INSTITUTE FOR LINGUISTIC STUDIES,
RUSSIAN ACADEMY OF SCIENCES

as a manuscript

Maria Kholodilova

FINITE RELATIVIZATION IN SLAVIC LANGUAGES

Dissertation Summary
for the purpose of obtaining academic degree
Doctor of Philosophy in Philology and Linguistics

Academic Supervisor:
PhD, Sergey S. Say

St. Petersburg 2020

This dissertation brings together nine papers on Slavic finite relative constructions. Three of them, namely (Kholodilova 2017a, 2019, Kholodilova, in print), present research based on a few Slavic languages, while the other papers (Kholodilova 2011, 2014, 2015b, 2016a, 2016b, 2017b) address Russian relative constructions with only occasional reference to other Slavic languages. The dissertation also includes a short summary of the existing academic research on Slavic finite relativization, which is presented in table form as Appendix A.

The papers selected for the defense are primarily based on **quantitative data obtained from corpora**. The use of corpus data imposes certain restrictions on the choice of language varieties for the sample. The dissertation research is therefore based almost exclusively on standard languages with large corpora, namely Russian, Ukrainian, Belarusian, Czech, Polish, Slovak, Upper Sorbian, Lower Sorbian, Bulgarian, Macedonian, Serbo-Croatian, and Slovene.

Some of the data, especially the data used for hypothesis building, was collected from multilingual parallel corpora, namely Parasol, InterCorp, the parallel subcorpus of RNC, and ASPAC. An example of a relative construction in almost all the Slavic language under consideration extracted from a parallel corpus is given in (1).

(1) Antoine de Saint-Exupéry. *The little prince* (RNC, parallel subcorpus)

	like the grown-ups	who	are not interested in anything but figures
rus	*...kak vzroslye*,	[*kotorym*	*ničto ne interesno, krome cifr*].
bel	*...padobnym na daroslyx,*	[*jakix*	*cikavjac' adny tol'ki ličby*].
ukr	*…jak dorosli,*	[*kotri*	*ničim ne cikavljat'sja, okrim cifr*].
hsb	*...tajki, kaž ći wulcy su,*	[*kotřiž*	*maja jenož ličby zańć*].
pol	*...podobny do dorosłych,*	[*którzy*	*interesują się tylko cyframi*].
slk	*...takým ako dospelí,*	[*ktorých*	*už nezaujíma nič iné iba číslice*].
ces	*...takovým jako dospělí,*	[*kteří*	*se už nezajímají o nic jiného než o číslice*].
bul	*...kato văzrastnite,*	[*koito*	*ne se interesuvat ot niščo drugo, osven ot cifri*].
mkd	*...kako i vozrasnite*	[*što*	*se interesiraat samo za brojki*].
sr	*...sličan odraslim osobama*	[*koje*	*interesuju samo brojevi*].
hr	*...{nalikovati} na odrasle,*	[*koje*	*zanimaju samo brojke*].
slv	*...tak, kot so odrasli,*	[*ki*	*jim je samo do številk*].

{I may become / am afraid of becoming} 'like the grown-ups who are no longer interested in anything but figures.'

Most quantitative data in the study was obtained from monolingual corpora or monolingual subcorpora within parallel corpora, the sample being unlimited by accessibility of the texts in other Slavic languages. The corpora used in the dissertation research are listed in Table 1.

Table 1. Corpora used for quantitative research in the present dissertation

Group	Language	The corpus used most frequently	Other corpora
East Slavic	Russian	RNC, main subcorpus	
	Ukrainian	RNC, parallel subcorpus	
	Belarusian	RNC, parallel subcorpus	
West Slavic	Czech	CNC, Czech National Corpus	
	Slovak	SNK, Slovak National Corpus	
	Polish	NKJP, National Corpus of Polish	
	Upper Sorbian	HOTKO, Hornolužický textový korpus	
	Lower Sorbian	DOTKO, Dolnoserbski tekstowy korpus	
South Slavic	Bulgarian	BNC, Bulgarian National Corpus	Bulgarian Dialectology as Living Tradition
	Macedonian	InterCorp, Macedonian subcorpus	Vidoeski 2000
	Slovene	slWaC, Slovene web corpus	FidaPLUS, Korpus slovenskega jezika
	Serbo-Croatian	HNK, Croatian National Corpus	

The study is focused on variation between competing morphosyntactic structures, both language-internal and cross-linguistic, and aims to describe the factors conditioning the variation. The cases of variation examined in most detail fall into the following groups. The references given for each group correspond to the relevant parts of this dissertation, for a more extended bibliography on the topics, see Apendix A below.

1) Competition between finite relative clauses (2) and participial constructions (3) (Kholodilova 2014).

(2) *Ja ne znaju čeloveka, kotoryj napisal eto stixotvorenie.*
I don't know person which wrote this poem
'I don't know the person who wrote this poem.'

(3) *Ja ne znaju čeloveka, napisavšego eto stixotvorenie.*
I don't know person write.PTCP.ACT.PST this poem
'I don't know the person who wrote this poem.' (Yandex)

2) Competition between syntactic structures with varying word order resultant from the relative pronoun movement, including the following:

– structures with different extent of pied-piping (Kholodilova 2011: 18–27; Kholodilova 2017b: 222–223);

– pied-piped structures with inversion (4) vs. without inversion (5) (Kholodilova 2011: 8, 12–16).

(4) *Delo v tom tol'ko, čtob grammatika znala svoi granicy*
deed in that only in.order grammar knew its limits
i slušalas' jazyka, [kotorogo pravila] ob'jasnjaet…
and obey to.language of.which rules explains
'The matter is only for the grammar to know its limits and obey to the language whose rules it explains' [V. G. Belinskij. Obščaja ritorika N. F. Košanskogo (1844)] (RNC).

(5) *…otdel fizičeskogo vospitanija, [pravila kotorogo] ⟨…⟩,*
department physical education rules of.which
dolžny byt' vyvedeny iz obširnogo i glubokogo znanija
must be deducted from wide and deep knowledge
anatomii, fiziologii i patologii…
anatomy physiology and pathology
'…a branch devoted to physical education, whose rules must be based on a wide and deep knowledge of anatomy, physiology, and pathology.' [K. D. Ušinskij. Čelovek kak predmet vospitanija. Opyt pedagogičeskoj antropologii (1867)] (RNC)

3) Relativizer choice, including:

– 'which' (6a) vs. 'who' (6b) (Kholodilova 2017a, 2017b: 240–241);

– specialized relative pronouns (7) vs. relative pronouns which coincide with interrogatives (8) (Kholodilova, in print);

– Rus. *kotoryj* 'which' vs. *čto* 'that' (Kholodilova 2017b: 249–255).

– Rus. *kotoryj* 'which' vs. *čej* 'whose' (Kholodilova 2011: 27–41, 2017b: 243–244);

– Rus. *kotoryj* 'which' vs. archaic Rus. *koj* 'which' (Kholodilova 2011: 8–9; 2017b: 245–247);

– Rus. *kotoryj* 'which' vs. archaic Rus. *kakovoj* 'which' (Kholodilova 2017b: 246–247);

– Rus. *kotoryj* (*v kotorom*) '(in) which' vs. *gde* 'where' (Kholodilova 2017b: 248–249).

(6) SERBIAN, Mikhail Bulgakov. The Master and Margarita (Parasol)

a. *I upravo tu Ivan Nikolajevič konačno izgubi onoga*
and exactly here Ivan Nikolaevich finally lost him
koji *mu je bio toliko potreban.*
which for.him was so necessary

b. *I* *eto* *tu* *Ivan* *Nikolajevič* *konačno* *izgubi* *onoga*
and this here Ivan Nikolaevich finally lost him
ko *mu* *je bio* *toliko* *potreban.*
who for.him was so necessary
'And it was here that Ivan Nikolaevich definitively lost him whom he needed so much.'

MACEDONIAN (InterCorp, subtitles)

(7) *Ne,* *jas* *sum* *toj* *koj* *e* *počesten.*
no I am that.one which is honored
'No, I would be the one honored.'

(8) *Jas* *sum* *sega* *toj* *koj-što* *e* *mnogu* *ranliv.*
I am now that.one which-that is much fragile
'I'm the one that's feeling fragile right now.'

4) Competition between animate and inanimate accusative forms with neuter nouns in the head (9)–(10) or inanimate heads (11) (Kholodilova 2016a).

(9) ⟨…⟩ *vaši* *desjat'* *ili* *pjatnadcat'* *rublej* *pojdut*
your ten or fifteen rubles will.go
na *pitanie* *životnogo,* *kotorogo* *vy* *nazovete.*
on feeding animal which.n.acc.anim you name
'Your ten or fifteen rubles will be used to feed the animal of you choice (lit. the animal you name).' [O. G. Barinov. Zoologičeskij sad // Pervoe sentjabrja, 2003] (RNC)

(10) ⟨…⟩ *temnyj* *užas* *životnogo,* *kotoroe* *presledujut* ⟨…⟩
dark horror of.animal which.N.ACC.INAN they.chase
'The dark horror of an animal being chased (lit. which they chase).' [L. N. Andreev. Vor (1904)] (RNC)

(11) CROATIAN (Franks 2013: 75, glossed by me. — *M. Kh.*)
a. *stol* ***kojega*** *sam* *prevrnuo*
table which.ACC.SG.M.ANIM be.PRS.1SG turn.over.PTCP.PST
b. *stol* ***koji*** *sam* *prevrnuo*
table which.ACC.SG.M.INAN be.PRS.1SG turn.over.PTCP.PST
'the table I turned over…'

5) The choice of agreement pattern for the dependent clause predicate in the case of subject relativization, for instance person agreement with the head vs. the use of 3rd person markers (Kholodilova 2017b: 240–241, 259–262; Kholodilova 2019).

SLOVAK (SNK)
(12) *mne,* *ktorý* ***som*** *očividne* *absolútny* *idiot*
to.me which be.PRS.1SG clearly absolute idiot
'…to me, who is clearly an absolute idiot…'

(13) *mne,* *ktorý* ***je*** *jeho* *predstaviteľom*
to.me which be.PRS.3SG its representative
'…to me, who represents it…'

A few general theoretical and methodological remarks are in order.

First, the basic methodological assumption behind all the studies in this dissertation is that **grammatical acceptability and the relative frequency** of competing morphosyntactic structures reflect the same underlying tendencies and **should be analyzed alike**. This approach is most consistently observed in the work by Corbett (2000: 194, 2006: 209).

A case in point is presented in Tables 2 and 3 below. The data in the tables describes the distribution of 'who'- and 'which'-relativizers[1] in light-headed relative clauses with demonstrative pronouns in the head. As Table 2 shows, Polish 'who' is impossible with plural demonstrative pronouns in the head (Křížková 1970). In Czech, this restriction doesn't hold, however, singular heads tend to combine with 'who' relativizers more frequently than plural heads. The data in both tables can be subsumed under the following generalization. Plural light heads are more likely than singular light heads to be combined with 'which'-relativizers as opposed to 'who'-relativizers. This generalization holds in other Slavic languages (Kholodilova 2017).

Table 2. Grammatical acceptability of 'who' and 'which'
in Polish light-headed relative clauses with singular and plural heads

Head	'who'	'which'
'that' (singular)	OK	OK
'those' (plural)	*	OK

Table 3. Frequency of 'who' and 'which'
in Czech light-headed relative clauses with singular and plural heads (in samples of 100 examples)

Head	'who'	'which'	ration of 'who'
'that' (singular)	91	9	0.9
'those' (plural)	54	46	0.5

Crucially, the present study didn't reveal any cases of the opposite relationship between highly comparable data of different languages, one competing construction being ungrammatical in one language but more (rather than less) frequent in another language. This suggests that the observed tendencies do not result from survivorship bias.

Second, the comparison of Slavic languages in the dissertation is driven by the theory of **intragenetic typology** in terms of (Kibrik 1998; 2003). Therefore, the study is designed to suggest generalizations which are not limited to the languages under consideration. According to Kibrik (1998), the data most suitable for intragenetic typological analysis is diachronically unstable, typologically rare, complex, and continuously variable. Most data considered in the dissertation meet all these criteria.

There is an extensive **literature** on Slavic relative constructions, including comparative studies by Bauer (1967), Křížková (1970), Gołąb and Friedman (1972), Minlos (2012), Mendoza (2019), Sonnenhauser and Wandl (in print), and others and monographic descriptions of relativization systems in individual languages, for instance, (Kordić 1999) for Serbo-Croatian, (Iliev 2012) for Bulgarian, and (Senderska 2013) for the history of Polish. The main research papers on Slavic relative clauses are summarized in Appendix A of the dissertation.

The main **conclusions** of the study are the following.

1) Slavic languages consistently follow the generalizations listed in Table 4. These generalizations are arguably typological.

Table 4. The main generalizations based on several Slavic languages

Generalization	Data type	
	Ungrammaticality	Quantitative tendency
Plural light heads are more likely than singular light heads to be combined with 'which'-relativizers as opposed to 'who'-relativizers.	Polish, Slovak, Upper Sorbian, Lower Sorbian	Russian of the 18th century, Slovene, Czech, Serbo-Croatian
Restrictive relative constructions are more likely than maximalizing relative clauses to contain specialized relative pronouns as opposed to interrogative pronouns without additional markers.	Bulgarian, Slovene	Macedonian, Old Russian

[1] For a definition of these notions see Kholodilova (2017: 122–125).

Appositive relative constructions are more likely than restrictive relative clauses to contain specialized relative pronouns as opposed to interrogative pronouns without additional markers.	Czech, Polish	Macedonian
The light head ‘those’ is more likely than the light head ‘all’ to be combined with ‘which’-relativizers as opposed to ‘who’-relativizers.	—	Russian of the 18th century, Ukrainian, Slovene, Czech
Under subject relativization, pronominal heads in the plural are more likely than pronominal heads in the singular to trigger predicate agreement in the relative clause as opposed to the use of 3rd person forms.	—	Polish, Czech, Ukrainian, Russian
Under subject relativization, pronominal heads in the nominative are more likely than pronominal heads in other cases to trigger predicate agreement in the relative clause as opposed to the use of 3rd person forms.	—	Polish, Czech, Ukrainian, Russian

2) A few syntactic phenomena suggest that at least two hierarchies, namely (14) and (15), align in their predictions, the positions to the left being increasingly preferred for the same morphosyntactic construction.

(14) no external head > external head without a pronoun > external head with a noun

(15) maximalizing > restrictive > appositive (Grosu, Landman 1988)

These phenomena include at least the following.

— Agreement of the relative clause predicate with the relative head, see (Kholodilova 2015b).

— Case attraction and inverse attraction, see (Kholodilova 2015a).

— The distribution of ‘who’- and ‘which’-relativizers (Kholodilova 2017a).

According to the hypothesis suggested in (Kholodilova 2017a: 139–142), the correlation between the hierarchies (14) and (15) reflects the macroparameter of higher or lower integration of the head into the relative clause, the level of integration decreasing along the hierarchies. Some additional data, including the distribution of ‘who’- and ‘which’-pronouns and the punctuation in Finnish relative constructions, suggest that this microparameter could also account for the hierarchy in (16).

(16) singular (light) heads > plural (light) heads

3) Agreement patterns in relative constructions are related to the occurrence of null subjects, agreement with the head being more prevalent in the languages that allow null subjects.

The following **publications** were selected for the defense:

1. Kholodilova M. A. Specializirovannye otnositel’nye mestoimenija, obrazovannye ot voprositel’nyx, v slavjanskix jazykax // Voprosy jazykoznanija 4, 2020, in print.
2. Kholodilova M. Person in Slavic relative clauses // Zeitschrift für Slavische Philologie 75, 1, 2019. P. 43–64.
3. Kholodilova M. Competition between ‘who’ and ‘which’ in Slavic light-headed relative clauses // Slověne 6, 1, 2017a. P. 118–147.
4. Kholodilova M. A. Otnositel’nye pridatočnye // Plungian V. A. et al. (ed.). Materialy k korpusnoj grammatike russkogo jazyka. II. Sintaksičeskie konstrukcii i grammatičeskie kategorii. St. Petersburg: Nestor-Istorija, 2017b. P. 205–279.
5. Kholodilova M. A. Slovoizmenitel’naja oduševlennost’ mestoimenija *kotoryj* // Proceedings of the V.V. Vinogradov Russian Language Institute X, 2016a. P. 342–355.
6. Kholodilova M. A. (*To,*) *čto nazyvaetsja*: meždu otnositel’noj konstrukciej i ustojčivym vvodnym oborotom // Acta linguistica Petropolitana. Trudy Instituta lingvisticheskih issledovanij XII, 3, 2016b. P. 763–780.
7. Kholodilova M. A. Soglasovanie s veršinoj otnositel’nyx konstrukcij i obosoblennyx imennyx oborotov v russkom jazyke // Russian Language and Linguistic Theory 30 (2), 2015b. P. 74–97.

8. Kholodilova M. A. Konkurencija osnovnyx strategij reljativizacii podležaščego v russkom jazyke // Acta linguistica Petropolitana. Trudy Instituta lingvisticheskih issledovanij X, 2, 2014. P. 478–509.
9. Kholodilova M. A. Reljativizacija pozicii posessora v russkom jazyke // Russian Language and Linguistic Theory 21, 2011. P. 5–46.

Some of the dissertation-related research is also discussed in the following publications:

10. Kholodilova M. A. *Review of* Y. Matsumoto, B. Comrie, P. Sells (eds.). Noun-Modifying clause constructions in languages of Eurasia: Rethinking theoretical and geographical boundaries. [Typological Studies in Language 116]. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2017. vi + 381 p. // Voprosy jazykoznanija 3, 2020. P. 135–146.
11. Kholodilova M. A. Konkurencija mestoimenij 'kto' i 'kotoryj' v slavjanskix jazykax // Mishchenko D. F. et al. (eds). Dvenadcataja Konferencija po tipologii i grammatike dlja molodyx issledovatelej. Tezisy dokladov (Sankt-Peterburg, 19–21 nojabrja 2015 g.). St. Petersburg.: Nestor-Istorija, 2015. P. 110–113.
12. Kholodilova M. A. Rassoglasovanie v ingermanlandskix finskix otnositel'nyx predloženijax // V. F. Vydrin, N. V. Kuznecova (eds). Ot Bikina do Bambaljumy, iz varjag v greki. Ekspedicionnye etjudy v čest' Eleny Vsevolodovny Perexval'skoj. St. Petersburg.: Nestor-Istorija, 2014. P. 288–301.
13. Kholodilova M. Inverse attraction in Ingrian Finnish // Linguistica Uralica XLIX, 2, 2013. P. 96–116.

The results of the study were presented in the following **talks**:

1. Kholodilova M. A. Specializirovannye otnositel'nye mestoimenija, obrazovannye ot voprositel'nyx, v slavjanskix jazykax. Talk at "Grammatical Processes and Systems in Synchrony and in Diachrony". Moscow, 27–29.05.19.
2. Kholodilova M. Possessor relativization in the Balkan languages. Talk at "Balkan languages and dialects: Corpus-based and quantitative studies". Saint Petersburg, 18–20.10.18.
3. Kholodilova M. Competition between relative an interrogative pronouns in Macedonian. Talk at "Corpus-Based Approaches to the Balkan Languages and Dialects". Saint Petersburg, 5–7.12.16.
4. Kholodilova M. Person in Slavic relative clauses. Talk at "Relativization strategies in a Central European perspective: Slavic and beyond", Zürich, 28–29.10.2016.
5. Kholodilova M. A. Slovoizmenitel'naja oduševlennost' mestoimenija *kotoryj*. Talk at "Grammatical Processes and Systems in Synchrony and in Diachrony", Moscow, 30.05–1.06.16.
6. Kholodilova M. Competition between 'who' and 'which' in Slavic relative clauses. Talk at the 12th Conference on Typology and Grammar for Young Scholars. Saint Petersburg, 19–21.11.15.
7. Kholodilova M. Case attraction in Non-standard Russian. Talk at 'Insufficient strength to defend its case': Case attraction and related phenomena, Wrocław, 18.–19.09.15.
8. Kholodilova M. A. *To, čto nazyvaetsja*: meždu otnositel'noj konstrukciej i ustojčivym vvodnym oborotom. Talk at "Constructional & Lexical Semantic Approaches to Russian". Saint Petersburg, 16.–18.04.15.
9. Kholodilova M. A. Soglasovanie s veršinoj otnositel'noj konstrukcii v russkom jazyke. Talk at "Typology of Morphosyntactic Parameters 2014". Moscow, 15.10.14–17.10.2014.
10. Kholodilova M. Animacy distinction in (mostly) Slavic possessive relative pronouns. Talk at CoQuaT 2013, Leipzig, 14.08.2013.
11. Kholodilova M. Relativization of subjects in Russian: a case study of competition between syntactic synonyms. Talk at the conference "Re-thinking synonymy: Semantic sameness and similarity in languages and their description", Helsinki, 28.–30.10.2010.

12. Kholodilova M. A. «Effekt krysolova» v konstrukcii s vnešnim posessorom. Talk at the 13th International Student Conference on Philology, Saint Petersburg, 5.–10.04.2010.
13. Kholodilova M. A. Konkurencija osnovnyx strategij reljativizacii podležaščego v russkom jazyke. Talk at 6th Conference on Typology and Grammar for Young Scholars. Saint Petersburg, 26.–28.11.2009.

Abbreviations

bel — Belarusian; bul — Bulgarian; ces — Czech; hr — Croatian; hsb — Upper Sorbian; mkd — Macedonian; pol — Polish; rus — Russian; slk — Slovak; slv — Slovene; sr — Serbian; ukr — Ukrainian.

Sources

Vidoeski 2000 — Vidoeski B. Tekstovi od dijalektite na makedonski. Skopje: Sv. Kliment Oxridski, 2000.
ASPAC, Amsterdam parallel corpus by Adrian A. Barentsen[2]
BNC, Bulgarian National Corpus (search.dcl.bas.bg)
Bulgarian Dialectology as Living Tradition (http://www.bulgariandialectology.org)
CNC, Czech National Corpus (www.korpus.cz, accessed via "Kontext" interface at kontext.korpus.cz)
DOTKO, Dolnoserbski tekstowy korpus (www.dolnoserbski.de/korpus/, accessed via "Kontext" interface at kontext.korpus.cz)
HNK, Croatian National Corpus (hnk.ffzg.hr)
HOTKO, Hornolužický textový korpus (korpus.cz/corpora/run.cgi/first_form, accessed via "Kontext" interface at kontext.korpus.cz)
InterCorp (https://ucnk.ff.cuni.cz/intercorp/, accessed via "Kontext" interface at kontext.korpus.cz)
FidaPLUS, Korpus slovenskega jezika
NKJP, National Corpus of Polish (nkjp.pl)
Parasol (von Waldenfels, Ruprecht and Meyer, Roland (2006–): ParaSol, a Corpus of Slavic and Other Languages. Available at parasolcorpus.org. Bern, Regensburg)
RNC, Russian National Corpus (ruscorpora.ru)
slWaC, Slovene web corpus (https://www.clarin.si/noske/run.cgi/first_form?corpname=slwac)
SNC, Slovak National Corpus (korpus.juls.savba.sk)

References

Bauer J. K. K vývoji vztažných vět v slovanských jazycích // Slavica Slovaca 2, 4, 1967. S. 297–320.

Corbett G. G. Number. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Corbett G. G. Agreement. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Gołąb Z., Friedman V. A. The relative clause in Slavic // Peranteau P., Levi J., Phares G. (eds.). The Chicago Which Hunt. Papers from the Relative Clause Festival. Chicago. 1972. P. 30–46.

Grosu A., Landman F. Strange Relatives of the Third Kind // Natural Language Semantics 6, 1998, 125–170.

Iliev I. G. Teorija na otnositeljnostta. Bălgarskite otnositelni mestoimenija – proizxod i razvoj. I, 2012.

Kholodilova M. A. Reljativizacija pozicii posessora v russkom jazyke // Russian Language and Linguistic Theory 21, 2011. P. 5–46.

Kholodilova M. A. Konkurencija osnovnyx strategij reljativizacii podležaščego v russkom jazyke // Acta linguistica Petropolitana. Trudy Instituta lingvisticheskih issledovanij X, 2, 2014. P. 478–509.

Kholodilova M. Case attraction in Non-standard Russian. Talk at 'Insufficient strength to defend its case': Case attraction and related phenomena, Wrocław, 18.–19.09.15a.

[2] I am grateful to Adrian A. Barentsen for access to the corpus data.

Kholodilova M. A. Soglasovanie s veršinoj otnositel'nyx konstrukcij i obosoblennyx imennyx oborotov v russkom jazyke // Russian Language and Linguistic Theory 30 (2), 2015b. P. 74–97.
Kholodilova M. A. Slovoizmenitel'naja oduševlennost' mestoimenija *kotoryj* // Proceedings of the V. V. Vinogradov Russian Language Institute X, 2016a. P. 342–355.
Kholodilova M. A. (*To,*) *čto nazyvaetsja*: meždu otnositel'noj konstrukciej i ustojčivym vvodnym oborotom // Acta linguistica Petropolitana. Trudy Instituta lingvisticheskih issledovanij XII, 3, 2016b. P. 763–780.
Kholodilova M. Competition between 'who' and 'which' in Slavic light-headed relative clauses // Slověne 6, 1, 2017a. P. 118–147.
Kholodilova M. A. Otnositel'nye pridatočnye // Plungian V. A. et al. (ed.). Materialy k korpusnoj grammatike russkogo jazyka. II. Sintaksičeskie konstrukcii i grammatičeskie kategorii. St. Petersburg: Nestor-Istorija, 2017b. P. 205–279.
Kholodilova M. Person in Slavic relative clauses // Zeitschrift für Slavische Philologie 75, 1, 2019. P. 43–64.
Kholodilova M. A. Specializirovannye otnositel'nye mestoimenija, obrazovannye ot voprositel'nyx, v slavjanskix jazykax // Voprosy jazykoznanija 4, 2020, in print.
Kibrik A. E. Does intragenetic typology make sense? // Böder Winfried et al. (eds.). Sprache im Raum und Zeit. In memoriam Johannes Bechert. Band 2. Beiträge zur empirischen Sprachwissenschaft. Tübingen: Günter Narr Verlag, 1998.
Kibrik A. E. Rodstvennye jazyki kak ob'ekt tipologii // Kibrik A. E. Konstanty i peremennye jazyka. St. Petersburg: Aletejja, 2003.
Kordić S. Der Relatisatz im Serbokroatischen. München — Newcastle: Lincom Europa, 1999.
Křížková H. Relativní věty v současných slovanských jazycích // Slávia, 39, 1970, 10–40.
Mendoza I. Relative particles and resumptive pronouns in Slavic // Zeitschrift für Slavische Philologie 75, 1, 2019. P. 5–42.
Minlos Ph. Slavic relative *čto* / *co*: between pronouns and conjunctions // Slověne 1, 2012. P. 74–91.
Schütze C. T. The empirical base of linguistics: Grammaticality judgments and linguistic methodology. Berlin: Language Scince Press, 2016. — 1st ed. 1996.
Senderska J. Zdania względne w historii polszczyny. Kielce: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jana Kochanowskiego, 2013.
Sonnenhauser B., Wandl F. Relative clauses // Greenberg M. L., Genis R. M. (eds.). Encyclopedia of Slavic languages and linguistics. Leiden: Brill, in print.