Marija Lazar (Saxon Academy of Sciences in Leipzig)

kerý/který on the way to indeclinable subjunction? Analysis of corpus evidence

Slavic dialects and other non-standard varieties show a strong preference for indeclinable relative markers (absolute relatives) in relative clauses.[1] Bauer (op.cit.) states that this phenomenon is not restricted to Slavic and is attested in a range of European languages. However, the discrepancy between the relativisation strategies in standard and non-standard varieties has not been satisfactorily explored yet. The ongoing compilation of dialectal corpora and of corpora of colloquial varieties is a prerequisite for research advancement in this field. Our corpus-based study of reanalysis of relative marker *kerý/který* in Common Czech sheds light on development of indeclinable relative markers and offers an explanation for its preference in a non-standard variety.

The contemporary Common Czech operates with a set of relative markers and their forms, which is different from standard variety. Some of them like *kerý/kery/kerej/keré* are attested exclusively in Common Czech or in mimetic passages of Standard Czech. A relative marker *který,* considered as its standard variant (cf. Toman 1998, 303), is one of some few exceptions shared in Standard and Common Czech. In its turn, *který* possesses a range of variants like *kterej, ktery,* or *které* that are regarded either as dialectal forms or as forms belonging to Common Czech (Kovaříková in Cvrček et al. 2010, 199).

In the current paper, we concentrate on the forms *kerý/který* together with their less used variants *kery/ktery*, which differ from the Standard Czech *který* in their agreement with the antecedent in the main clause. While in Standard Czech the relative marker is congruent with the antecedent, we observe the ongoing loss of agreement in Common Czech, cf.:

(1) *To* *je* **cesta**, **které** *se* *nevyhneme [...]*
  this is **way-SG.NOM** **which-SG.DAT.F** REFL NEG-avoid-1.PL.FUT

This is the way that we cannot avoid.

<div align="right">(SYN2015, Stavitel 1/2012)</div>

(2) *tak* *mají* *ňákou* **firmu** *najatou*
  so have-3.PL.PRES any-SG.ACC.F **firm-SG.ACC** charged-SG.ACC.F
  kerý *de* *o* *peníze* *že* *jo ?*
  which go-3.SG.PRES about money-PL.PREP PART PART

so they have charged a firm which is concerned with the money, haven't they?

<div align="right">(ORAL2013, 09H004N/2009)</div>

The analysis of *kerý/který* has been carried out using the data from three corpora of non-standard varieties in Czech National Corpus:

- ORAL2013 has been taken as a representative sample for contemporary Common Czech;

- PMK and BMK have been selected as dialectal samples for respectively Bohemia and Moravia with Silesia.

The study provides a formal-functional explanation of reanalysis from a relative pronoun toward a relative particle. This development started with phonological change [ɛ:]>[i:],[2] sporadically accompanied by quantity loss [i:]>[ɪ]. As a result, we observe gen-

---

[1] Bauer[1] 1972/1967, 318; Meyer 2015.
[2] é-raising, Wilson 2010, 103-105.

der,[3] animacy, and singular/plural neutralization, which leads to the loss of agreement with head noun. This development is attested on the whole territory of Czech Republic, however, most consequently in Bohemia and Silesia. The change [i:]>[ɛj][4] places one of possible restrictions on this development. The second factor that restricts the usage of *kerý/který* as a relative particle is adherence to the Standard Czech adjective paradigm, preconditioned by individual sociolinguistic variables and pragmatic settings of the utterance.

This analysis shows that in a non-standard variety the syntactic change in relativization strategies can be evoked by phonological changes that lead to simplification of declension paradigms and thus to the change of congruence type between the syntactic entities. The changes in standard varieties differ from them in a principal way, since their impetus erases from reanalysis of derivation,[5] while a relative marker becomes associated with a new paradigm (cf. Standard Czech *jeho* 'his' – *jehož* 'whose') or develops to a relic form that has a potential for a particle and a subjunction (cf. Old Russian *iže* 'that-PRON.M' > 'that-PART/SUBJ'). Obviously the non-standard varieties tend to generalization of relativisation marking, whereas the standard varieties to their re-distribution supported by analogy within a system.

References

Bauer, Jaroslav[1] 1972 (1967). K vývoji vztažných vět v slovanských jazycích. In: Bauer, Jaroslav, Syntactica Slavica. Vybrané práce ze slovanské skladby. (= Opera Universitatis Purkynianae Brunensis, Facultas Philosophica = Spisy University J.E. Purkyně v Brně, Filozofická Fakulta ; 174). Brno, pp. 300-320.

Bauer, Jaroslav[2] 1972 (1962). Relativa a spojky. In: Bauer, Jaroslav, Syntactica Slavica. Vybrané práce ze slovanské skladby. (= Opera Universitatis Purkynianae Brunensis, Facultas Philosophica = Spisy University J.E. Purkyně v Brně, Filozofická Fakulta ; 174). Brno, pp. 361-366.

Cvrček, Václav et col. 2010. Mluvnice současné češtiny: Jak se píše a jak se mluví. Vol. 1. Praha.

Meyer, Roland 2015. A variationist analysis of relativizers and subordinators in Middle East Slavic. Slides, available online at http://site.uit.no/slavhistcorp/files/2015/04/Meyer.pdf, accessed on 2016-07-26.

Rappaport, Gilbert C. 2000. The Czech possessive relative pronoun *jehož* and its paradigm: Synchronic morphosyntax and developmental pathways of the Slavic relative clause. Slavic and East European Journal 44 (1), pp. 1-28.

Toman, Jindřich 1998. A discussion of resumptives in colloquial Czech. In: Bošković, Željko; Franks, Steven; Snyder, William. Annual Workshop on Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics. The Connecticut Meeting 1997. Ann Arbor, pp. 303-318.

Wilson, James 2010. Moravians in Prague. A sociolinguistic study of dialect contact in the Czech Republic. Frankfurt am Main. (= Prague Papers on Language, Society and Interaction. Vol. 2).

Czech National Corpus: www.korpus.cz (accessed on 2016-07-26).

---

[3] Cf. Wilson 2010, 113-114.

[4] ý-diphthongization, cf. Wilson 2010, 105-109.

[5] Cf. the case of *jehož* 'whose' in Standard Czech in Rappaport 2000; *čto* in Russian and *co* in Czech and Polish in Meyer 2015; for an overview on relative markers in Slavic languages see Bauer[1] 1972/1967, 306-317 and Bauer[2] 1972/1962.