

W. R. SCHMALSTIEG

LITHUANIAN CONSTRUCTIONS OF THE TYPE *JO BŪTA* AS A REFLECTION OF THE INDO-EUROPEAN MIDDLE VOICE*

In an earlier article (1976) I have assumed that at the earliest date of Proto-Indo-European there was no diathesis marking the difference between the active and the middle voices. The forms which are now represented by the middle voice were originally indifferent as to diathesis and only later when the active voice was constituted did these endings adopt the meaning of the middle voice.

Evidence for the original lack of diathesis can perhaps be adduced from the following. For example, Meillet, 1937, 232, writes that the forms called middle forms did not always have the meaning (*la valeur*) that one usually attributes to the middle voice. For example, in Homer the preterit of *phēmi* 'I say' is frequently *pháto* 'said'¹.

In Hittite the *-nt-* participle has preterit meaning and with transitive verbs is always passive according to Kronasser, 1956, 210, who gives the following examples: *kunant-* 'killed', *tant-* 'taken', *appant-* 'captured', *atant-* 'eaten'. In other Indo-European languages the etymological **-nt-* participle is in principle present and active for transitive verbs. If one assumes an original lack of diathesis, one could also assume that the participle adopted a passive meaning in Hittite and an active meaning in the other Indo-European languages at the time when diathesis was developed. With intransitive verbs we find Hittite *pant-* 'gone', *arant-* 'arrived', *akkant-* 'dead, died'.

In the Indo-European languages the participle in *-t-* can be formed in principle from any verb regardless of diathesis or transitivity, cf. Skt. *gatá-*, Gk. *batós* 'gone', Lat. (*circum-*) *ventus* < IE **g^wmtó-s*, Skt. *matá-* 'thought', Goth. *munds*, Lith. *miñtas*, Skt. *srutá-* 'flowing', etc. (See Thumb—Hauschild, 1959, 360—362.) Cf. also Gk. *hrutós* 'flowing', Skt. *mṛtá-s*, Avestan *mər²ta-* 'dead', Skt. *sattá-s* 'sitting', Skt. *sthitá-s*, Gk. *statós* 'standing', Skt. *bhūtá-s*, Avestan *būta-* 'having become, being'. (Brugmann, 1906, 394—400.)

In the attested Indo-European languages, however, when these participles are derived from transitive verbs the participles become passive and the logical subject (or agent) is in the genitive case. Thus we encounter Skt. *pátyuḥ kritá* 'bought by the spouse', *rājñām arcitaḥ* 'honored by kings' (Wackernagel—Debrunner,

*I should like to thank herewith my colleague, Prof. P. Baldi, for reading an earlier version of this paper and commenting on it. The responsibility for any errors is, of course, mine.

¹ It may be argued, however, that the apparent free variation between active and middle was conditioned by lexical meaning. In the case of the verb 'to say' there was no possibility of the verb's meaning 'he spoke to himself'. With other verbs such as *louómai* 'I wash myself' the free variation could not exist because the meaning would be different if an active voice were used.

1954, 578) *rājñām mataḥ* 'approved of by kings' (Macdonell, 1927, 194), *tā asya prajāḥ sṛṣṭāḥ* 'the beings created by him', Avestan *a'wiynixta sūnō* 'eaten by a dog', *ka'nīna anupaēta mašyānaṃ* 'maidens who are not yet to be touched by men', Old Persian *manā kartam* 'done by me', (Brugmann—Delbrück, Grundriß, 1911, 601) Gk. *Diós-dotos* 'given by God', *soũ phōnēs prosphthegktós* 'addressed by thy voice', *hápanta gár soi t'amá nouthetēmata keinēs didaktá* 'for all the admonitions to me from you are taught by her' (Schwyzer, 1966, 119), Gothic (John 6, 45) *jah wairþand allai laisidai gudis* = Gk. *kaì ěsontai pántes didaktoì theoũ* 'and all will be taught by God'. Cf. also Lith. *Jaropolko užmuštas* 'killed by Jaropolk'. Although they are usually interpreted differently the following examples from Latin might be compared also: (Kühner—Stegmann, 1962, 443) *attonitus serpentis* 'astonished by the serpent', *contentus partis dimidia dotis* 'content with a half of the dowry', (444) *fessus rerum* 'tired of things (from the events)', *interrita leti mens* 'a mind not frightened by death', *fractus opum* 'weakened (broken) by work'.

In Slavic also probably originally the logical subject was in the genitive case. In Slavic, however, the preposition *otъ* came to be used to reinforce the genitive case, which by itself had originally been sufficient to denote the logical subject of the passive participle. Thus an etymological form **u-bitъ* (or **u-bbjenvō*) *Jaropolka* 'killed by Jaropolk' was replaced by **u-bitъ otъ Jaropolka*, cf. the modern Slovene equivalent *ubit od Jaropolka* = Lith. *Jaropolko užmuštas*. (See Paternost and Schmalstieg, 1977.)²

Now Watkins, 1969, 113—114, has proposed that the participle in *-tos* has its origin in the 3rd sg. middle ending *-to*. Watkins writes: 'Es ist zu beachten, daß die Vollstufe des Partizipiums auf *-tó-* einer *TeRT-* Wurzel wie in $\epsilon\upsilon\chi\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$: *aoxta-* wahrscheinlich ein Archaismus ist, der die alte Einförmigkeit des Vokalismus im alten athematischen Medium unabhängig bezeugt. Ursprüngliche 3. Sg. **éugh^w-o* (später erneuert in **éugh^w-to* und schließlich thematisiert) → Verbaladjektiv **eugh^w-tós*. Wir können das gleiche, nicht ablautende Verhalten im lat. *ūsus* < **oit-tós* im Verhältnis zu dem alten Medium *ūtor* (vgl. alat. Infin. *oitier*, osk. *úittiuf* < **oit-ion-* wie alat. *pac-iō* gebildet) beobachten. Daher ist es warscheinlich richtig, *ūsus* < **oit-tós* im Ablaut zu vergleichen mit gr. $\omicron\iota\sigma\text{-}\tau\acute{o}\sigma$, mit der Wurzel des Futurs $\omicron\lambda\sigma\omega$, $\omicron\lambda\sigma\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$ < **ois-se/o-*'. Thus Burrow, 1965, 317, writes: "There appears to exist the same relation between the terminations of the active and middle of the 3 sg. ((*á*)*kar(t)*, (*á*)*kṛta*) as is found in the nominal suffixes in *kṛt-*: *kṛtá*".

Furthermore the connection between the Germanic weak preterit and the participle in **-tos* which had always been suspected (see Brugmann, 1904, 550) becomes obvious. The Germanic weak preterit merely reflects the 3rd sg. middle ending *-to* which, when incorporated into the nominal paradigm becomes the participle.

We may note here also the use of the participle in *-ta* in Sanskrit as a finite verb (see Macdonell, 1916, 329), e. g., *tatām me āpas tād u tāyate pūnaḥ* 'my work is

² This explanation of the Slavic phenomena can appear convincing only to those who have a somewhat broader knowledge of Indo-European linguistics. The term *convincing* depends upon the knowledge, taste and background of the evaluator. Probably the broader the background of the evaluator the better. On the other hand, it is always difficult for persons to throw off the blinders of preconceived notions, particularly when such notions are gained early in one's life. As F. Bezlaj, 1976, 12—13, writes: 'Žal se človek najteže otrese tega, kar se je v mladosti naučil'.

done and it is being done again'; *ná tvávam indra kás caná ná jātó ná janiṣyate* 'no one is like thee, O Indra, he has not been born, and he will not be born'.

One recalls now (1) that the participle in *-t-* can be transitive or intransitive, active or passive, depending upon the meaning of the verbal stem and (2) that the logical subject (the agent) of such a participle is in the genitive case.

It is usually stated that in a Lithuanian syntactic construction such as *jo būta* 'he was', *jo eīta* 'he went' the ending *-ta* is the neuter form of the participle *-tas* (< **-tos*). The assumption is, however, unnecessary. This Indo-European ending **-to* may have no grammatical concord with any other word in the sentence. It would possibly be attached to a (verbal) stem which would acquire the function of active, middle, transitive or intransitive depending upon the lexical meaning.

Thus a Hittite sentence such as **antuhša-š ar-ta* 'a man stands, takes his stand' (in which the *ar-ta* is 3rd sg. middle present) may have originally been cognate with Lith. *žmogaũ-s stó-ta* as far as inflectional endings are concerned. The same ending is retained in the 3rd sg. middle aor. Gk. (*ě-do-*)*to*, Skt. (*á-di-*)*ta*.

In fact the identity of Hittite 3rd sg. middle present and the Sanskrit and Gk. 3rd sg. middle aorists has long been recognized. Petersen, 1932, 205, compares Hittite *ar-ta* 'rises, stands' with Gk. *ōr-to* 'arose' and Skt. *ār-ta* 'rose'.

Vaillant, 1936, and Uhlenbeck, 1901, proposed long ago that in the noun the morphological element *-s* may have originally been the marker of the ergative. This marker was split between the genitive and the nominative case in the later Indo-European languages.

The *t*-participle has been re-interpreted in Indo-Iranian. According to Vaillant, 1936, 95, "... le tour usuel *mayā dṛṣṭa-* 'par moi vu' du sanskrit, avec le participe passif et l'instrumental, donne le prétérit 'j'ai vu' du néo-indien...; le vieux-perse *avayā krtam* 'par lui fait', avec le pronom au génitif-datif...se continue dans le persan *vay kard* 'il a fait', de sens actif".

I believe that there is good evidence that originally there was no concord between the Indo-European verb and its subject. One notes, e. g., the following preterit forms which show no difference between the 2nd and 3rd sg.: Hittite *tījat* (from the root *tīja-* 'treten' [Friedrich, 1960, 93]); OCS *jas-tō* 'ate'. It is usually assumed that the *-t* of the Old Irish *t*-preterit has been introduced into other persons of the verb from the 3rd person singular (Thurneysen, 1946, 422 – 423), but it makes just as good sense to assume a single original form *·bert* which was later subjected to analogical influences from the present to produce the attested forms. Thus 1st sg. preterit *·biurt* (influenced by the 1st sg. pres. *·biur*), 2nd sg. pret. *·birt* (influenced by the 2nd sg. pres. *·bir*), etc. Traces of the original lack of agreement between subject and verb are found in other parts of the Indo-European paradigm also. One may recall the Gothic paradigm with the 1st and 3rd sg. passive *bairada* 'was carried', 1st, 2nd and 3rd pl. *bairanda*, and the Sanskrit 1st sg. and 3rd sg. middle perfect *cakré* 'made, did.'

Indeed the Skt. 2nd sg. middle aor. ending (*a-di-*)*thāḥ* 'you (sg.) gave' was probably originally identical with the 3rd sg. middle aor. (*a-di-*)*ta*. One notes in Sanskrit the general tendency for the 2nd person forms to be differentiated from the 3rd person by means of aspiration of the *-t-*. Note the following items:

	2nd person	3rd person
Dual		
pres. act.	<i>bhāvathaḥ</i>	<i>bhāvataḥ</i>
pres. middle	<i>bhāvēthē</i>	<i>bhāvētē</i>
imperf. middle	<i>ābhavēthām</i>	<i>ābhavētām</i>
perfect	<i>cakrāthuḥ</i>	<i>cakrātuḥ</i>

Thus the ending *-thāḥ* shows the typical aspiration, whatever the origin of the latter may be. The final element of this ending is derived from a contamination with the 2nd sg. secondary ending **(e)s*. In other words **-t(h)a* (< **-t(h)o* < **-to*) plus *-aḥ* (< **-es*) gives *-thāḥ*. (See Watkins, 1969, 188.)

At a later date there developed an active voice for the verb. This active voice was correlated with personal endings and showed concord with the subject. The verb in the active voice was originally rather adjectival in nature agreeing with the subject in person and number. For certain nominal vocalic stems (e. g., **i-*, **u-* and **o-*stems) the subject case (i. e., the genitive case in **-s*) of the verbs in **-to* came to be the subject case (the nominative case) of the new active verbs. In Hittite, for example, the nominative and genitive singular forms of *antuhšaš* 'man' are the same. For most noun classes, however, the subject of the active verbs (i. e., the nominative case) remained the bare stem.

Let us keep in mind, however, Watkins' suggestion that the participle in *-tos* has its origin in the 3rd sg. middle ending *-to*. Now, although the origin of participle is to be found in the middle ending, once the active voice came to exist with its regular concord between subject and verbal form, the old middle ending *-to* (> Baltic *-ta*) appeared to the speakers of Proto-Baltic to be a derivative of the participle. In other words there was a complete reversal of the apparent *forme de fondation* and the *forme fondée*. This was a result of the fact that the old middle ending **-to* > Baltic *-ta* was to *-tas* and **-tā*, just like the old neuter adjective (*gēr-*)*a* was to (*gēr-*)*as* and **(ger-)**ā*. Thus for the speakers of Proto-Baltic the ending *-ta* came to be exactly as it is analyzed today, a neuter adjectival formation.

In addition as a derivative of the *past* passive participle it took on a preterit function in addition to its other semantic functions. Now there is in the Baltic languages a clear contrast between the preterit and the present tense. In order to maintain the balance between the preterit and the present tense, constructions of the type *jo ēsama* 'he is' (the present tense innovated on the basis of the preterit *jo būta*), *jo dirbama* 'he works' (present of *jo dirbta*), *jo āriama* 'he plows' (present of *jo ārta*), etc. were created. The analogy worked in the following direction: *jis dirbo* : *jo dirbta* : *jis dirba* : *x* and *x* = *jo dirbama*. In this manner the neuter form of the present passive participle took on all the same functions (except for tense) of the neuter form of the past passive participle.

Thus for the earliest stages of Indo-European I assume then a verb (without diathesis) and a subject in the ergative (genitive) case. This stage is reflected by such Lithuanian constructions as *jo būta*³. Far from being a Baltic innovation this is a true archaism.

³ Although there is probably no etymological connection there is an interesting syntactic parallel from Old Armenian. The genitive case could be used as a subject in the periphrastic preterit tenses. Some examples from Meillet, 1936, 95: *ēr nora hraman areal* 'he received the order',

REFERENCES

- Bezljaj F. 1976: Petindvajset let dela za slovenski etimološki slovar. XII. Seminar slovenskega jezika, literature in kulture. — In: Zbornik predavanj, ed. Helga Glušič. Ljubljana, pp. 7–15.
- Brugmann K. 1904: Kurze vergleichende Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen. Straßburg, Karl J. Trübner.
- Brugmann K. 1906: Grundriß der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen. Vol. 2, Pt. 1. Straßburg, Karl J. Trübner.
- Brugmann K. — Delbrück B. 1911: Grundriß der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen. Vol. 2, Pt. 2. Straßburg, Karl J. Trübner.
- Burrow T. 1965: The Sanskrit Language. 2nd ed. Glasgow, The University Press.
- Krause W. — Thomas W. 1960: Tocharisches Elementarbuch. Band I. Grammatik. Heidelberg, Carl Winter.
- Kronasser H. 1956: Vergleichende Laut- und Formenlehre des Hethitischen. Heidelberg, Carl Winter.
- Kühner R. — Stegmann C. 1962: Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache. 4th ed. First part. Munich, Max Heuber Verlag.
- Macdonell A.A. 1916: A Vedic Grammar for Students. Bombay, Calcutta, Madras, Oxford University Press. (1962 reprint.)
- Macdonell A.A. 1927: A Sanskrit Grammar for Students. 3rd ed. Oxford.
- Meillet A. 1936: Esquisse d'une grammaire comparée de l'arménien classique. 2nd ed. Vienna, Imprimerie des PP. Mekhitharistes.
- Meillet A. 1937: Introduction à l'étude comparative des langues indoeuropéennes (1964 reprint by University of Alabama Press, University, Alabama).
- Paternost J. — Schmalstieg W. R. 1977: Slovanski edninski rodilnik kot izvor dejanja pri deležnikih na -no- in -to-. — "Jezik in slovstvo", No 5, pp. 146–149.
- Petersen W. 1932: The personal endings of the Hittite verb. — "American Journal of Philology", 53, pp. 193–212.
- Schmalstieg W.R. 1976: Speculations on the Indo-European active and middle voices. — KZ, 90, pp. 23–36.
- Schwyzer E. 1966: Griechische Grammatik. Vol. 2. Munich, C.H. Beck'sche Verlag.
- Thumb A. — Hauschild R. 1959: Handbuch des Sanskrit. Vol. 1, Pt. 2. Heidelberg, Carl Winter.
- Thurneysen R. 1946: A Grammar of Old Irish. Tr. by D.A. Binchy and Osborn Bergin. Dublin, The Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies.
- Uhlenbeck C.C. 1901: Agens und Patiens im Kasussystem der indogermanischen Sprachen. — "Indogermanische Forschungen", 12, pp. 170–171.
- Vaillant A. 1936: L'ergatif indo-européen. — "Bulletin de la société de linguistique de Paris", 37, pp. 93–108.
- Vogt H. 1936: Esquisse d'une grammaire du géorgien moderne. Oslo, A.W. Brøggers Boktrykkeri A/S.
- Wackernagel J. — Debrunner A. 1954: Altindische Grammatik. Vol. II, Pt. 2.
- Watkins C. 1969: Indogermanische Grammatik. Band III: Formenlehre. Heidelberg, Carl Winter.

in which *nora* 'he, of him' is the subject in the genitive case, (128) *oꝛoç tesimal ər zna* 'who had seen him' in which *oꝛoç* 'who, of whom' is in the gen. (-dat. -abl.) plural; (129) *nora bereal ē* 'he carried'. Perhaps here we find some influence from the Caucasian languages. In Georgian, for example, the subject of the perfect tense is in the dative case. Thus Vogt, 1936, 116, gives the example: "mgels šeučamia cxvari 'le loup a, parait-il, mangé le mouton', litt. 'au loup est mangé le mouton', en d'autres mots, le parfait est un temps passif". The logical subject *mgel-s* 'wolf' is in the dative case, a case, interestingly enough, marked by the element *-s* in Georgian.

Concerning Tokharian I should like to quote Krause–Thomas, 1960, 82–83, who write: 'Der Genetiv zur Bezeichnung des Agens beim Passiv findet sich vor allem bei infiniten Formen und periphrastischen Bildungen'. Among the examples are (West Tokharian): *ršākemts lānte pēspirttu pelaikeṣṣe cākkār* 'the law wheel turned by the king of the *R̥ṣi's*', *ñi no ytārye ākṣusa oktatsa* 'the eightpart path proclaimed by me'. Krause–Thomas also note, 83, that occasionally the genitive is found as an agent with finite verbs, e.g., *srukor aiṣaumpyepi olypo ritoytār* 'sooner might death be sought after by a wise man'.