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1. A relative clause can be defined as a predicative construction (containing a *verum finitum* in Indo-European) modifying a noun in the governing clause. This, a relative clause 1) expresses predication, and 2) is "adnominal." Schematically, it can be presented as follows:

main clause \((...Vpr....)\)  
relative clause \((...Vpr....)\)  

The arrows indicate the essential syntactic relationship between the noun of the main clause and the predicate of the relative clause. From the standpoint of the main clause, the relationship is that of domination (\(\downarrow\)), but determination (\(\uparrow\)) from the standpoint of the relative clause. The central problem is the question of the formal means which are used to express this syntactic relationship (\(\downarrow\)): the fact that a predicative clause functions as a modifier of a noun belonging to another clause. As is known, Indo-European languages use the so-called "relative pronouns" for this purpose. Hence, the problem of relative clauses in Indo-European, and *a fortiori* in Slavic, can be reduced to the typology and history of relative pronouns.

2. Before we pass to a survey of the typology and history of relative pronouns in Slavic, it is worthwhile to consider those linguistic entities which perform basically the same function as relative clauses. I mean here the "competitors" of relative clauses in Slavic, namely participles. Common Slavic, on the basis of Old Church Slavonic (OCS) and the older stages of all Slavic languages, had the following participles, which occurred in both attributive and predicative positions: present active (e.g., *vedoli*), past passive (*veden*), and past passive (*veden*). Among the modern Slavic languages, Russian, owing to OCS influence, is the only one which has preserved this system, cf. *vedolii*, *vedeni*, *vedenii*, *vedenii*, etc. (Under the influence of literary Russian, a similar situation can be observed in literary Bulgarian, where, however, the past active participle of the Russian type *vedii* is replaced by the *L*-form and occurs only with perfective verbs, e.g., *dovel*, etc.) The question is whether the two categories under consideration, relative clauses and corresponding participles, are functionally identical. The transformational method seems to answer this question affirmatively, since the participles will be interpreted by this method as "nominal transforms" of underlying relative clauses, e.g., using OCS forms —

### Notes

**A.** Declinable relative (gender, number, case), e.g., OCS (and Common Slavic) *leko, leka, leko* 'qui, quae, quod'.

**B.** Indeclinable (indicative) relative, which usually represents Nom., Acc., Nom., etc., e.g., OCS *leko* (cf. *leka* in Lith., *leka* in Lat.).

**C.** Possessive relative, which replaces the genitive case of the declinable relative: *izgoło hone* to *Kig hone*, etc. OCS (and Common Slavic) *Kii, Kia, Kii* is declinable and functions attributively. This is, however, a later acquisition of the Slavic languages and represents the relative use of an interrogative pronoun *Kii* 'whose?'

**D.** Adverbial relative, which replaces "adverbial" cases of the declinable relative, e.g., *vrem vsleko vs jeane* to *vrem* (*vsleko vs* *jeane*), *vrem* vs *leko* to *vrem* (*vsleko vs* *leko*), etc. (To the latter cf. *vsleko* *vrem* to *vrem* vs *vsleko* *vrem*; *vrem* vs *vsleko* *vrem*; etc.)
expressed by separate adjectives (OCS and Common Slavic jaka, jako, jaka(ke), jaka(ke) 'qualis, -a, -o, e.g., Klovna (velik) jaka(ke) /

taka (jaka(ke)/jako(ke), where the latter should be translated 'such as'). In connection with jaka(ke), cf. hede to toda skyte

taka (hade jake or hade magee mira ... etc. (Pers. N 20:125)

'then' in this way' (primary meaning)

Relative pronouns have their correlates in corresponding demonstrative pronouns which may be used in the main clause either for emphasis or simply for replacing the governing noun. Thus we obtain a clear system of correlations demonstrative relative, e.g., ta = jaka, taka = jaka(ke), tovda = jaka(ke), to = jaka(ke), tame = jaka(ke), tama = jaka(ke) — ta = jaka(ke), etc.

4. The above system of relative pronouns, which — except for jaka, jake, jale — can be considered as Common Slavic, was already undermined in the prehistoric epoch by a gradual encroachment of interrogative pronouns. It can be seen clearly in OCS, e.g., a planta toy iten prilmita (Buch. tin. 318a, 2) instead of the regular a planta toy iten ... The replacement of jaka, jale, jale 'qui, quae, quod' functioning without their nominal correlates (i.e., when these pronouns should be translated 'the who' etc.) by the interrogatives jake 'who', jale 'what' is exceptional in OCS; it spreads in later medieval Slavic texts. But the replacement of the adjectival jake by the interrogative jake and of the adverbial jake by the interrogative jale seems to be more frequent in OCS, e.g., in Slavic languages, ci jake i ochi imeni vlasti ne

jaka(ke) sp. ci bora nabo wylad sp byvite (Schr. 88, 14) 'in the presence of ... ci tovto nabo nakej sp byvite'.

The interrogative jake, jale replaces jaka(ke) referring to a noun modified by an adjectival. In the following example, an interrogative replaces an adverbial relative: luna otide otide 'by the, otide, ide' (models zhita, baka, jale zavita ne razdaja sp. otide, kde ljudi Silavat (Schr. 40, 29). In the last sentence we have a parallel use of the relative jake i jake (<*i jake(ke)>> and the interrogative jake. Thus already in OCS we can observe the very beginnings of a process which in the historical Slavic languages brought about a fundamental transformation of the primary Common Slavic system of relatives. In order to grasp that process and the present results in the Slavic languages, it is worthwhile to realize its structural basis, i.e., the correlation between demonstrative, relative, and interrogative pronouns which can be established for OCS and late Common Slavic. This correlation is as follows: to, jake, jale 'the who' etc.

ja, ta, to 'this'

jake, jale 'who', 'what'

i jaka(ke), jale, jale 'which'

like, jale (primary meaning)

(jacifying a member of a set)

The whole historical development in all Slavic languages consisted of the elimination of the opposition *jko-*jko, whose result in most cases (but not always) was the replacement of *jko- by jko. Thus the interrogative pronoun proved to be "dominant" in its relation to the primary relative. The reasons for this dominance should be investigated. I think that the main reason is the unmarked character of the interrogative in its elective function. The interrogative pronoun "points" toward something which should follow on the temporal axis of developing speech, namely:

* jko + jko → * jko →

It is obvious that in the case of neutralization, the unmarked term of an opposition, i.e., the term with fewer positive features, takes over. But the essence of the whole phenomenon, it should be emphasized, is the neutralization of the opposition *jko-*jko, which presupposes a period when *jko- and jko were used as optional variants. Such a situation accounts for the appearance of the new interrogative jaka etc. (continuing the old relative *jko) in some North Slavic languages (e.g., in Polish, Czech, and Ukrainian).

5. In the following section I will briefly present the situation of relative clauses in four contemporary North Slavic languages: Russian, Ukrainian, Polish, and Czech. The present situation in these languages will be supplemented by some historical data.
Examples:
(1) Zabyła w chobie, kto żartuje nad wodą ... "Close to that grove which grows black above the water ...";
(2) Jesteśmy zakończeni już, nie powinieneś już być z nami. "We are finished with you, do not stay with us."
(3) I wtedy podniosłem się i rzekłem: "I then stood up and said:"
(4) A z tego rodzaju są scëykowe. "And from this kind are scëykowe."
(5) Wtedy rzekł: "Then he said:

Examples:
(1) Podobnie, also, in this case;
(2) Jesteśmy zakończeni już, we are finished with you;
(3) I wtedy podniosłem się i rzekłem: I then stood up and said;
(4) A z tego rodzaju są scëykowe. And from this kind are scëykowe.
(5) Wtedy rzekł: Then he said:

Examples:
(1) Zabyła w chobie, kto żartuje nad wodą ... "Close to that grove which grows black above the water ...";
(2) Jesteśmy zakończeni już, nie powinieneś już być z nami. "We are finished with you, do not stay with us."
(3) I wtedy podniosłem się i rzekłem: "I then stood up and said:"
(4) A z tego rodzaju są scëykowe. "And from this kind are scëykowe."
(5) Wtedy rzekł: "Then he said:

Examples:
(1) Zabyła w chobie, kto żartuje nad wodą ... "Close to that grove which grows black above the water ...";
(2) Jesteśmy zakończeni już, nie powinieneś już być z nami. "We are finished with you, do not stay with us."
(3) I wtedy podniosłem się i rzekłem: "I then stood up and said:"
(4) A z tego rodzaju są scëykowe. "And from this kind are scëykowe."
(5) Wtedy rzekł: "Then he said:

Examples:
(1) Zabyła w chobie, kto żartuje nad wodą ... "Close to that grove which grows black above the water ...";
(2) Jesteśmy zakończeni już, nie powinieneś już być z nami. "We are finished with you, do not stay with us."
(3) I wtedy podniosłem się i rzekłem: "I then stood up and said:"
(4) A z tego rodzaju są scëykowe. "And from this kind are scëykowe."
(5) Wtedy rzekł: "Then he said:
is my neighbor'; (6) 'I zeml. dělal jsem zadoa v tránu, iest nělápavý v klášte 'The pupil whose homework we are reading just now is the best in the class'. (This use of osi in rather colloquial.) (7) 'V čase světich/světich zpověděval jsem se osvětlu, někde jačí mučený i k zádavci in alike, because the time when I was preparing for my exam, I worked late into the night'; (8) 'Mírícich, jak bys návraty jež jsem nesplnil ten jest jest pestý pole! On the spot where our house once stood, there is now an empty lot'; (9) 'Zdrav to v taci osobě, jak je pochlebeni! Do the way I told you!'; (10) 'Kladem kelaték, jaké mě sebe! I bought as many books as I could'. (Ila and jak are more common when preceded or 'announced' by their correlates tvíra and tak.)

From among the above declarative relatives, the most common is kótůr, em (cf. Russian kótoryy etc.): it may refer both to the "substance" of the governing noun and to its "accidents", although in the latter case, in a careful style, Polish prefers the purely "adjectival" jačí, em (which, as in Ukrainian, continues the Common Slavic relative jači). Jaké etc. is, of course, obligatory if its correlate taki etc. appears in the governing clause. But we can find cases, even in literary Polish, where jaké etc. is used instead of kótůr etc. without any clear semantic justification, e.g. (1) 'Sle jsem zpočátku po brusdách, jaké duše překvaplivá! The grey eyes glanced along the furrows which had been made by the runners'. The only justification for the use of jaké instead of kótůr in the above example is the intention of the author to emphasize the quality of the furrows rather than the simple fact that they were left by the steigh runners. There are, however, cases when even such a psychological justification would be difficult to imagine, e.g. (2) 'Jaké také se man v varinách tváře kompromižer, ne jaké neprávě je tvářen ...' ... but also from the changes in economic conditions which those tribes experienced ...' (T. Lehr-Szawinski et al. 1954:29). The unjustified substitution of jaké for kótůr is a phenomenon of colloquial Polish and should be investigated. I will remind the reader that in standard Ukrainian, which is closer to folk dialects than standard Russian, jaké eliminated kótůr as the unmarked relative. The use of osi as well as the relative particle em with other pronouns is archaic. In addition, we have the same historical Slavic phenomenon: the neutralization of the opposition relative/interrogative in pronouns.

Examples:
(1) 'Mám říct, kterež mu naprosto zahalit slyšel, jaké išli, kteří do všech thing with complete involvement'; (2) 'Jen

Wol. a nich jaké nevěstivé! There are things about which one does not talk'; (3) 'Potěšil jsem se velice, jíkač velice nězaditelný host! She suppressed the initial dislike which an unexpected guest usually evokes'; (4) 'Již kdyby také p o t o b y k tého, kdo jí má také a sociálnímu městskému životu! Our grandfather was one of those who spread education and socialism in the Czech countryside!'; (5) 'O忱ál nich jaké těžké oken, co výstup na zahrát! He opened some of those windows that face the garden'; (6) 'Vyzvala jsem jívli, kdo o osobách! They chose the moment when he was resting!'; (7) 'Chodí v brněni, kde se že svěříval na druhého! He wanted to the bunker, where the partisans where hidden!'; (8) 'Již hned opět tak ryšela, jak se vpravý! My anger calmed down as fast as it arose'. (This type of relative clause introduced by the relative adverb jak - in other Slavic languages jaký - is usually considered "comparative", but I think that it can be treated as relative - strictly, relative-adverbial.)

In colloquial Czech, as in Polish, Ukrainian, and Russian (?), the general indeclinable osi + oblique forms of the personal pronoun are used instead of the literary jsem or kótůr, e.g. (9) 'To te ten klovác, co jsem ti o něm mluvit! 'This is the man I've told you about' manages to be used in the same position in folk dialects, e.g. (10) 'To te ten chlapac, jak jsem ti o něm mluvit! (some meaning as the preceding example).

6. After having reviewed relative clauses in the main North Slavic languages — South Slavic will be presented separately because of some characteristic differences - let us consider the question of the logical typology of relative clauses in the languages just reviewed. As is known, in traditional grammar, at least two logical varieties of relative clauses are distinguished: restrictive and nonrestrictive. The problem is whether Slavic languages provide any formal (morpho-syntactic) means for such a distinction.

The standard handbooks of Slavic languages which I have consulted are in part, silent on this subject. Russian linguists, however, point out the difference between clauses of the following types: ja vratel zůši, kotoruji vermuša ... 'I met a man who came back ... 'Ja vratel zůši, kotoruji vermuša ... 'I met the man who came back ...', the former being nonrestrictive, the latter restrictive. But the above distinction is a simple result of the modification of the governing noun by the demonstrative pronoun te, which is the consequence of the semantics of any demonstrative pronoun determining a noun. The formal structure of the relative clause, however, remains the same in both cases. The only grammatically relevant distinction between nonmarked (unmarked) relative clauses and restrictive (marked) relative clauses in Slavic should be expressed by corresponding distinct relative pronouns. Among the languages I have checked, such a distinction seems to exist only in literary Czech and Ukrainian. In Czech, it is expressed by the opposition between jaké (nonrestrictive) and kótůr (restrictive), cf. Kopecký 1953:50, remark 2. In Ukrainian, this distinction seems to be conveyed by the opposition jaké/kotry
the synchronic situation as well as the diachronic development of relative pronouns in North Slavic. It seems to confirm the hypothesis that the main pool from which general subordinating conjunctions are usually drawn consists of relative pronouns. Namely, the general relative serves as a general subordinating conjunction. This is the situation in Russian (kto), Ukrainian (koho), dialectal Polish (ko), and dialectal Czech (kde). In all these languages, we have homonymy between impersonal interrogative pronouns, general relative pronouns, and general subordinating conjunctions (notice a similar situation in the Romance languages). The tendency to use a relative adverb of manner (i.e., an indeclinable relative pronoun) in the function of a general subordinating conjunction is already realised in OCS, where kako = 'that' (cf. plenolip. kako; plenolip. prieč = Greek ὅτι and Lat. quoniam, quod ... 'which', ako = 'that' (conjunction)).

The above facts, presented in a sketchy manner, should be investigated separately. In any case, they clearly point out a direction of research concerning the origin, development, and typology of subordinating conjunctions in relation to relative pronouns. Tentatively, we may venture a hypothesis that in the languages with relative pronouns, these are syntactically the most expressive morphemes.

Notes
1 Sometimes Nom. sing. masc. jako (sicl)
2 Including here adjectives and adverbs.
3 Nom. pl. masc. of kdo
4 Also when toj is deleted, e.g. kto sorviti esto, vrst 'whoever' (sicl)
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South Slavic displays a high degree of internal variation, as well as marked differences from North Slavic, in the treatment of relative clauses. As in the preceding part, the problem of relative clauses will be dealt with primarily in terms of the typology of relative pronouns. While there is no given set of features characterizing all of the South Slavic languages in opposition to all of the North Slavic, there exist certain facts which are true for most South Slavic as opposed to most North Slavic:

a) There are no relative pronouns descended from the Indo-European *ko* in South Slavic.

b) Special morphemes are employed to differentiate relatives from Interrogatives (except in Serbo-Croatian).

c) The reflexes of *kō* are used while those of *kytā* are not (except in Slovenian).

d) "Where" takes on the meanings of "that" (except in Slovenian).

e) The distinction restrictive/non-restrictive can be reflected in the choice of relative pronoun (except in Serbo-Croatian and Bulgarian).

The words which introduce relative clauses in South Slavic will be considered in the four classes defined by Z. Golić: A) Declinable, B) Indeclinable, C) Possessive, and D) Adverbial. The account which follows will, of necessity, be brief and touch only on the most important points concerning relative pronouns and their clauses. Only the principle pronouns of the modern literary languages will be considered, i.e., compounds and many adverbials, archaisms, and dialectisms will not usually be mentioned. A language by language description of the distribution and usage of relative pronouns in the South Slavic languages will follow the comparative table given below:

### SLOVENIAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>who/what</th>
<th>which</th>
<th>such (as)</th>
<th>so much (as)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kdör/kítulo</td>
<td>kōl</td>
<td>kāl</td>
<td>kāl/kählt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kāl/kählt</td>
<td>kāl/kählt</td>
<td>kāl/kählt</td>
<td>kāl/kählt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SERBO-CROATIAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>who/what</th>
<th>which</th>
<th>such (as)</th>
<th>so much (as)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>t(k)/tšt</td>
<td>tšo</td>
<td>tšo</td>
<td>tšo/tšo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tšo</td>
<td>tšo</td>
<td>tšo/tšo</td>
<td>tšo/tšo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MACEDONIAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>who/what</th>
<th>which</th>
<th>such (as)</th>
<th>so much (as)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kōj</td>
<td>kōj</td>
<td>kōj</td>
<td>kōj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kāl</td>
<td>kāl</td>
<td>kāl</td>
<td>kāl</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### BULGARIAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>who/what</th>
<th>which</th>
<th>such (as)</th>
<th>so much (as)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kōj</td>
<td>kōj</td>
<td>kōj</td>
<td>kōj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kāl</td>
<td>kāl</td>
<td>kāl</td>
<td>kāl</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Slovenian, all relative pronouns are formed by suffixing or infixing - to the form of the interrogative, except for kateri 'which' and kti 'that', which do not bear this marker. The relative marker is descended from the Common Slavic *ko* via rothacism, and Slovenian is the only Slavic language to preserve this old relative marker as a relative in common speech. Slovenian is also the only South Slavic language to preserve reflexes of *kiterali*, the others using only *kytā*. In Slovenian, *kytā* gives the declinable interrogative kai 'what?', whose relative form is kar 'that which', and it gives the indeclinable relative kti. The pronouns which best display the peculiarities of the Slovenian system are kateri, kti, kai, kāl, and kar. Kateri is indeclinable and only used with a personal masculine singular antecedent; with any other antecedent either the genitive of kateri or kti with the appropriate possessive pronounal adjective is used, e.g. (1) kai, kiteri hiše videl, je naš spade 'the peasant whose house you see in the valley is our neighbor'; (2) kateri, kai hiše videl ... or (3) kateri, kti hiše videl ... 'the peasants whose houses you see ...' or 'the peasants, whose houses you see ...'.

Kateri and kti have much the same meaning. When kti must serve an oblique function in its relative clause, it is followed by a personal pronoun marking the appropriate case and agreeing in gender and number with the antecedent, e.g. (d) through (10) below. There are some contexts in which kateri is said to be preferable to kti. Three of these contexts are clear: a) after a preposition, e.g. (a) Tovariš, kateri se znanstveno izkuša, je znanstvenik 'my friend, whom I know from school, has fallen ill'; b) when the relative clause precedes its antecedent or the main clause, e.g. (5) Kateri se med resno zdravi, se smete nasele, 'who laughs last, laughs best' as opposed to (6) Kateri, ki se med zdravi, 'who laughs ...'; c) when kti would be ambiguous, e.g. (7) Srčal je Slovanka, ki mi je posodil denar 'he met the man who lent money' or 'he met the man to whom he lent money' — for the first meaning kateri should replace kti, for the second kateri should replace kti...

There is a fourth set of contexts in which kti and kateri are not supposed to be equally acceptable, but these contexts are not easy to distinguish formally. Since Slovenian sets off all relative clauses with commas, there is no orthographic distinction restrictive/non-restrictive, nor do Slovenian grammarians give this name to any distinction. They write that kti is used to refer to definite persons or things thought of by themselves, while kateri refers to indefinite persons or things, which it makes definite, or to persons or things thought of as part of a group. Thus it appears that kateri is preferred for restrictive relative clauses while kti is non-restrictive, but these terms do not seem to have the same meaning for Slovenian as for English, e.g. (8) Kaj mi brate v Srbiji, ki so lih bom vedno lako zgradili, 'our brothers in Serbia, whom we shall always fondly remember, hospitably'; (9) Pokliči Slovanka, ki se mi je posredovala ...
English, the difference is not expressed in the choice of pronouns. Where ambiguity might result from the use of što, however, koi is preferred, e.g. (20) šovek što mu je dao novac 'the man who gave him money' (što mu = koi mu) or 'the man to whom he gave money' (što mu = koi mu). If the antecedent is a pronoun referring to a thing (nasto 'something', ovo 'this', to 'that/thin', ono 'that/those', sve 'everything') or the predicate of the governing clause, the declinable što must be used, e.g. (21) Na zaboravlja ono o čemu smo govorili 'He forgot that about which we were speaking' ; (22) Valja pozoditi njihova država razvjetati usta kada novoriš. 'Noo za met na maš to trudio' 'It is necessary for Mr. Lender to spread his lips widely when he speaks, which again costs him no small effort.Što can also occur idiomatically in the function of such relatives as koliko, e.g. (23) Podivljala jake što mu je gleda 'He shouted as loudly as his throat would allow'.

The use of što 'where' as a general relative (and subordinating conjunction) is a Balkanism which has penetrated Serbo-Croatian to some degree. But in Serbo-Croatian, što always retains a sense of locality, e.g. (24) što je gleda o čemu je tolika laži 'I hear the dogs that bark around the sheep pens' and 'I hear the dogs where they bark around the sheep pens'. Similarly, some uses of the paratactic conjunction to 'and so', the modal hypotactic conjunction da 'that', to 'so that', etc., and the conjunction kao 'like, how' are considered to be relative by some grammarians (Stevanović, 1969), e.g. (25) Što je ono doneo to je gleda 'Whose is that shoulder-blade which I see'; (26) što je ona u kojoj nema čoveka da ne zna čitati i pišati 'There are peoples among whom there is not a person who does not know how to read and write' ; (27) žalito mene je koi pleše... koi tine sa šai nedodatke prehore kritički 'It is interesting to hear writers... who reproach critics for that failing'. The use of što implies resultativeness or modality: da ne zna could be transformed into koi ne bi znao 'who wouldn't know'. što implies consecutiveness due to its primary meaning, and kao carries an overtone of manner. In these functions, što, to, da, and kao take oblique forms of the personal pronouns like što. The theoretical problems regarding the relations between relative clauses, other hypotactic constructions, and paratactic constructions which are raised by these usages are worthy of further consideration.

Macedonian

The problem of the relative clause in Macedonian was the subject of much discussion not long after the official establishment of the literary language in 1944. In 1951, certain norms were suggested for the literary language, and they have become generally accepted. Further normative rules were suggested only recently, and it remains to be seen whether they will be followed. The entire matter concerns the usage of što, što, and koliko 'which, the way that'.

In folk dialects, što is the most widely used interrogative and relative, and can even replace the interrogative koi, e.g. (23) što je to šešak? for 'Who is that man?'.
the subject of the relative clause, kto requires the addition of an oblique personal pronoun agreeing with the antecedent in gender and number, e.g. (29) kako se vika kovekto kto ne kote neまね viktor ‘That’s the name of the man he walked with yesterday’. This example is quite colloquial.

The rules for the literary language are the following:
a) Use kai with a preposition. Hence, (29) should be
   (30) kovekto se koro(κατο) se kato viktor ‘... the man whom he walked with yesterday’.
b) Use kai elsewhere, e.g. (31) vetase kai ge aretauva ‘The child when we met ...’
c) Use koi/kai in place of either kai or kto to break stylistic monotony and avoid ambiguity, e.g. (32) liandeta kai ge se suhaveta se kai komekta se dekatera kai kovekto se atopo ka ‘The young people who participated in masses in the conference, which testifies to their high conscience, tensely followed the discussion, which was very important’. The first kai and the last kai should both be koi/kai: the first for the sake of appearance, the last in order to refer clearly to the discussion and not to the act of following.

Macedonian, like Serbo-Croatian, distinguishes restrictive and nonrestrictive relative clauses by punctuation rules similar to those of English. It has been suggested by Blagoja Korpun (1969), however, that the distinction can also be indicated by pronounal usage. Since kai (κατο) is anaphoric while kai (κατο) is non- anaphoric, and since restrictive relative clauses are more closely connected with their antecedents than nonrestrictive, Korpun suggests that kai be used for the former and kai (κατο) for the latter, where the weakened connection increases the need for anaphora, e.g. (33) Te kai te rodile ne smesi viktor ‘They who bore you are not among the living’; (34) Ba ovol sobr de prizanveta ... Apos, kai deluva simo de Aliki ‘Aristof, who arrived last night from Aigina, will attend this meeting’.

It is interesting to note that clauses which are conjoined in folk speech are relativized in the literary language, e.g. (35) kai bi da cikle pripeske si kai cikle ad break povolmvo ‘There were two friends, and they were closer than brothers’; (36) ... kai pripeske; kai de cikle ‘... friends, who were ...’.

The paraetic nature of certain nonrestrictive relative clauses is especially evident when they modify the predicate of the main clause, in which case they can be introduced only by kai or the neutral kai (κατο), e.g. (37) Dikis kai koris prevojevov povsdo ki am rubi, poradi kai je preden na ndeljenost and ‘The director embezzled more thousands of rubles, due to which he was turned over to the official court’.

Like any other South Slavic language, Macedonian can use the relative pronouns for ‘who’ and ‘what’ without any antecedent, to mean ‘the who’ and ‘that which’, e.g. (38) kai wine niat, be ne Staten spici ‘He who drinks wine sleeps without a bride’; (39) kai

BULGARIAN

Bulgarian relatives are formed by adding the enclitic -to to any interrogative except kai and a few adverbs (kato does occur in dialects and as an archaism). In Bulgarian, as in Macedonian, kai (κατο) or kai (κατο) can also be used. While oblique forms (kai kai) and a rare dative kai kai which is usually replaced by ma kai (κατο) ma kai (κατο) but only for a personal masculine singular antecedent whose relative pronon serves as a function, e.g. (40) kai kai diret a kai kai ‘He whom you seek is here’.

When referring to the entire main clause, the neuter kai kai or kai kai or the indeclinable kai (κατο) kai (κατο) is used, e.g. (41) kai xai kai ma preobrez, kai kai ma preobrez and ‘This raised a little discussion regarding the opposition kai kai kai or kai (κατο) or kai (κατο)’. Kai is considered more literary, kai and kai are more colloquial. Koi is especially preferred for animate antecedents, but sentences such as the following are not uncommon, albeit very colloquial: (42) Dva li a povoljata, dat (na more victor) ‘Is this the bridge that you were praising so much’. Both synchronically and diachronically, kai (κατο) or kai (κατο) is a relative meaning ‘there’. Its function as a general hypotactic conjunction meaning ‘that’. In a calque from the Greek kata, the Macedonian kai (κατο) which is cognate with the relative construction only in verbal constructions, whereas the Bulgarian and Greek forms are very common relatives in their respective spoken languages.

Kai is not very common in spoken Bulgarian; na kai is more common, and kai kai also occurs in this function, e.g. (43) kai kai (κατο) kai kai na kai kai (κατο) kai kai kai kai kai kai (κατο) kai kai kai kai kai kai (κατο) kai kai kai kai kai kai (κατο) kai kai kai kai kai kai (κατο) kai kai kai kai kai kai (κατο) kai kai kai kai kai kai (κατο) ‘The man (the grain (the grain which) to which he will set out tomorrow’. As in Slovenian, interrogative pronouns
are used in Bulgarian for indirect questions, e.g., (45) Na znam kolko  
se baviti! I do not know who is looking for me. Bulgarian does not  
appear to distinguish restrictive and nonrestrictive relative  
clauses in any way.

According to Bulgarian grammarians, the subordinating conjunc-
tions da and to "that", which normally occur in modal and comple-
tive verbal constructions, respectively, can be used to introduce  
relative clauses, e.g., (46) Naime kovak da se o Kal koja povernja  
licitsi, No  
licitsi v Baja Cetinica, me povernja licitsi ... all! The  
thought that there was an uprising in Baja Cetinica returned all  
his ... powers! However, these clauses appear to essentially  
modify the noun, e.g., (47) could be transformed to Novcozuo mielenko  
a ... his thinking that ... " Da clauses imply nonindicative  
modality.

The Bulgarian participle was mentioned in S. Géza’s paper.  
It need only be added that they rarely occur in spoken Bulgarian  
and are not encouraged in literary Bulgarian; relative clauses are  
preferred.

Notes

1. A form cir does occur occasionally.

2. Cigari has a variant cigavé derived from the interrogative cigavé.

3. I wish to thank R. W. C. Browne for helpful suggestions concern-
   ing this section.

4. In Yanka’s language, the pronoun can be omitted when cito serves as  
a non-comitative instrumental function, e.g., Anota cito me Cito  
vyit ~ the shoe with which the grain is winnowed.

5. The use of to here is especially characteristic of Montenegro.

The four conjunctives equated with to could be seen simply as  
subordinating conjunctives whose translation would be a partici-
pal construction, e.g., to sam ra chudovoto k’photo da egara tenis  
I watched him playing tennis.
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Some problems concerning Standard German relative clauses

Andreas Loeschner  
University of Chicago

Relative clause formation essentially works the same way in  
Standard German as in English. For a first approach, the easiest  
way to formulate it is to start from a clause adjoined to an NP  
which contains an NP referentially identical to the head. This NP  
is changed into a relative pronoun and moved in front of the  
whole clause. German pronouns, as almost all nominal elements, are  
much more extensively marked for grammatical categories as gender  
and case; but once we have solved the problem of the assignment  
of such features in general, it is solved for relative pronouns  
as well. For an illustration, take 1(a) and 2(b):

1a) Der Apfelstrudel (Frau Knollrausch einen Apfelstrudel [masc,  
acc, sg] für mich gebakken hat) war himmlisch.

b) Der Apfelstrudel, den [masc, acc, sg] Frau Knollrausch für mich  
gebakken hat, war himmlisch.

2a) Die bosen Tiere [bőse Tiere [nom, pl]] mich letzte Nacht im Traum  
verfolgten) hatten sechs Beine und einen feurigen Blick.

b) Die bösen Tiere, die [nom, pl] mich letzte Nacht im Traum  
verfolgten, hatten sechs Beine und einen feurigen Blick.

It is worth mentioning that the morphology of the relative  
pronouns isn’t without its problems, especially because of a number  
of instances where different pronouns can be used in the same  
place.

3) Das ist das Haus, in dem ich als Kind gelebt habe.

4) Der Kuchen, von den, es ein Stück abgebiss, war vergiftet.

5) In 3), we have to choose between an analytical form with a pre-
position, and a locative pronoun. In 4), the choice is between an  
analytical form and a so-called prepositional adverb. Normally  
it is said that for pronouns referring to [human] only the analy-
cial form is to be used, whereas for [human] both forms are  
equally possible. The first statement seems to be true, the  
second needs many more specifications. E.g., 5) and 6) both  
are cases where only one form seems acceptable.

5) Die Türe (an die) er klopfte, blieb verschlossen.

6) Sie gab mir ein Pfund Meh und zwanzig Erdbienen, mit denen  
ich hätte eine Torte backen sollen.

I’m not going further into this question, mainly for the reason  
that these problems not only arise for relative pronouns, but for  
pronouns generally, and moreover for all kinds of problems in the  
same way (with a few exceptions due to morphological gaps.) There-
fore, it seems that when we have explained the morphology of pro-

tions generally, we automatically have explained it for relative