

**Tsvetana Dimitrova** (Sofija University)

## **Relativizers in the history of Bulgarian**

The status of the invariable relativizer *deto* ‘that, which’ and *wh*-relativizers in present-day Bulgarian have been already discussed in the literature (Rudin 1986; Krapova 2009), and there are a number of studies on the relativizers in the history of Bulgarian (for an extensive review of their origin, functions, categorial and functional status, see Iliev 2012 and the bibliography there; Bujukliev 1977).

The proposed talk will offer observation on the distribution of the relativizers in the history of Bulgarian with respect to the status and properties of the (relative) clauses they introduce (the texts to be excerpted are representative for the different stages in the history of Bulgarian, with a focus on Middle Bulgarian (the Troya Legend, the German Codex) and Early Modern Bulgarian (Troyanski Damaskin, Loveshki Damaskin and other texts that are part of the Historical Corpus of Bulgarian Language), with comparative data from Old Church Slavonic (Codex Marianus, Codex Zographensis and Codex Suprasliensis). The relativizing markers in the focus of the study (except for the old relative pronoun *iže* ‘who, which’ which were very early replaced by other elements) are: the declinable *wh*-constituents – *kъto* ‘who’, *čъto* ‘which, what’, *kotorъ* ‘who’, *kyi* ‘who’ (among others), and *koito* ‘who’ – vs. the indeclinable *deto* ‘what, which, that’, *što* ‘what’, *štoto* ‘what’, etc.

The study is based on evidence from diachronic data and includes an overview of the status of the relativising markers with free relatives, correlatives, relative clauses that are nominal modifiers to a full nominal head, subjunctive relatives, etc. The analysis will take into account evidence with regard to: lexico-semantic and grammatical features of the modified noun phrase (subclass of the noun head and the modifiers; definiteness – the article on the head noun and on modifiers, demonstrative pronouns or pronominal adjectives as modifiers; syntactic functions of the head noun in the matrix clause and of the relativising constituent in the relative clause); resumptives (clitic or non-clitic); position of the relative clause (pre-posed or post-posed with respect to the full nominal head); co-occurrence of the relativizers and clitics; etc. For instance, it is observed that *deto* is used as a relativizing marker in subjunctive relative clauses and in modifier relative clauses to noun phrases (ex. 1), in phrases (noun, adverbial and prepositional phrases) with locative meaning (ex. 2); as a complementizer with factive clauses (ex. 3); *wh*-elements are found in free relatives (with *koito* ‘who’ often occurring in free relatives (ex. 4) and correlatives (ex. 5). A comparison will be made between *deto* and the other invariable relativisers *što* and *štoto* with respect to the contexts in which they occur (*što* is found more often with free relatives; both *što* and *štoto* in modifier relative clauses to full nominal – or pronominal – heads, both with animate and inanimate referents). The study will involve discussion on quantitative data on the status of the relativizers and their clausal position.

### *References*

Bujukliev, Ivan. 1977: Буюлиев, Иван. Развой на относителните изречения с въвеждаща връзка от к-основа и съдбата на иже в славянските езици. (=

Evolution of the relative clauses with linking k-marker and the faith of *iže* in the Slavic languages.) – *Закономерности в развитието на славянските езици* (= *Regularities in the development of the Slavic languages*). Sofia, 1977, 83–120.

Rudin, Catherine. 1986. *Aspects of Bulgarian Syntax: Complementizers and Wh Constructions*. Slavica Pub.

Krapova, Piana. 2010. Krapova, I., Bulgarian relative and factive clauses with an invariant complementizer. *Lingua* 120: 1240-1272, doi: 10.1016/j.lingua.2009.08.002

Пиев 2012: Илиев, Иван. 2012. *Теория на относителността. Българските относителни местоимения – произход и развой*. (= *Theory of relativity: the relative pronouns in Bulgarian – origin and evolution*). Plovdiv University.

### Examples<sup>1</sup>

- (1) и Заповѣдь бжїа. дето да се не поклонишь  
 I zapověď božia deto da se ne poklonišь  
 And order of-God that (1a) to ReflCL not bow  
 дрѡгомѡ бѡ, тѣкмо едномѡ бѡ, дето е сторїль  
 drugomu bogu tьkmo ednomu bogu deto e storilь  
 other God only one/the one God who (1b) is created  
 нбо и землю и сїчкы свѣтъ.  
 nebo i zemlju i sičky světь  
 Sky and earth and whole world
- (2) амї и по сїчкы свѣтъ. дето нашъ оумъ не може да стїгне,  
 ami i po sičky světь deto našь umь ne može da stigne  
 But also on entire world where our brain not can to reach
- (3) Амї ныє слѡшаме на сѣды днь, дето ны оучи стое  
 Ami nye slušame na sědy dнь deto ny uči svetoe  
 But we listen on judging day as us learn holy  
 Еѡлїе:  
 evangelie  
 Gospel
- (4) И който ще да поїде да се смѣси със' тѣ,  
 I kouyto šte da poude da se směsi sьs' tьhь  
 and who will to come to ReflCL mix with them
- (5) оти който дѡма така, той чїни ба крїва  
 oti kouyto дума така той čini boga kriva  
 because who say that he deem God at-fault

<sup>1</sup> All examples in this abstract are excerpted from Troyanski Damaskin.