

## Competition between relative and interrogative pronouns in Macedonian (with some additional reference to Bulgarian)

### 1. Introduction

(1) InterCorp (Subtitles)

He, jaс сум тој кој е почестен  
no I am that.one which is honoured  
'No, it would honour me.'

(2) InterCorp (Subtitles)

Jaс сум сега тој кој-што е многу ранлив  
I am now that.one which-that is much fragile  
'I'm the one that's feeling fragile right now.'

- (1): relativizer = interrogative pronoun;
- (2): relativizer = interrogative pronoun + the general relativizer *што* 'what, that'.<sup>1</sup>
- Note. Whether to call the pronoun in (2) interrogative or relative is basically a question of terminology, in this paper I call them interrogatives.
- The **narrow understanding** of the phenomenon:  
so-called “doubly filled Comp”: both a relative pronoun and a general relativizer are present
  - Attested in some Germanic varieties, eg. Bavarian German (Brander, Bräuning 2013);
  - Also reported for Macedonian Turkish (Matras, Tufan 2007: 224);
  - No clear parallels in other Slavic languages, with a possible exception of some Sorbian phenomena (Murelli 2011: 103)
- The **wider understanding** of the phenomenon (to which I primarily adhere in this talk):  
relative pronouns = interrogatives + an additional marker
  - Parallel patterns in many Slavic languages:
    - obligatory or nearly obligatory additional marking in Bulgarian, Upper and Lower Sorbian, and Slovene (Bauer 1967);
    - variation between relativizers with and without additional marking in older varieties of Bulgarian (Демина 1975; Димитрова 2010), Czech (Bauer 1967), and Russian (Зализняк 1981).
- Literature on Macedonian relative clauses (Lunt 1952: 44; Корубин 1969; Gołąb, Friedman 1972: 43–45; Минова-Ѓуркова 1993; Topolińska 1986/2008; Topolińska 1997/2008; Topolinjska 1997: 163–173; Vužaravska 2009; Murelli 2011; Shagal 2016) gives relatively scarce information on the distribution of interrogative and relative pronouns;
- NB: The status of the claims is not always clear:
  - No quantitative data are given;
  - Some of the authors tend to make prescriptive rather than descriptive claims, see especially (Корубин 1969).
- The main statements so far:
  - (Lunt 1952; Gołąb, Friedman 1972): The difference is basically stylistical;
  - (Корубин 1969): It would be nice to use *којшто* only in non-restrictives and *кој* only in restrictives;
  - (Корубин 1969): *кој* is preferred after prepositions;
  - (Kramer, Mitkovska 2011: 162):
    - “*што* is never followed by *што*;
    - *кога* is rarely followed by *што*;
    - *кој* and *чиј* may be followed by *што*;
    - *каде* is more likely to be followed by *што*”.

---

<sup>1</sup> According to prescriptive sources ‘which’ and ‘whose’ are written without a space and the other pronouns with a space before *што* (Kramer, Mitkovska 2011). In the corpus, both variants are widely attested for the former pronouns, but not the latter.

- Data:
  - Standard Macedonian (parallel translated texts);
  - some (little) data from dialectal Macedonian texts;
  - + some data on Bulgarian dialects.
- Work in progress, still lots to be done.

## 2. Data

### 2.1. Standard Macedonian

- The frequency of additional marking is largely dependent on the relative pronoun:

Table 1. The frequency of additional relativizing marking as related to the pronoun (InterCorp)

	(-)умо	without (-)умо	ratio of (-)умо
таков (,) каков (such what.kind.of)	27	1	1,0
таму (,) каде (there where)	262	16	0,9
така (,) како (so how)	130	68	0,7
толку (,) колку (so.much how.much)	41	29	0,6
тој (,) кој (that which)	10	51	0,2
тогаш (,) кога (then when)	0	144	0,0

- *чиј* ‘whose’ is also clearly different from *кој* ‘which’:<sup>2</sup>

Table 2. The frequency of additional relativizing marking: ‘whose’ vs. ‘which’ (InterCorp, in the literature, after a comma)

	(-)умо	without (-)умо	ratio of (-)умо
<i>чиј</i> ‘whose’	16	63	0,2
<i>кој</i> ‘which’ (a random sample)	1	99	0,0

- Additional morphological marking favours heads without nouns:<sup>3</sup>

Table 3. The frequency of nouns in the head in random samples of *које-умо* (which.N-that) and *које* (which.N) (InterCorp)

	noun in the head	other (demonstratives, ‘all’, ‘something’...)	ratio of nouns in the head
<i>које-умо</i> (which.N-that)	66	34	0,7
<i>које</i> (which.N)	91	9	0,9

- Additional marking is indeed preferred in non-restrictive relatives, as postulated by (Корубин 1969);
- The semantic type is correlated with interpunctuation, the non-restrictive clauses being usually preceded by a comma (Корубин 1969; Gołąb, Friedman 1972).

Table 4. Restrictiveness and the presence of additional marking for *кој* (InterCorp)<sup>4</sup>

	-умо	without -умо	% of -умо
after a comma	188	7340	2%
not after a comma	260	18880	1%

- Additional morphological marking is even less frequent in correlatives as opposed to postnominal relatives:

Table 5. The frequency of additional relativizing marking: correlatives vs. postnominal relatives with *каде* ‘where’ (InterCorp)<sup>5</sup>

	-умо	without -умо	ratio of -умо
postnominal relatives	262	16	0,9
correlatives	4	4	0,5

<sup>2</sup> The difference is statistically significant,  $\chi^2$ ,  $P < 0,01$ .

<sup>3</sup> The difference is statistically significant,  $\chi^2$ ,  $P < 0,01$ .

<sup>4</sup> The difference is statistically significant,  $\chi^2$ ,  $P < 0,01$ .

<sup>5</sup> The difference is statistically significant, Fisher’s exact test, two-tailed,  $P < 0,01$ .

## 2.2. Macedonian dialects

- Based on (Дигитална збирка на текстови од македонските дијалекти, <http://ical.manu.edu.mk/index.php/dialect-collections>)
- Very little done so far;
- Still some results:
  - The difference between *кој* ‘which’ and *кај* ‘where’ is very clear-cut at least in the Central dialect: the latter usually takes additional morphological marking, while the former doesn’t;
  - There is a difference between the two relativizers with the meaning ‘where’:

Table 6. The frequency of additional morphological marking for *кај* and *каде* ‘where’ in Southwestern, Western, and Northern dialects

	with additional marking	without additional marking	ratio with additional marking
<i>кај</i>	6	1	0,9
<i>каде</i>	3	13	0,2

## 2.3. Bulgarian dialects

- Counts based on Bulgarian Dialectology as Living Tradition [2016] (<http://www.bulgariandialectology.org>)
- Interrogative-based relativizers, except ‘what’ and ‘where’.
- The basic results (see also Figure 1):

Table 7. The frequency of relative and interrogative pronouns used as relativizers in Bulgarian dialects

	Dialectal group	relative	interrogative	ratio of relative pronouns	
Eastern	Balkan	10	0	1,0	
	Cantral Balkan	12	0	1,0	
	Central Rhodope	13	0	1,0	
	Eastern Rhodope	14	0	1,0	
	Eastern Rupic	37	1	1,0	
	Moesian	38	241	1	0,9
	Rhodope	66	10	0,9	
	Rupic	17	3	0,9	
	Sub-Balkan	18	1	0,9	
	Western Balcan	8	5	0,6	
	Western Rupic	8	0	1,0	
Western	Northwestern	2	8	0,2	
	Southwestern	2	41	0,1	
	Transitional	1	12	0,1	

- A strong tendency for Western dialects (to the left of the yat border) as compared to Eastern dialects to use interrogative relativizers with no additional marking;<sup>6</sup>
- Further counts for the pronoun *кој* based on the dialectal groups with most variation in the observed material, namely Western Balcan and Southwestern:
  - Additional relative marking is preferred in postnominal relative clauses:

Table 8. The frequency of relative and interrogative pronouns as related to the positional type of relative clauses in Western Balcan and Southwestern Bulgarian texts<sup>7</sup>

	relative	interrogative	ratio of relative pronouns
postnominal relative clauses	7	2	0,8
other (correlatives, free relatives etc.)	1	10	0,1

<sup>6</sup> The difference between the two dialectal groups as a whole is statistically significant ( $\chi^2$ ,  $P \ll 0,01$ ).

<sup>7</sup> The difference is statistically significant, Fisher’s exact test, two-tailed,  $P < 0,01$ .





- Зализняк А. А. Противопоставление относительных и вопросительных местоимений в древнерусском // Балто-славянские исследования 1980. М.: Наука, 1981. С. 89–107.
- Корубин Б. За основните структурно-смысловни типови на релативната реченица во македонскиот литературен јазик // Македонски јазик XX, 1969. 7–34.
- Минова-Ѓуркова Л. Релативното надоврзување во македонскиот стандарден јазик // Прилози МАНУ / ОЛЛН 18/2, 1993, 67–96.
- Стойков С. Българска диалектология, 2002. — 1-е изд. 1962.
- Bauer J. K. K vývoji vztažných vět v slovanských jazycích // Slavica Slovaca 2, 4, 1967. S. 297–320.
- Bužarovska E. Restrictive relative clauses in standard Macedonian and standard Bulgarian // Dimitrova-Vulchanova M., Tomić O. M. Investigations in the Bulgarian and Macedonian Nominal Expression, 2009.
- Cristofaro S., Giacalone Ramat A. Relativization strategies in the languages of Europe // Ramat P., Roma E. (eds.). Europe and Mediterranean as Linguistic Areas: Convergences from a Historical and Typological Perspective [Studies in Language Companion Series 88]. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 2007. P. 63–93.
- Gołąb Z., Friedman V. A. The relative clause in Slavic // Peranteau P., Levi J., & Phares G. (eds.). The Chicago Which Hunt. Papers from the Relative Clause Festival. Chicago, 1972. P. 30–46.
- Grosu A., Landman F. Strange relatives of the third kind // Natural Language Semantics 6, 1998. P. 125–170.
- Kramer E., Mitkovska L. Macedonian: A course for beginning and intermediate students. Madison, 2011.
- Lunt H. Grammar of the Macedonian literary language. Skopje, 1952.
- Matras Ya., Tufan Ş. Grammatical borrowing in Macedonian Turkish // Grammatical Borrowing in Cross-linguistic Perspective. Berlin – New York, 2007.
- Murelli A. Relative constructions in European non-standard varieties, Berlin – Boston, 2011.
- Rudin C. Pair-list vs. single pair readings in Multiple Wh Free Relatives and Correlatives // Kansas Working Papers in Linguistics, Vol. 30, 2008. P. 257–267.
- Shagal K. Factors regulating variation in Macedonian relative clauses // In search of the center and periphery – Linguistic attitudes, minorities, and landscapes in the Central Balkans. Helsinki, 2016. 163–177.
- Thompson S. A., Longacre R. E., Hwang Sh. J. J. Adverbial clauses // Shopen T. (ed.). Language Typology and Syntactic Description, Vol. II. Complex constructions. Cambridge, 2007.
- Topolińska Z. Południowosłowiańskie kalki greckiego που Topolińska Z. Z polski do macedonii. Studia językoznawcze. Tom 1. Problemy predykcji. Kraków, 2008. 220–227. (1997)
- Topolińska Z. Unusual patterns of the Macedonian relative clause // Topolińska Z. Z polski do macedonii. Studia językoznawcze. Tom 1. Problemy predykcji. Kraków, 2008. 133–141. (1986)
- Topolinjska Z. Macedonian dialects in the Aegean part of Macedonia. Book 1. Syntax. Vol. II. Skopje, 1997.