A x e l H O L V O E T
The Lithuanian Language Institute, Vilnius

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 (H o l v o e t 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 (H o l v o e t, forthcoming).

Among the contemporary Baltic and Slavonic languages, only Latvian has fully developed infinitival relative clauses. These are a subtype of what P a l m e r (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. Zeiferts)
     'He wanted to set up a shop out of which to make a living.'

(2) *Viņš pat mēģināja ieteikt kādas [...] grāmatas, ko viņai lasīt 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 (B e r g m a n e e.a. 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 sentences[1]. 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 *nečego*, *nekogo* 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. Š v e d o v a, 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.'

(7) Latv.   *Mums ir, ko ēst. Mums nav, ko ēst.*

(8) Russ.   *Nam est', čto kušat'. / Nam nečego kušat'.*
          'We have got something / We have got nothing to eat.'

(9) Latv.   *Mums ir, kur dzīvot. Mums nav, kur dzīvot.*

(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.

(11) Lith.   *Neturiu, ką/ko tau duoti.*

(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 imǫtъ česo ěsti* '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 *něstъ kъto ichъ prijemlę* are treated as simple sentences in Russian historical grammar, with *kъto* as the subject and *něstъ* 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. M i r o w i c z 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. E n d z e l ī n s 1951, 918, 989; S t a n g 1966, 447–8; A m b r a z a s 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 A m b r a z a s 1995):

(15) *įpyliau 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 virsūnīte putniņiem uzmesties* alongside

(18) *lai stāvēja virsūnīte kur putnam uzmesties* BW 2765 (cf. E n d z e l i n 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. A m b r a z a s 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 (H o l v o e t, 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 ką/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.* (E n d z e l i n 1951, 990)
      'If only we've got [enough] to eat.'

(22) *Turiu ir pavalgyt, ir apsvilkt.* (LKŽ 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 A m b r a z a s (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

40

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 ēst* '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 P o r á k (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 miluję. i něstъ k'to milosrъduję* (Cod. Suprasliensis)
= καὶ οὐκ ἦν ὁ ἐλεῶν
'there is no one who pities';

(24) *ože ne budetъ kto jego mъstę. to položiti za golovu 80 grivenъ* (Russkaja Pravda)
'if there is no one to avenge him'
(cited from V e č e r k a 1961, 99–102).

As A m b r a z a s (1990, 115–6) points out, this type of participial clause is parallelled by Lithuanian, where the construction, though attested, of course, at a

41

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 nueinąs* 'чтобы было кому пойти';

(26)   *nebuvo kas bedirbąs* 'не было кому работать';

(27)   *bau butu kas ischmanąs* 'ob jemand klug sey' (A m b r a z a s 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 B a u e r (1972, 306), who explains *kto miluję* as a complement clause (*obsahová věta*) rather than a relative clause. However, the extention 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)   *něstъ, kъto rabotaetъ;*

(29)   *nėra 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. A m b r a z a s 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)   *nėr kam aztaria rūsciuos žādeliuos*
       'nicht einer ist da, der... für mich Fürsprache einlegen könnte bei zornigen Worten'
                                                                    (F r a e n k e l 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. A m b r a z a s (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 parallelled 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. H o l v o e t, 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 imǫtъ česo ěsti*. B a u e r (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 *něstъ* (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 OChSl with participles. The following is an instance of

an interrogative complement clause, judging from the use of the interrogative pronoun rather than the relative *eže*:

(31) *ne vědętъ bo, čьto tvoręšte*

οὐ γὰρ οἴδασιν τί ποιοῦσιν

'They do not know what they are doing.'

This construction has its exact counterpart in Lithuanian *nežino ką darą*, cf. A m b r a z a s (1990, 114–5; on the correspondence between the Lithuanian and Slavonic constructions: 1990, 121–2)[3].

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

(32) *ne vědętъ, čьto tvoręšte*

'They do not know what they are doing.'

(33) **ne imǫtъ čьto (čego) tvoręšte*

'They have nothing to do.'

In Lithuanian, the parallelism could be represented as:

(34) *Jie nežino, ką darą.*

(35) *Jie neturi, ką darą.*

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 **ne imǫtъ, čьto tvoriti*, there is no means to distinguish it from an interrogative complement clause as in **ne vědętъ, čьto 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 *vím, co dělati* and *mám, co dělati* are pointed out for Old Czech by P o r á k (1967, 103). In a similar way, both Lithuanian Academy Grammars (U l v 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 *ne věmь čьto glagolješi* = οὐκ οἶδα τί λέγεις Matthew 26, 70 and *ne věmь ježe glagolješi* = οὐκ οἶδα ὃ λέγεις Luke 22, 60 cannot have been determined exclusively by the Greek original. He points out that some originally relative pronouns, such as Polish *jaki*, Czech *jaký*, have extended their scope and can now be used interrogatively, which

---

[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:

(36) *Irrag jums fche kas ja-ehd?* (Glück, Luke 24.41)

(37) *Ir iums ʃʒœ kas iaœde?* (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' (M ü h l e n b a c h 1907, 316–7). If modern Latvian has infinitival relative clauses with the pronominal stem *k^wo-*, 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^wo-*, 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^wo-*, 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 iamakʃa, abbems 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 wêna barriba iaœdu, kattru iûs 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 M ü h l e n b a c h 1907:

(41) *pańam kač pavadu zirgu jusapin*

    'возьми 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 use[6]). 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) **estъ čьto ěsti*

    'There is something to eat.'

---

[5] Cf. the corresponding Lithuanian translations containing adverbial infinitives of purpose: *Esch turiu penukfchlą walgiti kurios ius nefzinot* (Bretkūnas), *aß turiu pena walgit, kurio jus nezÿnnote* (Chylinskis).

[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. R o s i n a s (1975, 169) for Baltic. For Slavonic cf. the survey in K u r z (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 P r e l l w i t z (1904) and E n d z e l i n (1905/1971) has never been refuted or seriously challenged.

Here čьto 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) *něstъ ničeso ěsti
    'There is nothing to eat.'

As the indefinite pronoun was identical to the interrogative pronoun, the construction *estъ čьto 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 věděti (žinoti) 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^wo- 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 *ne imǫtъ česo ěsti*. In Russian, the agglutinative forms that have arisen from accretion of the relative pronoun to the main clause verb *nětъ < *něstъ* have retained the genitive: *im nečego est'* derives from **imъ nětъ čego ěsti* analogous to Old Church Slavonic *ne imǫtъ česo ěsti*[7]. 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 vědętъ, čego tvoriti*, Lith. **nežino, ko daryti*, unless we assumed that only in *ne imǫtъ, čьto 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 *věděti*, as in *Já tomu nevím jak hlavy zlomit, Neví, kam koz hnáti*, cited from Komenský by P o r á k (1967, 105–106), but these seem to be rather exceptional in Slavonic[8].

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* F r a 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. H o l t h u s e n 1953, 158. In Czech and Polish, the case form of the pronoun in *Nie mam co robić, Nemám, co dělati* is hard to interpret, as the original genitive **čьso* 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 dělati* should be set apart from interrogative complement clauses and be compared to the type *mám, co dělati*, where *co* is an indefinite pronoun and *dělati* 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 dělati* is concerned, but rather than assuming the type *vím, co dělati* 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 dělati* had undergone a reanalysis and developed into a bi-clausal structure.

the genitive of negation has fallen in disuse, but the prefix *jā-* 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 jāēd* < **man nav jā ēst*, 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 á v n í č 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 *míti* 'have' as an auxiliary, and the pronoun as the object of the complex verbal phrase *nejmám dáti* But in that case the use of the interrogative-relative pronoun instead of the negated form *nic* would become inexplicable. Another possibility would be to interpret the whole sentence type as idiomatic, 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 interpret 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 idiomatic[9].

---

[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 *nětъ ničeso ěsti* 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. Palmer 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 bedirbąs, ne budetъ kto jego mьstę*, 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. *nėra 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 debitive. No satisfactory explanation has been proposed up to now for the introduction of the 3rd person form instead of the infinitive in the debitive, 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 debitive were still living syntactic structures. At any rate, no satisfactory explanation of the development of the debitive can be found without the Lithuanian data being taken into consideration[10].

INFINITYVINIAI SANTYKINIAI SAKINIAI BALTŲ IR SLAVŲ KALBOSE

Santrauka

Latvių kalba, skirtingai nuo lietuvių kalbos, turi infinityvinių santykinių sakinių, žyminčių vardažodines grupes (*grāmatas, ko lasīt* „knygos skaitymui, – kurias galima skaityti"). Lietuvių ir slavų kalbos turi tik vieną infinityvinių santykinių sakinių tipą: jie žymi egzistencinio predikato neišreikštą subjektą (*yra ką valgyti, nėra ką/ko valgyti*; r. *есть, что делать*) arba veiksmažodžio *turėti* neišreikštą objektą (*turiu ką valgyti, neturiu ką/ko valgyti*, s. b. sl. *ne imǫtъ česo ěsti*). Akivaizdu, kad vardažodines grupes žymintys latvių kalbos infinityviniai santykiniai sakiniai yra šios kalbos naujadarai: jie atsirado prieš adverbialinę paskirties bendratį įterpus santykinį įvardį, plg. lie. *nusipirkau arklį akėti* ir la. *nopirku zirgu, (ar) ko ecēt*. Bet lietuvių ir slavų kalbų infinityvinių santykinių sakinių atsiradimo negalima paaiškinti santykinio įvardžio įterpimu (pvz., *neturiu ko valgyti* iš **neturiu valgyti*, s. b. sl. *ne imǫtъ česo ěsti* iš **ne imǫtъ ěsti*), nes tada būtų nesuprantama, kodėl įterpus įvardžius ten neatsirado vardažodines grupes žyminčių infinityvinių santykinių sakinių (**neturiu duonos, kurią valgyti*). Šiame straipsnyje iškeliama mintis, kad tokios struktūros kaip lie. *neturiu ko valgyti*, sl. *ne imǫtъ česo ěsti* galėjo atsirasti santykiniam įvardžiui pakeitus ankstesnį nežymimąjį (arba neigiamąjį) įvardį ir adverbialinei paskirties bendračiai tapus naujo santykinio sakinio predikatiniu centru, pvz., *turiu ką* (= kažką) *valgyti* (= valgymui) → *turiu, ką valgyti*. Sąlygas tokiam procesui įvykti galėjo sudaryti panašios reikšmės santykinių sakinių su predikatiniais dalyviais buvimas ir baltų, ir slavų kalbose, plg. lie. *nebuvo kas bedirbąs* ir s. b. sl. *něstъ k'to milosrъduję*. Tokiu būdu šalia archajiško dalyvinio tipo *(ne)turiu ką valgąs* atsirado naujas infinityvinis tipas *(ne)turiu ką valgyti*. Senas dalyvinis tipas struktūros atžvilgiu buvo artimas tam tikram dalyviniam netiesioginio klausimo sakinių tipui: *nežino, ką darą* (s. b. sl. *ne vědětъ, čъto tvoręšte*) : *neturi, ką darą* (s. b. sl. **Ne imǫtъ čъto (čego) tvoręšte*). Dėl abiejų sakinių tipų paralelizmo bendratis iš

---

[10] This means that Mühlenbach's explanation of the 3rd person form contained in the debitive 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 'у меня есть, на чем ездят', Mühlenbach 1907, 322) should be definitively abandoned.

51

naujų infinityvinių santykinių sakinių galėjo būti įsivesta ir į netiesioginio klausimo sakinius (*nežino, ką daryti,* sl. *ne vědętъ, čьto tvoriti*), ir abu šie tipai toliau vystėsi lygiagrečiai. Šis paralelizmas sukliudė infinityviniams santykiniams sakiniams paplisti ir prasiskverbti į kitas sintaksines pozicijas, būtent į vardažodinės grupės pažyminio poziciją. Tik latvių prokalbėje minėtas paralelizmas išnyko, kadangi į infinityvinius santykinius sakinius buvo įvesti *ye/o-* kamieno santykiniai įvardžiai, reliktiniu pavidalu išlikę debityvo sudėtyje (plg. s. la. *teem ne bij ja ehd* „jie neturėjo ko valgyti"). Nutrūkus ryšiui su netiesioginio klausimo sakiniais (abiejų tipų sakiniuose vartojami įvardžiai formaliai nebesutapo) infinityviniai santykiniai sakiniai latvių kalboje plito toliau ir juos imta vartoti taip pat ir vardažodinėms grupėms žymėti. Dabar vartojamas atnaujintas jų variantas su *kʷo-* kamieno santykiniais įvardžiais.

REFERENCES

A m b r a z a s V., 1989, Baltic languages and the reconstruction of the Indo-European complex sentence, – General Linguistics, XXIX, 52–59.

A m b r a z a s V., 1990, Sravnitel'nyj sintaksis pričastij baltijskich jazykov, Vilnius.

A m b r a z a s V. (ed.), 1994, Dabartinės lietuvių kalbos gramatika, Vilnius.

A m b r a z a s V., 1995, Lietuvių kalbos bendraties konstrukcijų raida, – Lietuvių kabotyros klausimai, XXXIII, 74–109.

B a u e r J., 1972, K vývoji vztažných vět v slovanských jazycích. – I d e m, Syntactica slavica. Brno.

B e r g m a n e A. e.a., 1962, Mūsdienu latviešu literārās valodas gramatika, II. Sintakse, Rīga.

B o r k o v s k i j V. I. (ed.), 1978, Istoričeskaja grammatika russkogo jazyka. Sintaksis prostogo predloženija, Moskva.

D e l b r ü c k B., 1900, Vergleichende Syntax der indogermanischen Sprachen, III, Strassburg.

E l g e r, EE = Evangelien und Episteln ins Lettische übersetzt von Georg Elger... I. Texte, hrsg. von Kārlis Draviņš, Lund 1961 (Slaviska Institutionen vid Lunds Universitet, Text- och Materialutgåvor, 1)

E n d z e l ī n s J., 1905/1971, Zur Entstehung des lettischen Debitivs, – Bezzenbergers Beiträge, XXIX, 320–321. (Reprinted in: I d e m, Darbu izlase, I, Rīga, 288–289.)

E n d z e l ī n s J., 1951, Latviešu valodas gramatika, Rīga.

F r a e n k e l E., 1928, Syntax der litauischen Kasus, Kaunas.

F r a e n k e l E., 1936, Der Stand der Erforschung des im Wilnagebiete gesprochenen Litauischen, – Balticoslavica, II, 14–107.

G e b a u e r J., 1929, Historická mluvnice jazyka českého, IV. Skladba, ed. F. Trávníček, Praha.

H o l t h u s e n J., 1953, Russisch *nečego* und Verwandtes, – Zeitschrift für slavische Philologie, XXIII, 156–159.

H o l v o e t A., 1998, Notes on the rise and grammaticalisation of the Latvian debitive, – Linguistica Baltica, VII, 101–118.

H o l v o e t A., (forthcoming), Lietuvių *dativus cum infinitivo* ir latvių infinityviniai santykiniai sakiniai, – Lietuvių kalbotyros klausimai.

J o d ł o w s k i S., 1977, Podstawy polskiej składni, Warszawa.

K u r z J., 1972, K problematice funkční geneze a původního významu slovanských složených adjektiv. In: *id.*, Kapitoly ze syntaxe a morfologie staroslověnského jazyka, Praha (Acta Universitatis Carolinae. Philologica. Monographia XL, 72), 33–41.

LKŽ = Lietuvių kalbos žodynas, Vilnius, 1941–

M i k l o s i c h F., 1926, Vergleichende Grammatik der slavischen Sprachen, IV. Syntax, Manuldruck der Erstausgabe von 1868–1874, Heidelberg.

M i r o w i c z A., 1964, Rosyjskie konstrukcje nieosobowe z zaimkami typu некого, нечего i odpowiadające im konstrukcje polskie, – Prace Filologiczne, XVIII 2, 363–372.

M ü h l e n b a c h [Mjulenbachъ] K. 1907, O debitive, – Izvestija Otdelenija russkago jazyka i slovesnosti Imperatorskoj Akademii Naukъ, XII3, 313–333.

Palmer F.R., 1986, Mood and Modality, Cambridge.

Porák J., 1967, Vývoj infinitivních vět v češtině, Praha (Acta Universitatis Carolinae. Philologica, Monographia XVI)

Prellwitz W., 1904, Zur Entstehung des lettischen Debitivs, – Bezzenbergers Beiträge, XXVIII, 319.

Rosinas A., 1975, Ar baltų *i-, *i̯o- resp. *ī, *i̯ā- kamienai buvo reliatyviniai?, – Baltistica, XI, 165–170.

Stang Chr. S., 1966, Vergleichende Grammatik der baltischen Sprachen, Oslo etc.

Šachmatov A. A., 1941, Sintaksis russkogo jazyka, Leningrad.

Švedova N. Ju. (ed.), 1970, Grammatika sovremennogo russkogo literaturnogo jazyka, Moskva.

Trávníček F., 1931, Neslovesné věty v češtině, II. Věty nominální, Brno (Opera Facultatis Philosophicae Universitatis Masarykianae Brnensis, 32.)

Ulvydas K. e.a., eds., 1976. Lietuvių kalbos gramatika, III. Sintaksė, Vilnius.

Večerka R., 1961, Syntax aktivních participií v staroslověnštině, Praha (Opera Universitatis Purkynianae Brunensis, Facultas Philosophica, 75)