INFINITIVAL RELATIVE CLAUSES IN BALTIC AND SLAVONIC

I have dealt with the Baltic infinitival relative clauses on several previous occasions, once in connection with the Latvian debitive, which historically derives from a complex structure involving an infinitival relative clause (Holvøet 1998), and once in connection with the Lithuanian infinitive constructions (often referred to as the dativus cum infinitivo) which have probably remained closer to the original Common Baltic infinitive constructions that underlie the Latvian infinitival relative clauses (Holvøet, forthcoming).

Among the contemporary Baltic and Slavonic languages, only Latvian has fully developed infinitival relative clauses. These are a subtype of what Palmer (1986, 178–9) calls relative purpose clauses. Such clauses express the purpose of an object or the function that the person denoted by the antecedent is expected to perform. (1) and (2) are examples of this:

(1) Viņš gribēja ierīkot veikalu, no kā dzīvot. (T. Zeisferts)
‘He wanted to set up a shop out of which to make a living.’

(2) Viņš pat meģināja ieteikt kādas [...] grāmatas, ko viņai laišat savā atpūtas laikā. (A. Eglītis)
‘He even tried to recommend some books for her to read in her moments of leasure.’

Only Latvian has infinitival relative clauses adjoined to nouns. They are briefly mentioned in the Latvian Academy Grammar (Bergmāne et al. 1962, 673) as a subtype of relative clauses expressing purpose. In Lithuanian and in Slavonic, only one type of infinitival relative clauses is attested, though, quite often, they are not recognised as relative clauses and, in some cases, the sentences in which they occur are described as simple sentences¹. The infinitival relative clauses referred to here have no overt antecedent and occur in the following circumstances:

---
¹ This is the case, in particular, with the Russian constructions containing the pronominal forms нечего, некого etc. As these are not immediately recognisable as relative pronouns (and in fact they are described as a subtype of negative pronouns in Russian grammar, cf. Švedova, ed. 1970, 306), the originally compound
(a) in the place where one would expect a nominative subject in an existential construction with the substantive verb ‘be’, or in a possessive construction with the verb ‘be’ (i.e., constructions of the type mihi est), e.g.,

(3) Lith. Yra apie ką papasakoti.
(4) Latv. Ir par ko stāstīt.
(5) Polish Jest o czym opowiadać.
(6) Russ. Est’ o čem rasskazyvat’.

‘There is something to talk about.’

(8) Russ. Nam est’, čto kušat’. / Nam nečego kušat’.

‘We have got something / We have got nothing to eat.’

(10) Russ. Nam est’, gde žit’. / Nam negde žit’.

‘We have (haven’t) got a place to live.’

(b) in the place where one would expect an accusative object in a possessive construction with the verb ‘have’. This type is, of course, restricted to those languages that have such a verb or where it is the normal means of expressing possession. The equivalent in languages that have only the construction mihi est is illustrated by the Latvian and Russian examples under (a) above.

(12) Polish Nie mam co ci dać.

‘I’ve got nothing to give to you.’

(13) Lith. Neturime, kur gyventi.
(14) Polish Nie mamy gdzie mieszkać.

‘We have got no place to live.’

There is, of course, no need to reconstruct this type as a Common ‘Balto-Slavonic’ clause type: it must have arisen independently in the separate history of the Baltic and Slavonic languages, as the infinitive lost its original nominal character and became a verbal form. The construction must be Common Slavonic, however, as it is attested already in Old Church Slavonic, e.g., ne imotь česo ēsti ‘they have nothing

character of the sentence is completely obscured. For the treatment of such constructions in Russian syntax cf. Šachmatov (1941, 149), Švedova, ed. (1970, 565, 569). Curiously enough, even Old Russian structures like něstь koto ichь prijemь are treated as simple sentences in Russian historical grammar, with koto as the subject and něstь as a copula, cf. Borkovskij, ed. (1978, 12–13).
to eat’, and it can also be found, with minor differences, in the modern Slavonic languages (cf. Mirowsicz 1964 for Russian and Polish).

If the type without overt antecedent is the only one to be attested in Lithuanian and in Slavonic, then it seems a priori more probably that the Latvian type of infinitival relative clauses adjoined to overt antecedents is an innovation of this language than that Lithuanian and the Slavonic languages should once have had this type as well but subsequently restricted its use. The Lithuanian equivalents of the Latvian infinitival relative clauses are constructions with infinitives performing by themselves the function of adnominal or adverbial modifiers expressing purpose. Here, Lithuanian has undoubtedly better preserved an older structure reflecting the original nominal character of the infinitive. The Baltic and Slavonic infinitive was originally the dative of a verbal noun in *-ti-* (cf./ Endzelins 1951, 918, 989; Stang 1966, 447–8; Ambrazas 1995, 74–5). The original nominal character of the infinitive is still reflected in one construction that is well preserved in Modern Lithuanian: the so-called dativus cum infinitivo, as instanced by the following sentences (examples cited after Ambrazas 1995):

(15) ipyliau pieno šuniukams lakti
    ‘I poured out some milk for the dogs to lap.’
(16) nusipirkau arklį laukams arti
    ‘I bought a horse to plough the fields with.’

In these constructions the grammatical relation which the noun bears to the infinitive (subject or object) does not affect its case form, as the noun was not originally dependent on the infinitive at all: it was directly connected to the noun or to the verb phrase as an adnominal or adverbial dative of purpose, just as the infinitive was.

The Latvian non-finite relative clauses adjoined to nouns probably arose when a relative pronoun was inserted before an infinitive functioning as a dative of purpose. In some cases, this could be achieved without any additional changes being required. So, for instance, the dativus cum infinitivo with the noun in subject function could easily be transformed into an infinitival relative clause, because the subject of an infinitive clause is always in the dative in Baltic. We thus have:

(17) lai stāvēja ķirsūnīte putniņiem uzmesties alongside
(18) lai stāvēja ķirsūnīte kur putnam uzmesties BW 2765 (cf. Endzelīn 1951, 990)
    ‘Let there be (in order that there should be) a tree-top for the birds to alight on.’

This transformation was somewhat more complicated when the dative noun phrase bore the relation of object to the infinitive, as in this case the original dative could not be maintained but had to be replaced with the accusative, e.g.,
(19) *es nopirku zirgu laukiem art
(20) es nopirku zirgu, ar ko laukus art
‘I bought a horse to plough the fields with.’

As the infinitive construction with the dative in object function is attested in Lithuanian and Slavonic (cf. Ambrazas 1995, with examples and literature), we may assume it to have existed in Proto-Latvian as well, and certain indirect traces of it might have been preserved in some dialectal varieties of the debitive, as I have argued in an earlier publication (Holvoet, forthcoming). These dialectal constructions will be discussed further on.

One would be tempted to extend this explanation, which works so well for the Latvian infinitival relative clauses with overt antecedents, to the type without overt antecedent attested in Lithuanian and Slavonic. Here, however, we face a number of difficulties. First, we have no external evidence that could corroborate an explanation along similar lines, as we have for the Latvian constructions that can be compared to the more archaic Lithuanian equivalents. But there is also a more fundamental difficulty. If we derive the type represented by Lithuanian neturiu ka/ko valgyti, Latvian man nav ko ēst from an original structure neturiu valgyti, man nav ēst in the same way that we can derive Latvian man nav maizes, ko ēst from an original *man nav maizes ēst, then the restrictions imposed upon this type of relative clause are inexplicable. If both constructions existed, then why would a relative pronoun have been inserted only in constructions where there was no noun phrase capable of functioning as an antecedent for it? By themselves, structures like neturiu valgyti, man nav ēst as Proto-Baltic constructions are also highly problematic. They certainly are attested in modern Lithuanian and Latvian, cf.

(21) Ka tik mums ir ēst. (Endzelinis 1951, 990)
‘If only we’ve got [enough] to eat.’

(22) Turiu ir pavalgšt, ir apsvilkt. (LKŻ XVII 93, s.v. turēti)
‘I’ve got [enough] to eat, and [clothes] to put on.’

Here, the infinitives function as subjects and objects respectively rather than as adverbials expressing purpose. Such uses are regarded as instances of secondary nominalisation of the infinitive by Ambrazas (1995, 102), and this interpretation seems justified. Parallels from Slavonic could be cited here, cf. colloquial Polish dać komuś jeść ‘give someone something to eat’, nie mam wydać ‘I don’t have the change’ etc. Constructions like these probably are not ancient. We might be tempted to project them upon Common Baltic and Slavonic, but we have to remember that the status of the infinitive in Common Baltic and Slavonic cannot be identified with
what it is in the modern languages. We should bear in mind that the infinitive was originally the dative of a verbal noun, which means that it could not have functioned as an object as it obviously does in modern Lithuanian *turiu valgyti*, modern Polish *zrobię ci jeść* etc. If we assume structures of the type *turiu valgyti, *man ir ėst* ‘I have something to eat’ to have existed in Proto-Baltic, then we must assume a zero object for the verb ‘have’, or a zero subject for the verb ‘be’. We would have to assume pronoun insertion as the next stage, but why should it have occurred only in those cases where there was a zero object or a zero subject? On the other hand, it is quite conceivable that there should have been constructions with indefinite pronouns rather than zero objects or subjects, i.e., constructions of the type ‘There is *something* to eat’, ‘I have got some *something* to eat’. Such an interpretation is actually proposed by Pórák (1967, 105) for Old Czech *mám co dělati*, where *co* would have been equivalent to *něco* ‘something’, and the infinitive would have retained its original status, viz. that of an infinitive of purpose. In this case, there would have been no pronoun insertion, but only a reinterpretation of a functionally ambiguous pronoun. I will return to this point below.

The above considerations suggest that, apart from the difference in chronology, there can be no common or even parallel explanation for the type of infinitival relative clause with an overt antecedent attested in Latvian, and the one without antecedent attested also in Lithuanian and Slavonic. For the latter, an explanation of another kind should be found that would account for the rise of the infinitival relative clause in those cases where there is no antecedent, i.e., when the existential construction is without a surface subject, or the verb ‘have’ without a surface object.

In the case of ‘esse’ there seem to be parallels for this zero subject. In Old Church Slavonic and the early history of other Slavonic languages, there are instances of participial clauses with a relative (actually an interrogative-relative) subject pronoun, adjoined to the zero subject of an existential verb:

(23) něstъ kto miluje. i něstъ k’to milosrđuju (Cod. Suprasliensis)
    = xai owa ḫyn ə elēwv
    ‘there is no one who pities’;

(24) ože ne budetъ kto jego mŷste. to položiti za golovu 80 grivenъ (Russkaja Pravda)
    ‘if there is no one to avenge him’

As Ambrazas (1990, 115–6) points out, this type of participial clause is paralleled by Lithuanian, where the construction, though attested, of course, at a
much later date, is actually much better preserved and can even be found in the contemporary dialects. Latvian does not offer any parallels in this particular case.2

(25) ka(d) būt kas nueinas ‘чтобы было кому пойти’;
(26) nebuvo kas bedirbas ‘не было кому работать’;
(27) bau butu kas ischmanas ‘ob jemand klug sey’ (Ambrazas 1990, 115).

One gets the impression that the relative clause functions as a subject clause, i.e., that it is not adjoined to the subject but takes the place of a nominative subject. This is actually the interpretation suggested by Bauer (1972, 306), who explains kto miluje as a complement clause (obsahová věta) rather than a relative clause. However, the extent of the notion of complement clause to cases where a predicate does not require a propositional argument does not seem convincing, and I will regard these cases as instances of relative clauses.

The subsequent development of this construction is clear: the participle was replaced by a 3rd person finite form, which gave rise to the constructions

(28) néstę, kąto rabotaet;
(29) nera kas dirba
‘there is no one to work.’

The infinitival constructions, however, are less easy to account for. The use of the participle in various types of subordinate clauses as well as in relative clauses seems to be an archaic feature inherited from Indo-European (cf. Ambrazas 1989 and 1990, 121–122). As far as the 3rd person forms are concerned, it is clear that at least part of them must have replaced original participles, as the use of participles in relative clauses is a receding rather than an expanding feature. It is interesting to note that in certain cases an original infinitive has been replaced with a 3rd person form as well. This can be seen in a number of Lithuanian constructions where the 3rd person occurs with a subject in the dative, which can be explained only on the assumption that is was originally the subject of an infinitive:

(30) nér kam ažtaria rūsciuos žādeliuos
‘nicht einer ist da, der... für mich Fürsprache einlegen könnte bei zornigen Worten’
(Fraenkel 1936).

2 Latvian has also preserved traces of the use of participles in relative clauses, but they are of an indirect kind. So, for instance, there is the idiomatic type lai būtu, kas būdams ‘however that may be, whatever may happen’. This type somehow seems to be connected with the one discussed here. It seems quite certain that the peculiarly Baltic participle in -dam- has replaced an inherited participle in -nt- here, as in all other cases where it occurs in relative clauses such as those discussed here. This tendency can be observed in Lithuanian as well, but in Latvian it has been generalised, and the original participles in -nt- are not attested at all, cf. Ambrazas (1990, 115).
This does not necessarily mean that the 3rd person must have replaced a participle or an infinitive wherever it is attested in a relative purpose clause, but it certainly points to the conclusion that the 3rd person is expanding in relative purpose clauses at the cost of other forms. This is paralleled by a similar development in Latvian, as far as can be judged from the development of the debitive, which historically derives from a structure with an infinitival relative clause. The debitive is now based on the 3rd person indicative, but, as Endzelin assumed, this form probably ousted an original infinitive, still retained in jābūt (for a more detailed discussion cf. Holvoet, forthcoming). If there are good reasons for assuming both participles and infinitives to have been replaced, at various stages, with 3rd person forms in relative purpose clauses, there are no equally valid reasons for assuming participles to have been replaced with infinitives in sentences like (23–27). Such a substitution would presuppose the use of the infinitive (originally, as noted above, a dative of purpose derived from a verbal noun) as a predicative form in some or other clause type. It would be hard, however, to point out a clause type where a predicative infinitive could have developed from an adverbial infinitive of purpose, and that could have served as a model for the substitution considered here. Sentences like (23–27) can therefore not be regarded as the direct source of infinitival relative clauses, but the evidence of such constructions is certainly relevant to the discussion of infinitival relative clauses in view of the obvious structural similarity between both types, the participial and the infinitival one. Of course, the variety that is directly relevant to our point is not that with the relative pronoun in subject position, as illustrated in (23–27); there must also have been similar constructions with the relative pronoun in some oblique case form, v. infra.

What is of particular importance in Slavonic constructions like (23–24) is the selection of the pronoun. It should be noted that Old Church Slavonic has retained the original relative pronominal stem *ye/o- in the shape iže, jaže, eže, and a distinct relative pronoun is also attested in Old Czech, but the interrogative stem is used in the construction ne imot y česo ęsti. Bauer (1972, 306) notes that the interrogative stem is not normally used instead of the relative stem *yo- in Old Church Slavonic, with the exception of those cases where kto is introduced by něstb (a fact he explains by assuming that these cases actually represent complement clauses rather than relative clauses, as mentioned above). It seems, therefore, that in the Slavonic languages the interrogative pronoun is found to occur in relative purpose clauses wherever it can be unambiguously identified. This suggests that, in Slavonic, relative purpose clauses are not formally distinguished from interrogative complement clauses. Both are attested in OChSLI with participles. The following is an instance of
an interrogative complement clause, judging from the use of the interrogative pronoun rather than the relative 
\textit{eže}:

(31) \textit{ne vėdėtę bo, čyto tvorešte}
\hfill \textit{They do not know what they are doing.}
\begin{align*}
& \text{où γὰρ οἶδασιν τι ποιοῦσιν} \\
\end{align*}

This construction has its exact counterpart in Lithuanian \textit{nežino ką daria}, cf. A m b r a z a s (1990, 114–5; on the correspondence between the Lithuanian and Slavonic constructions: 1990, 121–2)\textsuperscript{3}.

It is therefore quite reasonable to reconstruct a parallelism of the following type:

(32) \textit{ne vėdėtę, čyto tvorešte}
\hfill \textit{They do not know what they are doing.}

(33) *\textit{ne imotę čyto (čege) tvorešte}
\hfill \textit{They have nothing to do.}

In Lithuanian, the parallelism could be represented as:

(34) \textit{Jie nežino, ką daria.}
(35) \textit{Jie neturi, ką daria.}

As the same pronoun is used in both clause types, a line of division between them cannot be drawn. The same holds true for the infinitival varieties. If no antecedent could be inserted before the relative clause in *\textit{ne imotę, čyto tvoriti}, there is no means to distinguish it from an interrogative complement clause as in *\textit{ne vėdėtę, čyto tvoriti}. In fact, both types are dealt with jointly by G e b a u e r (1929, 575), M i k l o s i c h (1926, 866) etc. The correspondences between the constructions \textit{vim, co dēlati} and \textit{mām, co dēlati} are pointed out for Old Czech by P o r ā k (1967, 103). In a similar way, both Lithuanian Academy Grammars (U l ν y d a s e a., eds., 1976, 811; A m b r a z a s, ed., 1994, 670) deal with infinitival relative clauses in close connection with infinitival interrogative complement clauses and state that both types are ‘formally similar’. As far as Old Church Slavonic is concerned, the state of affairs is probably somewhat obscured by the influence of the Greek model, but D e l b r ü c k (1900, 393) correctly observes that the co-occurrence of \textit{ne vėmę čyto glagolješi = oùx oïðxa τi λέγεσι Matthew 26, 70} and \textit{ne vėmę ježe glagolješi = oùx oïðxa o λέγεσι Luke 22, 60} cannot have been determined exclusively by the Greek original. He points out that some originally relative pronouns, such as Polish \textit{jaki, Czech jaký}, have extended their scope and can now be used interrogatively, which

\textsuperscript{3} Once again, exact correspondences are lacking in Latvian, but they may be reconstructed on the basis of the Lithuanian constructions.
can be explained only if we assume that certain types of relative and interrogative clauses have merged or have not been consistently distinguished.

As mentioned above, infinitival relative clauses and infinitival interrogative complement clauses must be of more recent origin than those containing participles and finite verb forms. It is quite possible that, when they were introduced, they were introduced at the same time in both types of clauses, as these were not consistently distinguished in the case of more archaic participial constructions either. At any rate, this seems to have been the case in Slavonic as well as in Lithuanian.

For Latvian, the situation is more complicated. The oldest type of infinitival relative clauses that can be identified in Latvian is that which, in a fossilised shape, has been preserved in the debitive. The prefix *jā- of the debitive is unambiguously derived from the relative pronominal stem *ye/o, which is distinct from the interrogative stem. The exact correspondence of the construction underlying the debitive to the infinitival relative clauses discussed here can be seen from Old Latvian examples such as (35) and (36). Note that in these examples kas is an indefinite pronoun (aliquid), and the verb forms in jā- have by themselves the value of relative purpose clauses:


(37) *Ir iums ēze kas iaæde? (Elger, EE 40r14)

= habetis hic aliquid, quod manducetur?

The Latvian dialects have also retained examples of the original meaning, cf. man nau jubrauc ‘Мне не на чем ехать’ (Мühlbach 1907, 316–7). If modern Latvian has infinitival relative clauses with the pronominal stem *k*ē-, identical to the interrogative stem, then this is no doubt a later development. After the earlier variety with the pronominal stem *ye/o- had been grammaticalised and had developed into what is now the debitive, the original infinitival relative clauses were renewed by means of the relative pronominal stem *k*ē-, which had ousted the original one by that time. In Glück, one finds a few isolated instances of infinitival relative clauses introduced by the pronominal stem *k*ē-, whereas instances of the ‘proto-debitive’ , i.e., the form underlying the present-day debitive, used in its original function of a relative purpose clause, still predominates:

(38) jo teem newaida tew ko makfaht (Luke 14.14)⁴

= quia non habent retribuere tibi.

It seems almost certain that the original Latvian infinitival relative clauses with the pronominal stem *ye/o- could be added to overt antecedents, just as their mod-

---

⁴ Cf. the exact equivalent of this construction, containing the proto-debitive, in Elger: vnd kad tems ne by iamaklā, abbrev pedewwe 64v5-6 = Luc. 7.42 non habentibus illis, unde redderent, donavit utrisque.
ern Latvian equivalents can. This is shown by adnominal uses of the proto-debitive in Old Latvian texts:

(39) Man ir wēna barriba iaædu, kattru iūs ne finnat. (Elger 24r2 = John 4.32)
(40) man irr Barriba jaehd, ko juhs ne finnat. (Glück, John 4.32)⁵
    = ego cibum habeo manducare, quem vos nescitis.

It is also shown by the fossilised relics attested in the modern Latvian dialects, cited by Mühlenbach 1907:

(41) paņam kač pavadu zirgu jusapin
    'взъмь хоть повод, чтобы им запутать лошадь'
    'Take a lead with you to fetter the horse with.'

These constructions with overt antecedents have been shown above to be a characteristic feature of Latvian. We will leave them out of consideration here, in order to concentrate on the type without overt antecedent. The Latvian debitive points to a prototype *(man) ir juo ēst 'There is (I have) something to eat', opposed to a Lithuanian and Slavonic construction with the pronominal stem *kʷo-. It is impossible to establish at what stage Proto-Lithuanian ceased to use the relative pronominal stem *ye/o- as an independent relative pronoun (Lith. jis is now a personal or anaphoric pronoun, and only the pronominal forms of the adjective might perhaps be interpreted as a trace of an original relative use⁶). If, from the start, Lithuanian used the pronominal stem *kʷo- in infinitival relative clauses, whereas Latvian used *ye/o-, then the following patterns of development could be reconstructed.

At a certain stage, infinitives were introduced into a certain type of relative clauses that was not clearly distinguished from interrogative complement clauses with verba sentiendi. The rise of this new type cannot be reconstructed exactly, but it is conceivable that it occurred in the following way: an infinitive of purpose could be added to an existential construction with an indefinite pronoun, e.g., in Slavonic, this process could be reconstructed as

(42) *estь čدو ēsti
    'There is something to eat.'

---

⁵ Cf. the corresponding Lithuanian translations containing adverbial infinitives of purpose: Esch turiu penukščia valgiti kurios iūs nezūnot (Brečkūnas), aš turiu pena valgīt, kurio jis nežūnė (Chylinskas).

⁶ In fact, the relative character of the pronoun contained in the pronominal forms of the adjective is disputed by some scholars as well, cf. Rosinaš (1975, 169) for Baltic. For Slavonic cf. the survey in Kurz (1972, 39). In the discussion of the original relative character of the pronominal stem *ye/o, the evidence of the Latvian debitive has not yet been duly taken into account, even though the explanation proposed by Prellwitz (1904) and Endzelin (1905/1971) has never been refuted or seriously challenged.
Here-čto was an indefinite pronoun functioning as the subject of byti ‘be’, and the infinitive functioned as an adverbial dative of purpose. The corresponding negative variety could be reconstructed as

(43) *nēstb ničeso ěsti

‘There is nothing to eat.’

As the indefinite pronoun was identical to the interrogative pronoun, the construction *estb čto ěsti was reanalysed as containing an infinitival relative clause. Of course, this process also involved a reanalysis of the case form of the pronoun (accusative instead of nominative). In Slavonic, this reanalysis is not problematic, as a neuter pronoun was involved. For Lithuanian and Latvian, one must assume that the neuter form of the pronoun kas still existed at the time when this reanalysis occurred, but this assumption does not seem a priori implausible. If this reconstruction is correct, then the first type of infinitival relative clause to come into existence was one with a relative pronoun in the position of direct object.

The infinitival clause which arose from this reanalysis of the pronoun was not formally distinguishable from an interrogative complement clause with a verb like vēdēti (činotī) but as the interrogative interpretation is hardly conceivable in a construction with byti (būti), we will have to interpret it as a relative clause. At this stage, an optional differentiation took place between the infinitival interrogative complement clause type and the infinitival relative clause type. Whereas in the former only the interrogative pronoun *k*e-o- could be used, in the latter the relative pronoun proper, i.e., *ye/o-, could be introduced. This, however, happened only in one of the Baltic dialects, viz. that which was to give rise to Latvian.

In Slavonic and Lithuanian, both types thus remained undifferentiated, which set apart infinitival relative clauses from other relative clauses and blocked the way towards further extension of infinitival relative clauses as we know them from Latvian. As a result, infinitival relative clauses with overt antecedents did not develop. In Latvian, on the other hand, the introduction of the relative pronominal stem *ye/o- led to a further distinct development of infinitival relative clauses and opened the way for further extension of this type.

I therefore assume two stages in the development of infinitival relative clauses in Baltic: (1) the type without overt antecedent, arising from pronoun reanalysis, common to Lithuanian and Latvian, and (2) the type with overt antecedent, arising from pronoun insertion, proper to Latvian. The situation in Slavonic was the same as in Lithuanian.

It should be added that the parallelism between infinitival interrogative complement clauses and infinitival relative clauses is not complete even in Slavonic and
Lithuanian. What seems to distinguish both clause types is the curious extention of the genitive of negation to an infinitival relative clause, which, as a rule, does not occur in infinitival interrogative complement clauses. When the main clause verb ‘have’ or ‘be’ is negated, then the relative pronoun is frequently, though not always, in the genitive of negation: this is attested already in Old Church Slavonic, where we have *niešto česo ėsti. In Russian, the agglutinative forms that have arisen from accretion of the relative pronoun to the main clause verb něť < *něšť have retained the genitive: *im nečego est’ derives from *imn něť čego ėsti analogous to Old Church Slavonic ne imotь česo ėsti. It should be noted that this genitive of negation is, strictly speaking, unmotivated, because the pronoun is the object of the infinitive, which has no negation, rather than of the main clause verb ‘be’ or ‘have’.

In infinitival interrogative clauses we do not, as a rule, observe this unmotivated extension of the genitive. If both types of clause types were exactly parallel, then we would expect *ne vėdėtъ, čego tvoriti, Lith. *nežino, ko daryti, unless we assumed that only in ne imotь, čyb tvoriti the pronoun was somehow felt to be the object of the verb ‘have’. In fact, constructions of this type are attested in Old Czech with the verb vědětъ, as in Já tomu nevím jak hlavy zlomit, Neví, kam koz hňati, cited from Komenský by Porák (1967, 105–106), but these seem to be rather exceptional in Slavonic.

In Lithuanian, we observe the same extension of the genitive of negation as in Slavonic. In Old Lithuanian, we find both the accusative and the genitive, e.g., from Vilentas’ Euangelias bei Epistolas Fra e n k e l (1928a, 51) cites netureia ko walgiti (104, 9 = Mark VIII. 1) alongside nerada ką iem turetu padariti (108, 6 = Luke 19. 48). This state of affairs has remained unchanged in modern Lithuanian, where one still finds neturiu ką valgyti alongside neturiu ko valgyti, though the genitive of negation for objects of negated verbs is now obligatory in Lithuanian. In Latvian,

---

7 A form derived from the accusative, as in nešto delat’ ‘there’s nothing to be done’, is attested in the dialects, cf. Holthusen 1953, 158. In Czech and Polish, the case form of the pronoun in Ně mám co robić, Nemám, co délati is hard to interpret, as the original genitive *čęso is also used as an accusative in these languages.

8 Porák argues on the basis of this genitive of negation that, for Old Czech, constructions of the type vím, co délati should be set apart from interrogative complement clauses and be compared to the type mám, co délati, where co is an indefinite pronoun and délati an infinitive of purpose. In my opinion, Porák’s analysis is correct as far as the interpretation of the original structure of the type mám, co délati is concerned, but rather than assuming the type vím, co délati to have passed from the category of infinitival interrogative complement clauses to another, I believe both types, infinitival interrogative complement clauses on the one hand and infinitival relative clauses on the other, to be structurally similar (though the different origin of the latter is betrayed by the genitive of negation), so that between them there may be a transitional zone, illustrated by the construction with věděti in Old Czech. This structural similarity arose when mám, co délati had undergone a reanalysis and developed into a bi-clausal structure.
the genitive of negation has fallen in disuse, but the prefix jă- contained in the
debitive is probably the genitive of the pronominal stem *ye/o-, and this case form is
likely to have spread from the negative variety man nav jăëd < *man nav jă est, the
equivalent of Lithuanian neturiu ko valgyti (cf. E n d z e l ī n s 1905, 321 = 1971,
289 and H o l v o e t 1998, 110–111).
The explanation of this genitive of negation is not evident. One possibility that
could be taken into consideration is that, after a period of parallel development,
both construction types discussed here, viz. infinitival interrogative complement
clauses and infinitival relative clauses, became dissociated from each other in such
a way that the former continued to function as a kind of embedded clauses, whereas
the latter lost its clausal status. Loss of clausal status is assumed by T r ā v n Ĭć e k
(1931, 45) for embedded infinitives in Old Czech sentences such as nejmámt' co
dáti ‘I have nothing to give’. It should be observed that as simple sentences such
structures are rather deviant. The alternative to recognising co dáti as an embedded
clause would be to interpret mítí ‘have’ as an auxiliary, and the pronoun as the
object of the complex verbal phrase nejmád dáti But in that case the use of the
interrogative-relative pronoun instead of the negated form nic would become inexp-
licable. Another possibility would be to interpret the whole sentence type as idi-
omatic, and therefore syntactically opaque. For Polish, this solution is suggested by
J o d ł o w s k i (1977, 146–7). One interesting fact that could be taken as evidence
for the monoclausal character of the sentences discussed here is that native speakers
of Lithuanian will often correct a construction like neturiu ką valgyti into neturiu ko
valgyti on the grounds that the object of a negated verb should be in the genitive.
Probably nobody would suggest that nežinau ką daryti should be corrected into
*nežinau ko daryti, which means that in this case nobody would be inclined to inter-
pret the relative pronoun as the object of the negated verb neturiu. This, in turn,
would mean that the sentence neturiu ko valgyti is composed of one single clause,
whereas nežinau ką daryti is composed of two. The whole construction neturiu ko
valgyti would then have to be interpreted as idiomatic⁹.

⁹ The interpretation of these constructions as idiomatic (or, as Jodłowski puts it, lexicalised) seems
convincing enough for the Slavonic languages. Apart from the morphological changes rendering the whole
construction completely opaque in Russian, there are also morphosyntactic changes with more or less the
same effect. In Polish, the subject dative is replaced with a subject nominative in nie ma kto otworzyć drzwi,
which occurs alongside the original nie ma komu otworzyć drzwi ‘There is no one to open the door’. This
means that the subject noun phrase of the infinitive clause (in the dative) is reanalysed as the subject of the
main clause verb nie ma. Inasmuch as the whole syntactic structure has become opaque, the question whether
it is monoclausal or biclausal does not seem relevant any more, but the sentence pattern as a whole does seem
to acquire more and more features of a simple sentence.
Another possibility could also be envisaged. The negative variety reconstructed above as *nētō ničeso ēsti is not attested as such, but it is conceivable that, when the indefinite pronoun in the corresponding affirmative construction was reanalysed as an interrogative-relative pronoun (there was no formal difference between them), the negative pronoun ničeso was replaced with the interrogative-relative pronoun, which retained, in this case, the case marking characteristic of negative sentences. In other words, the case marking of the relative pronoun (which should be determined by the syntactic function of this pronoun within the relative clause) was inherited from the main clause to which the pronoun (i.e., the pronoun replaced by the relative one) originally belonged. If we accept this assumption, we gain an explanation for the otherwise unaccountable use of the genitive in infinitival relative clauses as opposed to the accusative normally used in infinitival interrogative complement clauses. In this way, the reconstruction suggested here would account both for the similarities and for the divergences in the development of both clause types just mentioned here.

Let us conclude with a few final remarks on the relationship between infinitives and other verb forms in Baltic relative purpose clauses. On the whole, relative purpose clauses are not characterised by the use of the indicative: they may contain the infinitive, as in Latvian and English (historically, such an infinitive derives from an adverbial infinitive of purpose), and Latin has a similar type containing the subjunctive, as in habetis hic aliquid, quod manducetur? (cf. Palmere 1986, 178–9). This is connected with the fact that relative purpose clauses are, by definition, non-assertive. On the evidence of archaic constructions like nebuvo kas bedīrbaš, ne budētē kē jēgo māstē, we may assume active participles to have been regularly used in such clauses in the early history of Baltic and Slavonic. Most of the attested participial relative purpose clauses are characterised by the occurrence of the relative pronoun in subject position (in the nominative). In clauses with relative pronouns in oblique case forms, the infinitive is already firmly established in Old Church Slavonic. When the relative pronoun was in subject position, the introduction of the infinitive was more complicated than in other cases, because it required additional morphosyntactic changes (the substitution of the dative for the nominative). This variety of the participial type of relative purpose clauses was therefore slower to give place to the infinitival type. When the participle fell into disuse, it was replaced with a 3rd person finite verb form; it was the demise of the predicative participle that gave rise to the modern Baltic constructions Lith. nēra kas dirba, Latv. nav kas strādā. As mentioned above, curious instances of the expansion of 3rd person verb forms in relative purpose clauses can be observed in Lithuanian dialects, where sentences like (30), with the relative pronoun in the dative, point to the original use
of an infinitive; and a similar substitution of a 3rd person verb form for an original infinitive seems to have occurred in the construction underlying the Latvian deitative. No satisfactory explanation has been proposed up to now for the introduction of the 3rd person form instead of the infinitive in the deitative, but the Lithuanian dialectal constructions seem to provide us with a clue. The 3rd person forms taking the place of infinitives seem to spread from those constructions which were originally characterised by the use of a predicative participle, and the demise of predicative participles might have been the reason why 3rd person forms began to compete with infinitives in Latvian as well. No relative purpose clauses with participles, analogous to those attested in the Lithuanian dialects, can be found in modern Latvian; but we may assume them to have existed at the time when the constructions underlying the deitative were still living syntactic structures. At any rate, no satisfactory explanation of the development of the deitative can be found without the Lithuanian data being taken into consideration.\footnote{This means that Mühlenbach's explanation of the 3rd person form contained in the deitative as an 'impersonal' verb form, i.e., a 3rd person form with an indefinite zero subject, as in saka 'they say' (cf. his rendering of man (ir) jubrauc as 'u menя есть, на чём едят', Mühlenbach 1907, 322) should be definitively abandoned.}

**INFINITYVINIAI SANTYKINIAI SAKINIAI BALTŲ IR SLAVŲ KALBOSE**

**Santrauka**

Latviņu kalba, skirtingai no lietuvių kalbos, turi infinityvinų santykinių sakinių, žyminčių vardažodines grupes (grāmatas, ko lasī „knygos skaitymui, – kurias galima skaityti“). Lietuvių ir slavų kalbos turi tik vieną infinityvinų santykinių sakinių tipą: jie žymi egzistencinio predikato nešreikštą subjektą (yra ką valgyti, nėra ką/ko valgyti; t. e. „čia bobas“) arba veiksmazodžio turėti nešreikštą objektą (turėti ką valgyti, naudoti ką/ko valgyti, s. b. sl. ne imorta česo ėsti). Akivaizdu, kad vardažodines grupes žymintys latviņu kalbos infinityviniai santykiniai sakinių yra šios kalbos naujadarai: jie atsirado prieš adverbialų paskirties bendrąjį įterpus santykinį įvardį, plg. lie. nusipirkau arkią akėti ir la. nopirkų zirgu, (ar) ko ečt. Bet lietuvių ir slavų kalbų infinityvinų santykinių sakinių atsiradimo negalima pasiskirstinti santykinio įvardžio įterpimu (pvz., neturiu ko valgyti iš neturių valgyti, s. b. sl. ne imorta česo ėsti iš ne imorta ėsti), nes tada būtų nesuprantama, kodėl įterpus įvardžius ten neatsirado vardažodines grupes žyminčių infinityvinų santykinių sakinių (*neturių duonos, kurią valgyti*). Šiame straipsnyje išskeliami mintis, kad tokios struktūros kaip lie. neturiu ko valgyti, sl. ne imorta česo ėsti galėjo atsirasti santykiniam įvardžiui pakeitus ankstesnį nežymimąjį (arba neigiamąjį) įvardį ir adverbiale paskirties bendračia tapus naujo santykinio sakinių predikatiniu centrui, pvz., turiu ką (= kažką) valgyti (= valgymiui) → turiu, ką valgyti. Šalygas tokiom procesui išvykti galėjo sudaryti panašios reikšmės santykinių sakinių su predikatinių dalyviais buvimas ir baltų ir slavų kalbose, plg. lie. nebuvo kas bedirbės ir s. b. sl. nėšį k’io milosrdują. Tokiu būdu šalia archaiko dalyvio tipo (ne)neturių ką valgys atsirado naujas infinityvinis tipas (ne)neturių ką valgys. Senas dalyvio tipo struktūros atžvilgiu buvo artimas tam tikram dalyviainiam netiesioginio klausimo sakinių tipui: nežino, ką darai (s. b. sl. ne vėdėte, čia tovęšete) → neturi, ką darai (s. b. sl. *Ne imortų čio (čego) tovęšete*). Dėl abiejų sakinių tipų paralelizmo bendratis iš
naujų infinityinių santykinių sakinių galėjo būti įsitesta ir į netiesioginio klausimo sakinius (nežino, ką daryti, sl. ne vėdėt, često tvorit), ir abu šie tīpai toliau vystėsi lygiagrečiai. Šis paralelizmas sukūrė infinityiniams santykiniams sakiniams paplūsti ir prasiskverbti į kitas sintakšines pozicijas, būtent į vardaždinės grupės pažyminio poziciją. Tik latvių prokalbėje minėtas paralelizmas išnyko, kadangi į infinityinius santykinius sakinius buvo įvesti *ye/o- kamieno santykiniai įvardžiai, reliktiinių pavidalu išlikę debityvo sudėtyje (plg. s. la. teem ne bij ja ehd „ie neturėjo ko valgyti“). Nutrūkus ryšiui su netiesioginio klausimo sakiniams (abiejų tipų sakiniuose vartojami įvardžiai formaliai nebesutapо) infinityiniams santykiniai sakiniams latvių kalboje plito toliau ir juos imta vartoti taip pat ir vardaždinėms grupėms žymėti. Dabar vartojamas atnaujintas jų variantas su *k*–o kamieno santykiniais įvardžiais.
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