

## SUBJUNCTIVE RELATIVES IN BULGARIAN AND MACEDONIAN

Eleni Bužarovska  
*University of Skopje/Center for Areal  
Linguistics, Skopje*  
[elenibuzarovska@mt.net.mk](mailto:elenibuzarovska@mt.net.mk)

Olga Mišeska Tomić  
*University of Leiden/Center for Areal  
Linguistics, Skopje*  
[o.tomic@let.leidenuniv.nl](mailto:o.tomic@let.leidenuniv.nl)

The authors discuss the use of subjunctive constructions as nominal modifiers in Bulgarian and Macedonian. It is shown that, in Bulgarian, these subjunctive relatives have a wide distribution and are independent of semantic factors, whereas in Macedonian they occur only if a number of semantic factors are satisfied and can always be alternatively interpreted as adjuncts of purpose. The distribution and variability of environments where the subjunctive relatives occur correlates with the presence of the relativizer. In Bulgarian, where they are introduced by relativizers, the subjunctive relatives have a wide unconstrained distribution and great syntagmatic variability, whereas in Macedonian where there are no relativizers, the occurrence and variability of subjunctive relatives is restricted.

### 1. Introduction

In the languages of the Balkans, subjunctive clauses are typically used (a) as complements of modal verbs and a group of verbs that may go under the name “intentional verbs”, including control verbs, causatives, volitionals and inchoatives; and (b) as “bare subjunctives” (i.e. subjunctives that do not occur in complement positions of main clauses), which most often express orders or wishes (cf. Tomić 2004, 2006). In view of the fact that the lack of time reference distances them from prototypical finite structures,<sup>1</sup> the Balkan subjunctive constructions may, however, also be used as nominal modifiers or adjuncts in sentences that express extemporal truth. This paper discusses the use of subjunctive constructions as nominal modifiers in Bulgarian and Macedonian. As these modifiers are often introduced by relativizers, and actually are relative clauses, we shall refer to them as “subjunctive relatives”.

In section 2, the properties of sentences with subjunctive relatives are discussed. Section 3 presents the analysis of the subjunctive relatives in sentences with verbs of quest. Sections 4 and 5 are devoted to subjunctive relatives in sentences with acquisition and existential verbs, respectively. Section 6 deals with oblique subjunctive relatives in Bulgarian, which have no counterparts in Macedonian. In Section 7, some general conclusions are drawn.

### 2. Properties of sentences with subjunctive relatives

Subjunctive relatives refer to properties of internal arguments or adjuncts of two groups of verbs that express an activity of an agent (often the speaker) featuring deliberate quest or

---

<sup>1</sup> Joseph (1983:38) argues that the subjunctive complements are finite expressions filling the function of an infinitive. The Balkan Slavic subjunctive proclitic *da* is bound to the finite form to signal non-factivity of the event coded by the finite verb (cf. Topolinjska 1995:241). In bare subjunctive constructions, i.e. in subjunctive constructions that are not governed by a main clause, it is a unique marker of non-factivity, while in complement clauses the factive or non-factive interpretation of the clauses depends on the lexical semantics of the matrix predicate (Topolinjska 2003:319).

acquisition of an unspecified object, to which we refer as “verbs of quest”<sup>2</sup> and “verbs of acquisition”. The group of verbs of quest includes verbs with or related to the meaning of ‘look for’; whereas the group of verbs of acquisition, in addition to verbs with the meaning of ‘find’ or meanings related to it, includes existential verbs.

### 2.1 *Semantic- pragmatic properties*

Subjunctive relatives perform a combined purpose and modification function.<sup>3</sup> The speaker anchors an unspecified participant in the discourse, through a modifying goal-oriented event. The lexical semantics of the “quest/acquisition” matrix verb and the goal meaning of the subjunctive clause have implicatures that result in an ambiguous role assignment of the first argument. The semantic representation of sentences with subjunctive relatives is:

X wants to acquire/find Y such that Y does something (for X)

Both X and Y have dual roles: while X has the role of Agent and Beneficiary, Y has the role of Theme of the Goal as well as the role of Agent.<sup>4</sup> The dual role of the external argument of the “quest” verb results from the fact that the participant is an intentional agent as well as a beneficiary of the event. The beneficiary role is available from the implicature of the second event, in which the internal, non-referring argument of the quest/acquisition verb performs an action beneficiary for the agent. This dual thematic assignment of both goal and possession has already been noted in Ladusaw and Dowty (1988:65), where it is suggested that “the Goal is the person in whose possession the Theme resides when the action initiated by the main verb is over.”

The dual role assignment of subjunctive relatives is related to control relation between the matrix clause and the subjunctive relative clause. As suggested in Bužarovska (2002:89), the control over the understood subject of the subjunctive clause is weakened by the non-referential status of the object of quest encoded by the matrix object NP. When the control is weak, the subjunctive relative has a modification reading, whereas strong control yields purposive meaning. The weakening of control causes the goal entailment in the gap to give way to possession entailment through which a Possession role (Location) is assigned to the controller.

Since “X wants to acquire/find Y...” implies that X’s deliberate initiation of quest to obtain Y has not yet resulted in its acquisition, i.e. in the possession of Y, we presume that while quest verbs have two semantic components – intentional quest and “unrealized” possession, with acquisition verbs the intentional meaning fades away at the expense of the meaning of possession. Therefore, existential subjunctive relatives are more common when the possession remains unrealized, i.e., in negated predications.

### 2.2 *Syntactic properties*

The Macedonian subjunctive relatives are formally indistinct from adjuncts of purpose when in specific contexts the goal marker *za* ‘for’ is omitted. Depending on context, the

---

<sup>2</sup> The term was introduced in Bužarovska (2004).

<sup>3</sup> In Bužarovska (2002), it is argued that the subjunctive relatives “move” along a purpose-modification continuum, with either the purpose or the modification component prevailing.

<sup>4</sup> Nishigaushi (1984:219) claims that the controller of the PRO is an NP that has the thematic role of Goal or Location; the verbs with Location arguments describe stative positions or possessions, while the verbs containing Goal in their thematic structure denote transition of position or possession.

subjunctive construction to the right of a direct object has a dual interpretation, resulting from structural ambiguity: as a nominal modifier or as an adjunct of purpose. In Bulgarian, however, subjunctive relatives are usually introduced by relativizers co-referential with the noun or nominal phrase to which the subjunctive relatives relate,<sup>5</sup> and are thus formally distinct from adjuncts of purpose.<sup>6</sup> The relativizers are most often subjects of the subjunctive relatives, but there may be relativizers that are prepositional objects in adjuncts within the subjunctive relative. In the latter case, the relationship of the nominal to which the subjunctive relative relates and the relativizer within the subjunctive relative is oblique (cf. section 6). The absence of a relativizer in Macedonian subjunctive relatives restricts considerably their functional zone and has an impact on their distribution.

### 3. Subjunctive relatives in sentences with verbs of quest

As pointed above, verbs of quest express an activity of an agent (often the speaker) that can be conceptualized as “his/her deliberate quest for an unspecified object with particular properties.” The desired “object” of quest could be a person or a thing that the agent wants to “obtain”. The verb of the main clause is typically in the imperfective aspect, as it encodes an unbounded, atelic event that has acquired state-like properties.<sup>7</sup> This atelic event expresses a property that characterises a set of objects. The agent is in search of one unspecified member of this set, which is referred to by the subjunctive relative. The *ex definitione* unspecified object possesses some property that makes the acquisition of the object beneficial for the agent. Thus, the agent is simultaneously a deliberate performer and a beneficiary of the quest.

In Bulgarian, the nominals to which the subjunctive relatives refer are, as a rule, bare generic nouns or indefinite non-specific nominal phrases, but reference to definite non-specific nominal phrases is sometimes possible. These nominals are in clauses with the verb *tǎrsja* ‘look-for/seek’ and a number of “quest” verbs whose meanings are related to this verb. There are no tense restrictions for the quest verb, but in indicative clauses, there may

---

<sup>5</sup> There are four Bulgarian relativizers constructed by a “wh” word followed by the anaphoric particle *to*: *kojto* ‘who/which.M.Sg+to.Anaph’, *kojato* ‘who/which.F.Sg+to.Anaph’, *koeto* ‘who/which.N.Sg+to.Anaph’, *koito* ‘who/which.Pl+to.Anaph’. In colloquial speech, the invariable relativizer *deto* ‘that+Anaph’ – a remnant from the interrogative “wh”-word *kǎde* ‘where’ plus the anaphoric particle *to* – can also be used as a relativizer. Our Internet search found only the following subjunctive relative introduced by the latter relativizer:

|     |   |                       |           |           |               |     |
|-----|---|-----------------------|-----------|-----------|---------------|-----|
| (i) | ...ako  | nameriš               | istinski  | sprintjor | deto          | Blg |
|     | if  | find.2Sg.Perf.Pres    | true.M.Sg | sprinter  | that+to.Anaph |     |
|     | da  | potvǎrdi              | tova.     |           |               |     |
|     | Subj.Mark   | certify.3Sg.Perf.Pres | that.Neut |           |               |     |
|     | ‘...if you find a true sprinter that would certify that.’ |                       |           |           |               |     |

In the glosses of the examples, the following abbreviations are used: 1/2/3 = 1<sup>st</sup>/2<sup>nd</sup>/3<sup>rd</sup> person; Acc = accusative (case); Anaph = anaphoric; Cl = clitic; Dat = dative (case); F = feminine; Imp = imperative; Imperf = imperfect, imperfective (aspect); Impers = impersonal; Indic = indicative; M = masculine; Mod = modal; Neg = negation; Neut = neuter; Part = participle; Perf = perfective (aspect); Pl = plural; Pres = present (tense); Refl = reflexive; Resumpt = resumptive particle; Sg = singular; Subj = subjunctive; Subj.Mark = subjunctive marker.

<sup>6</sup> In both Macedonian and Bulgarian, the subjunctive constriction can be preceded by the preposition *za* ‘for’, which disambiguates the sentence in favour of the adjunct of purpose reading.

<sup>7</sup> “An atelic event is the one that has no built-in end point”. (Bybee at al. 1994:55).

be aspectual restrictions – the verbs tend to be imperfective. In (1) we have subjunctive relatives in sentences with indicative verbs, in (2) subjunctive relatives in sentences with imperatives.<sup>8</sup>

- (1) a. *Toj tārsi takāva kniga,* Blg  
 he look-for.3Sg.Imperf.Pres such.F.Sg book  
*kojato da mu haresva.*  
 which.F.Sg+to.Anaph Subj.Mark 3Sg.M.Acc.Cl please.3Sg  
 ‘He is looking for (such) a book that he would like.’
- b. *Tārsex roklja kojato da* Blg  
 find.1Sg.Imperf.Past dress which.F.Sg+to.Anaph Subj.Mark  
*mi xaresva.*  
 1Sg.Dat.Cl please.3Sg.Imperf.Pres  
 ‘I was looking for a dress that I like.’
- c. *Ne iskaše aparat sās kojto* Blg  
 not want.1Sg.Imperf.Past device with which.M.Sg+to.Anaph  
*da se raboti vnimatelno.*  
 Subj.Mark Acc.Refl.Cl work.3Sg.Imperf.Pres carefully  
 ‘(S)he didn’t want a device which has to be handled carefully.’
- (2) a. *Kupete mi kniga kojato* Blg  
 buy.2Pl.Imper 1Sg.Dat.Cl book which.F.Sg+to.Anaph  
*da ima mnogo kartini!*  
 Subj.Mark have.3Sg many pictures  
 ‘Buy me a book that has many pictures!’
- b. *Dajte mi roklja kojato* Blg  
 give.1Sg.Imper 1Sg.Dat.Cl dress which.F.Sg+to.Anaph  
*da ne se mačka.*  
 Subj.Mark not Acc.Refl.Cl crease.3Sg.Imperf.Pres  
 ‘Give me a dress that does not crease!’

None of the above examples can be translated into Macedonian with a subjunctive relative – a fact that indicates that the domain of the Macedonian subjunctive relatives in sentences with quest verbs is limited. In order to confirm this indication, we searched for Bulgarian and Macedonian subjunctive relatives in literary works and the Internet (Google search).<sup>9</sup> No subjunctive relatives were found in the examined Macedonian prose works and a

<sup>8</sup> The examples are ours. We are grateful to Mila Dimitrova Vulchanova and Ileyana Krapova for checking our Bulgarian examples other than those extracted from literary works or found in the Internet.

<sup>9</sup> Seven hundred and fifty pages of Bulgarian prose works and six hundred pages of Macedonian prose works were covered. The Bulgarian prose works included: *Ljubov i smärt pod krivite kruši* [Love and Death under the Crooked Pear Trees] by Kristina Dimitrova (Sofija: Obsidian, 2004) – Dimitrova (2004); *Esenni razkazi* [Autumn Stories] by Ivajlo Petrov (Sofija: Bălgarski pisatel, 1978) – Petrov (1978); *Gospodin Nikoj* [Mister Nobody] by Bogomil Rajnov (Sofija: Bălgarski pisatel, 1971) – Rajnov (1971); *Cenata* [The Price] by Marko Semov (Sofija: Bălgarski bestselăr, 2004) – Semov (2004). The Macedonian prose works included: *Omarnini* by Slavko Janevski (Skopje: Nova Makedonija, 1972); *Zora zad agolot* [Dawn Behind the Corner] by Dimitar Solev (Skopje: Kultura, 1984); *Razgovor so Spinoza* [Dialogue with Spinoza] by Goce Smilevski (Skopje: Kultura, 2002).

limited number of subjunctive relatives were found on the Internet – all of them with the quest verb *bara* ‘look for/seek’:<sup>10</sup>

- (3) a. *Baram kauč/krevet da Mac*  
 look-for.1Sg.Imperf.Pres couch/bed Subj.Mark  
*prespijam.*  
 sleep.1Sg.Perf.Pres  
 ‘I am looking for a couch/bed to spend the night in.’
- b. *Baram nekoj da mi Mac*  
 look-for.1Sg.Imperf.Pres somebody Subj.Mark 1Sg.Dat.Cl  
*dade link za Sky Star.*  
 sleep.3Sg.Perf.Pres link for Sky Star  
 ‘I am looking for someone to give me a link for Sky Star.’
- c. *Baram zgodna plavuša da Mac*  
 look-for.1Sg.Imperf.Pres attractive.F.Sg blond.Noun Subj.Mark  
*mi zgotvi sarma za ruček.*  
 1Sg.Dat.Cl prepare.3Sg.Perf.Pres stuffed-cabbage for lunch  
 ‘I am looking for an attractive blond to prepare stuffed cabbage for my lunch.’
- d. *Baram žena da mete Mac*  
 look-for.1Sg.Imperf.Pres woman Subj.Mark sweep.3Sg.Imperf.Pres  
*ednaš dnevno, da mie sadovi dva pati*  
 once daily Subj.Mark wash.3Sg.Imperf.Pres dishes two times  
*dnevno, da gotvi jadenje*  
 daily Subj.Mark prepare.3Sg.Imperf.Pres meal  
*tri pati i barem četiri pati dnevno*  
 three times and at-least four times daily  
*da í tekne na mene.*  
 Subj.Mark 3Sg.F.Dat.Cl remember.3Sg.Perf.Pres of me  
 ‘I am looking for a woman to sweep (the floor) once a day, to wash the dishes twice a day, to prepare a meal three times a day and at least four times a day to think of me.’

In the Bulgarian prose works examined, subjunctive relatives were scarce, but on the Internet a wealth of examples were found. The majority of examples were with the verbs *társja* ‘look-for’ and *iskam* ‘want’ in the main clause, though examples with other verbs that belong to the quest group (but have a more or less pronounced acquisition component) – *naemam* ‘hire’, *kupuvam* ‘buy’, *polučavam* ‘get’, *dobavjam* ‘add’, *davam* ‘give’, *kazvam* ‘say’,

<sup>10</sup> All the examples are ambiguous; in addition to the readings as subjunctive relatives, they have readings as adjuncts of purpose. The readings as subjunctive relatives denote a quality but also refer to the future, i.e. they denote a possibility that might be realized.

*pitam* ‘ask’ – also occurred. In (4) we quote examples with the verbs *tǎrsja* and *iskam*; in (5) examples with other quest verbs:<sup>11</sup>

- (4) a. *Tǎrsja* *rabota* *kojato* Blg  
 look-for.1Sg.Imperf.Pres work/job which.F.Sg+to.Anaph  
*da* *rabotja* *po* *e-maila*.  
 Subj.Mark work.1Sg.Imperf.Pres by e-mail+the.M.Sg  
 ‘I am looking for a job that I can do through e-mail.’
- b. *Iskam da* *vi* *popitam* *za* Blg  
 want Subj.Mark 2Pl.Dat.Cl ask.1Sg.Imperf.Pres for  
*njakakva* *rabota* *kojato* *da*  
 some.F.Sg work/job which.F.Sg+to.Anaph Subj.Mark  
*se* *vǎrši* *ot* *nepǎlnoletna* *vǎzrast*.  
 Acc.Refl.Cl do.3Sg.Imperf.Pres from junior.F.Sg age  
 ‘I want to ask you for a job that can be done by minors.’
- c. *Ljusi iskaše* *da* *se* Blg  
 Ljusi want/seek.3Sg.Imperf Subj.Mark Acc.Refl.Cl  
*nastani* *na* *efektno* *mjasto*. *Mjasto*  
 settle.3Sg.Perf.Pres on/to representative.Neut.Sg place place  
*koeto* *da* *podxožda*  
 which.Neut.Sg+to.Anaph Subj.Mark correspond.3Sg.Imperf.Pres  
*na ličnostta* *mu*.  
 on/to personality+the.F.Sg 3Sg.M.Dat.Cl  
 ‘Ljusi wanted/sought to settle down in a representative place; a place that would be adequate for his personality.’
- (5) a. *Kupi si* *modem* *kojto* Blg  
 buy.2Sg.ImperDat.Refl.Cl modem which.M.Sg+to.Anaph  
*da* *ne e samo za* *Windows*.  
 Subj.Mark not be.3Sg only for Windows  
 ‘Buy yourself a modem which is not only for Windows.’
- b. *Ako me* *nasočite* *kǎm podxodjštite* Blg  
 if 1Sg.Acc.Cl direct.2Pl.Perf.Pres toward adequate.Pl+the.Pl  
*specialisti,* *koito* *da* *rešat*  
 specialists who.Pl+to.Anaph Subj.Mark solve.3Sg.Perf.Pres  
*problemite* *mi...*  
 problems+the.Pl 1Sg.Dat.Cl  
 ‘If you direct me toward competent specialists that can solve my problems.’
- c. *Sega trjabvaše ...* *da* *dobavjat* Blg  
 now should.Impers.Imperf Subj.Mark add.3Pl.Perf.Pres more  
*ošte vratovrǎzka, predi neja riza, kojato*  
 more tie, before her shirt which.F.Sg+to.Anaph

<sup>11</sup> There were only two examples in the corpus of examples from literary works – here given as example (4c), from Dimitrova (2004:80) and example (5c) from Semov (2004:275). All the other examples are from the Internet.

|           |                          |           |                  |
|-----------|--------------------------|-----------|------------------|
| <i>da</i> | <i>odgovarja</i>         | <i>na</i> | <i>kostjuma.</i> |
| Subj.Mark | correspond.3Sg.Perf.Pres | on/to     | suit+the.M.Sg    |

‘It was only left for them to add a tie, before that a shirt which would match the suit.’

Interestingly, the majority of the quest verbs other than *tǎrsja* ‘look-for’ and *iskam* ‘want’ are in imperative or other modal clauses. The relativizer introducing the subjunctive relative most often functions as a subject of the subjunctive clause, but there are cases such as (1c), in which it is prepositional complement in an adjunct.<sup>12</sup>

Our analysis exhibited a wide variety of environments in which the Bulgarian subjunctive relatives can relate to constituents in sentences with verbs of quest, while confirming the initial indication that the functional zone of the Macedonian subjunctive relatives is limited. Since the only formal difference between the Bulgarian and Macedonian subjunctive relatives is the presence/versus absence of relativizer, we conclude that the restricted usage of the subjunctive relatives in Macedonian can be ascribed to the ambiguity which arises due to lack of relativizers.<sup>13</sup>

The fact that no examples of subjunctive relatives in sentences with quest verbs were found in the Macedonian literary corpus and only two examples were found in the Bulgarian one, leads to the conclusion that subjunctive relatives relating to complements of verbs of quest typically occur in the spoken language.

#### 4. Subjunctive relatives in sentences with verbs of acquisition

Verbs of acquisition represent a semantic extension of the quest verbs, as they can be conceptualized as the end of the “quest” process that comes as a result of the agent’s acquisition of the “desired” unspecified object. The acquisition verbs include verbs with the meaning of ‘have/possess’, ‘find’ and ‘meet’.<sup>14</sup>

In (6) we present several examples with subjunctive relatives in clauses with “have/possess” as a main verb, which in Macedonian and Bulgarian have practically the same words:<sup>15</sup>

|     |                |                 |               |           |            |  |     |
|-----|----------------|-----------------|---------------|-----------|------------|--|-----|
| (6) | a <sub>1</sub> | <i>Imam</i>     | <i>bratja</i> | <i>da</i> | <i>mi</i>  |  |     |
|     |                | have.1Sg        | brother       | Subj.Mark | 1Sg.Dat.Cl |  | Blg |
|     |                | <i>pomagat.</i> |               |           |            |  |     |
|     |                | help.3Pl.Pres   |               |           |            |  |     |

<sup>12</sup> This “oblique” relativization, which is not licensed in Macedonian, is of particular interest and will be discussed in section 6.

<sup>13</sup> In Macedonian, subjunctive relatives can be introduced by a relativizer word only in some South-Western dialects (e.g. in the Macedonian dialect of Korča in Southern Albania, as described by Mazon 1936). As exemplified in (i), the relativizer in these Macedonian dialects is the invariable *relativum generale što* ‘what’:

|     |               |              |            |           |              |               |  |     |
|-----|---------------|--------------|------------|-----------|--------------|---------------|--|-----|
| (i) | <i>%Baram</i> | <i>čovek</i> | <i>što</i> | <i>da</i> | <i>znaet</i> | <i>grčki.</i> |  |     |
|     | look-for.1Sg  | man          | what       | Subj.Mark | know.3Sg     | Greek         |  | Mac |

‘I am looking for a man who knows Greek.’

<sup>14</sup> The verbs with the meaning ‘have/possess’ are inflecting verbs, distinct from the existential impersonal “have” verbs, as well as from the “have” auxiliaries in the two languages. Note that the verbs with the meaning of ‘find’ and ‘meet’ also have semantic possessive components.

<sup>15</sup> There are no relativizers in these sentences, not only in Macedonian, but also in Bulgarian.

|                |  |                         |                           |                         |                             |     |
|----------------|--|-------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|-----|
| a <sub>2</sub> | <i>Imam</i><br>have.1Sg<br><i>pomagaat.</i><br>help.3Pl.Pres | <i>braќa</i><br>brother | <i>da</i><br>Subj.Mark    | <i>mi</i><br>1Sg.Dat.Cl |                             | Mac |
|                | ‘I have brothers to help me.’                                |                         |                           |                         |                             |     |
| b <sub>1</sub> | <i>Imaš</i><br>have.2Sg<br><i>radvaš.</i><br>rejoice.2Sg     | <i>deca</i><br>children | <i>da</i><br>Subj.Mark    | <i>se</i><br>Acc.Ref.Cl |                             | Blg |
| b <sub>2</sub> | <i>Imaš</i><br>have.2Sg<br><i>raduvaš.</i><br>rejoice.2Sg    | <i>deca</i><br>children | <i>da</i><br>Subj.Mark    | <i>se</i><br>Acc.Ref.Cl |                             | Mac |
|                | ‘You have children to give you joy.’                         |                         |                           |                         |                             |     |
| c <sub>1</sub> | <i>Imat</i><br>have.3Pl                                      | <i>kuće</i><br>dog      | <i>da gi</i><br>Subj.Mark | <i>3Pl.Acc.Cl</i>       | <i>pazi.</i><br>protect.3Sg | Blg |
| c <sub>2</sub> | <i>Imaat</i><br>have.3Pl                                     | <i>kuće</i><br>dog      | <i>da gi</i><br>Subj.Mark | <i>3Pl.Acc.Cl</i>       | <i>pazi.</i><br>protect.3Sg | Mac |
|                | ‘They have a dog to protect them.’                           |                         |                           |                         |                             |     |
| d <sub>1</sub> | <i>Imame</i><br>have.1Pl                                     | <i>peќka</i><br>stove   | <i>da</i><br>Subj.Mark    | <i>ni</i><br>1Pl.Acc.Cl | <i>topli.</i><br>warm.3Sg   | Blg |
| d <sub>2</sub> | <i>Imame</i><br>have.1Pl                                     | <i>peќka</i><br>stove   | <i>da</i><br>Subj.Mark    | <i>ne</i><br>1Pl.Acc.Cl | <i>topli.</i><br>warm.3Sg   | Mac |
|                | ‘We have a stove to keep us warm.’                           |                         |                           |                         |                             |     |

In Macedonian, the acquisition verbs allow for subjunctive modification much less readily than in Bulgarian, and no Macedonian examples were attested in the texts we searched. In Bulgarian, two examples were attested in the literary works (examples (7a) and (7b)); both of them with the verb “find”<sup>16</sup> and a wealth of examples on the Internet – all of them in modal contexts:<sup>17</sup>

<sup>16</sup> Example (7a) is from Semov (2004:46); example (7b) from Semov (2004:310).

<sup>17</sup> No examples of subjunctive relatives in indicative contexts were found in the Internet, though an example is given in Tomić (2006: section 2.6 of the chapter “Infinitives and Subjunctives”):

|     |   |                        |                                      |                        |                         |     |
|-----|---|------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|-----|
| (i) | <i>Namerix</i><br>find.1Sg.Aor<br><i>xaresva.</i><br>please.3Sg.Imperf.Pres | <i>roklja</i><br>dress | <i>kojato</i><br>which.F.Sg+to.Anaph | <i>da</i><br>Subj.Mark | <i>mi</i><br>1Sg.Dat.Cl | Blg |
|     | ‘I found a dress which I like.’   |                        |                                      |                        |                         |     |

As observed by Mila Dimitrova- Vulchanova (p. c.) such constructions are common in colloquial Bulgarian.



- (7) a. *Ne možexa da namerjat* Blg  
not can.3Pl.Imperf Subj.Mark find.3Pl.Perf.Pres  
*tabelite, koito da im*  
signpost+the.Pl which.Pl+to.Anaph Subj.Mark 3Pl.Dat.Cl  
*pokažat pāta.*  
show.3Pl.Perf.Pres way+the.M.Sg  
‘They couldn’t find the signposts that would show them the way.’
- b. *Može kāsmetāt mu otnovo da* Blg  
may.3Sg.Pres luck+the.M.Sg 3Sg.M.Dat.Cl again Subj.Mark  
*se usmixne, da popadne*  
Refl.Acc.Cl smile.3Sg.Perf.Pres Subj.Mark fall.3Sg.Perf.Pres  
*pak na njakakva dobronamerena policajka,*  
again to some.F.Sg good-natured.F.Sg police-woman  
*kojato da hareasa*  
who.F.Sg+to.Anaph Subj.Mark like.3Sg.Perf.Pres  
*belega mu.*  
mark+the.M.Sg 3Sg.M.Dat.Cl  
‘His luck might smile again; he might encounter some good-natured police-woman, who would like the mark on his face.’
- c. *Da znaeš kade šte* Blg  
Subj.Mark know.2Sg.Imperf.Pres where will.Mod.Cl  
*si nameriš nešto,*  
Refl.Dat.Cl find.2Sg.Perf.Pres something  
*koeto da te*  
which.Neut.Sg+to.Anaph Subj.Mark 2Sg.Acc.Cl  
*spasi.*  
save.3Sg.Perf.Pres  
‘You should know where to find something that would save you.’
- d. *I naistina se nadjavam da* Blg  
and indeed Refl.Acc.Cl hope.1Sg.Imperf.Pres Subj.Mark  
*nameriš čovek, kojto da*  
find.2Sg.Perf.Pres man who.M.Sg+to.Anaph Subj.Mark  
*te običa po sājstija način.*  
2Sg.Acc.Cl love.3Sg.Imperf.Pres by same+the.M.Sg way  
‘And indeed I hope that you would find a man that would love you in the same way.’
- e. *Mnogo rjadko v Bālgarija se* Blg  
very seldom in Bulgaria Refl.Acc.Cl  
*srešta takāva ličnost*  
meet.Impers.Imperf.Pre such.F.Sg personality  
*kojato da sačetava* v  
who.F.Sg+to.Anaph Subj.Mark combine.3Sg.Imperf.Pres in

*sebe si krasota fizičeska i glasova.*  
 self Refl.Dat.Cl beauty physical and vocal  
 ‘In Bulgaria, one very seldom meets such a personality that would combine  
 in itself physical and vocal beauty.’

The verbs with the meaning of “have” and “find”, as well as verbs with related acquisition meanings allow subjunctive modification only in non-factive sentences. As pointed above, subjunctive relatives in sentences with these verbs are more common in Bulgarian than in Macedonian, where they seem to be possible only in emphatic assertive contexts, such as those in (6).

## 5. Subjunctive relatives in existential sentences

The existential verbs in sentences with subjunctive relatives refer to the (non-)existence of an object/person that has a particular property. A “possessive” beneficiary meaning is available because the existence of a required object is beneficial to the agent. The intentional meaning, however, fades away at the expense of the meaning of possession. Existential subjunctive relatives are particularly common in negative sentences, in which the possession remains unrealized.

### 5.1 Subjunctive relatives in negated existential sentences

Negative existential sentences with subjunctive relatives express absence of the “desired” (human or non-human, animate or inanimate) referent involved in a certain activity. The existential meaning is expressed by the impersonal negative verb *nema* (Mac)/*njama* (Blg) ‘not+have’, while the absent object is most frequently encoded by an indefinite pronoun. In Bulgarian, the subjunctive construction is most often introduced by a relativizer (cf. 9a-b), though there are sentences without a relativizer (cf. 9c).<sup>18</sup> The examples found on the Internet have the indefinite pronoun *njakoj* ‘somebody’, but the negated indefinite pronoun *nikoj* ‘nobody’ and the modal existential pronoun *koj* (cf. Grosu 2004) also occur:<sup>19</sup>

- (9) a. *Ami tam, v Amerika njama* Blg  
 but there in America not+have.Impers.Pres  
*njakoj kojto da ne e*  
 somebody who.M.Sg+to.Anaph Subj.Mark not be.3Sg  
*na rabota.*  
 on work  
 ‘But over there, in America, there isn’t anybody who does not work.’

<sup>18</sup> According to Rudin (1985:156), with the matrix verbs *imam* ‘have’/*njamam* ‘not have’, the indefinite head of the relative subjunctive in Bulgarian allows only pronominal relativizers without the anaphoric *-to*:

- (i) *Imam koj da mi pomaga.* Blg  
 have.1Sg who Subj.Mark 1Sg.Dat.Cl help.3Sg  
 ‘I’ve got someone to help me.’

<sup>19</sup> Examples (9a-b) are from the newspaper *Dnevnik* (of March 22, 2005). Note that the dative clitics reinforce the beneficial reading.

- b. *Njama* *njakoj* *kojto* Blg  
 not+have.Impers.Pres somebody who.M.Sg+to.Anaph  
*da e ostanal neoklepan.*  
 Subj.Mark be.3Sg remained.M.Sg./-Part unslandered.M.Sg  
 ‘There is nobody who has not been slandered.’
- c. *Njama* *njakoj* *da* *mi* Blg  
 not+have.Impers.Pres somebody Subj.Mark 1Sg.Dat.Cl  
*podari takava igračka.*  
 present.3Sg.Perf.Pres such.F.Sg toy  
 ‘There is nobody to give me such a toy as a present.’

In Macedonian, no relativizers ever occur. The examples found on the Internet were with the negated indefinite pronoun *nikoj* ‘nobody’:<sup>20</sup>

- (10) a. *Nema* *nikoj* *da* *te* Mac  
 not+have.Impers.Pres nobody Subj.Mark 2Sg.Acc.Cl  
*zameni.*  
 replace.3Sg.Perf.Pres  
 ‘There is nobody to replace you.’
- b. *Nemaše* (*nikoj*) *da* *ni* Mac  
 not+have.Impers.Past nobody Subj.Mark 1Pl.Dat.Cl  
*otklučī.*  
 unlock.3Sg.Perf.Pres  
 ‘There was nobody to unlock the door for us.’
- c. *Zošto nema* *nikoj* *da* *mu* Mac  
 why not+have.Impers.Pres nobody Subj.Mark 3Sg.M.Dat.Cl  
*pomogne?*  
 help.3Sg.Perf.Pres  
 ‘Why is there nobody to help him?’

Non-referring NPs that denote a class of (human or non-human, animate or inanimate) objects can also represent the “missing object” in negative sentences with subjunctive relatives. On the Internet, Bulgarian sentences with subjunctive relatives referring to such objects,<sup>21</sup> by far outnumber the Macedonian sentences of the kind:

- (11) a. *Njama* *máže* *koito* *da* Blg  
 not+have.Impers men who.Pl+to.Anaph Subj.Mark  
*razbirat ženite.*  
 understand.3Pl.Imperf.Pres women+the.Pl  
 ‘There are no men who understand women.’
- b. *Njama* *drug* *podoben* *fakultet,* Blg  
 not+have.Impers otherM.Sg similar.M.Sg faculty

<sup>20</sup> The modal existential pronoun *koj* can also be used, but the indefinite pronoun *nekoj* ‘somebody’ cannot be used in a sentence with the negated verb *nema* ‘not+have.’

<sup>21</sup> No examples were found in the examined literary works.



*da*                    *poddārža*                    *postojannata*                    *mirizma*  
 Subj.Mark        support.3Sg.Perf.Pres permanent+the.F.Sg    smell  
*na*    *piknja.*  
 of        piss

‘(S)he has almost never seen a living sole that would permanently smell of piss.’

- c.    *Do*    *sega*    *ne*        *sām*    *popadnal*                    *na*    Blg  
 until    now    not        be.1Sg come-across.M.Sg.l-Part    on  
*nekoj*                    *s*        *kojto*                    *da*  
 somebody.M.Sg        with    which.M.Sg+to.Anaph        Subj.Mark  
*e*        *trudno*        *da*                    *se*                    *raboti.*  
 be.3Sg difficult.N.Sg    Subj.Mark        Refl.Acc.Cl        work  
 ‘Up to now I haven’t met anybody with whom it would be difficult to work.’

### 5.2 Subjunctive relatives in interrogative existential sentences

Existential relatives can also occur in questions. The occurrence of the indefinite pronoun is typical om this case, especially in Macedonian (cf. 14),<sup>24</sup> though nouns modified by indefinite modifiers are also encountered. In Bulgarian the subjunctive relatives in questions are, as a rule, introduced by relativizers (cf. 15).<sup>25</sup>

- (14) a.    *Ima*                    *li*                    *nekoj*                    *da*                    Mac  
 have.Impers    Inter.Cl                    somebody        Subj.Mark  
*reagira*                    *na toj*                    *povik?*  
 react.3Sg.Imperf        to this.M        call  
 ‘Is there anybody to react to this call?’
- b.    *Zarem*                    *ima*                    *nekoj*                    *da*                    *mi*                    Mac  
 whether        have.Impers        somebody        Subj.Mark        1Sg.Dat.Cl  
*obrazloži*                    *kako*    *Ohrid nema*                    *univerzitet?*  
 explain.3Sg.Perf.Pres how    Ohrid not+have.3Sg university  
 ‘Is there anybody to explain to me how come there is no university in Ohrid?’
- c.    *Ima*                    *nekoj*                    *da*                    *mi*                    Mac  
 have.Impers        somebody        Subj.Mark        1Sg.Dat.Cl  
*kaže/preporača*                    *koj*                    *Internet*  
 tell/recommend.3Sg.Perf.Pres        which.M.Sg        Internet  
*prebaruvač*        *da*                    *go*                    *koristam?*  
 searcher        Subj.Mark        3Sg.M.Acc.Cl use.1Sg  
 ‘Is there anybody to tell/recommend to me which Internet searcher to use?’
- (15) a.    *Ima*                    *li*                    *žena*                    *kojato*                    Blg  
 have.Impers        Inter.Cl                    woman                    who.F.Sg+to.Anaph  
*da*                    *iska*                    *da*                    *se*  
 Subj.Mark        want.3Sg        Subj.Mark        Acc.Refl.Cl

<sup>24</sup> The sentences were found on the Internet.

<sup>25</sup> Sentence (15a) is from Semov (2004:13), while (15b) and (15c) were found in the Internet.



one such example, (17a), was found in a novel,<sup>26</sup> and a number of examples on the Internet; (17b-c) are two of the latter examples.

- (17) a. *Trjabvaše* *da* *se* Blg  
 be-necessary.Impers.Imperf Subj.Mark Acc.Refl.Cl  
*izmisli* *nešto* *po-taka,* *njakoj*  
 think-up.3Sg.Perf.Pres something Compar-so, some.M.Sg  
*trojanski kon ot dumi, kojto*  
 Trojan horse of words which.M.Sg+to.Anaph  
*da se vmäkne nezabeljazano*  
 Subj.Mark Acc.Refl.Cl sneak-in.3Sg.Perf.Pres imperceptibly  
*prez vestnika.*  
 through newspaper+the.M.Sg  
 ‘It was necessary to think of something more like that, some Trojan horse of words to sneak through the newspaper imperceptibly.’
- b. *Radvam se će ima mjesto,* Blg  
 rejoice.1Sg Acc.Refl.Cl that have.Impers place  
*koeto da obedinjava potrebitelite*  
 which.M.Sg+to.Anaph Subj.Mark unite.3Sg users+the.Pl  
*na Internet v Haskovo!*  
 of Internet in Haskovo  
 ‘I am glad that there is a place that unites the users of the Internet in Haskovo.’
- c. *Estestveno, će šte ima novi lica,* Blg  
 naturally that will.Mod.Cl have.Impers new.Pl persons  
*koito da sa nekorumpirani.*  
 which.Pl+to.Anaph Subj.Mark be.3Pl uncorrupted.Pl  
 ‘It is natural that there should be new persons that are not corrupted.’

Like other types of existential subjunctive relatives, the positive existential subjunctive relatives occur in non-factive contexts.<sup>27</sup>

## 6. Oblique subjunctive relatives

In Bulgarian, but not in Macedonian, there are two types of oblique subjunctive relatives – prepositional and predicative subjunctive relatives. In both types the relativizer is obligatory.

### 5.5 Prepositional subjunctive relatives

In prepositional subjunctive relatives the process of relativization involves an oblique co-reference relationship between the head noun in the matrix clause and its “wh” co-referent in the subjunctive clause. Whereas in the Bulgarian subjunctive relatives discussed so far there is a direct co-reference relation between the nominal in the matrix clause and the

<sup>26</sup> In Dimitrova (2004:6).

<sup>27</sup> In example (18a) the main verb is modally marked – it expresses the speaker’s desire for the existence of a particular scheme.

relativizer in subject position in the subjunctive clause, in the prepositional subjunctive relatives, the head nominal co-refers with the prepositional object in an adjunct in the subjunctive clause. The semantic representation of these sentences is as follows:

X (not) find Y such that Y does something or can be used in a certain way

Prepositional subjunctive relatives occur in sentences in which the verb of the main clause can be of any of the types discussed above. The preposition encodes a number of relationships – most commonly locative, associative and instrumental.

Prepositional subjunctive relatives expressing associative and locative relationships, in sentences with verbs of quest in the main clause, are exemplified in (18a) and (18b), respectively.<sup>28</sup>

- (18) a. *Tārsja* *si* *devojka* *s* Blg  
 look-for.1Sg.Imperf.Pres Dat.Refl.Cl girl with  
*kojato* *da* *se*  
 who.F.Sg+to.Anaph Subj.Mark Acc.Refl.Cl  
*razbirame.*  
 understand.1Pl.Imperf.Pres  
 ‘I am looking for a girl, such that we understand each other.’

- b. *Iskam doklad na OON, v kojto* Blg  
 want report on UN in which.M.Sg+to.Anaph  
*da piše jasno, če...*  
 Subj.Mark write.3Sg.Imperf.Pres clearly that...  
 ‘I want a report in which it is clearly stated that...’

In (19) we have prepositional subjunctive relatives in sentences with acquisition verbs in the main clause. The prepositional phrases in (19a), (19b) and (19c) express locative, associative and manner relationships, respectively:

- (19) a. *Daj si e-maila na* Blg  
 give.2Sg.Imper Dat.Refl.Cl e-mail+the.M.Sg on/to  
*kojto da ti pratja*  
 which.M.Sg+to.Event Subj.Mark 2Sg.Dat.Cl send.1Sg.Perf.Pres  
*tova, koeto pečatame nie.*  
 that which.Neut.Sg+to.Anaph print.1Pl.Imperf.Pres we  
 ‘Give me the e-mail number to which I can send you the things that we print.’

- b. *Nadjavam se da namerja* Blg  
 hope.1Sg.Imperf.Pres Refl.Acc.Cl Subj.Mark find.1Sg.Imperf.Pres  
*čovек s kojto da*  
 man with who.M.Sg+to.Anaph Subj.Mark

<sup>28</sup> All the examples in (18), (19) and (20) were found in the Internet.



*umeja da govorja, predi*  
 can.1Sg.Imperf.Pres Subj.Mark speak.1Sg.Imperf.Pres before  
*vsičko.*  
 everything

‘I hope to find a man to whom I can talk, first of all.’

- c. *Kažete mi način po kojto* Blg  
 tell.2Pl.Imper 1Sg.Dat.Cl way by which.M.Sg+to.Anaph  
*da podxodja kām*  
 Subj.Mark approach.1Sg.Perf.Pres towards  
*problema...*  
 problem+the.M.Sg  
 ‘Tell me a way to approach the problem.’

In (20) we have prepositional subjunctive relatives in sentences with existential verbs in the main clause. The prepositional phrases in (20a), (20b) and (20c) express locative, source, associative and instrumental relationships, respectively:

- (20) a. *Edva li ima občestvo, v* Blg  
 hardly Inter.Cl have.Impers society in  
*kojto da njama*  
 which.Neut.Sg+to.Anaph Subj.Mark not+have.Impers  
*njakakāv red.*  
 some-kind.M.Sg order  
 ‘There is hardly a society, in which there isn’t some kind of order.’
- b. *Ako njakoj znae sajt ot* Blg  
 if somebody know.3Sg site from  
*kojto da može da*  
 which.M.Sg+to.Anaph Subj.Mark can.Impers Subj.Mark  
*si namerja melodii...*  
 Acc.Refl.Cl find.1Sg.Perf.Pres tunes  
 ‘If somebody knows a site at which I can find music...’
- c. *Do sega ne sām popadnal na njakoj* Blg  
 until now not be.1Sg fall.M.Sg.l-Part on somebody.M.Sg  
*s kojto da e trudno*  
 with which.M.Sg+to.Anaph Subj.Mark be.3Sg difficult  
*da se raboti.*  
 Subj.Mark Refl.Acc.Cl work  
 ‘Up to now I haven’t met anybody with whom it would be difficult to work.’
- d. *Ima mnogo nešta s koito* Blg  
 have.Impers many things with which.M.Sg+to.Anaph  
*da se gordeem.*  
 Subj.Mark Acc.Refl.Cl pride.1Pl  
 ‘There are many things with which we can pride ourselves.’

## 6.2 *Predicative subjunctive relatives*

Predicative subjunctive relatives are a subtype of prepositional subjunctive relatives. As in the other prepositional subjunctive relatives, the relativizer functions as an object of a preposition in an adjunct. However, whereas the relativizers in other prepositional subjunctive relatives co-refer with complements or adjuncts, here the relativizer is co-referential with the predicate nominal. No examples of predicative subjunctive relatives were attested in the texts examined. Example (21) is from Tomić (2006: section 2.6 in the chapter “Infinitives and Subjunctives”).

- (21) *Tova e aparat šas kojto da Blg*  
 this be.3Sg device with which.M.Sg+to.Anaph Subj.Mark  
*se raboti vnimatelno.*  
 Acc.Refl.Cl work.3Sg.Imperf.Pres carefully  
 ‘This is a device which has to be handled carefully.’

## 7. **General conclusions**

In both Bulgarian and Macedonian, the internal arguments or adjuncts of verbs of quest or acquisition can be modified by subjunctive relative clauses. In Bulgarian, the subjunctive relatives are usually introduced by relativizers co-referential with the nominal to which the subjunctive relatives relate, and are thus formally distinct from subjunctive clauses functioning as adjuncts of purpose. In Macedonian, however, there are no relativizers, so that a subjunctive construction to the right of an internal argument has a dual interpretation: as a nominal modifier or as an adjunct of purpose. Several factors contribute to the nominal modifier reading.

### 7.1 *Indeterminacy*

The nominals to which the subjunctive relatives relate are unspecified. The non-referential status of this nominal is due to a pragmatic need to anchor a new participant in the discourse. Like the English infinitival relatives (cf. Givón 1990), the South-Slavic subjunctive relatives modify an indefinite participant by providing asserted information about the new participant, as opposed to presupposed information encoded by prototypical relative clauses. In Macedonian existential relatives, the indeterminacy of the matrix nominal plays a more important role than in Bulgarian, where the modifying function of the relative clause is marked by the relativizer.

### 7.2 *Object – Subject vs. Object – Prepositional Object*

Though all candidates for subjunctive relatives can also function as adjuncts of purpose, the modification reading is readily available in object control structures such as (22a) where the head nominal is co-referential with the underlying subject of the subjunctive clause, and is unavailable in control structures, such as (22b), where the head nominal is co-referential with an underlying adjunct.

- (22) a. *Baram čovek da go popravi Mac*  
 look-for.1Sg man Subj.Mark 3Sg.M.Acc.Cl repair.3Sg.Perf.Pres  
*krovot.*  
 roof+the.M.Sg  
 ‘I am looking for a man to repair the roof.’

- b. *Baram skala da go popravam Mac*  
 look-for.1Sg ladder Subj.Mark 3Sg.M.Acc.Cl repair.1Sg.Perf.Pres  
*krovot.*  
 roof+the.M.Sg  
 ‘I am looking for a ladder to repair the roof.’

The co-reference shift in (22b) signals that the Goal argument in the object position does not control the understood subject and the thematic continuity that enables the modification reading in (22a) is broken.<sup>29</sup> Furthermore, pragmatically-motivated factors such as discourse continuity lead to preference for object controlled subjunctive relatives with modification reading. The more common object relativization<sup>30</sup> is probably due to discourse factors. Thus May (1990:9) claims that “the Theme of the matrix persist as a theme for discourse, since the empty slot tends to take the matrix theme as a co-referent.”

The existence of the relativizer in Bulgarian provides for formal means to represent oblique relativization. A preposition plus relativizer sequence links the subjunctive relative clause to the matrix clause. In oblique relative clauses, as mentioned in section 6, the head nominal is co-referential with a prepositional object in an adjunct. In Macedonian, on the other hand, the head nominal can only co-refer with an empty subject position in the subjunctive clause.

### 7.3 Imperfectivity

Subjunctive relatives are characterized by the atelicity of the purpose event that has acquired state-like properties. This is much more readily achieved if the verb is in the imperfective aspect, than if it is in the perfective aspect. Thus, the subjunctive clause in the Macedonian sentence (23a) may have a reading as a modifier of the noun to its left, whereas in (23b), which differs from (23a) only in the aspect of the verb in the subjunctive clause, such a reading is not available:

- (23) a. *Baram žena da gi Mac*  
 look-for.1Sg woman Subj.Mark 3Pl.Acc.Cl  
*čisti skalite.*  
 clean.3Sg.Imperf.Pres steps+the.Pl  
 ‘I am looking for a woman to clean the steps.’
- b. *Baram žena da gi Mac*  
 look-for.1Sg woman Subj.Mark 3Pl.Acc.Cl  
*isčisti skalite.*  
 clean.3Sg.Perf.Pres steps+the.Pl  
 ‘I am looking for a woman to clean up the steps.’

<sup>29</sup> According to Geisler (1998) the difference between the object and subject relatives is based on the discourse position of the element that anchors the non-referring participant in the conversational space. In object relative clauses, the anchoring is performed by the agent (Subject) of the relative clause, via reference outside the clause, whereas in subject relatives the subordinate object NP anchors the antecedent by being anaphoric to it.

<sup>30</sup> In Keenan and Comrie’s (1977) relativization hierarchy, subject relativization is more common.

Nevertheless, in Bulgarian, where subjunctive relatives are predominately introduced by relativizers, the subjunctive relatives can have a perfective verb referring to the future, futurity being understood as a special case of extemporal truth or genericity. The following examples are from the Internet:

- (24) a. *Njamam vreme otnovo da tãrsja* Blg  
 Not+have.1Sg time again Subj.Mark look-for.1Sg.Imperf.Pres  
*mãža na života si, kojto*  
 man+the.M.Sgof life+the.F.Sg Refl.Dat.Cl who.M.Sg+to.Anaph  
*da stane i bašta na*  
 Subj.Mark become.3Sg.Perf.Pres and father to  
*deteto mi.*  
 child+the.Neut.Sg 1Sg.Dat.Cl  
 ‘I have no time to look again for the man of my life, who would become father of my child.’
- b. *Kãžete mi naçin po kojto* Blg  
 Tell.2Pl.Imper 1Sg.Dat.Cl way by which.M.Sg+to.Anaph  
*da podhoda kãm*  
 Subj.Mark approach.1Sg.Perf.Pres towards  
*problema...*  
 problem+the.M.Sg  
 ‘Tell me a way to approach the problem...’

To conclude, our analysis has shown that, in Bulgarian, subjunctive relatives have a wide distribution and are only to a limited extent dependent on semantic factors, whereas in Macedonian they occur only if a number of semantic factors are satisfied and can always be alternatively interpreted as adjuncts of purpose. The distribution and variability of environments where subjunctive relatives occur correlates with the presence of the relativizer. In Bulgarian, where they are introduced by relativizers, the subjunctive relatives have a wide unconstrained distribution and great syntagmatic variability, whereas in Macedonian where they are not introduced by relativizers, the occurrence and variability of subjunctive relatives is restricted.

It is noteworthy that the correlation between the distribution and variability of subjunctive relatives, on the one hand, and the presence of relativizer, on the other, obtains in other Balkan languages. The subjunctive relatives in Modern Greek and the Balkan Romance languages are introduced by relativizers and have a wide distribution in a variety of environments (cf. Bužarovska 2004; Farkas 1985). The analysis has shown that, in both formal and syntactic features, Bulgarian subjunctive relatives are more similar to their Romanian counterparts than to the Macedonian subjunctive relatives. Topolinjska (1996:7) suggests, there seems to exist a Bulgarian-Romanian common structural zone vs. a Macedonian-Aroumanian zone within the Balkan Sprachbund. This zoning applies to the subjunctive relatives.

## References

- Bužarovska, Eleni. 2002. “The Purpose-Modification Continuum: Purposive *Da*-Relatives in Macedonian”. *Southwest Journal of Linguistics* 21/2. 67-98.

- Bužarovska, Eleni. 2004. "The distribution of subjunctive relatives in Balkan languages". In Tomić, Olga Mišeska ed. 2004. *Balkan Syntax and Semantics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 377-404.
- Bybee, Joan, Revere Perkins, and William Pagliuca. 1994. *The Evoluton of Grammar: tense, aspect, and modality in the languages of the world*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Farkas, Donka. 1985. *Intensional Descriptions and the Romance Subjunctive Mood*. New York/London: Garland Publishing.
- Geisler, Christian. 1998. "Infinitival Relatives in Spoken Discourse". *Language Variation and Change* 10. 23-41.
- Givón, Talmy. 1993. *English Grammar*. Vol. 2. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Grosu, Alexander. 2004. "The Syntax-Semantics of Modal Existential 'wh' Constructions". In Tomić Olga Mišeska ed. 2004. *Balkan Syntax and Semantics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.. 405-438.
- Joseph, Brian. 1983. *The Synchrony and Diachrony of the Balkan Infinitive: A study in areal, general and historic linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Keenan, Edward and Bernard Comrie. 1977. "Noun Phrase Accessibility and Universal Grammar". *Linguistic Inquiry* 8/1. 63-99.
- Ladusaw, William and David Dowty. 1985. "Thematic Relations". In Wendy Wilkins ed. *Syntax and Semantics*. Vol. 21. New York: Academic Press. 61-73.
- May, Thor. 1990. "Purposive Constructions in English". *Australian Journal of Linguistics* 10. 1- 40.
- Mazon, André. 1936. *Documents, contes et chansons slaves de l'Albanie du Sud*. Paris.
- Nishigaushi, Taisuke. 1984. "Control and the Thematic Domain". *Language* 60/2. 215-250.
- Rudin, Catherine. 1985. *Aspects of Bulgarian Syntax: Complementizers and WH Constructions*. Columbus: Slavica Publishers.
- Topolinjska, Zuzanna. 1995. "Convergent Evolution, Creolization and Referentiality". In Eva Hajičova, M. Červenka, O. Leška and Peter Sgall eds. *Prague Linguistic Circle Papers*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 239-247.
- Topolinjska, Zuzanna. 1996. *Studii od makedonska-bugarska jazična konfrontacija*. [Studies of the Macedonian-Bulgarian linguistic Confrontation]. Skopje: MANU.
- Tomić, Olga Mišeska. 2004. "The Balkan Sprachbund properties: Introduction". In Tomić, Olga Mišeska ed. 2004. *Balkan Syntax and Semantics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 1-57.
- Tomić, Olga Mišeska. 2006. *The Balkan Sprachbund Morpho-Syntactic Features*. Dordrecht: Springer.