

ON THE POSTPONED NEUTER PRONOUN *-ja IN BALTIC

ABSTRACT. The paper consists of two parts: 1) on the etymology of the Lith. *kiek* and Latv. *cik* ‘how many / how much’, 2) on the origin of the Lith. superlative. What these forms have in common is the presence of postponed neuter pronoun *-ja* < IE *(H)*yo-d*.

KEY-WORDS: Lithuanian, neuter pronoun, superlative.

1. OLITH. *kaja-kas* AND OCS *ko-je*

The OLith. indefinite pronoun *kajakas* ‘whoever, anybody, anything’ appears twice in the third edition of the *Dictionarium trium linguarum* (1642) by the Lithuanian Jesuit priest Konstanty Szyrwid (Lith. Konstantinas Sirvydas), cf.:

- (1) *Ktokolwiek / ktofzkolwiek / (...) quispiam, aliquis, Kasnor / kiekwienas / wienaskurisgi kaiakas* (SD³ 139) ‘anybody’ and *Ládá co / ledá co (...) Kaiakas* (SD³ 147) ‘no matter which, anything’.

Traditionally it is said that *kajakas* arose via the phonetic development of the indefinite pronoun *kažin kas* ‘somebody’ (LKŽ vol. 5: 85; Rosinas 1988: 221; Smoczyński 2007: 245). However, this interpretation gives rise to the following objections. Firstly, the phonetic change *kažin kas* > *kajakas* in Lithuanian is hardly probable. Secondly, *kažin kas* ‘somebody’ is a so-called specific indefinite pronoun, whereas *kajakas* ‘anybody’ seems to function as a non-specific indefinite pronoun¹. Of course, due to the lack of broader context, a more precise description of how *kajakas* functioned is impossible². Thirdly, as will be shown in the next section (1.1.), a remnant of the indefinite pronoun *kajakas*, strictly speaking its neuter form **kajaka*, can also be encountered in Latvian. Therefore, as an alternative explanation, I propose the following elucidation: etymologically *kajakas* consists of two pronouns, i.e. the relative **kaja* ‘which’ and *kas* ‘who’. From **kaja* comes the common Baltic connective *kaĩ*

1 For the terms, cf. Hockett (1968: §30.3), Bhat (2004: 252–255).

2 It is possible that *kajakas* could be used both in ‘specific’ (i.e. ‘somebody, something’) and ‘non-specific’ (i.e. ‘anybody, anything’) meanings, like the interrogative pronouns in Sanskrit and in most of the modern Indo-Aryan languages, cf. Sanskrit *kim-cid* ‘something, anything’ (Bhat 2004: 256).

(section 1.2.). Such an explanation would be borne out by parallels like the Russian indefinite pronouns *koe-cto* ‘some (people), somebody’ and *koe-čto* ‘something’, coming from the combination of the neuter pronoun *koe* (cf. OCS *ko-je* ‘what, which’) and the pronouns *cto* ‘who’ / *čto* ‘what’. As far as the origin of **kaja* is concerned, it developed from the conflation of two neuter relative pronouns: *ka* < IE **k^wo-d* (cf. Lat. *quod*) and *ja* < IE **(H)yo-d* (cf. Ved. *yád*); an analogy is found in OCS *ko-je* (masculine *kyjb*, feminine *kaja*). This analysis of the Baltic data supports Vasmer’s hypothesis (1922: 140), according to which the Old Church Slavonic pronouns (masc.) *kyjb*, (fem.) *kaja*, (neut.) *koje* ‘qui, qualis’ are compound pronouns and trace back respectively to **k^wo-je*, *ka-ja* and *ko-je*. The similarity of the neuters *ko-je* and **ka-ja* allows us to see in **ka-ja* an archaism dating back to the epoch of the Balto-Slavic community. On the other hand, there are no grounds to assume that Lithuanian (and Baltic in general) was provided with an entirely formed paradigm. Apart from the neuter **ka-ja* other forms (viz. masculine **kas-jas* / *kas-is* and feminine **kā-jā* / **kā-jī*) cannot be reconstructed.

1.1. Old Lithuanian *kajakas* and Lith. *kíek* / Latv. *cik* ‘how many / much’.

Lith. *kíek* ‘how many / much; however many / much; a little; every, any; anything’ traces back to neuter *kíeka*, cf. the masculine form *kíekas* ‘how many / much; some; something, anything’³ (Zinkevičius 1981: 169). In Old Lithuanian texts *kíek(a)* is testified in the following meanings:

a) *kíek(a)* ‘how many / much’, e.g.:

- (2) *Ir jis klausė juos: kíkka gi turite duonų?* (Bretke’s Bible, LKŽ 5: 745)
 ‘And he asked them, **How many** loaves have ye?’⁴ (Mark 8: 5)

b) *kíek(a)* ‘no matter how many / much’, e.g.:

- (3) *Jlekolwiek. Quotquot. Kiekagi* (SD³: 89) ‘however many / much’,
 (4) *Sichem kunigaykβtis ažu Dinu dukteri Jakoba Patriarchos siule pinigus tewuy ir broliamus ios / kiek noretu.* (SP I: 226)
 ‘Sychemskie książę za Dynę corkę Jakoba Patryarchy ofiarowało pieniądze ocyu y braćiej iey / **ileby** chcieli.’
 ‘Shehem, the prince, offered money for Dinah, the daughter of the Patriarch Jacob, to her father and brothers **however much** they would want.’

3 Cf. LKŽ 5: 744–745: (Loc. sg.) *Kiekame jūs važiuosit?* ‘**How many** people are going to set off?’, *kiekamė dienų páfkui sáwa vžgimima* (DP 424: 6) ‘w **kilkunaście** dni po swym narodzeniu’ / ‘**some** days after his birth’; *poduczyć się czego* / *Discere aliquid ex parte (...)* / *pasimoket kiek* (SD³: 313) ‘to learn **something** / **anything**’.

4 The English renderings come from the Authorized King James Version.

c) *kíek(a)* ‘anything’:

- (5) *iey metai ir walundos iu wieszpatawimuy pažimetos (...) pasibaygie / ergu dabar atliekt **kíek** iš iu / ...* (SP I: 134)

‘ieśli lata y godziny panowaniu ich naznaczone (...) skończyły się / czyli ieszcze zostaie **co** z nich / ...’

‘if years and hours destined for their reign (...) ended, would there be **anything** left of them...’ (i.e. ‘years and hours’)

d) *kíek(a)* ‘somewhat’, e.g.:

- (6) *O Katholikųfiamp nórini dábar yr **kíekag** to nòbažnumo / bęi ir tas nę kuriųfiamp silpnas.* (DP 293: 40–41; Zinkevičius 1981: 169)

‘A u Katholikow acz ieszcze iest **nieco** tego nabożeństwa / ale y to w niektórych słabe.’

‘At least Catholics have still **a bit** of piousness but also that is weak in some of them.’

e) *kíek* ‘every’, e.g. *kíek-diena* ‘every day’, *kíek vakarą* ‘every evening’, *kíek-vienas* ‘anyone’, cf. also Latv. *cik* in (7):

- (7) *cik rītiņa migla kāpa **every** morning the fog used to rise* (Rosinas 1988: 195 after ME vol I: 380).

Especially worthy of attention is the example (5), where *kíek* appears as an indefinite pronoun⁵. The semantic connection between *kíek* ‘anything’ in (5) and OLith. *kajakas* ‘anything’ is obvious. Secondly, in (3) and (4) we encounter *kíek(a)* as a marker of indefinite amount ‘however many / much’, which can easily be explained as a staging post between *kíek(a)* ‘anything’ in (5) and *kíek(a)* ‘how many / much’ in (2). Thirdly, both *kíek* ‘every’ and Latv. *cik* ‘every’ in (6), can be traced back to ‘no matter which’ > ‘every’, cf. Engl. *any* and *any-one* alongside Lith. *kíek-vienas* ‘each, every, everyone, anyone’ (*vienas* ‘one’). It seems that from the semantic point of view there is no impediment to joining *kíek(a)* and *kajakas*, strictly speaking *kíek(a)* and the neuter form **kajaka*.

As for the formal analysis, Lith. *kíek* corresponds to Latv. *cik* ‘how many / much’; the latter stems from the older *ciēk* < **kiek* (Endzelin 1922: 465; Fraenkel 1962: 250; Karulis 1992 I: 173). Traditional attempts to trace *kíe-* back to **kei-* < **k^wey-* (cf. Karulis *loc. cit.*; Smoczyński 2007: 283) are pure speculation, as we do not know what **k^wey-* is and whence comes the acute intonation in the Lith. *kíek* and the broken tone in the Latv. *ciēk*. However, if we agree that the diphthong /ie/ < /ai/, e.g. Lith. *bríedis* ‘elk’ / Latv. *briēdis* ‘deer’ : OPr. *braydis* ‘elk’, then assuming a syncope of the unstressed vowel /a/ we can with no problem explain *kíeka* as stemming from **kāika* < **kaja-ka*. The shape **kāika* is testified in Finnish *kaikki* ‘all, altogether, everything’,

⁵ Cf. also masc. *kiekas* in *poduczyć się czego / Discere aliquid ex parte (...)* / *pasimoket **kieko*** (SD³: 313) ‘to learn something / anything’.

a loanword from Baltic, cf. Toivonen (1955: 141), Rosinas (1988: 195). The etymology presented above also has the advantage that it allows us to elucidate the acute intonation in *kíek* as a result of the compensatory lengthening after loss of unaccented vowel, cf. an analogous process in Lith. *kēlinės* > *kėlnės* ‘trousers’. Furthermore, if we assume an etymological connection between *kajakas* / **kajaka* and *kíekas* / *kíek*, then the accentuation *kiekó*, *kiekám’* documented in Daukša’s *Postilla* indirectly points at the oxytonesis of *kajakas* (cf. Skardžius 1999: 227). Secondly, the presumed oxytonesis in **kaja-ka* would explain the broken tone of Latv. *ciēk*, triggered by the moving back of stress from the final syllable onto the preceding one. Last but not least, the explanation *kíekas* < *kaja-kas* and *kíeka* < **kaja-ka* indicates that there existed in Proto-Baltic the distinction *kas* vs. **ka* (< IE **k^wo-d*, cf. Latin *quo-d*), probably a ‘human’ vs. ‘non-human’ opposition like Slav. *kvto* ‘who’ vs. *čvto* ‘what’.

1.2. On the origin of the Lithuanian *kaĩ* and *taĩ*. On the account of the aforementioned etymology of *kajakas*, the question arises of how to explain the common Baltic connective *kai*, cf. Lith. *kaĩ* ‘when; than; if; how?’ / *kaĩ-p(o)* ‘how’, OPr. *kai* (*kāi*) ‘how; that; in order to’, Latv. (Latgalian) *kaĩ* ‘how’. Traditionally it is said that Baltic *kai* stems from an old Loc. sg. of the pronoun *ka-* and relates to OCS *čě* ‘though’ (Nieminen 1922: 43; Endzelin 1922: 466; Mažiulis 1993: 69). However, it is tempting to assume that *kai* traces back to the neuter **ka-ja*; as a parallel one might mention Pol. *jak* and Russ. *kak* ‘how’, both shortened from neuters *jako* and *kako*. Such an explanation of *kaĩ* is supported by the etymology of the neuter pronoun *taĩ* ‘this, that’ from *ta-ja*, see Rosinas (1988: 187), cf. *tajag* ‘exactly the same’ in (8):

- (8) *tađ múmus taiağ tíkfis / kas’ tam’ târnui fmârkiam’ tikoós.* (DP 361: 30–31)
 ‘tedy się nam **toż** ostanie / co się temu słudze okrutnemu ostało.’
 ‘So **the same** will happen to us what happened to this cruel servant.’

IE neuter pronoun **to-d* > Lith. *ta-* is testified in Lith. *ta-tai* ‘this, that’⁶, OLith. *ta-pirmiaus* ‘firstly, at the beginning’ (cf. Old Russian *to p̄rvo* ‘now’) and *ta-pagaliaus* ‘finally’. A parallel to the Nom-Acc. neut. *ta-ja* is Acc. and Instr. sg. fem. *tu-ju-g* < **tq-jq-g*, e.g. *tu-ju-g adin-u* ‘the same hour’, documented in *Ewangelie polskie y litewskie* (1647) by Jan Jachnowicz (Lith. Jonas Jaknavičius), cf.:

- (9) *Ir kiel-y-s tu-iu-g adin-u*
 and rise up:PTC.PST.ACT.M-RFL the same:ACC.SG.F-FOC hour:ACC.SG
fu-grižo ing Ieruzalem (JE 63: 26–28)
 PRV-return:PST3 to Jerusalem

‘A wstawszy **teyże godziny** wrocili się do Ieruzalem’
 ‘And they rose up **the same hour**, and returned to Jerusalem’ (Luke 24: 33)

⁶ Nieminen (1922: 47); Nau & Ostrowski (2010: 22); Ostrowski 2011; Ostrowski 2011a.

- (10) *Nes tuiu-g mier-u / kuri-u mieri-fi-te /*
 for the same:INST.SG.F-FOC measure:INST.SG that:INST.SG.F measure:FUT-2PL
bu-s iums at-mieruo-t-a (JE 87: 9–12)
 be:fut3 you:DAT.PL PRV-measure:PTC.PST.PASS-NOM.N

‘Bo **taż miarą** / którą mierzyście / będzie wam odmierzono.’

‘For with **the same measure** that ye mete withal it shall be measured to you again.’

(Luke 6: 38)

Probably a typo is the notation *ta-ju-g dien-u* ‘the same day’ instead of **tu-ju-g dien-u* in (11):

- (11) *Du iž-gi mokitini-u Iež-aus ei-o tuiu-g dien-u*
 two of-FOC pupil:GEN.PL Jesus:GEN.SG go:PST3 the same:ACC.SG.F-FOC day:ACC.SG
ing miestel-i / kurf-ai buw-o (...) ward-u Emaus. (JE 60: 4–14)
 to village:ACC.SG which:FOC be:PST3 name:INST.SG Emmaus

‘dwa z wczniow Iezusowych **tegoż dnia** szli do miasteczka / które było (...) imię Emaus.’

‘two of them went **that same day** to a village called Emmaus’ (Luke 24: 13)

It is interesting that one can find compound pronouns also in the Slavic languages, cf. ORuss. *tyi-že* ‘totъ že, totъ že samyj’ (Sreznevskij 1989: 1071), Czech (masc.) *tý*, (fem.) *tá*, (neut.) *té*⁷ and Pol. *ty-* in the compound *ty-dzień* ‘week’ < *‘precisely this day’⁸ (Lehr-Spławiński 1966: 178).

The postponed neuter pronoun gave rise to *-ja(g)*, which together with the postpositions *-jau*, *-ai* and *-g(i)* became a marker of the so-called ‘emphatic assertion of identity’⁹. *-ja(g)* was combined with deictic and anaphoric words regardless of their case and gender, cf. Nom. sg. *tas-ja liežuv-is* < *tafs-iía liežúw-is*> ‘the very tongue’ and Nom. pl. *tie-ja-g pátis fánar-iei* ‘exactly those limbs’ in (12):

- (12) *Bať tof-iáu ne-gédz-ios âk-is / (...) / tafs-iía*
 but that:NOM.PL.F-FOC NEG-shy:NOM.PL.F eye:NOM.PL that:NOM.SG.M-FOC

⁷ Cf. Czech neuter *té* < **to-je* like adjective (neut.) *dobré* ‘good’ < *dobro-je* (Lehr-Spławiński & Stieber 1957: 83).

⁸ Pol. *ty-* < **tv-jb* like adjective (masc.) *nowy* ‘new’ < **novb-jb*.

⁹ The term ‘emphatic assertion of identity’ was coined by Ekkehard König (1991: 125ff.) and pertains to such particles as Germ. *eben*, *genau*, *ausgerechnet*, Eng. *exactly*, *precisely*, thus to such words that “are (...) used emphatically to assert the identity of one argument in a proposition with an argument in a different, contextually given proposition” (König 1991: 127). In Lithuanian a similar function was performed by the postponed particle *jau*; see Ostrowski 2011a, Ostrowski (submitted).


<i>liežúw-is</i>	<i>wil-qf-is /</i>	<i>tafs-ái</i>	<i>piłw-as</i>		
tongue:NOM.SG	betray:PTC.PRS.ACT.NOM.SG.M-RFL	that:NOM.SG.M-FOC	belly:NOM.SG		
<i>nę</i>	<i>pa-fsótin-t-as / (...)</i>	<i>ir</i>	<i>tie-ia-g</i> <i>pát-is</i>		
NEG	PRV-satiate-PTC.PRS.PASS-NOM.SG.M	and	that:FOC FOC same:NOM.PL.M		
<i>fánar-iei</i>	<i>kur-ié</i>	<i>tarnáw-o (...)</i>	<i>kreiwúmo-p /</i> <i>tie pát-is</i>		
limb:NOM.PL.M	which:NOM.PL.M	serve:PST	immoral deed:ALL.SG the same		
<i>o</i>	<i>ne</i>	<i>kit-í</i>	<i>pa-kél-s</i>	<i>káncž-iq</i>	<i>ir</i>
and	NEG	other:NOM.PL.M	PRV-experience:FUT	torture:ACC.SG.F	and
<i>koróim-q /</i>	<i>kur-i</i>	<i>nu-pėn-e.</i> (DP 7, 54-8, 1-3)			
punishment:ACC.SG.M	which:ACC.SG.M	PRV-deserve:3PST			

‘Ale **te iste** wszeteczne oczy / (...) / **ten** język zdradliwy/ **ten** brzuch nienasycony/ (...) / y **też iste** członki które służyły ku nieprawości / te same a nie insze podeymą mękę y karanie/ ktore zasłużyły.’

‘But **exactly those** shameless eyes, (...), **the very** tongue which betrays, **precisely that** insatiable belly, (...), and **exactly those** limbs that served immoral deeds, the same, not other ones will experience the torture and punishment they deserve.’

2. THE ORIGIN OF THE LITHUANIAN SUPERLATIVE *-iaūs-ia*

The degrees of comparison in Lithuanian are presented in the table below (cf. Ambrazas *et al.* 1997: 138-9, 386):

	positive	comparative	Superlative 
adj. masc.	<i>gēr-as</i> ‘good’	<i>ger-ėsn-is</i> ‘better’	<i>ger-iaūs-ias</i> ‘best’
adj. fem.	<i>ger-à</i> ‘good’	<i>ger-ėsn-ė</i>	<i>ger-iaūs-ia</i>
adj. neut.	<i>gēr-a</i> ‘good’	<i>geresn-(i)</i> , <i>ger-iaūs</i> / <i>ger-iaũ</i>	<i>ger-iaūs-ia</i>
adverb	<i>ger-aĩ</i> ‘well’	<i>geresn-(i)</i> / <i>-iai</i> , <i>ger-iaūs</i> / <i>ger-iaũ</i>	<i>ger-iaūs-iai</i>

The highlighted forms are attested only in dialects and Old Lithuanian writings.

In numerous languages the superlative degree is formed with the marker of definiteness, e.g. in French:

(13) *Marie est plus sage.* ‘Mary is wiser’

(14) *Marie est la plus sage.* ‘Mary is the wisest’. (Heine & Kuteva 2002: 106)

Definiteness is expressed in Baltic postpositively, e.g. Lith. *gėras* (masc.) ‘good’ : definite adjective *geràs-is* ‘the good’ (cf. OLith. *ger-iaus-is* ‘the best’), therefore also the Lithuanian superlative can be traced back to the combination of neuter adjective

in *-iaus* with the neuter pronoun *-ja* (IE relative **(H)yo-d*)¹⁰. The masculine (*-iáusias*) and feminine (*-iáusia*) forms arose following this pattern of the neuter superlative. The adverbial superlative in *-iáus-iai* was formed in accordance with adverbs in *-ai*, e.g. *ger-ai* ‘well’. This claim is justified by the fact that in Lithuanian dialects there are still surviving remnants of the primary usage of the neuter definite forms in predicative function, cf. (15), and attributive function, cf. (16), in one phrase with masculine subject, i.e. (masc.) *bærn-az dzidz’-áus’-a* (neut.) ‘the boy is the biggest / the boy is big’ and (neut.) *didžiáus-ia bried-is* (masc.) ‘the big elk’:

(15) *bærn-az dzidz’-áus’-a, é kój-a kap merg’-ðk-ęs*¹¹
 boy:NOM.SG.M big:SPRL-NOM.SG.N but leg:NOM.SG.F like girl:DIM-GEN.SG.F
 ‘The boy is the biggest, but his leg is like a girl’s.’¹²

(16) *Ein-u ryt-q, tai didž-iáus-ia bried-is ulioj-a*¹³
 go:1PRS.SG morning:ACC.SG this big:SPRL-NOM.SG.N elk:NOM.SG.M walk:3PRS
 ‘I am going in the morning and behold the big elk is walking.’¹⁴

The modern form (masc.) *ger-iáus-ias* ‘the best’ instead of OLith. *ger-iaus-is* ‘the best’ and respectively fem. *ger-iáus-ia*, are based on the masculine and feminine adjectives with endings *-as* and *-a*, that is:

(17) *ger-as vyr-as* ‘a good husband’
 good:NOM.SG.M husband:NOM.SG

(18) *ger-a žmon-a* ‘a good wife’
 good:NOM.SG.F wife:NOM.SG

An excellent parallel for the hypothesis presented here is provided by the *Gospels* in the translation of Johann Bretke (late 16th century). Bezzenberger (1877: 237) and Cotticelli-Kurras (1998: 182–184) have demonstrated that in some cases Bretke used the DEFINITE FORMS OF COMPARATIVE in the meaning of superlative, cf. *Wir-esn-ie-ghi* in (19) to render Germ. *Obersten* and Lat. *principes*:

(19) *Er Wiresnieghi musu nu tikrai paszista, kaip ghis tikrai Christus ira?*
Erkennen onser Obersten nu gewis (das er gewis Christus sey?)

10 The relation between the comparative marker *-iaus* and superlative forms has also been recognized by other researchers, cf. Stang (1966: 269). Attention to the role of definiteness in the forming of the Lith. superlative has been paid by Rasmussen (1999: 563–4), but only within the frame of his highly speculative considerations about the origin of the Lith. comparative *-iaus*. As for the origin of the comparative *-iaūs*, cf. Ostrowski (*submitted*).

11 Kardelytė (1975: 54), Rosinas (1988: 215⁷).

12 Cf. the similar construction in (masc.) *Medus yra skanu* (neut.) ‘Honey is nice’ (*yra* ‘is’).

13 Rosinas (1988: 215⁷) after Stundžia (1982: 134).

14 In (16) the primary definite usage of comparative has survived.

numquid verum cognoverunt principes (quia hic est Christus?)

Do the rulers know indeed that this is the very Christ? (John 7: 26)

and Gen. pl. *masz-esn-iu-ių* in (20) for Germ. *kleinesten* and Lat. *minimis*:

(20) *Kursai tadda wieną isch maszesniuių [= maszausių] Prisakimu ischrisch, ir mokinna Szmones taipo, tas maszausis bus wadinamas Dangaus Karalistoie.*¹⁵

Wer nu eines von diesen kleinsten Geboten auffloeset / und leret die Leute also / Der wird der kleinst heissen im Himmelreich.

Qui ergo solverit unum de mandatis istis minimis et docuerit sic homines, minimus vocabitur in regno caelorum.

*Whosoever therefore shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven. (Matthew 5: 19)*¹⁶

Another analogy is provided by Latvian, where the superlative is formed as a definite comparative of the adjectives, e.g.:

(21) *tuv-āk-ie* *rad-i* 'die nächsten Verwandten' (Endzelin 1922: 354)
 close:CMP-DEF.NOM.PL.M relative:NOM.PL
 'the closest relatives'

The presented explanation supports the old hypothesis by Berthold Delbrück (1893: 433), according to which Baltic and Slavonic definite adjectives arose by conflation with the relative pronoun *-ja- < IE *(H)yo-, cf. Zinkevičius 1957, Koch 1992, Hajnal 1997. The reasons why the relative stem *(H)yo- has been driven out by *i-s in Lithuanian definite adjectives are unclear, i.e. we do not know why we have Lith. *geras-is* (masc.), *gero-ji* (fem.) instead of **geras-jas*, **gerā-jā*. On the other hand, it is probable that no attention has previously been drawn to the fact that the existence of the postponed relative pronoun *-jas < IE *(H)yo-s (cf. Old Indic *yás*, Old Greek ὄς 'who, which') in Baltic is confirmed by the Latvian *kurš* 'who, which' < **kur-jas* (cf. Loc. *kur* 'where') and *viņš* 'he' < **vin-jas* (cf. OPr. *winna* 'heraus' and OCS *vně* 'outside' – Endzelin 1922: 381f.)¹⁷. Their derivation resembles the Old Lithuanian definite adjectives formed from Loc. sg., e.g. *dągu-ię-iis ukinik-as* 'the host of heaven' (DP 33: 13), *daikt-ái (...)* *žėme-ię-iie* 'the earthly things', etymologically: *'the things (being) on the earth' (DP 616: 33)¹⁸; *dąguię* and *žėmeię* are Loc. sg. forms and a postponed pronoun agrees with a noun (Koch 1992: 60), i.e.:

(22) *dągu-ię-iis* *ukinik-as*
 heaven:LOC.SG-DEF.NOM.SG.M host:NOM.SG

¹⁵ The superlative form *maszausių* instead of *maszesniuių* was introduced by a proofreader.

¹⁶ Other examples Bezenberger (1877: 237).

¹⁷ Viz. *'who is outside / who does not take part in the situation of the dialogue'.

¹⁸ More examples Palionis (1967: 126f.), Zinkevičius (1981: 33).

ABBREVIATIONS. ACC – accusative, ACT – active, ADV – adverb, CMP – comparative, DEF – definite, DIM – diminutive, F – feminine, FOC – focus, GEN – genitive, INST – instrumental, LOC – locative, M – masculine, N – neuter, NOM – nominative, NEG – negation, PASS – passive, PL – plural, PRS – present, PRV – preverb, PST – past, PTC – participium, REF – reflexive, SG – singular, SPRL – superlative

REFERENCES

- Ambrasas, V. (ed.) 1997: *Lithuanian Grammar*, Vilnius: Baltos lankos.
- Bezenberger, A. 1877: *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Litauischen Sprache auf Grund litauischer Texte des XVI. und des XVII. Jahrhunderts*, Göttingen: Verlag von Robert Peppmüller.
- Bhat, D.N.S. 2004: *Pronouns*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cotticelli-Kurras, P. 1998: Morphosyntaktische Untersuchungen zur Bibelübersetzung von Johannes Bretke: Die Pronominalform des Adjektivs in Bretkes Evangelien. A. Bammesberger (ed.), *Baltistik: Aufgaben und Methoden*. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag C. Winter, 171–194. (*Indogermanische Bibliothek* 3–19.)
- Delbrück, B. 1893: *Vergleichende Syntax der indogermanischen Sprachen* 1, Straßburg: Karl J. Trübner.
- DP: [M. Daukša], Poftilla CATHOLICKA. Tái eft: Ižguldimas Ewangeliu kiekvienos Nedelos ir Bwetes per wilłús metús. Per Kúniga MIKALOIV DAVKŠĄ Kanoniką Médnikų (...) [= J. Palionis (red.), *Mikalojaus Daukšos 1599 metų Postilė ir jos šaltiniai*, Vilnius: Baltos lankos, 2000.]
- Endzelin, J. 1922: *Lettische Grammatik*. Riga: Kommissionsverlag A. Gulbis.
- Fraenkel, E. 1962: *Litauisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* 1, Heidelberg: C. Winter.
- Hajnal, I. 1997: Definite nominale Determination im Indogermanischen. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 102, 38–73.
- Heine, B., Kuteva, T. 2002: *World Lexicon of Grammaticalization*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hockett, Ch.F. 1968: *Kurs językoznawstwa współczesnego*, Warszawa: PWN.
- JE: [J. Jachnowicz / Jaknavičius], EWANGELIE POLSKIE Y LITEWSKIE (...) [= M. Lučinskienė (red.), *Jono Jaknavičiaus 1647 metų EWANGELIE POLSKIE Y LITEWSKIE*, Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos instituto leidykla, 2005. (*Bibliotheca Archivi Lithuanici* 6.)]
- Kardelytė, J. 1975: *Gervėčių tarmė*, Vilnius: Mintis.
- Karulis, K. 1992: *Latviešu etimolģijas vārdnīca* 1–2 (1: A–O, 2: P–Ž), Rīga: Avots.
- Koch, C. 1992: Zur Vorgeschichte des relativen Attributivkonnexes im Baltischen und Slavischen. B. Barschel, M. Kozińska, K. Weber (Hrsg.), *Indogermanisch, Slawisch und Baltisch. Materialien des vom 21.–22. Sept. 1989 in Jena in Zusammenarbeit mit der Indogermanische Gesellschaft durchgeführten Kolloquiums*, München: Otto Sagner, 45–88.

- König, E. 1991: *The Meaning of Focus Particles. A Comparative Perspective*, London and New York: Routledge.
- Lehr-Spławiński, T. 1966: O pochodzeniu wyrazu *tydzień*. T. Lehr-Spławiński, *Studia i szkice wybrane z językoznawstwa słowiańskiego* 2, Warszawa: PWN, 177–179. [= *Język Polski* 13, 1928, 12–14.]
- Lehr-Spławiński, T., Stieber, Z. 1957: *Gramatyka historyczna języka czeskiego*, Warszawa: PWN.
- LKŽ: *Lietuvių kalbos žodynas* 1–20, Vilnius, 1956–2002.
- Mažiulis, V. 1993: *Prūsų kalbos etimologijos žodynas 2: I–K*, Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidykla.
- ME: Mühlenbach, K., *Lettisch-deutsches Wörterbuch* 1–4. Redigiert, ergänzt und fortgesetzt von J. Endzelin, Rīga: Herausgegeben vom lettischen Bildungsministerium, lettischen Kulturfond.
- Nau, N., Ostrowski, N. 2010: Background and perspectives for the study of particles and connectives in Baltic languages. N. Nau, N. Ostrowski (eds.) *Particles and Connectives in Baltic*, Vilnius: Vilniaus Universitetas; Asociacija *Academia Salensis*, 1–37. (*Acta Salensia* 2.)
- Nieminen, E. 1922: *Der urindogermanische Ausgang -āi des Nominativ-Akkusativ Pluralis des Neutrums im Baltischen*, Helsinki: Drukerei der Finnischen Literaturgesellschaft.
- Ostrowski, N. 2011: *Iš lietuvių kalbos istorinės morfologijos problemų (apie nebe(-) ir bent kilmę)*. Lietuvių kalba 5 (<http://www.lietuviukalba.lt/index.php?id=186>)
- Ostrowski, N. 2011a: On the origin of the Lithuanian *tačiau* 'but, however, yet'. *Lingua Posnaniensis* 53–2, 75–81. (<http://versita.com/lp>)
- Ostrowski, N. (submitted): From focus marker to comparative suffix – the original character of the Lithuanian comparative *-iaus*. *Historische Sprachforschung* 126.
- Palionis, J. 1967: *Lietuvių literatūrinė kalba XVI–XVII a.*, Vilnius: Mintis.
- Rasmussen, J.E. 1999. Miscellaneous Morphological Problems in Indo-European Languages V.J.E. Rasmussen: *Selected Papers on Indo-European Linguistics* 2, Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum Press, 552–573.
- SP: [K. Sirvydas], PVNKTY KAZAN. F. Specht (Hrsg.), *Šyrwids Punktay sakimu (Punkty kazań). Teil I: 1629, Teil II: 1644 litauisch und polnisch mit kurzer grammatischer Einleitung*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1929.]
- Rosinas, A. 1988: *Baltų kalbų įvardžiai*, Vilnius: Mokslas.
- SD³: Pakalka, K. (red.), *Pirmasis lietuvių kalbos žodynas*. Vilnius: Mokslas, 1979.
- Skardžius, P. 1999: Daukšos akcentologija. A. Rosinas (red.), *Pranas Skardžius. Rinkiniai raštai* 5. Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidybos institutas. [= Pranas Skardžius. *Daukšos akcentologija*, Kaunas: V.D.U. Humanitarinių Mokslų Fakulteto leidinys, 1935.]

Smoczyński, W. 2007: *Lietuvių kalbos etimologinis žodynas*. Vilnius: Vilniaus universitetas, Filologijos fakultetas.

Sreznevskij, I.I. 1889: И.И. Срезневский, *Словарь древнерусского языка 3-2*, Репринтное издание, Москва: Книга.

Stang, Ch. 1966: *Vergleichende Grammatik der Baltischen Sprachen*, Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Stundžia, B. 1982: Dėl negimininės būdvardžių superliatyvo formos. *Sintaksės ir semantikos klausimai: Respublikinės mokslinės konferencijos, skirtos TSRS įkūrimo 60-mečiui pranešimų tezės*, Šiauliai, 134.

Toivonen, Y.H. 1955: *Suomen kielen etymologinen sanakirja*. Helsinki.

Vasmer, M. 1922: Die Flexion von altbulg. *kyjъ* 'qui'. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 40-1/2, 139–144.

Zinkevičius, Z. 1957: *Lietuvių įvardžiuotinių būdvardžių bruožai*, Vilnius: Valstybinė politinės ir mokslinės literatūros leidykla.

Zinkevičius, Z. 1981: *Lietuvių kalbos istorinė gramatika 2*, Vilnius: Mokslas.

О ПОСТПОЗИЦИОННОМ МЕСТОИМЕНИИ СРЕДНЕГО РОДА *-ja В БАЛТИЙСКИХ ЯЗЫКАХ

РЕЗЮМЕ. В статье анализируется происхождение нескольких литовских форм с постпозиционным местоимением среднего рода *-ja. Его существование в балтийских языках подтверждают неопределенное древне-литовское местоимение *kajakas* 'некоторый/какой-то, кто-то', и его последователь *kiekas* 'сколько; сколько-нибудь'. Форма среднего рода *kiek(a)* 'сколько (...)' (лтш. *cik* 'то же') восходит к более ранней форме **kāi-ka* (ср. фин. *kaikki* 'все, всё') < **kaja-ka*. Строение литовского *kajakas* лучше всего объясняется сравнением с русским *кое-кто*, образованным из сращения местоимения среднего рода *кое* (ст.-ц.-слав. *ko-je*) с местоимением *кто*. На основании сказанного следует различать местоимение **ka-ja*-, образованное при сращении двух местоимений среднего рода: **ka-* < и.-е. **k^wo-d* и *-ja < и.-е. *(*H*)*yo-d*. Местоимение **ka-ja-* кроется и в общем для балтийских языков союзе *kai* 'когда'. Подобным образом можно объяснить происхождение местоимения среднего рода *taī* 'это, то' – это сокращенная форма составного (древне-литовского) местоимения **ta-ja-*. Параллель местоимению среднего рода Nom.-Acc. **ta-ja-* представляет форма женского рода Acc. *tu-ju-g* < **tq-jq-g* (Jaknavičius, 1647). Существование постпозиционного местоимения среднего рода *-ja подтверждают и формы превосходной степени прилагательных, образованные из определенных форм сравнительной степени среднего рода.

APIE POSTPOZICINĮ BEVARDĖS GIMINĖS ĮVARDĮ *-ja BALTŲ KALBOSE

SANTRAUKA. Straipsnyje analizuojama kelių lietuvių kalbos formų su postpoziciniu bevardės giminės įvardžiu *-ja kilmė. Jo egzistavimą baltų kalbose patvirtina senosios lietuvių kalbos nežymimasis įvardis *kajakas* ‘kai kas/kai kuris, kažkas/kažkuris’, ir jo įpėdinis *kiekas* ‘kiek; kiek nors’. Bevardės giminės forma *kiek(a)* ‘kiek (...)’ (La. *cik* ‘t. p.’) kilusi iš ankstesnės formos **kāi-ka* (plg. suomių *kaikki* ‘visi, viskas’) < **kaja-ka*. Senosios lietuvių kalbos žodžio *kajakas* sandarą geriausiai paaiškina lyginimas su rusų *ko-eto* ‘kažkas’, kilusiu iš bevardės giminės įvardžio *ko* (OCS *ko-je* ‘kuris’) samplaikos su įvardžiu *eto* ‘kas’. Remiantis tuo, kas pasakyta, galima skirti įvardį **ka-ja-*, sudarytą suaugus dviem bevardės giminės įvardžiams: **ka-* < IE **k^wo-d* ir *-*ja* < IE *(*H*)*yo-d*. Įvardis **ka-ja-* glūdi ir baltų kalboms bendrame jungtuke *kai*.

Panašiai galima paaiškinti bevardės giminės įvardžio *taĩ* kilmę – tai sutrumpėjusi sudurtinio (senosios lietuvių kalbos) įvardžio **ta-ja-* forma. Bevardės giminės įvardį Nom.-Acc. **ta-ja-* atitinka moteriškosios giminės forma Acc. *tu-ju-g* < **tq-jq-g* (Jaknavičius, 1647). Bevardės giminės postpozicinio įvardžio *-*ja* egzistavimą patvirtina ir būdvardžių aukščiausiojo laipsnio formos, kilusios iš apibrėžiamųjų aukštesniojo laipsnio bevardės giminės formų.

NORBERT OSTROWSKI

Institut Językoznawstwa

Zakład Baltologii

Uniwersytet im. Adama Mickiewicza w Poznaniu

al. Niepodległości 4

PL-61-874, Poznań

norbertas@poczta.onet.pl