

Relative clauses in South Slavic and the predictability of morphosyntactic features

Julia Bacskai-Atkari

University of Konstanz

julia.bacskai-atkari@uni-konstanz.de

14th European Conference on the Formal Description of Slavic Languages
Leipzig, 2–4 June 2021

Introduction

various elements introducing relative clauses:

- (1) a. This is the problem **which** we should solve first.
- b. This it the problem **that** we should solve first.

Differences

differences in the etymology (cf. Hopper & Traugott 1993, Heine & Kuteva 2002):

- interrogative-based – e.g. *which/who(m)*
- demonstrative-based – e.g. *that*

differences in the position of the elements:

- relative pronouns – e.g. *which/who(m)*, German *der/die/das*
- relative complementisers – e.g. *that*, South German *wo*

Observation

Germanic: combinations restricted by the etymology – only asymmetric combinations attested as genuine “rel+rel” combinations

→ questions:


- how strong the generalisation is cross-linguistically – Slavic data
- how apparently excluded combinations can be analysed synchronically
- what independent evidence we have for the featural properties of individual elements

Proposal

combinations restricted by the distribution of [rel] features that are determined by the etymology but can show subsequent deviations

Germanic

doubly filled COMP effects involving an overt pronoun and an overt complementiser:



English

wh-pronoun + *d*-complementiser: English (see van Gelderen 2009), marginally Swedish:

- (3) a. It's down to the community **in which that** the people live.
(van Gelderen 2013)
- b. Detta är studenten **vilken som** bjöd in Mary.
this is the.student which that invited in Mary
'This is the student who invited Mary.'
(Bacskai-Atkari & Baudisch 2018)

South German

d-pronoun + *wh*-complementiser: South German dialects
(Brandner & Bräuning 2013, Weiß 2013, Fleischer 2017)

- (4) Des Geld, **des wo** ich verdiene, des geheert mir.
the.N money that.N REL I earn.1SG that.N belongs I.DAT
'The money that I earn belongs to me.'
(Hessian; Fleischer 2017)

Combinations

four logically possible configurations – only two attested as genuine “rel+rel” (both members independently and productively attested as relative markers)

	<i>d</i> -complementiser	<i>wh</i> -complementiser
<i>d</i> -pronoun	–	+
<i>wh</i> -pronoun	+	–

Symmetric combinations

d-pronoun + *d*-complementiser attested in Old English (van Gelderen 2009) and in Waasland Dutch (Boef 2013):

- (5) Dat is de man **die dat** het gedaan heeft.
that is the man who that it done has
'That is the man who has done it.' (Boef 2010)

Properties

- Dutch: relatives with a single *dat* (as a complementiser) found in Vlaams-Brabant Dutch (Boef 2013) → the complementiser marks finiteness, not [rel]
- Old English: doubling in the process of reanalysis of one of the *d*-pronouns (*that*) into a complementiser, removing the original complementiser *þe* (van Gelderen 2009) – *þe* possibly only a finiteness marker, or the pronoun still a demonstrative but not [rel]

no combinations of *wh*-pronoun + *wh*-complementiser

The data

Slavic languages regularly use *wh*-based elements (cf. Kljajevic 2012, 36)

two major strategies also in South Slavic languages

Serbian/Croatian (Gračanin-Yuksek 2013):

- (6) a. čovjek **što** puši
man that smokes
'a/the man that smokes/is smoking'
- b. čovjek **koji** puši
man which.NOM smokes
'a/the man who smokes/is smoking'

Interrogatives

both elements phonologically identical to their *wh*-operator counterparts (Halpern 1995):

- (7) a. **Što** je Marija videla?
what AUX Mary seen
'What did Mary see?'
- b. **Koji** čovek je voleo Mariju?
which.NOM man AUX seen Mary.ACC
'Which man saw Mary?'

Macedonian

variation (Bužarovska 2009):

- (8) a. Covekot **koj** vleze e moj
man.the.M.SG who.M.SG come.AOR.3SG is my.M.SG
sosed.
neighbour
'The man who came in is my neighbour.'
- b. Covekot **što** go sretnavme e moj
man.the.M.SG that 3SG.ACC.CL meet.AOR.3PL is my.M.SG
sosed.
neighbour
'The man whom we met is my neighbour.'

Bulgarian

similar, with the colloquial complementiser *deto* (Rudin 2014) –
corpus examples from Bužarovska (2009):

- (9) a. Imaše xora, **koito** ne viždaxa
have.IMPERF.3SG people who.PL not see.IMPERF.3SG
ništo pred sebe si.
nothing before own CL
'There were people who saw nothing in front of them.'
- b. Mu kazvali, ce ima xora, **deto** bjabat ot
CL told.PL.PART that has people that run.3PL from
dobroto kato zajci ot kopoj.
good.the.N.SG like rabbits from hound.M.SG
'He was told that there are people who run away from
good like rabbits from a hound.'

Slovene

Slovene (Hladnik 2010):

- (10) a. Poznam človeka, **katerega** so iskali.
know.1SG man.ACC who.ACC AUX.3PL looked.for
'I know the man who they were looking for.'
- b. Poznam človeka, **ki** so ga iskali.
know.1SG man.ACC that AUX.3PL M.ACC.CL looked.for
'I know the man that they were looking for.'

West Slavic

variation also in West Slavic (at least in non-standard varieties) –
relative complementisers, i.e. Czech and Polish *co*, Slovak *čo*
(Šimík 2008, Guz 2017, Minlos 2012)

Doubling

recall: doubling patterns appear to be asymmetric → hypothesis by Bacskai-Atkari (2020): differences due to differences in the interpretability of [rel] features

feature distribution:


- *d*-pronouns and *d*-complementisers: [i-rel]
- *wh*-pronouns and *wh*-complementisers: [u-rel]

interpretability apparently inherited from original definiteness features – demonstratives definite, *wh*-base indefinite (cf. Watanabe 2009)


Feature checking

asymmetric patterns ensure proper feature checking:

(11) a.



b.



Symmetric patterns

↔ symmetric patterns essentially problematic for feature checking:


- [i-rel] + [i-rel]: movement of the operator not motivated
- [u-rel] + [u-rel]: [u-rel] cannot be checked

but: some *d*-pronoun + *d*-complementiser combinations exist

- Waasland Dutch: *dat* marks finiteness, underspecified for [rel]
- Old English: *þe* losing [i-rel] and changing into being underspecified for [rel], marking finiteness only

Underspecification

→ *d+d* patterns can be accounted for – independent evidence for the *d*-complementisers as underspecified for [rel] – no head nouns in declaratives



lexicalising a finite C a general tendency in Germanic
(Bacskai-Atkari 2018, 2020)

Slavic

no *wh+wh* patterns in Germanic

wh+wh patterns in South Slavic:

- Serbian/Croatian: not attested (Goodluck & Stojanović 1996, 292)
- Slovenian: not attested (Hladnik 2010, 12–13)
- Macedonian: possible (Rudin 2014, 320)

Macedonian

- (13) čovekot **koj-što** zboruva
the.man who-that talks
'the man who is talking' (Rudin 2014, 316)

pattern in (13) productive: attested with all relative pronouns, except when the pronoun also has the form *što* (Rudin 2014, 320) – probably a phonological constraint (cf. similar constraints in multiple *wh*-fronting, see Bošković 2002)

Interrogatives

both elements available as interrogative operators (Rudin 2014):

- (14) a. **Koj** zboruva?
who talks
'Who is talking?'
- b. **Što** sakaš?
what want.2SG
'What do you want?'

→ (13) apparently a *wh+wh* pattern

Declaratives

but: *što* also available as a declarative complementiser (Rudin 2014):

- (15) Se raduvam, **što** ve gledam.
REFL rejoice.1SG that you.PL.ACC see.1SG
'I am happy that I see you.' (Tomić 2006, 419)


Relative clauses

status of *što* as a complementiser in relative clauses (Rudin 2014):

- doubly filled COMP patterns indicate it cannot be a pronoun
– word order constraint follows from the internal structure of the CP (Bacskai-Atkari 2018, 2020)
- independent evidence for *što* being a complementiser otherwise
- prepositions cannot take *što* (same as for English *that*)

Structure

structure in itself not problematic:



question: what the feature specification of *što* is

Feature specification

two possibilities:

- underspecification for [rel], just like *dat* in Waasland Dutch
- specification as [i-rel]

underspecification: plausible under a late insertion approach (Halle & Marantz 1993), inasmuch as the abstract underlying head is lexicalised by a partial match – assumption less problematic if the abstract head is [u-rel] than when it is [i-rel]

no independent evidence for the *wh*-operators to be [i-rel]

Alternative

što is [i-rel] → implies a difference from the Germanic pattern

- doubling in Germanic primarily in embedded interrogatives and much less in relative clauses (Bacskai-Atkari to appear)
- relative declarative complementisers in South Slavic introduce factives

Serbian/Croatian

Serbian/Croatian (Arsenijević 2020, 341):

- (17) a. Jesam ti rekao **da** je Marija orišla na
AUX.1SG you.DAT told that AUX.3SG Marija gone on
odmor?
vacation
'Did I tell you that Marija went on vacation?'
- b. Jesam ti rekao **što** je Marija orišla na
AUX.1SG you.DAT told that AUX.3SG Marija gone on
odmor?
vacation
'Did I tell you that Marija went on vacation?' (it is a
fact that she did)

Referentiality

→ *što*-declaratives have referential properties (Arsenijević 2020) and are thus similar to relative clauses; see Krapova (2010, 1266) for Bulgarian and Macedonian

but: no head noun and no relative operator movement → *što* cannot be [u-rel] in these constructions → loss of this feature

Features

loss of [u-rel] does not make [i-rel] automatically available:

- Serbian/Croatian: no *wh+wh* doubling in ordinary relative clauses
- Macedonian: *wh+wh* doubling in ordinary relative clauses – *što* available as [i-rel]

implicational hierarchy: *wh*-based declaratives a prerequisite for *wh+wh* doubling in ordinary relative clauses but not vice versa

Conclusion

doubling in South Slavic relative clauses – morphological inventory:
both *wh*-pronouns and *wh*-complementisers available

typological predictions based on Germanic and Slavic:

- genuine *wh+wh* combination not attested
- exception: Macedonian – *wh*-complementiser *što* has different properties (independent evidence) → further reanalysis possible

→ morphological properties decisive for most patterns, they do not prohibit further grammaticalisation even in languages where the original *wh*-element is still available

Thank you!

Danke!

References I

- Arsenijević, Boban. 2020. Referential properties of subordinate clauses in Serbo-Croatian. In Teodora Radeva-Bork & Peter Kosta (eds.), *Current developments in Slavic linguistics: Twenty years after (based on selected papers from FDSL 11)*, 341–353. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Bacskai-Atkari, Julia. 2018. Doubly filled COMP in Czech and Slovenian interrogatives. In Denisa Lenertová et al. (eds.), *Advances in formal Slavic linguistics 2016*, 1–23. Berlin: Language Science Press.
- Bacskai-Atkari, Julia. 2020. German V2 and Doubly Filled COMP in West Germanic. *The Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 23(2). 125–160.

References II

- Bacskai-Atkari, Julia. to appear. Discourse-driven asymmetries between embedded interrogatives and relative clauses in West Germanic. In Nicholas Catasso, Marco Coniglio & Chiara De Bastiani (eds.), *Language change at the interfaces: Intrasentential and intersentential phenomena*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Bacskai-Atkari, Julia & Lisa Baudisch. 2018. Clause typing in Germanic: A questionnaire and its results. Potsdam: University of Potsdam. URL: <https://publishup.uni-potsdam.de/frontdoor/index/index/docId/40681>, last accessed: 07.04.2018.

References III

- Boef, Eefje. 2010. The structure of embedded CP-domains: Evidence from Dutch dialects (and new questions for research on language in aphasia). Talk delivered at: Aphasia and Syntactic Movement, Aarhus University, Denmark, September 10, 2010.
- Boef, Eefje. 2013. *Doubling in relative clauses: Aspects of morphosyntactic microvariation in Dutch*. Utrecht: LOT.
- Bošković, Željko. 2002. On multiple *wh*-fronting. *Linguistic Inquiry* 33(3). 351–383.
- Brandner, Ellen & Iris Bräuning. 2013. The particle *wo* in Alemannic: Only a complementizer? *Linguistische Berichte* 234. 131–169.

References IV

- Bužarovska, Eleni. 2009. Restrictive relative clauses in standard Macedonian and standard Bulgarian. In Mila Dimitrova-Vulchanova & Olga Mišeska Tomić (eds.), *Investigations in the Bulgarian and Macedonian nominal expression*, 230–260. Trondheim: Tapir Academic Press.
- Fleischer, Jürg. 2017. Relativsatz-Einleitung. In *SyHD-atlas*. Available at <http://www.syhd.info/apps/atlas/#relativsatz-einleitung> (last accessed: 14 July 2017).
- van Gelderen, Elly. 2009. Renewal in the left periphery: Economy and the complementiser layer. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 107(2). 131–195.

References V

- van Gelderen, Elly. 2013. *Clause structure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Goodluck, Helen & Danijela Stojanović. 1996. The structure and acquisition of relative clauses in Serbo-Croatian. *Language Acquisition* 5(4). 285–315.
- Gračanin-Yukse, Martina. 2013. The syntax of relative clauses in Croatian. *The Linguistic Review* 30(1). 25–49.
- Guz, Wojciech. 2017. Definiteness and specificity in two types of Polish relative clauses. In Joseph Emonds & Markéta Janebová (eds.), *Language use and linguistic structure: Proceedings of the Olomouc Linguistics Colloquium 2016*, 323–342. Olomouc: Palacký University.

References VI

- Halle, Morris & Alec Marantz. 1993. Distributed morphology. In Ken Hale & Samuel Jay Keyser (eds.), *The view from Building 20: Essays in linguistics in honor of Sylvain Bromberger*, 111–176. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Halpern, Aaron. 1995. *On the placement and morphology of clitics*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Heine, Bernd & Tania Kuteva. 2002. *World lexicon of grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hladnik, Marko. 2010. *Restrictive relative clauses in slovene and its spoken varieties*. Utrecht Utrecht Institute of Linguistics OTS MA thesis.
- Hopper, Mike & Elizabeth Traugott. 1993. *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

References VII

- Kljajevic, Vanja. 2012. *Comprehension of Wh-dependencies in Broca's aphasia*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Krapova, Iliyana. 2010. Bulgarian relative and factive clauses with an invariant complementizer. *Lingua* 120. 1240–1272.
- Minlos, Philip. 2012. Slavic relative *što* / *co*: Between pronouns and conjunctions. *Slověne* 1. 74–91.
- Rudin, Catherine. 2014. Sorting out *-to* and *što*: Bulgarian and Macedonian relative markers. In Jacek Witkos & Sylwester Jaworski (eds.), *New insights into Slavic linguistics*, 315–326. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

References VIII

- Šimík, Radek. 2008. Specificity in (Czech) relative clauses. In Jacek Witkoś & Gisbert Fanselow (eds.), *Elements of Slavic and Germanic grammars: A comparative view*, 177–198. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Tomić, Olga Mišeska. 2006. *Balkan Sprachbund morpho-syntactic features*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Watanabe, Akira. 2009. A parametric shift in the D-system in Early Middle English: Relativization, articles, adjectival inflection, and indeterminates. In Paola Crisma & Giuseppe Longobardi (eds.), *Historical syntax and linguistic theory*, 358–374. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

References IX

Weiß, Helmut. 2013. Satztyp und Dialekt. In Jörg Meibauer et al. (eds.), *Satztypen des Deutschen*, 764–785. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.