

2. a. Može da mi se obadi kojto i da e.
 can_{3SG} to me REFL call_{3SG} who *i da* is
 ‘Anyone can call me.’ WIP—B
- b. Može da mi se javi koj i da e.
 can_{3SG} to me REFL call_{3SG} who *i da* is
 ‘Anyone can call me.’ WIP—M

Both UCCs and WIPs contain a *wh*-element, *i* and *da* (boldfaced throughout the article and untranslated in the glosses) followed by a verb or verbal phrase. They differ from each other most obviously in what the verb can be: only a form of ‘to be’ in WIP, while any verb may occur in UCC. Subtler differences include their syntactic position with respect to the matrix clause, word order with modified nouns, the possibility of multiword *wh*-phrases, the possibility of containing subjects, objects and other clausal elements, and thus arguably status as a full-fledged clause for UCCs as opposed to a frozen nominal or adjectival form in the case of WIPs.

The Bulgarian and Macedonian instantiations of these two constructions are extremely similar, but differ in the obligatory presence *vs.* absence of the suffix *-to* on the *wh*-word. The analysis of this suffix is problematic (see, for instance, Rudin 2009 and forthcoming). It has been taken as essential to the semantic interpretation of UCCs in Bulgarian (Izvorski 2000), but this clearly cannot be correct, given that Macedonian UCCs without *-to* have exactly the same interpretation.

The organization of the article is as follows: *Sections 1* and *2* introduce the basic facts of UCCs and WIPs, respectively, in both Bulgarian and Macedonian. *Section 3* contrasts the two constructions in terms of their internal syntactic form, external syntactic behavior and semantic characteristics. *Section 4* elaborates on the role and functions of the various constituent elements of the constructions: *wh*, *i*, *da* and *-to*. Finally, *Section 5* is a brief conclusion, focusing on the utility of comparing closely related languages and constructions.

1. A First Look at UCC

Universal Concessive Conditionals are adjoined clauses which assert that the proposition expressed by the main clause is true regardless of a choice among

options or in any possible world. Consider the English examples in (3), with two different types of UCC:

3. a. Whatever I eat, I never lose any weight.
 b. I never lose any weight, no matter what I eat.

The main clause, *I never lose any weight*, is a complete independent clause; the underlined UCC is not an argument or any type of constituent of this main clause, but rather stands outside it, adjoined at the beginning or end (or possibly inserted as a parenthetical). The UCC asserts that the proposition *I never lose any weight* is true regardless of choice of food: candy, celery, spaghetti or any other option.

UCCs vary in their expression in the languages of the world, but they virtually always involve a *wh*-element and often include a free-choice operator (*-ever* in our example), negation (*no matter*) or other *irrealis* markers including modal auxiliaries and/or subjunctive, hortative or imperative mood. For a general typological overview of UCCs, see Haspelmath and König 1998; studies of their syntax and semantics in some Slavic languages include Rudin 2012, Rudin and Franks 2014, Citko 2003 and van de Kruys 2011.

1.1. Basic Description of UCCs in Bulgarian

As mentioned above, Bulgarian UCCs have the form ***wh-to i da*** plus a verbal phrase (probably TP, though its exact identity is immaterial for this article). Various *wh*-words occur, always with the *-to* suffix characteristic of relative as opposed to interrogative *wh*-words (e.g., *koj* ‘who’ [interrogative]; *kojto* ‘who’ [relative pronoun]). Examples with several different *wh*-words are given in (4):

4. a. **Kojto i da** pobedi v Germanija,
 who i da win_{3SG} in Germany
 šte ni donese problemi.
 will to-us bring_{3SG} problems
 ‘Whoever wins in Germany, it will cause us problems.’

- b. **Kakvoto i da** pravite — pravete go na svetlo!
 what *i da* do_{2PL} do_{IMP} it in light
 ‘Whatever you do, do it in the light!’ (ad for a lighting company)
- c. Dejstvajte, **kolkoto i da** e trudno!
 act_{IMP} how-much *i da* is hard
 ‘Do something, no matter how hard it is!’

In addition to simple *wh*-words, complex *wh*-phrases can also occur. In this case, as shown in (5-6), *i* can follow the entire *wh*-phrase (the “a” versions) or only the *wh* word (the “b” versions).

5. a. **kolkoto daleč i da** zamina, ...
 how-much far *i da* set-off_{1SG}
- b. **kolkoto i daleč da** zamina, ...
 how-much *i* far *da* set-off_{1SG}
 ‘no matter how far away I go, ...’
6. a. **kakvoto objasnenie i da** izmisliš, ...
 what-kind explanation *i da* think-up_{2SG}
- b. **kakvoto i objasnenie da** izmisliš, ...
 what-kind *i* explanation *da* think-up_{2SG}
 ‘no matter what kind of explanation you come up with, ...’

Finally, note that as in other Bulgarian *wh*-constructions, multiple *wh* is possible, and if more than one *wh*-phrase occurs, all of them must front to the beginning of the clause.¹

7. a. **Kakvoto kădeto i da** krija, vse go namirat.
 what where *i da* hide_{1SG} always it find_{3PL}
 ‘No matter what I hide where, they always find it.’

- b. **Kojto** **kakvoto** **i** **da** vi pomoli,
 who what *i* *da* you request_{3SG}
 prosto ne možete da otkazete.
 simply NEG can_{2PL} to refuse_{2PL}
 ‘No matter who asks you for what, you simply can’t
 refuse.’

1.2. Basic Description of UCCs in Macedonian

Macedonian UCCs are very similar to those of Bulgarian, the only significant difference being the lack of any suffix corresponding to *-to*. The form of the construction is *wh i da* plus a verbal phrase; examples with a variety of *wh* words are shown in (8):

8. a. **Kolku** **i** **da** e skap, ke go
 how-much *i* *da* is expensive, will it
 kupi
 buy_{3SG}
 ‘No matter how expensive it is, he will buy it.’
- b. **Koga** **i** **da** odam doma, se
 when *i* *da* go_{1SG} home REFL
 čuvstvuvam ubavo.
 feel_{1SG} nice
 ‘No matter when I go home, I feel good.’
- c. **Kogo** **i** **da** vidiš, ne kažuvaj, deka
 whom *i* *da* see_{2SG} NEG say_{IMP} that
 sum vo gradot.
 am in city-the
 ‘No matter who you see, don’t tell them I’m in town.’

As in Bulgarian, complex *wh*-phrases occur, with two possible word orders, *i* following either the *wh*-word alone or the entire *wh*-phrase:

9. a. **Kolku i dobro da go**
 how-much *i* well *da* it
 ne poznavame, čoveškoto telo nikogaš
 neg know_{1PL} human-the body never
 prestanuva da nè iznenaduva.
 ceases to us surprise
 ‘No matter how well we know it, the human body
 never ceases to surprise us.’
- b. **Kolko dobro i da go ne poznavame, ...**
10. a. **Kakvi i podaroci da mi kupat, ...**
 what-kind *i* presents *da* me buy_{3PL}
 ‘No matter what kind of presents they buy me, ...’
- b. **Kakvi podaroci i da mi kupat, ...**

Multiple *wh*-UCCs are possible, though not common; two examples are given in (11).

11. a. **Koj kade i da odi, nikogaš**
 who where *i da* go_{3SG} never
 nema da se čuvstvuva tolku
 won’t to REFL feel_{3SG} as
 dobro kako doma.
 good as home
 ‘Wherever anyone goes, they’ll never feel as good
 as at home.’
- b. **Koj što i da reče za nego,**
 who what *i da* say_{3SG} about him
 toj e dobar čovek.
 he is good person
 ‘No matter who says what about him, he’s a good
 person.’

We return to a deeper examination of some of these points below, but first, a brief introduction to the other construction of interest, the WIP.

2. *A First Look at WIP*

Unlike the very widespread (perhaps universal) UCC construction, the *Wh*-Indefinite Pronominal (WIP) construction found in Bulgarian and Macedonian is idiosyncratic, idiomatic and not found in most languages.² It is a *wh*-expression with the form of a (very restricted type of) relative clause, superficially identical in simple cases to UCCs in each language but functioning as an indefinite pronominal or other indefinite pro-form.

2.1. *WIP in Bulgarian*

Wh-Indefinite Pronominals are phrases which express something like “any X at all.” In Bulgarian these normally take the form *wh-to i da e* or *wh-to i da bilo*. A few examples are given in (12)

12. a. Njamaše vreme da napravi **kakvoto**
 wasn't time to do what
i da bilo.
i da was
 ‘There was no time to do anything at all.’
- b. Ne lipsva **kojato i da e** čast
 NEG lack_{3SG} what-kind *i da* is part
 na izrečenieto.
 of sentence-the
 ‘No part of the sentence (at all) is missing.’
- c. Ako imaš **kakvito i da e** vāprosi, ...
 if have_{2SG} what-kind *i da* is questions
 ‘If you have any questions at all, ...’

This looks superficially simply like a UCC with a ‘be’ verb, but closer inspection shows that the two constructions differ both in internal form and external syntactic behavior, as we will see in *Section 3*, below.

As suggested by their name, WIPs function as essentially a kind of frozen pronominal construction. Hauge (1999) refers to them as “Composite All-Quantifying Pronouns,” and includes under the same label a very similar construction with the form *wh da e* instead of *wh-to i da e/bilo*, which we may consider a second type of WIP.³ He points out that these differ in scope interpretation. In a negative context like (13), negation scopes over the *wh*-universal quantifier in (13a) but below it in (13b) (examples from Hauge, p. 67).

13. a. Toj njama da govori s **kogo da**
 he won’t to talk_{3SG} with whom *da*
e (a samo s direktora).
 is but only with director-the
 ‘He won’t talk to [just] anyone (but only to the director).’

- b. Toj njama da govori s **kogoto i da**
 he won’t to talk_{3SG} with whom *i da*
bilo / s **kogoto i da e**.
 was / with whom *i da* is
 ‘He won’t talk to anyone [to nobody at all].’

2.2. WIP in Macedonian

As with UCCs, Macedonian WIPS once again are similar to those of Bulgarian, but without the suffix *-to* on the *wh*-word. Their basic form is *wh (i) da e*. The following examples are from Kramer 1999.

14. a. Možeš da mi se javiš **koga i da e**.
 can_{2SG} to me REFL call_{2SG} when *i da* is
 ‘You may call me any time.’
- b. **Koj i da e** će može da ti objasni.
 who *i da* is will can_{3SG} to you explain_{3SG}
 ‘Anyone could explain it to you.’

- c. Vo **koj i da e** grad **ke** najdete takvi
 in which *i da* is city will find_{2PL} such
 prodavnici.
 stores
 ‘In any city you will find such stores.’

The *i* is optional in all of these, so for instance (14c) could be *Vo koj da e grad ...*, with little if any change in meaning or usage. Macedonian also has two other ways of expressing “any at all”: *wh bilo* (or *bilo wh*) and *wh-gode*. Thus Kramer gives (15a-b) as alternatives to (14c); I do not deal with these alternate constructions specifically, but their external syntax appears to be identical to that of the *wh (i) da e* type of WIP.⁴

15. a. Vo **koj bilo / bilo koj** grad **ke** najdete takvi prodavnici.
 b. Vo **koj-gode** grad **ke** najdete takvi prodavnici.

3. Differentiating UCC and WIP

Universal Concessive Conditionals and *Wh*-Indefinite Pronominals, in spite of their superficially similar form, differ in both internal and external syntax, that is, they contrast both in the composition of the UCC/WIP itself and in its relation to the rest of the sentence. They also differ semantically. In this section, I summarize these differences. For the sake of simplicity I give only Bulgarian examples in most of this section, but the Macedonian facts are parallel.

3.1. Differences in Internal Form

Internally WIPs are much more limited in their possible constituents than UCCs; the form [***wh-word-to i da e/bilo***] in Bulgarian or [***wh-word (i) da e***] is essentially a frozen idiom. There are several aspects to this frozen form. First, WIPs always contain a form of *be* (*e* or *bilo*), unlike UCCs which can contain any verb. Second, WIPs can only have a single *wh*-word, never a complex *wh*-phrase, nor multiple *wh*-words or phrases. Third, WIPs cannot contain any other elements, unlike UCCs which can have subjects, objects and all the other parts of a normal clause.

The two examples in (16) show that a complex *wh*-phrase like *kakvito vāprosi* cannot occur in a WIP, either with *i* following the whole phrase (16a) or just the *wh* word (16b). In contrast the identical phrase freely occurs in a UCC in (17); compare also (9) and (10) above.

16. a. *Ako imaš **kakvito vāprosi i da** e, ...
 if have_{2SG} what-kind questions *i da* is
- b. *Ako imaš **kakvito i vāprosi da** e, ...
 if have_{2SG} what-kind *i* questions *da* is
 (intended: ‘if you have any questions at all/any
 kind of questions, ...’)
17. **Kakvito i vāprosi da** imaš, mālči.
 what-kind *i* questions *da* have_{2SG} be-silent_{IMP}
 ‘No matter what kind of questions you have, be quiet.’

This leads to apparent differences in word order in UCC *vs.* WIP. With an adjectival WIP, as in (18), the modified N comes after the whole WIP, including *da e*; an order which would be impossible in a UCC. Since the entire *wh*-phrase (*kakvito vāprosi* in this set of examples) must front in a UCC, the two possible word orders in a UCC are those in (19a-b), exactly the opposite of the pattern we find in the WIP in (18), where *kakvito i da e* must stick together as a unit..

18. a. Ako imaš **kakvito i da e**
 if have_{2SG} what-kind *i da* is
 vāprosi, ...
 questions
 ‘If you have any questions at all, ...’
- b. *Ako imaš **kakvito vāprosi i da e**, ...
- c. *Ako imaš **kakvito i vāprosi da e**, ...

19. a. **Kakvito i vāprosi da** imaš, ...
 what-kind *i* questions *da* have_{2SG}
 ‘No matter what kind of questions you have, ...’
- b. **Kakvito vāprosi i da** imaš, ...
 what-kind questions *i da* have_{2SG}
- c. ***kakvito i da** imaš **vāprosi**

Another manifestation of the limited form of WIPs is that multiple *wh* is not possible. In comparison to the grammaticality of multiple *wh*-UCCs, (20a) and (20b), which attempt to construct WIPs based on Bulgarian (7) and on Macedonian (11b), respectively, are both bad.

20. a. *Ivan ne e nameril **kakvoto kădeto**
 Ivan NEG has found what where
i da e.
i da is
 (intended: ‘Ivan didn’t find anything anywhere.’)
- b. ***Koj što i da e** ke može
 who what *i da* is will can_{3SG}
 da ti objasni.
 to you explain_{3SG}
 (intended: ‘Anyone could explain anything to you.’)

In addition, WIPs cannot contain any other elements, unlike UCCs which can have subjects, objects and all the other parts of a normal clause. In (21), the UCCs contain a subject (*Ivan*), a prepositional phrase/indirect object (*na podobni hora*), and a direct object (*klavišite*).

21. a. **Kakvoto i da** sgotvi Ivan, ...
 what *i da* cook_{3SG} Ivan
 ‘No matter what Ivan cooks, ...’

- b. **Kolkoto i da** sačuvstvat
 how-much *i da* sympathize_{3PL}
 na podobni hora, ...
 to similar people
 ‘No matter how much they sympathize
 with such people, ...’
- c. **Čijto i rāce da** natiskat
 whose *i* hands *da* press_{3PL}
 klavišite, programata e edna i sašta.
 keys-the program-the is one and same
 ‘No matter whose hands press the keys, the program is
 exactly the same.’

An attempt to create corresponding WIPs places these elements in the main clause; the WIP consists only of the boldfaced *wh i da* e.

22. a. Ivan e saqlasen da sgotvi
 Ivan is willing to cook_{3SG}
kakvoto i da e.
 what *i da* is
 ‘Ivan is willing to cook anything at all.’
- b. Ne sačuvstvat **kolkoto**
 neg sympathize_{3PL} how-much
i da e na podobni hora
i da is to similar people
 ‘They don’t sympathize [any amount] at all with
 such people.’
- c. Može da natiskat klavišite **čijto**
 can to press_{3PL} keys whose
i da e rāce
i da is hands.
 ‘Anyone at all’s hands can press the keys.’

3.2. Differences in External Syntax

In terms of their external syntax the main difference between UCC and WIP is their status as adjoined clause on the one hand versus nominal, adjectival or adverbial constituent of the main clause on the other. In (23a), we see that the UCC is outside the main clause; it is an optional adjunct, and the main clause, marked by square brackets, would be a complete sentence without it. On the contrary the WIPs in the remaining examples form part of the main clause: the WIP is a nominal argument (direct object) in (23b), an adjectival modifying “screen” in (23c) and an adverbial complement to the verb in (23d).

23. a. **Po** **kojto** **i** **păt** **da** **idete**, [šte zakāsneete].
 by which *i* path *da* go will be-late
 ‘Whichever way you go, you’ll be late.’
- b. Lično ne iskam **kakvoto** **i** **da**
 personally NEG want_{1SG} what *i* *da*
 bito ot nego.
 was from him
 ‘Personally, I don’t want anything at all from him.’
- c. Možete da kazvate “ok” ot **kojto**
 can_{2PL} to say_{3PL} OK from which
 i **da** **e** ekran na telefona si.
 i *da* is screen of telephone your
 ‘You can say “OK” from any screen of your telephone.’
- d. Njama da hodja **kădeto** **i** **da** **e**.
 won’t_{1SG} to go_{1SG} where *i* *da* is
 ‘I won’t go anywhere.’

WIPs are traditionally treated as a type of complex pronoun; see, e.g., Rå Hauge 1999, p. 66-67; Guentcheva 1981. This analysis seems to be essentially correct with the caveat that it can play roles other than nominal.

Nominal and adverbial WIPs look very much like free relative clauses, which are also *wh*-constructions functioning as arguments of the higher clause,

usually nominal but sometimes adjectival or adverbial; compare the boldfaced free relatives in (24) to the UCCs in (23).

24. a. Lično iskam **kakvoto** **ima**
 personally want_{1SG} what there-is
v **kutijata.**
 in box-the
 ‘Personally, I want what’s in the box.’
- b. Njama da hodja **kădeto** **hodiš ti.**
 won’t_{1SG} to go_{1SG} where go_{2SG} you
 ‘I won’t go where you go.’

However, once again WIPs are distinguished by their tightly restricted form, as well as by their semantics, to which we turn in the next section.

In Macedonian, WIPs and free relatives differ in one additional way. Free relatives, like other relative clause types, optionally allow the complementizer *što* to follow the *wh*-word; see (25a-b).⁵ However, this is not possible in WIPs, as shown by the asterisk in (25c), nor for that matter in UCCs like (25d).

25. a. Ķe dademe **kolku** **(što)** **imame.**
 will give_{1PL} how-much that have_{1PL}
 ‘We will give as much as we have.’
- b. **Koj** **(što)** **ķe** **dojde** **na** **vreme, ...**
 who that will come_{3SG} on time
 ‘Whoever comes on time, ... / He who comes on time, ...’
- c. Možeš da mi se javiš **koga (*što)**
 can_{2SG} to me REFL call_{2SG} when that
i **da** **e.**
i *da* is
 ‘You may call me any time.’

- d. Ne se v^ra^kaj nazad **kolku** (*što)
 NEG REFL turn_{IMP} back how-much that
 i **da** **boli.**
 i *da* hurt_{3SG}
 ‘Don’t turn back, no matter how much it hurts.’

3.3. Differences in Meaning

As hinted in the example glosses throughout the article, WIPs and UCCs differ subtly in meaning. A formal semantic treatment of the two constructions is beyond the scope of this article, but informally speaking, the difference in meaning is roughly one of universal *vs.* indefinite interpretation. A UCC states that the associated main clause is true in all possible worlds, regardless of circumstances. A WIP, on the other hand, may imply that any of a set of choices is possible, any of the options is to be chosen, or in the case of a negated main clause, none of the choices is possible. WIPs are most naturally translated into English with an *any* or *just any* phrase instead of the *whatever* or *no-matter* clause that translates a UCC. The meanings of the two constructions can and do overlap, but they are not identical.

4. On the Role of *wh*, *i*, *da* and *-to*

One of the most interesting questions about UCCs is why they contain the particular set of grammatical morphemes which characterize them – namely, *wh*, *i*, *da*, and in the case of Bulgarian, the suffix *-to*. How do these morphosyntactic parts create the meaning of the whole construction? For WIPs this question is both less interesting and harder to study, since as frozen idioms their parts presumably no longer play much of an active role morphologically, syntactically or semantically. But WIPs must have developed from UCCs historically and the component parts of the WIP must have had the same function as in the UCC construction. Even now they are not entirely an unanalyzable unit. For instance, in Bulgarian the semantic difference between the two types of WIP, *wh-to i da e/bilo* and *wh da e*, depends on the presence of *-to* and *i* in the first type and their absence in the second type. Nonetheless, the issues are clearer in UCCs and I therefore concentrate on UCCs in the following subsections, with only brief remarks on WIPs. I briefly explore the relatively straightforward contribution of *wh*, *i* and *da* to

the structure and meaning of the construction in *Section 4.1* and briefly consider the much thornier problem of the role of *-to* in *Section 4.2*.

4.1. *wh, i, da*

Semantically, UCCs in all languages involve elements expressing choice among alternatives, universal quantification or focus, and irrealis/modality. (See Haspelmath and König (1998) for a typological overview⁶ and Citko (2003) for an analysis of how this semantics is computed from a variety of syntactic elements in different languages.) In Bulgarian and Macedonian *wh*, *i* and *da* each express one of the components of the meaning of UCCs. The functions of *wh* and especially *i* and *da* are discussed and analyzed in considerably more detail in Rudin (2012) and Rudin and Franks (2014). Here, I simply summarize the conclusions of those earlier works.

As in other *wh*-constructions, including questions, the *wh*-element in the UCCs signals a choice among options, accounting for the portion of the meaning of a UCC concerned with choice: in (26b), there is a range of various clothing options implied, just as in the corresponding question (26a). WIPs also involve choice among options as in (26c).

26. a. Kakvo nosjat?
 what wear_{3PL}
 ‘What are they wearing?’ (jeans, dresses, shorts, ...)
- b. Kakvoto i da nosjat, ...
 what i da wear_{3PL}
 ‘Whatever they wear, ...’ (jeans, dresses, shorts, ...)
- c. Može da nosiš kakvoto i da e.
 can to wear_{2SG} what i da is
 ‘You can wear anything at all’ (jeans, dresses, shorts, ...)

The second element of the UCC and WIP constructions, *i*, is a focus marker, not to be confused with the homophonous coordinating conjunction *i* ‘and.’ This focusing *i* is also seen in many other constructions in Bulgarian and Macedonian, including,

for example, conditional clauses like (27a) and focused constituents like the noun phrase in (27b); note the translation as emphatic ‘even.’

27. a. **i** **da** **znaex** ...
 i *da* knew_{1SG}
 ‘even if I had known’
- b. **i** **decatata**
 i children-the
 ‘even the children’

i thus plays somewhat the same role as the free-choice suffix *-ever* in English UCCs with *wh-ever*, emphasizing the unrestricted choice of options expressed by the *wh*-element. The two positions of *i* in Bulgarian and Macedonian UCCs, following the whole *wh*-phrase or only the *wh*-word, result from the fact that either the *wh*-word or *wh*-phrase can be focused; all and only the focused portion of the UCC precedes *i*. The very subtle difference in emphasis was not mentioned in connection with earlier examples ((5-6) and (9-11)) but is shown by upper case representing emphasis in (28-29).

28. a. **KOLKOTO** **i** **daleč** **da** **zaminem**, ...
 how-much-to *i* far *da* depart_{1PL}
 ‘HOWEVER far we go, ...’
- b. **KOLKOTO DALEČ** **i** **da** **zaminem**, ...
 ‘HOWEVER FAR we go, ...’
29. a. **KOLKU** **i** **dobar** **da** **e** **prevodot**,
 how-much *i* good *da* is translation,
 original *si* e original.
 original REFL is original
 ‘HOWEVER good the translation is, an original is
 still an original.’
- b. **KOLKU DOBAR** **i** **da** **e** **prevodot**, ...
 ‘HOWEVER GOOD the translation is, ...’

Notice that *i* follows the focused *wh*-word/phrase rather than preceding it, as does the focused material in non-*wh* constructions like those in (27). This is presumably due to fronting of the *wh*-element over the focus head *i* to a specifier position; something like (30a). I suggest that this movement is triggered by the *wh*-phrase's status as an operator. In non-*wh* focus constructions the specifier position is occupied by a null focus operator, shown as "OP" in (30b); in *wh*-focus constructions the *wh*-phrase is the operator and moves into the operator position.⁷

30. a. [FocP *wh* [Foc **i** ~~*wh*~~ ...]]

b. [FocP OP [Foc **i** *dvamata*]]

The focus marker *i* plays a role in WIPs as well, at least in Bulgarian. Recall from *Section 2.1* above that there are two types of WIPs in Bulgarian, one with *i* and one without, which differ in relative scope of negation and universal quantification. The type with *i* has wide scope of the universal quantifier, suggesting (covert) movement of the focused *wh+i* in (31b) above negation, while the non-focused *wh* in (31a) remains below negation and thus has narrow scope.

31. a. ne ... **koj** **da** **e**
 NEG who *da* is
 'not just anyone' (only certain people=narrow scope)

b. ne ... **kojto** **i da** **e**
 NEG who *i da* is
 'not anyone at all' (nobody=wide scope)

This distinction is not available in Macedonian, to the best of my knowledge. In Macedonian WIPs, *i* is generally said to be optional; no semantic difference is noted between *wh da e* and *wh i da e*. The sentence in (32) has the wide scope "nobody" interpretation in spite of lacking *i*; it does not mean that "not just anyone" is here.

32. Nema **koj** **da e** tuka da ja razveseli dušava.
 there-isn't who *da* is here to it cheer_{3SG} soul-the
 'There's no one here to cheer my soul.'

Finally, turning to the third element of UCC and WIP, *da* is a marker of modality, a modal particle, instantiating the non-real modality that characterizes UCCs cross-linguistically. This *irrealis* quality is expressed in Polish (33), for instance, by means of a negative and a conditional element, and in other languages through a variety of other means.

33. Czego **bym nie** zjadła, to robi
 what COND NEG eat, it makes
 mi się niedobrze.
 me REFL unwell
 ‘Whatever I eat, I feel sick.’

The modality of Bulgarian *da* has frequently been discussed and demonstrated in grammatical traditions going back at least a century; it is commonly labeled “subjunctive,” and has optative, dubitative, conditional, purposive and other uses, all instantiating a basic meaning of potential rather than realized or asserted truth.

34. a. **Da** trǎgnem.
da leave
 ‘Let’s leave.’
- b. **Da** ne si bolen?
da not are ill
 ‘Are you perhaps ill?’
- c. **Da** bi mi kazal
da would me told
 ‘If he had told me, ...’
- d. Dojdoha **da** me vidjat.
 came-3p *da* me see-3p
 ‘They came (in order) to see me.’

Macedonian *da* has also been studied in depth (e.g., Kramer 1986) and has much the same range of functions. For a summary of some of the masses of work on *da*

in Bulgarian and Macedonian as well as similar particles in other Balkan languages, see Krapova 2001 and Ammann and van der Auwera 2004.

To summarize this section, three of the components of Bulgarian and Macedonian UCCs – and to some extent WIPs – have clear functions: *wh* indicates a range of options, *i* marks focus and universal quantification, and *da* provides non-real modality. These three elements together account for the semantics of the UCC construction; roughly, an unlimited choice among possible worlds. For Macedonian UCCs this is all there is: *wh i da* plus a verb phrase. In Bulgarian, we need to talk about one more element, *-to*.

4.2. What Is *-to*?

In comparing Bulgarian and Macedonian, by far the most interesting of the components of the UCC is the suffix *-to* on the *wh*-word, seen in Bulgarian examples throughout this paper. This suffix is absolutely required in Bulgarian UCCs and one type of WIP, but nothing like it occurs in Macedonian; the *wh*-word in UCCs and WIPs is always bare. Compare Bulgarian (35a-b) to Macedonian (35c-d).

35. a. **Kogato i da** hodja v kăšti, ...
 when-*to* *i da* go_{1SG} in house
 ‘No matter when I go home, ...’
- b. Hodja tam **kogato i da** e.
 go_{1SG} there when-*to* *i da* is
 ‘I go there any time.’
- c. **Koga i da** odam doma, ...
 when *i da* go_{1SG} home
 ‘No matter when I go home, ...’
- d. Odam tamo **koga i da** e.
 go_{1SG} there when *i da* is
 ‘I go there any time.’

The same contrast is found in a wide range of non-interrogative *wh*-constructions in the two languages. Questions in both languages have bare, unsuffixed *wh*-words. In relative clauses, Bulgarian always has the *-to* suffix on the *wh* word (36a), while in Macedonian the relative complementizer *što* can follow the *wh* (as mentioned in Section 3.2, above) but is optional, as indicated by the parentheses in (36b).⁸

- 36.a. Tozi **kojto** govori...
 that who-*to* talks
 ‘The one who is talking ...’
- b. Onoj **koj(što)** zboruva...
 that who-*što* talks
 ‘The one who is talking ...’

The obligatoriness of Bulgarian *-to* holds for all types of relative clauses (headed, “light-headed” and headless, with single or multiple *wh*), as well as for other non-interrogative *wh*-constructions, including equative and comparative clauses and correlatives as well as UCCs. In Macedonian, the complementizer *što* can occur in most types of relative clauses and some of the other constructions: clausal comparatives and some correlatives. But in many cases only bare *wh* is possible. For a detailed inventory and comparison of *-to* and *što*, see Rudin (forthcoming).

It is an open question what exactly *-to* is. One possibility is that it is a relative complementizer, similar to Macedonian *što*; this is appealing as an account of relative clauses but creates difficulties in explaining why their usage is so different; why in some constructions *-to* is obligatory and *što* is impossible. A second possibility, that *-to* is a definiteness marker – perhaps syntactically a determiner or nominalizer – similarly is appealing in some constructions but problematic in others. Victor Friedman has suggested to me (personal communication) that *-to* is “simply derivational morphology”; that is, that it is simply a stipulated fact that Bulgarian relative *wh*-words have *-to* suffixed to them. This may in fact be the correct answer, but it is a peculiarly unsatisfying one, leaving us with no explanation as to why UCCs, WIPs and several other constructions all require a “relative” rather than “interrogative” *wh*-word.

Adding to the mystery is the only Bulgarian non-interrogative construction that does not require *-to*: the *wh da e* type of WIP. As discussed above, the *wh da e* and *wh-to i da e* types of WIP differ in scope properties, and this scope difference

may be attributable to a difference in covert focus-movement connected to the presence *vs.* absence of the focus marker *i*. It is unclear to me how “relative” (*wh-to*) as opposed to “interrogative” (bare *wh*) morphology could contribute to this difference in interpretation, and the complementizer or definiteness marker analyses of *-to* are equally difficult to align with the observed scope difference.

One thing that is clear about *-to* is that it cannot be essential to the syntax or semantics of the UCC or WIP construction, since the corresponding Macedonian constructions are entirely parallel in their meaning, usage and structure but lack *-to* or anything similar to it. This contradicts work on Bulgarian alone which posits crucial functions for *-to*. For instance, Izvorski (2000) claims that the reason modal *da* appears in Bulgarian UCCs is to offset the semantic contribution of *-to*; *-to* makes the *wh*-element definite, too narrowly specified for the meaning of a UCC, and *da* serves to reintroduce the necessary degree of uncertainty to allow free choice of alternatives. This seems plausible when looking just at Bulgarian but is thrown into doubt by the fact that *da* is required just as much in Macedonian UCCs, which do not involve *-to*.

5. Conclusion

The immediate goals of this article are modest: to distinguish two similar *wh*-constructions from each other and to observe how they are alike and different in two Balkan Slavic languages. This constitutes one small cog in the larger, long-range project of comparing Bulgarian and Macedonian grammar as well as that of other areally and genetically related languages and dialects, a project to which Victor Friedman has contributed as much as anyone. Friedman (1995), for instance, discusses several ways in which Macedonian and Bulgarian subtly differ, even when they appear to share the same grammatical categories; object clitic doubling occurs in both languages, but differs in details of how and when it occurs; meaning and use of some verbal forms is not identical in the two languages, and so on. We now add subtle differences in the expression of UCCs and WIPs to the list. This type of comparison between very closely related, even mutually intelligible varieties can sometimes be politically fraught, providing ammunition for arguments that the two are “just dialects” of a single language or are completely separate languages. But comparison also serves a number of truly linguistic purposes: adding to our knowledge of what structures are possible and impossible; how morphosyntactic changes start and spread; how dialect continua and language

contact areas work; how phrases and sentences are built and processed; and how identical semantics can be computed from different lexico-morpho-syntactic material.

Notes

0. I am indebted to many people whose ideas directly or indirectly contributed to this article, but most concretely to Ognen Vangelov for his invaluable help with the Macedonian data.

1. For discussion of multiple *wh*-UCCs and their analytical implications, including complications related to the possibility of repeated *i* with each *wh*-phrase, see Rudin and Franks 2014.

2. This is somewhat reminiscent of colloquial English frozen expressions like *what's her name* or *what's his face*, in which what looks like a question is actually a sort of pronoun, or certain uses of *wh-ever* to mean 'anything'/'it doesn't matter what.'

i. I ran into *what's his face* yesterday.

ii. Just drop by *whenever*; no appointment needed.

iii. What should we have for lunch? I don't care, I'll eat *whatever*.

3. Though not mentioned by Hauge, in colloquial Bulgarian, for instance in blogs and social media posts, one also encounters a third variant, *wh i da e* with no *-to* suffix, as in Macedonian. This is probably part of the "sofijski ezik" phenomenon, in which Sofia urban slang reflects the speech of migrants to the city from southwestern Bulgaria, that is, from Macedonian-speaking regions; see Kǎnčeva 2008.

4. The difference among the three Macedonian WIP types is one of style. According to Kramer, *bilo wh/wh bilo* is more literary, *wh-gode* has old-fashioned or dialectal overtones and sounds more negative to some speakers, while *wh i da e* is the norm in everyday speech. In websites one sometimes sees what appear to be hybrid forms with *bilo wh da e*.

5. The extension *što* is less common in free relatives than in headed relative clauses and is dispreferred by some speakers. However, it is accepted by many and is clearly less bad than *što* in a UCC or WIP.

6. As mentioned in the introduction, cross-linguistically UCCs almost universally involve *wh*, but the other morphosyntactic elements vary; they can include conditional, dubitative, hortative or negative morphology, possibility modals or verbs of *wanting/willing*, among other ways of expressing *irrealis*, along with a variety of free-choice or universal quantifiers.

7. It is possible that the focus head in (30a-b) is actually a C head with focus features rather than head of FocP, or that it can be either C or Foc; arguments for the exact syntactic position are beyond the scope of this article. Steven Franks and I have proposed a copy analysis of both *i* and another focus marker, *li*, in which the *wh* or other focused phrase is copied in both Foc and C projections and any non-focused portion of the *wh*-phrase is pronounced in the lower copy, below the focus marker. This analysis accounts for the appearance of two positions for *i* in (28-29) as an artifact of pronouncing the whole higher *wh*-copy (before *i*) or part of the higher copy and part of the lower one (after *i*). For details, see Rudin and Franks (2014).

8. *Što* is written as a separate word with most *wh*-words but as a suffix with *koj* ‘who’ and *čij* ‘whose’ in all their gender/number/case forms.

Works Cited

- Ammann, Andreas, and Johan van der Auwera. 2004. “Complementizer-Headed Main Clauses for Volitional Moods in the Languages of South-Eastern Europe: a Balkanism?” *Balkan Syntax and Semantics*, Tomić, Olga (ed.). Amsterdam: Benjamins, pp. 293-314.
- Citko, Barbara. 2003. “On the Syntax and Semantics of English and Polish Concessive Conditionals,” *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 11.1, pp. 37-54.
- Friedman, Victor. 1995. “The Differentiation of Macedonian and Bulgarian in a Balkan Context,” *Balkan Forum* 3:3, pp. 291-305.
- Guentchéva, Zlatka. 1981. “Recherches sur les valeurs des indéfinis *njakoj* i *njakakā*,” *Revue des études slaves* 53.3, pp. 403-26.
- Haspelmath, Martin, and Ekkehard König. 1998. “Concessive Conditionals in the Languages of Europe,” *Adverbial Constructions in the Languages of Europe* van der Auwera, J. (ed.), pp. 563-640.
- Hauge, Kjetil Rå. 1999. *A Short Grammar of Contemporary Bulgarian*. Bloomington, IN: Slavica.
- Izvorski, Roumyana. 2000. “Free Adjunct Free Relatives,” *WCCFL 19 Proceedings*, pp. 232-45.
- Kănčeva, Pavlina. 2008. *Sofijskijat ezik na preselnicite ot zapadnite pokrajnini*. Sofija: Akademično Izdatelstvo Prof. Marin Drinov.
- Kramer, Christina E. 1986. *Analytic Modality in Macedonian* (= *Slavistische Beiträge*). Munich: Verlag Otto Sagner
- _____. 1999. *Macedonian*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Balkanistica* 28:1 (2015)

- Krapova, Iliyana. 2001. "Subjunctives in Bulgarian and Modern Greek," *Comparative Syntax of Balkan Languages*, Rivero, M.L., and A. Ralli (eds), Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 105-12.
- Rudin, Catherine. 2009. "The Bulgarian Relative Marker *-to*," *A Linguist's Linguist: Studies in South Slavic Linguistics in Honor of E. Wayles Browne*, Franks, S., V. Chidambaram and B. Joseph (eds). Bloomington, IN: Slavica. Pp. 403-22
- _____. 2012. "However You Analyze Them: Universal Concessive Conditionals in Bulgarian and in Slavic," paper given at Slavic Linguistics Society 5th annual meeting, Lawrence, KS.
- _____. forthcoming. "Sorting out *-to* and *-što*: Bulgarian and Macedonian Relative Markers," *SLS* 8, Jaworski, Sylwester (ed.).
- Rudin, Catherine and Steven Franks. 2014. "Focusing on Irrealis Concessions," *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics: The McMaster Meeting 2013*. Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publications, pp. 266-86.
- van de Cruys, K. 2011. "Focus on the Irrefutable," paper given at Slavic Linguistics Society 6th annual meeting, Aix-en-Provence.