-the my
“accuse my friend falsely”

The participles deriving from such verbs also require a direct object complement (of course we exclude the group of passive participles, which cannot have a direct object complement).

(8) izprazniliat * (kasata) sluzhitel (Perfect)
emptied-the cash-box-the man
“the man who emptied the cash box”

(9) vlacheshtata *(chergata) zhena (Progressive)
hauling-the rug-the woman
“the woman hauling the rug”
There are verbs which, apart from being obligatorily transitive, could also be used as intransitive (unaccusative or unergative) verbs:

(10) a) izkliuchiliat naprezhenieto mehanizum (Perfect - Transitive)
    switched off the tension-the mechanism
    “the mechanism that switched off the tension”

b) izkliuchiliat mehanizum (Perfect - Unaccusative)
    switched off the mechanism
    “the mechanism that switched off”

(11) a) izpulniavashtiat ariata tenor (Progr. – Transitive)
    performing-the area-the tenor
    “the tenor that sings the area ”

b) izpulniavashtia tenor (Progr. - Unergative)
    performing-the tenor
    “the tenor that is singing/performing”

We would like to keep apart the cases in which a verb is realized as transitive and those in which it is intransitive. We will attribute this phenomenon to the lexical ambiguity of the verb.

Another group of participles are those deriving from verbs which are unambiguously intransitive.

(12) padnaliat snoshti sniag (Perfect - Unaccusative)
    fallen-the yesterday night snow
    “the snow that fell yesterday”

Apart from the transitive participles which obligatorily require a direct object complement, the rest of the participle-looking words are ambiguous. They could be both adjectives and
participles. Our next objective will be to devise a test for identifying other clear-cut cases of real deverbal participles, from among the adjectival forms.

Before looking at the Bulgarian data we will present an overview of the existing tests and methods for distinguishing between adjectives and participles.

2. Methods and tests established in the literature for distinguishing between adjectives and participles.

There is a long-standing debate in the generative literature concerning the distinction between adjectives and participles. With few exceptions, the data discussed come mainly from English. We are presenting below some of the main tests the authors use, which will be commented on in relation to Bulgarian in the next section.

The prenominal position.

Since the prenominal position is traditionally believed to be reserved for adjectives, many authors (among them Wasow 1977, Bresnan 1982, 1995), analyzing mainly data from English, claim that the participle-looking words found in front of the noun are nothing else but pure adjectives.

Of course, there are also opponents of this idea Laczkó (2001), working within Lexical Functional Grammar, provides data from Hungarian, arguing against Bresnan, who claims that all prenominal forms are adjectival.

Based on data from Bulgarian, we will also argue in favour of the claim that the prenominal position is not necessarily adjectival. As it was stated in the introduction of this chapter, we will present evidence that verbal participial forms not only can occur in prenominal position, but also display certain ordering restrictions.

The degree quantifier.

One of the tests for adj ectivality is the compatibility of an expression with the degree quantifier. Since the latter precedes only adjectives, not verbs, whatever participial looking expression is compatible with it, it must be adjectival. Of course, this test applies only to expressions which are gradable but still it can be used as a diagnostics.
Complements of some verbs.

Another test, applied in the literature is the possibility of adjectives to appear as complements of verbs like seem, remain, look, sound, act and become. The examples are adapted from Wasow (1977).

(13) John looked eager to win.

(14) John remained happy.

Another similar diagnostics is presented in Embick (2004), who suggests that after verbs of creation, like build, create, make only adjectives can appear. The examples are taken from Embick (2004).

(15) This door was built open.

(16) This new ruler was built long.

Concessional relative phrases with “however”.

Bresnan claims that only adjectives could head concessional relative phrases beginning with “however” and verbs cannot do that.

however AP vs. *however VP: however supportive of her daughter she may have been vs. *however supporting her daughter she may have been…
(Bresnan, 1995)

Modification with too/very without much.

Another typical adjectival characteristic is the modification with too/very without much. Only verbs necessarily need much.

(17) it is too flat

(Bresnan, 1995)

(18) * it is too much flat

(Bresnan, 1995)
(19) John very *(much) respects your family. (Wasow, 1977)

(20) John is very *much fond of your family. (Wasow, 1977)

Negative un- prefixation.

The negative prefix un- can attach to a considerable number of passive participles. The same prefix can attach also to adjectives but not to verbs. This prefix conveys the meaning “something which has not been performed.”

(21) unopened, unshaven, untouched (Levin & Rappaport, 1986)

This adjectival prefix must be distinguished from the verbal affix un- which has a “reversative” meaning.

(22) John unloaded the truck. (Levin & Rappaport, 1986)

Wasow shows that there are certain verbs which can take the negative prefix only if they are passive, as is shown by the examples below, taken from Wasow (1977):

(23) Our products are untouched by human hands

(24) The island was uninhabited by humans.

(25) All his claims were unsupported by data.

Wasow, then, claims that the negated words in these examples belong to the group of adjectival expressions holding the negative prefix, otherwise it would be strange that the participle-like expressions in these examples can take the negative prefix only when they are in the passive.
Kratzer (2000) suggests that the *un*-prefix is attached to the resultative passive in the lexicon since it cannot be attached to a phrasal passive, as the example below suggests:

(26) Das Haar war hässlich ungekämmt.
the hair was sloppily uncombed

Kratzer’s claim is challenged by Embick (2004), who suggests in a footnote that there should be a different explanation for the unacceptability of Kratzer’s example, namely that it is not possible to have adverbial modification over an event that is in the scope of negation. In this way Embick tries to invalidate Kratzer’s conclusion that the negative prefix is assigned in the lexicon.

3. Comments on the tests in view of the Bulgarian data.
According to the first test, all participial expressions which are found in prenominal position should be considered adjectives because the prenominal position is reserved for adjectives. As we have already mentioned above, we are going to argue against this assumption. The arguments supporting this view, however, will be presented later on. We are going to discuss now the rest of the tests and to provide examples from Bulgarian.

One of the most popular tests in the literature regards the complement position of verbs like *seem, remain, look, sound, act* and *become*. In order to explore the status of the complements of these verbs in Bulgarian we will apply the following diagnostics. First, we place in the slot of the complement an adjectival expression, then an adjectival participial expression (or an ambiguous participial expression, to be more precise). Third, we will place in the complement position a participial expression which takes a direct object, of which we know that it is a real verbal participle.

*An adjective in complement position.*

(27) uchitellkata ostana nedovolna ot otgovora
teacher-the remained unsatisfied from answer-the
“the teacher remained unsatisfied by the answer”
An unmodified participial expression in complement position.

(28) Knigata ostana neprochetena.
book-the remained unread
“The book remained unread”

(29) Plikut ostana (ne)zapechatan.
envelope-the remained closed
“The envelope remained closed.”

Compare with:

A participle with a direct object in complement position.

(30) * Momcheto ostana neprochelo knigata.
boy-the remained unread book-the

(31) * Zhenata ostana nezapechatala plika.
woman-the remained (NEG)closed envelope-the

We see that a verbal participle, carrying a direct object complement is banned in the complement position of the verb remain\(^2\).

The examples presented above suggest that the complements of verbs like remain are really adjectival and that in Bulgarian verbal participial cannot be used in this environment.

Another test presented above concerns degree quantifiers. In Bulgarian too they seems to be adjectival.

\(^2\) The Bulgarian equivalents of the rest of the English verbs of this group do not sound so good in the relevant contexts in Bulgarian. For this reason we used in the examples only the equivalent of the verb remain.
With adjectives.

(32) nai-krasivite zali na palata
    most beautiful-the halls of the palace
    “the most beautiful halls of the palace”

With unmodified participial expressions.

(33) Nai-nadrastkanata tetradka e tazi na Petia.
    most scratched-the notebook is that of Petia.
    “Petia has the most scratchy notebook.”

The participles derived from transitive verbs are not compatible with the degree quantifier.

(34) * Nai-nadraskaloto tetradkata si momche.
    most scratched-the notebook-the his boy
    “the boy that scratched mostly his notebook”

Another very common test in the literature, which demonstrates the adjectival nature of participial expressions, concerns the use of “however” in concessional phrases. According to the works cited above, only adjectives can head concessional phrases introduced by “however”. With the examples below we are trying to see whether this test also works for Bulgarian. The Bulgarian equivalent of this expression would be kolkoto i ...
da e....

With adjectives.

(35) Kolkoto i dulga da e opashkata, shte triabva da chakam.
    however long DA is queue-the will have to wait
    “However long the queue is, I will have to wait.”
With unmodified participial expressions.

(36) Kolkoto i nadraskana da e tetradkata, pak shte mi svurshi rabota.

However and scribbled DA is notebook-the (it) will me serve

“Howver scribbled the notebook is, it will serve me.”

Compare with:

With a transitive participle.

(37) * Kolkoto i nadraskal tetradkata da e, tia pak shte mi svurshi rabota.

(Perf.part.)

however scratched notebook-the (he) DA is, it still will to me serve

“No matter how much he has scratched the notebook, it can still serve me.”

The Bulgarian data seem to show that the concessional phrases of the mentioned type require an adjectival expression also in this language. A verbal participle is not allowed, as shown above.

As to the test concerning the modification with *too/very (much)*, no Bulgarian correspondences can be formed. Therefore we will not consider this test here. As to the verbs of creation like build, discussed above, since no good examples can be found from Bulgarian, I would prefer not to discuss this test in relation to Bulgarian.

Another interesting test is the negative prefixation. We would like just to introduce this issue here and to make some very tentative suggestions, since it is not very easy to form examples of the type we need.

The Bulgarian negative prefix ne- displays quite different properties in comparison to its English counterpart. In fact, there are at least two different uses of the Bulgarian negative prefix. As to the semantics of the prefix, we have to say that it corresponds in meaning to that English negative prefix which means “something which has not happened.” We said above that this English prefix is used only with adjectives. In Bulgarian, however, the negative prefix holding the same semantic meaning can be attached not only to adjectives but also to real verbal participles.
The negative prefix can be attached to almost all verbs from which transitive perfect and present participles are derived. The participle formed in this way is verbal and not adjectival because it takes a direct object complement.

(38) nezashtitiloto sestra si momche  
NEGdefended sister his boy  
“the boy who did not defend his sister”

(39) nedulzhashtiat nikomu pari chovek  
NEGowing-the nobody money man  
“the man who does not owe money to anyone”

As can be seen from the last example, the participle preserves not only the verb’s direct object but also the non-direct one. Another interesting thing to note is that what I called “verbal use” of the negative prefix, in cases of perfect participles, seems to carry some kind of modal meaning; that is, it carries the meaning that something that should have taken place or that was expected to take place, has not happened.

(40) nedoshliat na sreshtata minister  
not arrived-the at the meeting minister  
“the minister that did not come to the meeting”

(41) neizchistilata kushtata domakinia  
not cleaned-the house housewife  
“the housewife that did not clean the house”

Verbs of unconscious acts seem to be an exception.
nenamachkaloto drehite si momiche
NEGwrinkled-the clothes her girl
“the girl who has not wrinkled her clothes”

There seems to be another use of the negative prefix; namely, when the same prefix is stressed. The following pair of examples shows the difference between the two types.

(43) Nemarkiralata dobre putniat uchastuk mashina beshe popravena
(Verbal NEGmarked well road-the section machine was repaired form)
“The machine that did not mark well the road section was repaired.”

(44) Nemarkiraniat puten uchastuk e zatvoren
(Adjectival form, stress on the NEGmarked-the road section is closed prefix)
“The non-marked road section is closed.”

(45) *Nemarkiralata (dobre) putniat uchastuk mashina beshe popravena
(Verbal form, NEGmarked well road-the section machine was repaired stress on Ne-)
“The machine that did not mark well the road section was repaired.”

Example (43), above, contains a verbal participle with a direct object complement. In cases like this the participle is not stressed. It can be stressed only if the participial expression is adjectival. (We are going to argue that all participial expressions which occur without any modifiers have also an adjectival use.) Notice that example (43), above, is rather heavy but acceptable. Example (45), instead, where the negative prefix is stressed, is absolutely impossible. The contrast between the two examples is quite visible. These considerations point to the conclusion that the stressed variant of the negative prefix is only adjectival. The data seem to show also that the negative prefix in the unmodified forms can either be stressed or unstressed. In fact, this is exactly what we expect if we assume, that the
unmodified participial expressions are ambiguous between adjectives and verbal participles. The following examples show these two possibilities.

(46) nenachukanite orehi sa v drugata torba (unstressed negative form)
NEGcracked-the walnuts are in ohter-the bag
“the uncracked walnuts are in the other bag”

(47) tova sa nachukanite, nenachukanite sa v drugata torba (stress on the negative form)
this are the cracked, the NEGcracked are in the other bag
“These are the cracked ones, the uncracked ones are in the other bag.”

Other examples of a possible adjectival use are the following: neizvineno otsustvie/an unexcused absence (from school); nenasturgani morkovi/ungrated carrots, etc. Notice also that many of the examples in which the stressed prefix can be used are not at all real passives but are rather adjectivalized passives. These are examples like: nekvalifitsiran rabotnik/unqualified worker, nemotiviran chovek/non-motivated person, etc.

So far we have seen that the unstressed variant of the negative prefix can be used with verbal participles and the stressed variant is used only with adjectival passives. Since the non-stressed variant can also be used with adjectival participial expressions, we cannot use it as a diagnostics but we can do so with the stressed prefix. If an expression carries the stressed negative prefix, it must be an adjectival expression.

4. In search for other types of real verbal participles.
In this section, we will focus on the verbal participles, those which do not exhibit adjectival characteristics. In particular, we will try to formulate diagnostics for isolating another group of real verbal participles in, apart from the already familiar one (i.e. the participles preserving the direct object of the verb).
We will try to show that both Bulgarian and English exhibit yet another type of verbal participles, apart from the transitive participles. First, we will discuss the data from Bulgarian and then we will turn to the data from English.

As was suggested above, we take as a solid piece of evidence of the verbal nature of the participle the fact that it requires a direct object complement. Of course, this holds only for the transitive variant.

As to the intransitive progressive and perfect participles, and the group of passive participles, we will analyze them in relation to adverbs.

It is true that the use of a participle with an adverbial does not necessarily demonstrate the verbal nature of that participle. The reason is that the participle-looking word could be understood as an adjectival element containing the verb “be” (with the meaning “being in the state of”), thus being not a participle but an adjective.

(48) naburzo postroenata kushta
    quickly built-the house
    “the house buist quickly”

The example above is ambiguous between referring to a house which is in the state of being built quickly (it may be implied that it has been built not very well), which is an adjectival reading, or to a house which has been in the process of being built quickly, which is a verbal reading.

Yet, we will try to find a diagnostics for distinguishing between the verbal and the adjectival reading of some of the ambiguous participles. In any case we will need the help of modifying adverbial expressions. The crucial point in our analysis will be the position of the modifying adverb. Our objective will be to show that participles post-modified by an adverbial exhibit verbal properties. We will apply the tests for adjectivality we enumerated above, to distinguish between adjectival and verbal forms. Before proceeding, we need to mention that, since there are some adverbs, like vchera/yesterday, for example, which can be used both with adjectives and with participles, we will have to limit ourselves to using just adverbs of which we are sure that can be used only with verbs. For this reason, we will use adverbs of manner, like vnimatelno/carefully and dobre/well.
4.1. The case of the Bulgarian postmodified participial expressions.

The degree quantifier.

First, we will examine a group of participial expressions which can be used either as adjectives or as participles depending on the environment. These participial expressions can combine either with the degree modifier or with an adverbial in postposition. Some of the words belonging to this group are the following: izbledneia/fade, izkrivia/bend something, opeka/bake something, nagreia/warm up something, zaostria/sharpen, natocha/grind, etc.

The adjectival use of these words is demonstrated by their being compatible with the degree quantifier.

(49) po-oprostenata shema shte bude izpolzvana za…
more simplified-the scheme will be used to…
“the more simplified scheme will be used to…”

(50) Po-natocheniat nozh shte bude izpolzvan za...
more grinded-the knife will be used to…
“the more grinded knife will be used to…”

The participial use of these expressions, which we would like to check, emerges when they are followed by an adverbial of time.

(51) Oprostenata vnimatelno shema shte bude izpolzvana za…
simplified-the carefully scheme will be used to…
“the carefully simplified scheme will be used to…”

(52) Natocheniat vnimatelno nozh shte bude izpolzvan za…
grinded-the carefully knife will be used to…
“the carefully grinded knife will be used to…”
To test the verbal status of the examples in which the participial expression is followed by an adverbial expression, we try to combine the use of the degree quantifier, of which we know that cannot combine with participles, and the use of the adverbial. The following examples show that such a combination is not possible.

(53) * po-oprostenata vnimatelno shema shte bude izpolzvana za...
    more simplified-the carefully scheme will be used to...

(54) * po-natocheniat vnimatelno nozh shte bude izpolzvan za ....
    more grinded-the carefully knife will be used to...

The fact that the degree quantifier and the adverbial expression are incompatible means that when using the adverbial expression we form real participles and when using the degree quantifier we form adjectival expressions. If we could use an adverbial of time with adjectives, it would not be impossible to place it also after a participial expression modified by the degree quantifier. We present below the same participle but in combination with the adverb *dobre/well*. The result we obtain is the same.

(55) Natocheniat dobre nozh mozhe da posluzhi za….
    grinded-the well knife can serve for...
    “the well grinded knife can serve for…”

(56) * po-natocheniat dobre nozh mozhe da posluzhi za…
    more grinded-the well knife can serve for...

The examples above show that the participial expressions postmodified by an adverbial are incompatible with the degree quantifier, although the unmodified form *is* compatible with it.

*Complements of verbs like ”remain”.*

Next, we will apply the test concerning the complement position of verbs like *remain*. We showed above that the complement position of that verb can be occupied only
by an adjective. Our purpose, here, is to see whether it is possible to fill this position with a participle followed by an adverbial.

The examples from Bulgarian show that premodified and unmodified participial expressions can occur in this position but participles taking a direct object complement and postmodified participial expressions cannot. We see here that, as we suggested above, the premodified participial expressions behave like adjectives.

**Unmodified participial expression.**

(57) trite ostanali nepochisteni sled partito pomeshtenia
three-the remained uncleaned after party-the rooms
“the three rooms that remained uncleaned after the party”

**Premodified participial expression.**

(58) Ostanalite vnimatelno podredeni vurhu biuroto dokumenti³.
remained-the carefully ordered on bureau-the documents.
“the documents that remained carefully ordered on the bureau”

(59) Ostanaloto vnimatelno razpechatano sled proverkata pismo⁴
remained-the carefully unsealed after examination-the letter
“the letter that remained carefully unsealed after the examination”

**Transitive participles:**

(60) *Ostanaliat podrezhdasht dokumentite sluzhitel.
remained-the ordering documents-the attendant
“the attendant that remained ordering the documents”

---

³ Examples (58) and (59) sound a bit odd because of the slight semantic incompatibility of the adverb “carefully”, which we use in order to be consistent, and the verb ostavam/remain. We aim at showing that, in this environment, an adverb in postposition with respect to the participle sounds worse than an adverb in preposition with respect to the participle. We see in (64) that, in a predicative use, the same premodified particle sounds better (since it is easier to insert the context).

⁴ See footnote 3.
Postmodified participial expression

(61) ???*ostanalite podredeni vnimatelno varhu biuroto dokumenti
    remained-the ordered carefully on bureau-the documents
    “the documents that remained carefully ordered on the bureau”

(The relevant meaning of the participle *ostanalite has to be distinguished from the
meanings: “remained at that place” and “the rest”)

(62) *Ostanaloto razpechatano vnimatelno sled proverkata pismo
    remained-the unsealed carefully after examination-the letter
    “The letter that remained carefully unsealed after the examination”

Predicative use:

Unmodified participial expression.

(63) Knigata ostana neprochetena.
    book-the remained unread
    “The book remained unread.”

Premodified participial expression.

(64) Dori sled obiska dokumentite na biuroto i ostanaha vnimatelno podredeni.
    Even after perquisition-the documents-the on bureau-the her remained carefully
    ordered.
    “Even after the perquisition, the documents on her bureau remained carefully
    ordered.”

Transitive participle.

(65) *Sluzhiteliat ostana podrezhdasht dokumentite.
    Attendant-the remained ordering documents-the
    “The attendant remained ordering the documents.”
Post-modified participle.

(66) *Dokumentite na biuro i ostanaha podredeni vnimatelno
Documents-the on bureau-the her remained ordered carefully.
“The documents on her bureau remained carefully ordered.”

To sum up, the examples above show that no postmodified participial expressions can occur in the complement position of the verb ostavam/remain. This is another piece of data suggesting that postmodified participial expression are verbal participles and not adjectives.

Concessional phrases with “however”.

The test with concessional phrases headed by however provides further support in favour of this hypothesis. We mentioned above that concessional phrases introduced by “however” could be headed only by adjectives and not by verbs. The examples below show that postmodified participial expressions cannot be used in this adjectival environment.

Unmodified participial expressions.

(67) Kolkoto i nadraskana da e tetradkata, pak shte mi svurshi rabota.
however and scribbled DA is notebook-the still will to me serve
“However scribbled the notebook is, it could serve me.”
Premodified participial expressions

(68) Kolkoto i vnimatelno podbrani da sa sustavkite …
however and carefully selected DA are ingredients…
“however carefully selected the ingredients”

Post-modified participial expression.

(69) *Kolkoto i nadraskana nevnimatelno da e tetradkata, pak shte mi svurshi rabota.
however and scribbled carelessly DA is notebook-the still will to me serve
“Howver carelessly scribbled the notebook is, it could serve me.”

Transitive participle.

(70) *Kolkoto I podbral sustavkite da e…
however and selected (masc.) ingredients DA is ...

5 One could object that, with premodified participles, kolkoto I/however modifies only the adverb and therefore examples like (68) are not really relevant. In my opinion, kolkoto I/however can modify both the adverb and the whole complex – the adverb plus the participle. Notice that the Bulgarian expression kolkoto I vnimatelno podbrani da sa/however carefully selected they are has the equivalent (i):

(i) Kolkoto I vnimatelno da sa podbrani
however and carefully DA are selected

in which the participle comes last. If kolkoto i/however modified only the adverb, we would expect that all examples like (68) would have an equivalent of the type (i). There are, however, cases in which the adverb and the participle cannot easily separate, as in the following example:

(ii). Kolkoto I dulboko zasegnata/obidena da e, shte mu prosti.
however and deeply hurt/insulted DA is will him forgive
“Howver deeply hurt/insulted she is, she will forgive him.”

Notice that, if we separate the adverb and the participle, the example degrades.

(iii). ?? Kolkoto I dulboko da e zasegnata/obidena, shte mu prosti.
however and deeply DA is hurt/insulted, will him forgive.
“Howver deeply hurt/insulted she is she will forgive him.”
In prenominal position:

*Unmodified participial expression.*

(71) Kolkoto i nadraskana tetradka da ima Ivan...
however and scribbled notebook DA has Ivan
“However scribbled Ivan’s notebook…”

*Premodified participial expression.*

(72) Kolkoto I vnimatelno podbrani sustavki da izpolzvat...
however and carefully selected ingredients DA use
“No matter how carefully selected ingredients they use…”

*Postmodified participle.*

(73) *Kolkoto i podbrani vnimatelno sustavki da izpolzvat...
however and selected carefully ingredients they use
“No matter how carefully selected ingredients they use…”

The examples above clearly show that the postmodified participial expressions cannot fill the slot of the adjectives. The premodified and the unmodified ones, on the other hand, can qualify as adjectives.

*The negative prefix -ne.*

The test which has remained unapplied so far is the one concerning the use of the negative prefix. As we have already seen, the Bulgarian negative prefix has a stressed variant and an unstressed variant. We showed above that, unlike the English negative prefix, the unstressed *ne-* can attach not only to adjectives but also to verbs. Therefore we consider it ambiguous and its use is not indicative as far as the adjectival or verbal nature of participles is concerned. The stressed variant, however, seems to be able to appear only on adjectives and never on verbal forms. Therefore, we can use it as a test. The results are as expected. The example below contains a negatied participle postmodified by an adverb.
The context: A company has just supplied its office with new tools, which have to be made an inventory list of.

(74) Neopisanite dobre materiali suzdadoha nepriatnosti na sekretarkata.  
NEGlisted-the well tools caused troubles to the secretary  
“The tools that were not listed well caused troubles to the secretary.”

The negative particle *ne* in the next sentence could either be stressed or not. (We mentioned earlier that, because of the ambiguity of the unstressed participial forms, the negative prefix attached on them can be both stressed and unstressed.)

(75) Ot diasno sa opisanite materiali, a ot liavo sa *ne*opisanite.  
      to the left are listed-the tools and to the right are NEGlisted-the  
      “To the right you find the listed tools and to the left the unlisted ones.”

The crucial piece of data is shown below. The participial expressions modified by an adverb cannot contain a stressed negative prefix.

(76) *Ne*opisanite dobre materiali suzdadoha nepriatnosti na sekretarkata.  
NEGlisted-the well tools caused troubles to the secretary  
“The tools that were not well listed caused troubles to the secretary.”

This last piece of evidence shows again that the postmodified participial expressions do not exhibit adjectival properties. They do not display any ambiguity, they are simply verbs.

4.2. The case of the English participial expressions.

In the previous subsection, we have shown that the participial expressions post-modified by an adverbial behave as verbal participles in Bulgarian while the ones pre-modified by an adverbial seem to be ambiguous between verbal participles and adjectives. In this subsection we will try to see whether this generalization holds for English. It is a well-known fact that there is a ban on postmodified participial expressions in English in
prenominal position. Thus, the only possibility we can explore is to test the participial expressions occurring in postnominal position.

*The negative prefix un*

The first test we will consider concerns the negative un- prefix. This prefix is considered adjectival in the literature. It never attaches to verbs in English (the negative prefix under consideration here is not to be confused with the reversative prefix, attaching to verbs, as in *undo*). As we can see from the examples below, there is no verb corresponding to the negative participial form.

(77) unaccepted * to unaccept

(78) unquestioned * to unquestion

Since there are no verbal forms corresponding to the negative participial forms in (77) and (78), the only conclusion we can draw is that these passives are adjectives and not verbs. What is of interest for us here is that passives like these can be pre-modified but not post-modified by adverbs.

(79) The invitations, politely unaccepted, lay strewn upon the table.

As shown below, it is impossible to reverse the order between the participle and the adverb.

(80) * The invitations, unaccepted politely, lay strewn upon the table.

The same contrast can be observed in the examples below:

(81) The king’s argument, respectfully unquestioned, rang throughout the room.

(82) * The king’s argument, respectfully unquestioned, rang throughout the room.
The complements of “seem”.

As was mentioned several times earlier, only adjectives and not verbs can follow the verb seem. Interestingly, only pre-modified and not post-modified participial expressions can appear in this environment.

(83) The floor has not been waxed and the curtains are still dirty, but the silver, at least, seems carefully polished.

(84) * The floor has not been waxed and the curtains are still dirty, but the silver, at least, seems polished carefully.

(85) The red lentils still have pieces of dirt and stone in them, but the green ones seem carefully sorted.

(86) * The red lentils still have pieces of dirt and stone in them, but the green ones seem sorted carefully.

(87) The present seems carefully wrapped up.

(88) * The present seems wrapped up carefully.

(89) The room seems carefully cleaned.

(90) * The room seems cleaned carefully.

(91) The issue seems carefully explained (in a suitable context it sounds fine)

(92) * The issue seems explained carefully.
Concessional phrases with “however”.

Another way to test the verbal character of the postmodified participial expressions is to see whether they can head concessional phrases with however. Unmodified participial expressions clearly can head such a phrase, as we show below.

(93) However **polished** the floor was, it didn’t seem completely clean.

The same holds true for the premodified participial expressions:

(94) However **carefully polished** the floor was, it didn’t seem completely clean.

It is, however, completely impossible to place a postmodified participial expression in this environment.

(95) * However **polished carefully** the floor was, it didn’t seem completely clean.

However seems to be compatible with other adjectival participial forms like the unmodified ones. This is shown below. (The examples below were pointed out to me by Megan Linke p. c.)

(96) A very promising extension, **however untouched**, is that of defining strategies that decide which presentation forms of the selectors to use, or even defining strategies that define such a strategy depending of e. g. the speed of the underlying hardware, the size of targeted display, etc., as indicated on p. 58.


(97) People have a psychological sense that a used object is worth much less, **however untouched** it is.

So far, we have provided evidence that postmodified participial expressions display verbal properties both in English and in Bulgarian, in behaving differently with respect to the premodified and the unmodified participial expressions. As to the last two types, we assume that they are rather ambiguous between the participial and the adjectival reading. The adverb in preposition, unlike the adverb in postposition, is not a signal of the verbal character of the participle.

4.3. The pre- vs. post-position of the adverbial.
In this section we discuss in more detail the position of the adverbial. We would like to observe how the meaning of the participial expression changes when the adverbial appears to the left or to the right of it. We argued that the adverbial in post-position renders the expression participial and not adjectival while with an adverbial in preposition the participial expression remains ambiguous.

There are some adverbials which can be found mainly to the right of the participle-looking-word. One of these is *vchera/yesterday*.

(98)   a) pristignaliat vchera gost
       arrived-the yesterday guest
       “the guests that arrived yesterday”

       b) ???vchera pristignaliat gost
       yesterday arrived-the guest
       “the guest that arrived yesterday”

Others, like *postoianno/constantly and doskoro/until very recently, vremenno/temporarily* can appear exclusively to the left.

(99)  a) postoianno narastvashtoto naprezhenie
       constantly growing-the tension
       “the constantly growing tension”
b) ? narastvashtoto postoianno naprezhenie  (unless the adverb is stressed)
growing-the constantly tension
“the constantly growing tension”

There is a third group of adverbials, which can appear either to the left or to the right of the participle-looking word. These adverbs like naskoro/recently, otdavna/long ago, dobre/well, zle/poorly, etc.

(100) a) naskoro zakupenoto imenie
recently bought-the estate
“the estate that was bought recently”

b) zakupenoto naskoto imenie
recently bought-the estate
“the estate that was bought recently”

Another test we can provide to show that the post-position of the adverbial with respect to the participle signals the verbal nature of the participle is to use pseudo-participles. We expect that with expressions of this kind it will not be possible to place the adverbial in post-position. Here are the examples:

(101) nemotiviran chovek  ( does not derive from “motivate someone”)
unmotivated person

(102) absoliutno nemotiviran chovek
absolutely unmotivated person

(103) * nemotiviran absoliutno chovek
unmotivated absolutely person
(104) Doskoro nemotiviraniat student otkri nov stimul i produlzhi rabotata si.

until recently unmotivated—the student found new stimulus and continued his work

“The student who until recently was unmotivated found a new stimulus and continued his work.”

(105) ???. nemotiviraniat doskoro student otkri nov stimul i produlzhi rabotata si

unmotivated until recently student found new stimulus and continued his work

6 We have to mention that certain examples containing adjectival participles post-modified by adverbials of time could be saved by placing a heavy stress on the participial expression and a pause between the participial expression and the adverb. Since when the example is pronounced with normal intonation such examples do not sound acceptable we would like to keep apart the cases in which a heavy stress and a pause are required from the cases involving verbal participles. Here we provide some other examples in which a change in the intonation makes the adjectival meaning in what we considered verbal environment, possible.

a) Zatvorenite vchera magazini

closed-the yesterday shops

b) Zatvorenite vchera magazini pokazaha gotovnostta na rabotnitsite da zapochnat vseobsha stachka. (stress on the participle-looking word)

Closed-the yesterday shops showed the readiness of the workers to begin a general strike.

The difference in meaning manifested by the examples above is the following. Example a) exhibits a completely verbal meaning of the participle, while in example b), where the participle-looking word is stressed it is rather adjectival. The only possible interpretation of a) is that yesterday something happened, namely, the shops were closed. The interpretation of b), though, probably, not the only possible one (if the participle is stressed for focus reasons), is that yesterday the shops were in the state of being closed, but maybe they closed them two days earlier. In other words, in example b), no event happened on the day indicated by the adverb (only if the adverb is not stressed for focus reasons). Example a), on the other hand, indicates an event.

Notice, however, that this effect is not present if instead of an adverbial of time, we use an adverbial of manner.

a) dobre zatvorenoto shishe niama da se izlee (adjectival interpretation present)

b) *zatvorenoto dobre shishe niama da se izlee (adjectival interpretation impossible)

Thus, in spite of the peculiarity of the adverbials of time, we continue to consider the post-modified participial expressions verbal participles.
“the student that was unmotivated until recently found a new stimulus and continued his work”

The following examples seem to provide some (though only intuitive) support in favour of our conclusion that the post-position of the adverbial renders the participial expression a real verbal participle and the pre-position of the adverbial does not disambiguate the expression.

(106) Nanesenata dobre boia izdurzha okolo mesets.
distributed-the well dye stands for about a month
“The dye that is distributed well resists for about a month”

(107) Dobre nanesenata boia izdurzha okolo mesets.
well distributed-the dye stands for about a month
“The well-distributed dye resists for about a month”

The combination of a participle and an adverb in the first expression has the meaning “only that dye that is distributed well stands for about a month”. The participle-looking word in the second example, instead, sounds ambiguous between appositive and restrictive. With normal intonation the example sounds rather descriptive. A stress on the adverbial might create a contrastive meaning; in this case the adverbial is focused. How is the opposition restrictive versus appositive relevant to our discussion? According to Cinque (2005a), RRCs can be of a different kind. The predicative area contains bare APs, complex APs or Participles. Thus we find adjectives both in the direct modification area and in the Indirect modification area. Participles, instead, could be found only in the Indirect modification area. Thus, theoretically, if an element has a restrictive interpretation, we cannot know whether it is an adjective or a participle. One particular feature of Bulgarian adjectives, however, seems to play a crucial role here. Being all in prenominal position, Bulgarian adjectives are all ambiguous between the attributive and the predicative interpretation. As it was mentioned in the previous chapter, the only way to disambiguate an adjective, i. e. to make a predicative adjective out of an ambiguous one, is to place it above the possessive or
the across the numeral. This is the only way to show unambiguously a predicative source for the APs in Bulgarian. What we have said so far would mean that, if an item, in prenominal position, for example, a participial expression, has a restrictive meaning, it can only be a real verbal participle. It cannot have the status of an adjective since all adjectives, unless occurring higher than a numeral or a possessive are ambiguous. Thus, according to our considerations, example (106) contains a participle and not an adjective. Example (107), instead, has no restrictive meaning and could be also an adjective.

Next, we would like to focus on the properties of those participle-looking words which are preceded by adverbial expressions and see how they differ from the post-modified ones.

While discussing the properties of the participles followed by adverbial expressions, we mentioned also some properties of those which are preceded by adjectival expressions. The general idea about the latter group of participle-looking expressions is that they are ambiguous in the sense that they exhibit both adjectival and verbal properties. In other words, they can behave both as adjectives and as participles. Here we will simply provide some more evidence in support of their ambiguous character.

(108) Naskoro zakupiliat imenieto muzh
recently-the purchased-the estate-the man
the man who recently bought the estate”

The co-occurrence of the preposed adverbial and the participle taking a direct object complement, as in the above example, shows that the preposed adverbial does not necessarily signal the adjectival nature of a participial expression. As we have seen above, there is evidence to believe that participial expressions pre-modified by adverbs can also be adjectival. Below we provide an example suggesting that the position in front of the participle could be occupied by elements which, combined with the participial expression have the interpretation of fixed phrases. The meaning of the adverbial in this case does not correspond to the meaning of the adverbial which is used in postposition with respect to the same participle-looking word.
What the examples above show is that, with premodified participles, it is possible to form fixed expressions. The meaning which emerges in these examples is not a real combination of the meaning of the verb and that of the participle-looking word. In examples like (109a), the participial expression does not convey the real meaning of the verb it derives from. What has happened is that the verb has been adjectivalized. As we can see, once we place the adverb in postposition, the original meaning of the verb reemerges and the example no longer sounds acceptable. This observation comes in support of the claim that the premodified participial expressions can be adjectival while the postmodified ones are only verbal. We mentioned, however, that the premodified participial expressions are actually ambiguous, which means that they can also be verbal. In other words, the premodifying adverb does not necessarily signal the verbal status of the expression it modifies but it does not necessarily signal its adjectival status either.

4.4. Summary.
We have seen in the last section that, both in English and in Bulgarian, the postmodified participial expressions are verbal participles and do not exhibit verbal properties. The postposition of the adverb was seen to be a signal of the verbal nature of the participial expression. The post-modified expression was shown to have a restrictive meaning and thus
to differ from adjectives, which are all ambiguous in Bulgarian. The post-modified participial expression cannot combine with the degree quantifier, which combines only with adjectives. The post-modified participle was shown to be also intuitively verbal since it refers exclusively to the event and not to the resultant state of the event, as the pre-modified expression. The premodified participial expressions, on the other hand, was shown to display both verbal and adjectival properties.

Thus, apart from the participles deriving from transitive verbs, we have isolated another group of participles which are also verbal expressions. The next step is to see whether we can combine the two types of participles and in what order they appear in front of the noun.

5. The ordering of the prenominal participles.
We present below the order of adnominal modifying elements we have established so far.

The attributive area contains all attributive adjectives of which we cannot assign the predicative status, simply because they do not exhibit predicative properties. We would like to recall that Bulgarian adjectives are ambiguous, thus we cannot isolate a field of a purely
attributive adjectives. We can observe, however, that some adjectives exploit a predicative source. As we have seen in the previous chapter, if an adjective occurs higher than the numeral (or the possessive) it enters an exclusively predicative area and exhibits the properties of predicative adjectives. This is possible only if the numeral is also present overtly in the noun phrase. We have to mention also that, in English, the numeral could precede two adjectives of which the lower one (in the adjectival hierarchy) appears higher than the other. Cases of this kind show that there is a predicative area also below the numeral. The higher predicative area contains elements like participles. Notice that Cinque’s (2005a) tree diagram contained both participles and adjectives in the predicative area. We will return to this later on in this chapter. We will concentrate now on the area containing prenominal participles in order to see whether the latter display specific ordering restrictions.

5.1. The order of the prenominal participles in Bulgarian.

We have seen so far that, apart from the transitive participles, there is another group of participial expressions which behave as verbal elements. In this section, we will take it for granted that the postmodified participial expressions are verbal participles and will try to see how two verbal participles combine in prenominal position in Bulgarian. What we will notice is that not all orders between the prenominal participles are allowed. We will try to explain this phenomenon in terms of Cinque’s (2005a) theory of adnominal modification.

We provide below some examples of two participles occurring in prenominal position.

(112) Vklucheniat vnimatelno izmervasht naprezhenieto ured pokaza, che …
swiched on-the carefully  measuring  voltage-the device showed that…
“The carefully switched on voltage measuring device showed that…”

---

7 It seems impossible to place two transitive participles in prenominal position in Bulgarian. The examples sound too heavy and a long pause between the two participles is required. One transitive and one postmodified participle, however, can co-occur in front of the noun.
(113) Nanesenoto vnimatelno razeriashto maznini veshtestvo, ne dopuska pronikvaneto na ..
impasted-the carefully solving fat substance not allows penetration-the of…
“The carefully impasted, fat solving substance does not allow the penetration of…”

Notice that once we change the places of the participles, the examples become ungrammatical.

(114) * Izmervashtiat naprezhenieto vkliuchen vnimatelno ured.
measuring-the voltage-the switched on carefully device
“the device that measures the voltage that has been carefully switched on”

(115) *Raztvriashtoto maznini naneseno vnimatelno veshtestvo...
solving-the fat impasted carefully substance
“the carefully impasted substance that solves fat”

Examples like (114) and (115) suggest that not all orders between the participles in prenominal position are allowed. How to account for this phenomenon?

One component of the semantic meaning of these participles is particularly relevant to our discussion. Notice that the participles which come first in each of the examples express a telic event, an action which has been performed once. The participles coming in second position, instead, express either a quality of the entity or an activity habitually performed by that entity. We would like to express this difference in terms of the stage-level/individual-level distinction. We could assume that the participles expressing a telic event are stage-level participles and the ones expressing an activity are individual-level participles. With this distinction in mind we could turn to the theory developed by Cinque (2005a) and Larson and Takahash (in press), about the order of the prenominal reduced relative clauses.

Discussing data from Japanese, Korean, Chinese and Turkish, Larson and Takahashi (in press) suggest that the adnominal modification area is divided into two large
layers – an individual-level layer, closer to the noun, governed by a generic operator and a stage-level layer, higher than the previous one and governed by an existential operator. Cinque (2005a) develops a theory of adnominal modification, adopting this analysis and predicting that if the noun phrase contains more than one participles in prenominal position, there would be one participle belonging to the stage-level layer and one to the individual-level layer. This is, actually, what the Bulgarian data seem to show. Apart from the impossibility to obtain the inverted order: individual-level > stage-level, we can notice also the impossibility to place two individual-level or two stage-level participles in the same phrase. This is show in the following examples.

Compare the correct (112) with the not so well-sounding (116).

(116) ????* Izkliucheniat vnimatelno izmeril naprezhenieto ured…
switched off-the carefully measured (perfect participle) voltage-the device
“the device that has measured the voltage, that has been switched off”

In example (116), two telic event participles are used. Therefore the phrase no longer sounds good. One could try to save the example by leaving a very long pause between the two participles but, still, it does not sound better.

Equally bad are examples containing two individual-level participles.

(117) *Izsledvashtiat Jupiter izuchavasht astronomia uchen…
examinig-the Jobe studying astronomy scientist…
“the scientist studying chemistry who studies Jobe”

The examples above suggest that participles seem to follow a certain order in prenominal position\(^8\). The order of the prenominal participles is shown on the tree-diagram in (118).

---

\(^8\) It is generally not so easy to place two verbal participles in prenominal position in Bulgarian. What we claim is that it is possible and easier in the cases in which the higher participle displays stage-level properties and the participles following it displays individual-level properties.
The last version of the tree diagram is very similar to the one suggested in Cinque (2005a) in that the predicative area is divided into a stage-level and an individual-level areas. Actually, the individual-level area extends also over the Attributive area. The only difference with the structure suggested in Cinque (2005a) is that the predicative area in the tree diagram above does not contain adjectives or heavier adjectival expressions. We made an attempt earlier to place an adjective higher than the numeral in order to obtain a predicative adjective co-occurring with a participle. In fact, what remains is to see where we can place the numeral in the structure above. Having seen that the space occupied by the participles is divided into two subfields, we could also try to place an adjective between the two types of participial expressions, i.e. above the individual-level participle and below the stage-level participle. Thus, we could obtain a predicative adjective. As we have already shown above, Cinque (2005a) predicts that the stage-level area contains a participle or a complex AP RRC which is followed by a bare AP RRC. Thus, any adjective occurring between the two participles would be considered to belong to the stage-level predicative area. What we expect from such an adjective is to exhibit predicative properties. The examples below show, first of all, that Bulgarian allows for adjectives preceding an
individual-level participle. They also show that the adjective preceding the individual-level participle do display the expected properties.

(119) Izpravnite izmervashti skorostta uredi shte budat prodadeni na klientite.
    in good state-the measuring speed-the devices will be sold to the clients
    “The speed measuring devices that are in a good state will be sold to the clients”

(120) Shirokite durzhashti osnovata gredi.
    wide-the holding base-the cross-beams
    “the base holding cross beams that are wide”

(121) Po-tochnite otchitashti naprezhenieto uredi hvashtat i nai-malkite promeni.
    more accurate-the registering tension-the devices register also the smallest changes
    “the tension registering devices that are more accurate register also the smallest changes”

Examples (119) – (121) are perfectly acceptable in Bulgarian. They show that there is another position, namely, a position for an adjective, in the predicative area of the Bulgarian noun phrase. More precisely, the adjective is situated in the stage-level layer of the predicative area. This is what the interpretation of the adjectives in the above examples show. In (119), the adjective izpravni has a restrictive interpretation. The meaning of the phrase is that only those devices which are in good state will be sold to the clients. In (120) reference is made only to the wide cross-beams, again the restrictive meaning emerges. The meaning of (121) is that only the more accurate devices can register the smallest changes. Thus, we see that the adjectives preceding an individual-level participle convey a restrictive meaning. Therefore, we suggest that these adjectives belong to the stage-level subfield of the predicative area. This is what Cinque’s (2005a) theory predicts.
The next crucial point is to see which is the position of the numeral. There are data suggesting that we have to place it within the predicative area. Let us have a look at the following examples.

(122) dvete kontrolirashti naprezhenieto ustroistva
    two-the controlling tension-the devices
    “the two devices that control the tension”

(123) dvamata izuchavashti fizika studenti
    two-the studying physics students
    “the two students that study physics”

In the two examples above, the individual-level participles are preceded by the numeral. This means that the numeral stays above the individual-level area. It does not seem to be higher than the stage-level participle, as shown below. Actually, the numeral does not seem to be compatible with the stage-level participles at all. Any order between the two elements sounds bad.

(124) * ??? dvete premesteni vnimatelno gredi
    two-the moved carefully beams
    “the two beams that were moved carefully”

(125) * premestenite vnimatelno dve gredi
    moved-the carefully two beams
    “the two beams that were moved carefully”

Anyway, we will assume that the numeral stays between the individual-level and the stage-level participles. We have seen in the previous chapter that, if an adjective occurs higher than the numeral it exploits a relative clause source. In the present context, this would mean that between the numeral and the stage-level participle there is another position, namely the position where the adjectives in question stay.
The following two example show another interesting thing.

(126) dvata izpravni izmervashti naprezhenieto ureda
two-the in good state measuring tension-the devices
“the two tension measuring devices that are in a good state”

The example above contains a numeral, an individual-level participle and an adjective which stays between the numeral and the participle. The adjective following the numeral again has a restrictive meaning. In (126), only the two devices in a good state are isolated. We have no indication as to the nature of the adjective in terms of its belonging to the stage-level or to the individual-level layer. In any case, it is a predicative adjective. Thus, so far we have seen that, between the two types of participles, we find two adjectival positions and a position for a numeral. One of the adjectival positions precedes the position of the numeral and the other follows it. The structure is presented on the tree-diagram below.
We mentioned above that, since, in English, some cases are registered in which the numeral precedes two adjectives the lower one of which occurs higher than the other and exploits a relative clause source, we assume, following Cinque (2005a), that the numeral is followed by a predicative layer, which in its turn precedes the attributive area. We see on the detailed diagram above that between the lowest adjectival predicative layer actually immediately precedes the individual-level participles, which, in their turn precede the attributive area. Since in English no verbal participles can be isolated in prenominal position, we cannot draw a diagram as detailed as the one for Bulgarian.

We would like to recall that, according to the theory, neither two stage-level adjectives nor two individual-level adjectives can occur in prenominal position. Of course, not only the participles but also the predicative adjectives are reduced relative clauses. Therefore, we expect that combinations like the following are impossible: a stage-level
participle and a predicative adjective, two predicative adjectives. Stage-level participles are expected to be able to combine only with individual-level participles or with individual-level adjectives (if the language allows such a combination.) The data from Bulgarian meet these expectations, as shown below.

(128) Izuchavashtiat fizika bulgarski studenti
       studying-the physics Bulgarian students
       “the Bulgarian students who studies physics”

It is clear that the adjective in the example above does not have a predicative interpretation only. It sounds ambiguous. Saying this phrase, we do not isolate only the Bulgarian students who study physics from among students of other nationalities.

We have already shown above that the individual-level participle can be preceded by a predicative adjective, as expected. More generally, predicative adjectives could combine only with the numeral and individual-level participles. We repeat here the examples which illustrate this.

(129) Izpravnite izmervashti skorostta uredi shte budat prodadeni na klientite.
       in good state-the measuring speed-the devices will be sold to the clients
       “The speed measuring devices that are in a good state will be sold to the clients”
       (Pred. Adj + Individual-Level participle)

(130) Toi kupi zelenite dve rizi.
       he bought green-the two shirts
       “He bought the green two shirts.”
       (Pred. Adj + Num)

We could see now what would happen if we place an adjective after an individual-level participle. We could use a context about a teacher who is explaining while the students are looking through the telescopes.
(131) durzhashtite osnovata shiroki gredi.
holding-the base-the wide cross-beams
“the wide cross-beams that hold the base”

The adjective *shirok/wide* does not have an exclusively restrictive interpretation in this example. It seems that this adjective is ambiguous, like all prenominal adjectives in Bulgarian. We will limit ourselves to saying that we have no means of testing the presence of predicative individual-level adjectives.

In this chapter, we have provided data suggesting that verbal participles can really appear in prenominal position. We argued against the assumption that all prenominal participle-looking words are adjectives and suggested, instead, that the prenominal participial expressions in English are rather ambiguous between the participial and the adjectival reading. It is not that real participles cannot occur in prenominal position in English, as has been argued in the literature. What we suggest is that, English, for independent reasons, does not allow for right modification of prenominal elements. Since the unmodified and the premodified participial expressions are ambiguous the verbal character of these elements is not so visible. Bulgarian, however, as well as Hungarian, as shown by Laczkó (2001), do not display any ban on verbal participial elements in prenominal position. These languages clearly show that verbal participles *can* occur in front of the noun.

Another interesting observation was that postmodified participial expressions actually do not pattern with the premodified and the unmodified ones. Both in Bulgarian and in English, these elements display verbal properties. The two languages differ only in terms of the position these participles occupy with respect to the noun – in Bulgarian they can be prenominal while in English they can only be postnominal.

The conclusions concerning the verbal status of the postmodified participial expressions served as a possibility to explore the co-occurrence of two participles in prenominal position. We have seen that it is possible to combine one transitive participle and one postmodified participle in front of the noun in Bulgarian. We have also observed that two participles can co-occur in prenominal position only if they obey the following
semantic restriction: the higher participle has to display stage-level properties and the lower participle has to display individual-level properties, a restriction discussed in the works of Larson and Takahashi (in press) and Cinque (2005a).
CONCLUSION

In this dissertation, we looked at the adnominal modifiers in Bulgarian. In particular, we analyzed mainly predicatively used adjectives and participles. In chapter two, we discussed adjectives and in chapter three – participles.

First, we paid attention to three similar colloquial constructions, whose articulated second element (which is an articulated adjective) proved to behave as a reduced relative clause. The semantic analysis unequivocally showed that these constructions are used in order to select an element, deictically or anaphorically. The restrictive meaning of these constructions suggested that the only possibility would be to analyse them as predicative structures in prenominal position. We proposed a syntactic analysis based on Cinque’s (2005a) theory of adnominal modification, according to which adjectives have two sources. Some of them are modifiers in the extended projection of the noun. These are the attributive adjectives, those that obey ordering restrictions and cannot be used in predicative position. There is another type of adjectives, those which can be used as predicates of relative clauses. These adjectives have different characteristics. They are not ordered and occur higher than the attributive adjectives. As we have seen, these groups of adjectives display different semantic and syntactic properties. We saw that, in Bulgarian, it is not so easy to distinguish between attributively and predicatively used adjectives. Bulgarian adjectives are all ambiguous in this respect. They are all used prenominally and no morphological markers are used to distinguish between predicatively used and attributively used adjectives. Colloquial Bulgarian, however, has devised a way to form a predicative structure in prenominal position, making use of the definite article. The occurrence of two definite elements (either two definite article or a definite article and a demonstrative) within the same phrase is not allowed in standard Bulgarian but is quite frequent in colloquial speech. As was mentioned above, we analysed the articulated second element as an occurrence of a predicative adjective in prenominal position. There is, however, one peculiarity which keeps apart the Bulgarian double definiteness constructions from similar phenomena occurring in Greek, Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian and Russian. Namely, the articulated second element of the double definiteness constructions proved to be not the main predicate of a reduced relative clause but rather a modifier of a null noun in
a DP predicate. The empty category in this predicative construction rendered this colloquial Bulgarian construction more similar to a colloquial construction found in Slovenian, introduced by the element TA.

Another interesting thing that we saw in this chapter was that the double definiteness constructions are not the only way of obtaining predicatively-used adjectives in prenominal position in Bulgarian. Using some semantic tests, extensively discussed in Cinque (2005a), we showed that when an adjective appears higher than the numeral or the possessive, it exploits a relative clause source. Thus, we showed that above the numeral and the possessive, there is a another predicative layer. (Examples from English had already shown that there is one below the numeral).

In chapter three, we discussed mainly participles. This chapter had a two-fold goal. On the one hand, we had to isolate verbal participles from adjectives, on the other hand we tried to see whether prenominal participles obey any ordering restrictions. We started by introducing several widely discussed tests for distinguishing adjectives from participles. Since they are all suggested about English, we reanalyzed them in view of the Bulgarian data. The result of our survey showed that, apart from the participles which preserve the direct object of the verb, there is another group of participial expressions, which exhibit only verbal properties. These are the participles which are modified by adverbs (crucially, we consider relevant only adverbs which cannot modify adjectives.) It turned out that not only Bulgarian but also English postmodified participles are verbal expressions. We provided data from both languages showing that both English and Bulgarian postmodified participles are verbs. Our next objective was to see whether verbal participles exhibit ordering restrictions, as discussed in the works by Larson and Takahashi (in press) and Cinque (2005a). We saw that, as expected, verbal participles are ordered, the stage-level participles being higher than the individual-level ones. No other orders are possible and, at least in Bulgarian, no sequences of two stage-level or two individual-level participles are allowed.

At the end of the chapter, we presented a finer structure of the predicative adnominal modification in Bulgarian. We showed that, as the data seem to suggest, the individual-level participles are preceded by a layer of predicative adjectives. These
adjectives are preceded by the numeral, which is, itself, preceded by another layer of predicatively used adjectives. Highest of all are the stage-level participles.

The analysis of the postmodified participles we proposed has some theoretical implication, which we would like just to mention here. As we have seen, the postposition of the adverb with respect to the participle necessarily signals the verbal nature of the participle. The preposition of the adverb, however, does not. This means that premodified participial expressions can be either verbs or adjectives while postmodified participial expressions are only verbs. What does this mean? One could interpret these facts as signaling the ability of verbs to move across their modifiers and the impossibility of the adjectives to do that. In other words, if an element, which is ambiguous between an adjective and a verb does not move, it remains ambiguous. It could be both. It is only the movement operation which it performs that disambiguates it. Only verbs are expected to move across their adverbial modifiers, not adjectives.

This generalization, however, seems to be valid for English and Bulgarian but not for Italian. Strangely enough, Italian postmodified participial expressions seem to be allowed in adjectival contexts. *Per quanto sia/however* seems to be an adjectival context, as the following examples show.

(1) Per quanto sia BELLA.
   however is SUBJ beautiful
   “however nice she is”

(2) Per quanto sia irritante, questa sostanza non danneggia la pelle.
   however isSUBJ irritating this substance not damage the skin
   “However irritating this substance is, it does not damage the skin”

(3) Una sostanza irritante la pelle ha danneggiato molto l’epidermide.
   one substance irritating the skin has damaged a lot the epidermis
   “A substance which irritating for the skin has damaged the epidermis.”
(4) per quanto sia irritante la pelle questa sostanza non danneggia molto l’epidermide.

however irritating the skin this substance not damages a lot the epidermis

“However irritating for the skin this substance is, it does not damage the epidermis”

We can see from the examples above that the context *per quanto sia*… /however does not allow verbal elements. It allows for adjectives and for participial expressions which are ambiguous between adjectives and verbal participles. If the direct object is added, however, the example is no longer acceptable. The following examples show that both premodified and postmodified participial expressions are allowed in this adjectival context.

(5) per quanto sia BEN CHIUSA

however is SUBJ well closed

“however well closed it is”

(6) per quanto sia CHIUSA BENE

however is SUBJ closed well

“however well closed it is”

We could interpret these facts suggesting that, in Italian language, adjectives can also move. Notice that, in French, which is another Romance languages, postmodified participles behave as in English and in Bulgarian, that is, they exhibit verbal and not adjectival properties. This might make us think that Italian allows a particular movement of the adjective across its modifiers and this renders it different from the other languages discussed here. Why does this happen the way it does and what mechanisms of grammar are responsible for this state of affairs will be the subject of our further research.
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