

Marisa Eberle (University of Zurich)

Relative clauses in Kajkavian – the distribution of *koji*, *ki* and *koteri* in 18th century written texts

The present paper is concerned with the distribution of *koji*, *ki* and *koteri* in 18th century Kajkavian written texts. In the contemporary Croatian standard language the most common relativizer is the pronoun *koji* (Kordić 1999: 26), whereas in Kajkavian texts we find up to three possible relative markers: *koji*, *ki* and *koteri*, as shown in (1)-(3). *Koteri* can take forms such as *kteri*, *šteri*, *teri*. Maček (1986-1987: 112) claims that – in what he calls ‘Serbo-Croatian’ – the newer form *koji* replaced the older *ki* in the 13th century. Obviously, this is not true for Kajkavian.

- (1) *Kada detetu kaj dadu, naj taki opomenu, da G. Bogu zahvali, prez kojega ne bi nikaj imali, niti davali.* (Mulih 1742: 12)
‘If you give the kid something, you should remind it to thank God, without whom we would have nothing, nor give nothing.’
- (2) *Naš Stvoritel i Sudec, ki vsa vidi i čuje.* (Mulih 1742: 14)
‘Our creator and judge, who sees and hears everything.’
- (3) [...], *dete kotero na naruchaju je derfala, zakrikne: Majka pufztime, idem fzama!* (Berke 1775: 10)
‘The child, who she was holding at her breast, screamed: Mother, let me go, I go alone!’

In his study of excerpts of seven Kajkavian texts, dating back to the 15th to the early 19th century, Gallis (1956: 115) states that “[m]ost of the writers in question alternate, each in his own characteristic way, between two of the above-mentioned relative pronouns, and a few of them use all three [...]”. My goal is to find out whether the distribution of *koji*, *ki* and *koteri* in 18th century Kajkavian texts exclusively depends on the author’s choice or whether linguistic factors may have played a role as well. Possible criteria are:

- position of RC
- type of RC
- syntactic role of relativised NP
- characteristics of head NP

In addition, factors such as the genre of the text and the author’s linguistic background may play a role as well (for other Slavic languages cf.: Gołąb/Friedman 1972, Sonnenhauser 2013, Murelli 2013, Mendoza *to appear*).

Further, I will compare the use of *koji*, *ki* and *koteri* to the use of relative pronouns in other Slavic languages, especially compared to Slovenian and Standard Croatian. Three of the most obvious differences are listed below:

1. Whereas in Slovenian *ki* is indeclinable (Chidambaram 2007: 290), it is declined in Kajkavian:
 - (4) *Ja ti iz Dalmatinskoga, ili Primorskoga, drugač takaj našega jezika, koga Iliričkoga ozivamo, ovo samo govorenje [...] ispisujem:* (Dijanić 1797: 7)
‘I write down for you only this saying from Dalmatian or Primorian, to put it differently, our language, which we call Illyrian.’

2. Whereas in Slovenian the origin of *ki* is unclear (Sonnenhauser 2013: 155), in Kajkavian *ki* is considered to be the short, contracted form of *koji* (Gallis 1956: 115). My data shows that this is quite likely, as the abbreviation is sometimes even marked as *kî*.

(5) *O, nesrečni takovi, kî se toga ne boje niti ne čuvaju.* (Mulih 1742: 19)
‘Oh, unhappy ones, who neither fear this nor are beware of that.’

3. Like *koji* in standard Croatian (Kordić 1999: 195), but unlike *ki* in Slovenian (Chidambaram 2007: 289), *ki* in Kajkavian can introduce a free relative clause:

(6) *Kî detece gingavo k sebe na postelju i tak vu žitka pogibel postavljaju; [...].* (Mulih 1742: 19)
‘Who puts the weak kid to himself into the bed and puts its life in danger like that.’

References

- Chidambaram, V. S. (2007): Relative and pseudo–relative clauses in Slovene, *Slovenski jezik* 6, S. 287–301.
- Gallis, A. (1956). *The syntax of relative clauses in Serbo-Croatian. Viewed on a historical basis.* Oslo.
- Gołąb, Z. & V.A. Friedman. (1972). The relative clause in Slavic. In: Peranteau P.M., J.N. Levi, Gloria C. Phares (ed.). *The Chicago witch hunt. Papers from the relative clause festival.* Chicago, S. 30-46.
- Maček, D. (1986-1987). Ambivalence of relative clause structures – a diachronic view. *Studia romanica et anglica Zagrebiensia* 30/31, S. 103-115.
- Mendoza, I. (to appear). Zur Variation von Relativpronomina im Altpolnischen. Die Rolle der Relativisatoren. *Wiener Slavistischer Almanach.*
- Murelli, A. (2011). Relative constructions in European Languages. A look at non-standard. *Journal LIPP* 1, S. 1-21. Online unter:
<http://ojs.ub.uni-muenchen.de/index.php/lipp/article/view/22>
- Sonnenhauser, B. (2013). Relative clauses in Slovene: diachronic puzzles, synchronic patterns. In: *Wiener Slavistisches Jahrbuch. Neue Folge* 1, S. 150–187.

Sources

- Berke, P. (1775). *Kinch oszebuini szlawnoga orszaga horvatzkoga. To jezft: Chudnovita pripechenya, y ofzebuine Milofche, kotere pri chudnovitom kipu Marie Bisztrichke vifše vre let fze fzkafuju. Graecii. Za pretisak priredio i pogovor napisao Alojz Jembrih,* Marija Bistrica 1995.
- Dijanić, J. (1797). *Hižna knjižica. Horvatski dece prijatel. Zagreb. Tekst transkribirao, za tisak priredio i popratnu studiju napisao Alojz Jembrih,* Samobor 1994. (= Samoborska škrinjica 1)
- Mulih, J. (1744). *Regule roditelov i drugeh starešeh i Regule dvorjanstva. Za tisak priredio, tekst transkribirao, rječnik sastavio i pogovor napisao Alojz Jembrih,* Zagreb 2002. (= Kajkaviana Biblioteka kinč osebujni 1)