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1. Theoretical and methodological premises
1.1. APPROACH: integrative functionalism (Croft 1995, Bisang 2004), typological-dialectological approach (Kortmann 2002).

1.2. LANGUAGE SAMPLE: non-standard varieties of some 30 European languages.

1.3. LANGUAGE VARIETIES CONSIDERED

1.4. WORK ISSUES
1. Which relativization strategies are attested in non-standard varieties?
2. Which tendencies and which functional principles do they express?
3. What do non-standard strategies tell us about the development of the varieties of a language?

1.5. SOURCES: grammars, linguistic studies, questionnaires, corpora, WWW.

1.6. DATA CLASSIFICATION

   a. Simple strategies: the relative marker consists of a single morphosyntactic unit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGY</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUBLORDINATION</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAP CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATTRIBUTION: GENDER</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATTRIBUTION: NUMBER</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRATEGY</td>
<td>CZE</td>
<td>ENG</td>
<td>ITA</td>
<td>DAN</td>
<td>FRE</td>
<td>SWE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ktery</td>
<td>who</td>
<td>che/cui</td>
<td>der, FRE</td>
<td>dont, POL</td>
<td>som</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relative</td>
<td>Relative</td>
<td>Specialized</td>
<td>Relative</td>
<td>Zero-</td>
<td>marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pronoun</td>
<td>relative</td>
<td>element</td>
<td>particle</td>
<td>marker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   b. Combined strategies: the relative marker consists of more morphosyntactic units.¹

¹ In the table below I give the number of languages in which the relevant strategy is attested.

2. Typological-functional issues

2.1. Word Order

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Headed</th>
<th>Embedded</th>
<th>Adjoined</th>
<th>(Free)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prenominal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circumnominal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postnominal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preposed (Correlative)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postposed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E1. Gizon [karrikan ikusi duzu- n a- -k] hemen lan egiten du. BAS Man in.the.street you.have.seen-REL-the-ERG here work is.doing.it ‘The man you saw in the street works here.’ (Oyharçabal 1989: 64)

E2. Neska zein-i loreak eman dizkiodan hor dago. BAS the.girl REL-DAT the.flowers I.gave.them.to.her there is ‘The girl I gave the flowers to is right here.’ (Trask 1998: 320)

E3. Kotorye den’gi ostanutsja položi v košelëk RUS REL.NOM.PL money remain put in wallet ‘The remaining money, put it in the wallet’ (Zaliznjak & Padučeva 1975: 74)

E4. Amelyik kutya ugart, az nem harap. HUN REL.NOM.SG dog barks that not bites ‘A barking dog does not bite.’ (Tompa 1968: 66)

2.2. Relative Element.

Following tendencies are attested:

a. inflected elements remain uninflected;

E5. Copilul la care i-ai dat bani e un ţigan. RUM The.boy to REL to.him-you.have given money is a gipsy ‘The boy you gave the money to is a gipsy.’ (Mădălina Chitez, p.c.)

E6. Čovekát kojto (go) vidjachme vs. Čovekát kogoto (*go) vidjachme BUL The.man REL (him) we.saw The.man REL.ACC.M.SG (*him) we.saw ‘The man we saw’ (Miseska-Tomić 2006: 271)

b. an element conveying the syntactic role of the relativized element does not convey it;

E7. E poi / tutta questa tecnologia che siamo invasi... ITA And moreover all this technology REL we.are invaded ‘And there’s still this technology – it’s invading us.’ (radio program, 02/06/06)

E8. Il s’ est vendu une armoire fribourgeoise dont un de mes amis a été la voir. FRE He REFL is sold a wardrobe Friburger REL one of my friends has been it see ‘He sold a Friburger wardrobe, which a friend of mine went to see.’ (Gapany 2004: 189)
c. generalization of a relative particle or of a specialized relative element, which becomes an
unspecific connection marker (or complementizer)

E9. Poznavam ženi deto vinagi sám se čudela kak uspjavat s vsičko.
BUL I know women REL always Lam REFL wondered how they come to terms with everything
‘I know women that I’ve always wondered how they get to do everything.’ (Maria Manova, p.c.)

E10. Ich spüre Schmerz an Muskeln, wo ich gar nicht wusste, dass sie da sind.
GER I feel pain in muscles REL I at all not knew that they there are
‘I feel pain in muscles whose existence I ignored’ (man, 50 y.o.)

2.3. RELATIVIZED SYNTACTIC POSITIONS
Starting from Bernini’s (1989: 88) proposal – based on its turn on Keenan & Comrie (1977) and
claimed to be valid for ITA and Romance languages –, I check whether it is valid for European
languages on the whole.

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{SU} & \text{DO} & \text{IO} & \text{OBL/POSS} \\
[-\text{case}] & & & \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{SU} & \text{DO} & \text{IO} & \text{OBL/POSS} \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{OBL/POSS} & \text{OBL/POSS} \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

a. the syntactic role of the relative item is expressed separately (decumulation);

E11. Imam chimikalka, deto moga da piša s neja s časove.
BUL I have pen REL I can COMPL I write with her from hours
‘I have a pen with which I can write for hours’ (Petăr Kehajov, p.c.)

E12. ten, co on potem uciekł ze szkoły.
POL that REL he then escaped from school
‘The one that escaped from school then.’ (Topolińska 1984: 345)

b. the syntactic role of the relativized item is expressed twice;

GRE I know the girl REL.DAT.F.SG. to her you gave money
‘I know the girl you gave the money.’ (Joseph & Philippaki-Warburton 1987: 27)

c. the syntactic role of the relativized item is not expressed;

GRE I know the girl REL you depend on her
‘I know the girl you depend on.’ (Joseph & Philippaki-Warburton 1987: 166)

d. equi type (case matching): a particular case of point c.

E15. Won jezo z tym awtom, ako cora jo jel.
LSO He goes with the car REL yesterday he is gone
‘He goes with the car he went with yesterday.’ (Lower Sorbian dialect, Janoš 1976: 187)

E16. sie gem’s dem Mo (dem) wo mir g’hoifa hom
GER they give it to the Mann REL.DAT.M.SG REL we helped have
‘They give it to the man that we helped’
vs. der Mantl *(den) wo i kaffd hob, ‘The coat I bought’ (Bavarian dialect, Fleischer 2006)

e. elimination of the relative clause;

E17. i ona druga cura, ona nova, ne mogu da joj se sjetim imena
BCS and the other girl, the new, not I can COMPL to her REFL remember name ‘and the other girl, the new one, whose name I can’t remember.’ (Milena Marić, p.c.)

E18. Ty ne videl ručku Ø ja zdes’ ostavila?
RUS You not saw pen I here left ‘Did you see by chance the pen I left here?’ (Akimova 1964: 141)

2.4. TYPOLOGICAL CONCLUSIONS
a. Relative elements are polyvalent: since several interpretations are possible, their syntactic status is to be determined each time according to the context (“construction”) in which they appear.

b. the tendencies attested in non-standard varieties can be seen as expressing functional principles:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>formal reduction and/or invariable relative elements</th>
<th>economy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1:1-relation between form and function</td>
<td>iconicity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>regularized paradigms of relative elements</td>
<td>analogy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>main clause word order</td>
<td>analogy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Counterexamples: formal non-economy

E19. Den fyr som at der købte bogen
DAN that boy REL COMP PTC bought the.book ‘The boy who bought the book’ (Platzack 2002: 91)

E20. D Kirch, newe dere wu er wohnt, isch im Griech kabütt gemacht wor.
GER The church beside REL PTC he lives is in the war ruined made been ‘The church beside which he lives was destroyed during the war’ (Alemannic, Balliet 1997: 214)

c. when applying Bernini’s (1989) proposal to a broader language sample, a number of counterexamples occur: relativization strategies which make the syntactic role of the relativized item explicit are attested all over the AH along with strategies which do not make it explicit and non-relative constructions.

3. Diachronic issues
3.1. ORIGIN OF NON-STANDARD CONSTRUCTIONS
a. They witness constructions attested in previous linguistic stages and very often developed in parallel with strategies which were to become ‘standard’

E21. A čto čelovek” moj Istomka Suvorov” syn” Graborukov” běgaet, i tot čelovek ženě moei
RUS And REL man my Istomka Suvorov son of Graborukij runs and that man to wife my Solomanide [...] Solomanida ‘My subject Istomka Suvorov, son of Graborukij, has to be given to my wife Solomida’ (Zaliznjak & Padučeva 1975: 75)

E22. Čto u tebja est’ plastinka ščas budut peredavat’
RUS REL at you is record now they will broadcast ‘The record that you have, it will play now on the radio’ (Lapteva 1976: 303)

b. They entered the language through its non-codified varieties or adapted autochthonous constructions under the influence of language contact.

E23. To su te gelice, z tymi ak ja som do šule chežil
LSO That are those chaps with those.INSTR.PL REL I am to school gone ‘Those are the chaps I went to school with’ (Faßke 1996: 170) cf. der was in German dialects (Fleischer 2004)
3.2. THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE OPPOSITION ‘STANDARD VS. NON-STANDARD CONSTRUCTIONS’

1. X
   exoglossic standard
   local language varieties
   A
   C
   A
   C
   X' B
   Z' D
2. X
   endoglossic standard
   local language varieties
   A
   C
   X'
   A
   C
   Z' B
   A
   Z' B
   C
3. standard variety
   non-standard varieties
   A
   C
   B
   A
   C
   B
   Y'
   Y'

A, B, C, D…, Y, Z = relative constructions
X', Y'… = borrowed constructions modelled on X, Y…
L1, L2, L3… = languages

Examples:
- TUR: the *ki* postnominal construction;
  E24. adam *ani* para verdim
  GAG man REL money I.gave
  ‘The man I gave the money’ (Menz 2006: 143)
  cf. TUR *humi* (Erkman-Akerson 1998), BUL *deto*, RUS *čto*

- BAS: the *zein* postnominal construction (cf. E2);
- RUS: the use of the relative particle *čto* for lower positions of the AH survives only in dialectal speech and in the language of poetry;
  E25. O *kız, ki* hiç gülmmezdi, sonunda güldü
  TUR That girl REL at.all didn’t.laugh at.the.end laughed
  ‘The girl that hadn’t laughed at all, finally laughed, too’ (Erkman-Akerson & Ozl 1998: 323)

- BCS: the construction ‘relative particle+resumptive’ appears in formal contexts, like Vuk Karadžić’s translation of the Bible (Gallis 1956), whereas a relative pronoun would be expected here;
  E26. Gde *èta ulica, gde ètot dom, / gde *èta* devuška, *čto* ja vljublën?
  RUS Where this street, where this house where this girl REL I  in.love
  ‘Where is the street, where is the house, where is the girl that I’m in love with?’
  (Zaliznjak & Padučeva 1975: 89)

- POL/CZE: the construction ‘relative particle+resumptive’;
  E27. *Žena, što u n’ezinoj kćeri bijaše duch nečisti.*
  BCS Woman REL in her daughter was spirit impure
  ‘The woman whose daughter was haunted by an impure spirit’ (Gallis 1956: 147)
3.3. CONCLUSION: the difficulties connected with the classification of relative elements and relativization strategies in the typological analysis are mostly due to the diachronic development of the relativization strategies.

Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALB</td>
<td>Albanian</td>
<td>EST</td>
<td>Estonian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS</td>
<td>Basque</td>
<td>FRE</td>
<td>French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLR</td>
<td>Belarusian</td>
<td>FIN</td>
<td>Finnish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUL</td>
<td>Bulgarian</td>
<td>GER</td>
<td>German</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAT</td>
<td>Catalan</td>
<td>GRE</td>
<td>Greek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZE</td>
<td>Czech</td>
<td>HUN</td>
<td>Hungarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAN</td>
<td>Danish</td>
<td>IRL</td>
<td>Irish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUT</td>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>ICE</td>
<td>Icelandic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>ITA</td>
<td>Italian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>accusative</td>
<td>DEM</td>
<td>demonstrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL2</td>
<td>clitic 2nd p.</td>
<td>ERG</td>
<td>ergative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPL</td>
<td>complementizer</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>feminine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>dative</td>
<td>INSTR</td>
<td>instrumental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LTV</td>
<td>Latvian</td>
<td>LIT</td>
<td>Lithuanian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSO</td>
<td>Lower Sorbian</td>
<td>MAC</td>
<td>Macedonian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAC</td>
<td>Macedonian</td>
<td>SLK</td>
<td>Slovak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>masculine</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTC</td>
<td>particle</td>
<td>REL</td>
<td>relative element</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>singular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUS</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>SWE</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUS</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>TUR</td>
<td>Turk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWE</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>UKR</td>
<td>Ukrainian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLOV</td>
<td>Slovak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USO</td>
<td>Upper Sorbian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCS</td>
<td>Ser./Cro./Bosn.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPA</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAC</td>
<td>Macedonian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSW</td>
<td>Lower Sorbian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIEL</td>
<td>Upper Sorbian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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