Relative constructions in European languages: a closer look at non-standard varieties.
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1. Theoretical premises

1.1. TOPIC
Relative clauses in non-standard varieties of European languages.

1.2. APPROACH
- Integrative functionalism (Croft 1995, Bisang 2004)
- Typological-dialectological approach (Kortmann 2002)

1.3. STARTING QUESTIONS
1.3.1. Which relativization strategies are attested in non-standard varieties of European languages?
1.3.2. Is it possible to explain the strategy a speaker adopts through factors like the context of use or its sociolinguistic status?

1.4. PREVIOUS STUDIES
- Smits 1989 (only West-Europe)
- Zifonun 2001 (few languages; only one East European language)
- Cristofaro & Giacalone Ramat 2007 (incomplete account)

1.5. LANGUAGE SAMPLE
Non-standard varieties of some 30 European languages.

1.6. LANGUAGE VARIETIES CONSIDERED
1.6.1. How can linguistic variation be modelled? (Dittmar 2004², Auer 2005)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DITTMAR 2004²</th>
<th>AUER 2005</th>
<th>MURELLI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Akrolekte</td>
<td>Standard (spoken/written)</td>
<td>Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesolekte</td>
<td>Regional standard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialekte</td>
<td>Regiolects</td>
<td>Non-standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dialects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.6.2. Which levels of analysis are possible?

2. An areal study of non-standard relative constructions

2.0. DEFINITION OF RELATIVE RELATION.

a. Relative relations involve two states of affairs, a dependent and a main one.

b. The dependent state of affairs qualifies a participant of the main state of affairs.
   - Either the dependent SoA identifies the main SoA inside a range of possible referents (restrictive relation)
   - or the dependent SoA supplies further information on the main Soa (non-restrictive relation)

c. From a semantic-pragmatic point of view, restrictive and non-restrictive relations cannot be assimilated; still, they are syntactically expressed through relative constructions. In fact, in both cases the main and the dependent SoA share a participant (Giacalone Ramat 2006: 121)

2.1. WORK ISSUES
The investigation of non-standard varieties aims to answer following questions:

2.1.1. Which relativization strategies are attested in non-standard varieties?
2.1.2. Can a ‘standardness scale’ of relativization strategies be formulated?
2.1.3. What do non-standard strategies tell us on the development of the varieties of a language?

2.2. SOURCES AND DATABASE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATA TYPE</th>
<th>QUANTITATIVE/QUALITATIVE</th>
<th>SPONTANEOUS/ELICITED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GRAMMARS &amp; STUDIES (IDIOLECT-BASED)</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Self-elicited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAMMARS &amp; STUDIES (CORPUS-BASED)</td>
<td>Qualitative and quantitative</td>
<td>Spontaneous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUESTIONNAIRES</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
<td>Elicited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORPORAS</td>
<td>Qualitative and quantitative</td>
<td>Spontaneous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORLD WIDE WEB</td>
<td>Qualitative (quantitative)</td>
<td>Spontaneous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HISTORICAL DATA</td>
<td>Qualitative (quantitative)</td>
<td>Spontaneous</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 According to the classification of linguistic data proposed in Penke & Rosenbach (2004).
2.3. DATA CLASSIFICATION

2.3.1. WORD ORDER, i.e. the position of the relative clause w.r.t. the matrix clause (Comrie 1981, Lehmann 1984, De Vries 2001)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Headed</th>
<th>Adjoined</th>
<th>Headless</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prenominal</td>
<td>Circumnominal</td>
<td>Postnominal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUR</td>
<td>BAS</td>
<td>Vast majority of European languages (cf. Haspelmath 2001)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3.2. RELATIVE ELEMENT (Comrie 1981, Lehmann 1984, Cristofaro & Giacalone Ramat 2007)

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functions conveyed by the relative element, Lehmann 1984</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. SUBORDINATION</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. GAP CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. ATTRIBUTION: GENDER</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ATTRIBUTION: NUMBER</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. Combined strategies: the relative marker consists of more morphosyntactic units, which can be contiguous or non-contiguous. Distinction between simple and combined is sometimes not clear-cut (cf. kojto vs. der da).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RELATIVE PRONOUN</th>
<th>RELATIVE PARTICLE</th>
<th>OTHER PARTICLE</th>
<th>RESUMPTIVE ELEMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPEC. REL. ELEMENT</td>
<td>1?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RELATIVE PARTICLE</td>
<td>1?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZERO-MARKER</td>
<td>1?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3.3. SYNTACTIC POSITIONS which a strategy can relativize (Keenan & Comrie 1977, Lehmann 1984)

Accessibility Hierarchy: SU > DO > IO > OBL > GEN > OCOMP

2.4. TYPOLOGICAL-FUNCTIONAL ISSUES

2.4.1. WORD ORDER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Headed</th>
<th>Adjoined</th>
<th>Headless</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prenominal</td>
<td>Circumnominal</td>
<td>Postnominal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TUR, BAS</td>
<td>RUS, HUN, GRE, LTV, (GEO)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

2 In the table I give the number of languages in which the relevant strategy is attested.
2.4.2. RELATIVE ELEMENT.
Following tendencies are attested:
a. inflected elements remain uninflected;

E6. Copilul la care i—ai dat bani e un țigan.
RUM The.boy to REL  to.him-you.have given money is a  gipsy
‘The boy you gave the money to is a gipsy.’ (Mândâina Chitez, p.c.)

E7. Čovekát kojto (go) vidjachme vs. Čovekát kogoto (*go) vidjachme
BUL The.boy 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;

E8. 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)

E9. 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);

E10. Poznavam ženi deto vinagi sâm se čudela kak uspjavat s vsičko.
BUL I.know women REL always I.am 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.)

E11. 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.)
2.4.3. RELATIVIZED SYNTACTIC POSITIONS

Starting from Bernini’s (1989: 88) proposal, valid for ITA and Romance languages, I check whether it is valid for European languages on the whole.

SU       DO       IO       OBL/POSS    OBL/POSS
[-case]   \--------->  [+case]    (-Rel ?)

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

E12. 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’ (Petar Kehajov, p.c.)

E13. 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 (redundancy);

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;

E15. Kséro tin kopéla pú eksartáse (ápó aftín).
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.

E16. 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)

E17. Amb els amics que sortie abans, vaig arribar a avorrir-REFL with.them a.lot
CAT With the friends REL I.went.out before I.arrived to get.bored
‘I got very bored with the friends I used to go around with’ (López del Castillo 1999: 538)

E18. Bizi naiz-en lagunarekin joan naiz
BAS Living I.am-REL with.the companion gone I.am
‘I went with the companion I’m living with’ vs. ??Bizi naiz-en laguna, ‘The companion I’m living with’ (Oyharçabal 1989: 69-70)

E19. El ga fatto baruffa col fio che ti ga fatto baruffa ti
ITA CL3 has made quarrel with.the boy REL CL2 have made quarrel you
‘He has quarrelled with the boy you also quarrelled with.’ vs. *El ga conossuo el fio che ti ga fatto baruffa ti. (Venetian dialect, Fiorentino 1999: 30)

E20. sie gem’s dem Mo (den) 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)
2.4.4. Typological Conclusions

a. Relative elements are construction-bound.

b. Competition between the particles of the “what/which”-pole and the “where”-pole for the relativization of the positions of the AH.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>“what/which”</th>
<th>“where”</th>
<th>Languages preferring “what/which”</th>
<th>Languages preferring “where”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RUM</td>
<td>ce (decreasing) care (increasing)</td>
<td>de (stable; dialectal) unde (limited to LOC, but also with [+animated] referents)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSC</td>
<td>što (more frequent)</td>
<td>gdje (less used; South-Eastern dialects)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITA</td>
<td>che (more frequent)</td>
<td>dove (less used, but also for higher positions)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRE</td>
<td>que (more frequent)</td>
<td>dont (less used, but also for higher positions)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POR</td>
<td>que (more frequent)</td>
<td>onde (used only with LOC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POL</td>
<td>co (more frequent)</td>
<td>gdzie (used only with LOC, but also with [+abstract] referents)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUS</td>
<td>čto (more frequent)</td>
<td>gde (only with LOC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GER</td>
<td>was (higher positions)</td>
<td>wo (lower positions; generic connector)</td>
<td>wo (in dialects; all positions)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUT</td>
<td>wat (higher positions)</td>
<td>waar (lower positions)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUL</td>
<td>što(to) (decreasing; archaic)</td>
<td>deto (increasing)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRE</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>pu (all positions)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALB</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>që (all positions)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The tendencies attested in non-standard varieties can be seen as expressing functional principles:

1. formal reduction and/or invariable relative elements
2. 1:1-relation between form and function
3. regularized paradigms of relative elements
4. main clause word order

Counterexamples:

- formal non-economy

E23. Den fyr som at der købte bogen
DAN that boy REL COMP PTC bought the.book
‘The boy who bought the book’ (Platzack 1997: 91)

E24. 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)
Still, the same principles are active in standard language and lead to the use of different construction! The difference between standard and non-standard needs be accounted for in partly grammar-external terms:
- morphosyntactic complexity,
- explicitness degree,
- adherence to a prestigious model.

d. 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 along with strategies which do not make it explicit and non-relative constructions all over the AH. More thorough language-specific studies are needed in order to understand the link between constructions, contexts of use and speakers (this handout, section 3).

2.5. SOCIOLINGUISTIC ISSUES

2.5.1. THE STANDARDNESS SCALE

If comparing the judgements contained in grammars, relativization strategies can be set onto a standardness scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relative Pronoun, Specialized Relative Element</th>
<th>Relative Particle for SU/DO</th>
<th>Relative Particle + Resumptive</th>
<th>Relative Particle for IO/OBL/GEN</th>
<th>Preposition + Relative Particle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>relative pronoun, specialized relative element</td>
<td>&gt; relative particle for SU/DO</td>
<td>&gt; relative particle + resumptive</td>
<td>&gt; relative particle for IO/OBL/GEN</td>
<td>&gt; preposition + relative particle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.5.2. THE POSITION OF EUROPEAN LANGUAGES ON THE STANDARDNESS SCALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language Group</th>
<th>BAS</th>
<th>EST, HUN</th>
<th>FIN, LIT, LTV</th>
<th>DUT, GER</th>
<th>FRE, ITA, RUS, SPA</th>
<th>POR</th>
<th>ALB, BLR, BUL, CZE, POL, RUM, UKR, USO</th>
<th>CAT, LSO</th>
<th>BCS</th>
<th>SLK, SLN, MAC, DAN, ISL, NOR, SWE, ENG</th>
<th>GRE</th>
<th>MAL, IRL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

2.5.2. FACTORS determining the position of a language on the standardness scale:
- the influence of a prestigious exoglossic model on the formation of the standard;
- the distinction between strategies considered ‘autochthonous’ and those considered ‘borrowed’;
- the influence of a dialectal koiné on the formation of the standard;
- the re-standardization of a language.
2.6. DIACHRONIC ISSUES
2.6.1. ORIGIN OF NON-STANDARD CONSTRUCTIONS

a. They witness constructions attested in previous linguistic stages, which very often
developed in parallel with strategies which were to become ‘standard’.

E25. 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
Solomanid […]
Solomanida
‘My subject Istomka Suvorov, son of Graborukij, has to be given to my wife Solomida’
(Zaliznjak & Padučeva 1975: 75)

E26. 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.

E27. To su te gelice, z tymi ak ja som do šule chežili
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)

2.6.2. THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE OPPOSITION ‘STANDARD VS. NON-STANDARD CONSTRUCTIONS’

On the basis of Auer’s (2005) model, the development of non-standard relativization
strategy can be temptatively formulated as follows.

1. exoglossic standard

2. endoglossic standard

3. standard variety

non-standard varieties

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 entered the language through Persian influence;
then, it was excluded from the standard on puristic grounds; still, it survives in dialects
and in the language of poetry;
E28. O kız, ki hiç gülmeydi, 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)

- BAS: the *sein* postnominal construction (cf. E2) entered the language through the contact
  with FRE and SPA, but it is rejected by codifiers on puristic grounds;
- 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;

E29. 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)

- BCS: the construction ‘relative particle+resumptive’ was banned from the standard, but
  appears in formal contexts, like Vuk Karadžić’s translation of the Bible (Gallis 1956);

E30. 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)

- POL/CZE: the construction ‘relative particle+resumptive’, attested at least from the 15th
  century (Urbańczyk 1939, Lamprecht & alii 1986: 385 sgg.), has always been precariously
  balanced between standard and non-standard; in present-day POL it also appears in
  written texts oriented towards the konzeptionelle Mündlichkeit (Baglaiewska-Miglus 1991).

2.6.3. 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.

3. Relative constructions: case studies
3.1. HOW TO INVESTIGATE CONSTRUCTIONS
   a. one investigates all contexts in which a single construction occurs (⇒ case study 3.2.);
   b. all constructions with the same function are singled out and their distribution inside the
      corpus is investigated (⇒ case study 3.3.)

3.2. PRESENTATIVE CONSTRUCTIONS IN GERMAN DISCUSSION FORUMS

3.2.1. WORK HYPOTHESIS: I aim to verify the incidence of non-standard relative clauses in
the GER presentative constructions [es gibt N IV2] and [es gibt N wo RC].

E31. Stell dir mal vor, es gibt Leute, die schleppen sowas zum Fotografieren rum.

      GER Imagine REFL PTC imagine there’s people REL.PL drag such.a.thing to take.photos around
      ‘Think that there are people going around and taking photos with such stuff.’
      (de.alt.rec.digitalfotografie - 4 Nov. 10:00)

E32. Es gibt Zeiten, wo einem alles gelingt.

      GER There’s times REL to.one everything succeed

      ‘There are moments when you happen to succeed in everything you do.’
      (microsoft.public.de.word - 15 Nov. 07:49)
3.2.2. RESULTS:
a. the construction [es gibt N IV2] is more frequent when N = ‘Leute’, ‘Personen’, ‘Sachen’;
b. in the construction [es gibt N wo RC], N is mostly occupied by substantive with an abstract local-temporal meaning (‘Fälle’, ‘Situationen’). If restricting the research to [+animated] Ns, it turns out that the relative element wo nearly always simply relationally connects the main and the subordinate clause, but leaves the role of the relativized item in the RC unexpressed.

3.2.3. DISCUSSION:
a. since IV2s are focussing constructions (Weinert 2007), it doesn’t surprise that they are used particularly with a generic antecedent. In fact, they constitute the very centre of the whole construction.
b. since the relative element wo is invariable, the speech can be planned with greater flexibility. The syntactic role of the relativized item can be expressed through a resumptive pronominal adverb, if necessary; otherwise it can be left unexpressed. Wo proves to be effective particularly in cases of ‘long relativization’, in which the referent is embedded in a double dependent subordinate clause.

3.3. RELATIVE CONSTRUCTIONS IN A SPOKEN RUSSIAN CORPUS
3.3.1. WORK HYPOTHESIS: I aim to establish the incidence of relative constructions in the corpus “Spoken Russian of North-Western European Russia” (RRR98) and to look for a relationship between the use of constructions and the informants’ sociolinguistic features. The 16 informants of the corpus RRR98 cover both high and low Russian varieties

3.3.2. QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS
- SU (60%) and LOC (20%) are the most frequently relativized positions;
- the relative element kotoryj (61%) is the most frequently used one;
- the relationship between restrictively and non-restrictively used constructions is 63% to 37%.

When considering now asyndetic clause clusters (which are often analyzed as instances of the zero marker strategy), we get the following results:
- once more, SU (50%) and LOC (30%) are the most frequently relativized positions;
- non-restrictively used constructions prevail (77% vs. 23%);
- an anaphoric pronoun (+RESUMPTIVE) is often set, which makes these constructions actually resemble coordinate clauses.

3.2.3. QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS
The linguistic behaviour of the single informants reveals a different use of relative constructions: this can be described through a number of linguistic and sociolinguistic parameters. A continuum can be set up; the informants can be set on it (see the table below).
3.2.4. DISCUSSION

a. The analysis of the relative constructions shows a strong preference for the use of the standard construction introduced by *kotoryj*

b. The restrictive function is mostly conveyed by headed constructions introduced by a relative element; the non-restrictive function is conveyed both by headed constructions (44 occurrences) and by asyndetic clause clusters (38 occurrences).

c. The use of the relative constructions varies from informant to informant. Cultivated, socially committed speakers use nearly exclusively the standard strategy; going down the sociolinguistic parameters, the use of asyndetic clause clusters and non-standard constructions increases (E33); standard constructions are sometimes imperfectly mastered (E34); there are also instances of contamination between constructions (E35-E36); in these cases, interpreting and classifying constructions may be arduous.

---

E33. V obščem-to vse, kotorye komi nachodjatsja ili nency nachodjatsja v tundre

*RUS* In general, all komi- and nentsy-people that live in the tundra are members of a colchos

(RRR98: 129, informant 12)

E34. každyj den’ pojavljaetsja očen’ mnogo / bogataja počta / razbor pisem

*RUS* every day appears very a.lot rich post collection of.letters

(RRR98: 54, informant 5)

E35.  Očen’ mnogo snesli étich barakov, takich vetchich

*RUS* Very a.lot they.demolished these.GEN.PL barracks.GEN.PL such.GEN.PL very.old.GEN.PL

(RRR98: 72, informant 6)

E36. Nu, u nas, vidimo, žil’ë, navernoe, ne chvataet, čtoby vsech

*RUS* PTC at us evidently housing probably not is.enough in.order.to all.ACC.PL
kto priežįjusčių, zaseli’.
REL.NOM.SG come.PART.PRES.ACC.PL to.accomodate
’We probably don’t have enough buildings to accommodate all those who move to our town.’
(RRR98: 27, informant 2)

4. Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ALB</th>
<th>Albanian</th>
<th>EST</th>
<th>Estonian</th>
<th>LTV</th>
<th>Latvian</th>
<th>RUS</th>
<th>Russian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BAS</td>
<td>Basque</td>
<td>FRE</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>LIT</td>
<td>Lithuanian</td>
<td>BCS</td>
<td>Ser./Cro./Bosn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLR</td>
<td>Belarusian</td>
<td>FIN</td>
<td>Finnish</td>
<td>LSO</td>
<td>Lower Sorbian</td>
<td>SLK</td>
<td>Slovak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUL</td>
<td>Bulgarian</td>
<td>GER</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>MAC</td>
<td>Macedonian</td>
<td>SLN</td>
<td>Slovenian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAT</td>
<td>Catalan</td>
<td>GRE</td>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>MAL</td>
<td>Maltese</td>
<td>SPA</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZE</td>
<td>Czech</td>
<td>HUN</td>
<td>Hungarian</td>
<td>NOR</td>
<td>Norwegian</td>
<td>SWE</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAN</td>
<td>Danish</td>
<td>IRL</td>
<td>Irish</td>
<td>POL</td>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>TUR</td>
<td>Turk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUT</td>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>ICE</td>
<td>Icelandic</td>
<td>POR</td>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>UKR</td>
<td>Ukrainian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>ITA</td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>RUM</td>
<td>Rumanian</td>
<td>USO</td>
<td>Upper Sorbian</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| ACC | accusative | DEM | demonstrative | M | masculine | PTC | particle |
| CL2 | clitic 2nd p. | ERG | ergative | N | noun | REFL | reflexive |
| COMPL | complementizer | F | feminine | NOM | nominative | REL | relative element |
| DAT | dative | INSTR | instrumental | PL | plural | SG | singular |
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