W. R. SCHMALSTIEG

THE SHIFT OF INTRANSITIVE TO TRANSITIVE PASSIVE IN THE LITHUANIAN AND INDO-EUROPEAN VERB*

The earliest type of Indo-European predication had no subject or object at all and is represented by such Lithuanian sentences as *pàsnig-ta* 'it has snowed' or *palỹ-ta* 'it has rained'. In contemporary Lithuanian such forms are analyzed as impersonal forms with the -*t*- participle in the neuter gender. Diathesis is so little felt, however, that it is possible to use what seem now to be masc. nom. pl. past active participle forms such as *pasnìg-ę* and *palìj-ę* with the same meaning as their -*t*- participle counterparts (Paulauskienė, 1979, 108). Let us take such a sentence as the following:

Čià	grỹbų	bū̃-ta	(bùv-ę)
Here	mushrooms	were	
Adv.	gen. pl.	neut.	
		prt.	

'There were mushrooms here'. In such a sentence the neuter form of the -*t*- participle and the -*ę* participle have exactly the same meaning (Ambrazas, 1979, 23). The subject of the sentence is in the genitive case. I propose next that at the earliest stage of Indo-European there were no transitive verbs, only intransitive verbs (see Woodcock, 1959, 2). Let us take, however, such a sentence as the following:

Senų̃	miškaĩ	mylė̆ta
Old people	forests	loved
Gen. pl.	nom. pl.	neut. prt.

This sentence is usually translated as 'The ancients loved the forests' (Matthews, 1955, 354). From the point of view of our contemporary Indo-European languages a passive translation is to be preferred, however, because the patient is in the nominative case and the agent is in the genitive case. Such a sentence as the one above is the

---

* In this paper the term transitive passive denotes a passive voice which appears to be derived from a transitive active form of the verb. Although I doubt that he accepts my conclusions, I would like herewith to thank Dr. Michael Back for good and helpful advice.

archetypal Indo-European sentence. I conceive of it as intransitive because the action of the predicate element *mylĕta* 'loved' goes back on the subject *miškaĩ* 'forests'. Since at this earliest period there were still no transitive verbs, both an English active translation: 'The ancients loved the forests' and the preferred passive translation 'Forests (were) loved by the ancients' are possible. At this stage there could be no contrast of active versus passive because no transitive verbs existed.

The lack of grammatical concord between the nom. pl. *miškaĩ* and the neut. sg. participle *mylĕta* is an ancient feature and reflects the original lack of concord between noun and predicate adjective. Ambrazas, 1979, 204—205, writes that such constructions as *rugiaĩ* 'rye' (nom. pl.) *pjáuta* '(is) cut' (neut sg.) and Slavic *batъka* 'father' (nom. sg.) *ubito* '(is) killed' (neut. sg.), which lack grammatical concord, are inherited from ancient times[1].

It has long been known that the earliest form of the Indo-European adjective in predicate position did not agree in case, number and gender with the noun. Thus Hirt, 1937, 25—26, gives such examples: Gk. οὐκ ἀγαθὸν πολυκοιρανίη 'the rule of many is not good' (in which ἀγαθὸν 'good' is in the neut. sg. and does not agree with the fem. sg. πολυκοιρανίη 'rule of many'); ἄπιστον ταῖς πολιτείαις ἡ τυραννίς 'despotic rule is untrustworthy for the states' (in which ἄπιστον 'untrustworthy' is in the neut. sg. and does not agree with the fem. sg. τυραννίς 'despotic rule'); Lat. *varium et mutabile semper femina* 'woman is always diverse and changeable' (in which

---

[1] Ambrazas writes further, 205, that it is difficult to derive these constructions directly from ergative constructions because the Baltic *genitivus auctoris* cannot be separated from the possessive constructions. Ambrazas explains further, personal letter dated 1981.2.5, that according to his chronology the passive was created relatively recently in the Baltic languages. At that time such constructions as *jõ gyvénta* 'he lived' (*jõ* 'of him') [gen. sg.], etc. had a possessive meaning similar to *jõ gyvénimas* 'his life'. This possessive genitive in its turn may have been derived from an ergative. This would be in agreement with the nominal origin of the participle and the possessive meaning of the genitive, but such a reconstruction is further back in time. Ambrazas has tried inasmuch as possible to describe the development of Lithuanian syntactic phenomena within the framework of nominal constructions, leaving the question of the possible derivation of the nominal constructions from the ergative to others.

I see no fundamental difference between the nominal constructions and the ergative, although I would be inclined to reverse the chronology and derive the ergatives from nominal constructions. In essence then I would see the nominal origin of the participles as an Indo-European development.

In this paper I have derived the passive from the reinterpretation of the intransitive at the time when the new active voice came into being. On the other hand, Ambrazas' view that the passive voice arose separately in the Baltic languages cannot be dismissed out of hand. It would be possible to imagine the emergence of the passive from an earlier intransitive at a date considerably later than the creation of an active voice. The passive is certainly not well established as an Indo-European syntactic category and one could well assume parallel development in all the languages in which the passive did emerge.

the neut. sg. adjectives *varium* 'diverse' and *mutabile* 'changeable' do not agree in gender with the fem. *femina* 'woman'); *turpe senex miles, turpe senilis amor* 'unseemly is an old soldier, unseemly is aged love' (in which the neut. sg. *turpe* 'unseemly' does not agree with the masc. sg. subjects *miles* 'soldier' or *amor* 'love'); Russian *грех сладко, а человек падко* 'sin is sweet and the human is susceptible' (in which the neut. sg. adjectives *сладко* 'sweet' and *падко* 'susceptible' do not agree with the masc. sg. subjects *грех* 'sin' and *человек* 'human').

Development of the participle *-tos* with concord with the grammatical subject (which is the patient if the verb is transitive) is later and parallel with the development of adjectival concord in general.

The case which we now know as the nominative case was originally the indefinite case. Consider such a sentence as:

patér	*bhr̥-tó*	*vīr-os*
father	carried	man
indefinite case	(verb = noun)	(gen. = ergative)

This sentence was originally non-diathetic and there was no grammatical concord between any of the elements. Such a sentence could mean either: 'The man carried the father' or 'The father was carried by the man'. Again the possibility of a distinction is only a function of the fact that English can provide two translations. Although there is no distinction between active and passive in such a sentence, it would be impossible to consider it transitive because strictly speaking there is no direct object, the word *patér* being the subject of the sentence.

Woodcock, 1959, 2, has suggested that an expression such as Lat. *peto urbem* 'I seek the city' may have originally meant 'I fly to the city' (cf. Gk. ἥέτομαι 'I fly'). I have suggested, 1980, 184 — 185, that originally the dative and accusative cases were not separate, that both of them had some kind of dative or locative function. The accusative case owes its origin to the reinterpretation of intransitive verbs as transitive verbs. The nominative case (other than for the old *o*-stems) was originally an indefinite case. Note then the following sentence:

patér	*bher-es*	*vīr-om*
father	is in the	as far as the
(subject of	state of	man is concerned
intransitive	carrying	(indirect object,
verb of	(durative, in-	since a stative or
state in	transitive	intransitive cannot
indefinite or	verb)	take a direct object)
absolute case)		

The sentence then comes to be reanalyzed as:

patér	*bher-es*	*vīr-om*
father	is carrying	the man
(nominative	(progressive	(direct object
subject of a	aspect which	of the active
transitive	becomes transitive	transitive verb
progressive	and active	in accusative case)
verb)	voice)	

Now three things are happening at once. A. The old indefinite or absolute case (*patér* 'father') is reanalyzed as a nominative case. B. The old durative intransitive verb (*bher-es* 'is{in the state of} carrying') is reanalyzed as a progressive aspect and becomes active and transitive. C. The old indirect object (*vīr-om* 'with respect to, as far as the man is concerned') becomes a direct object. This case furnishes the basis for both the new accusative and the old dative.

In the example given above the ending *-es* is assumed as being indifferently the animate pronominal marker of both the 2nd and 3rd sg., cf. e. g. the Hittite 2nd and 3rd sg. preterit *tar-na-aš* 'abandoned'. The meaning of transitive and active voice represented by an old present conjugation (1st sg.) *bher-om*, (2nd sg.) *bher-es*, (3rd sg.) *bher-es(-et)* is completely new. Originally such verbs were durative and intransitive and even today in many modern Indo-European languages the successors of many of these verbs can be used either intransitively or transitively, cf. e. g. the following pairs of sentences: Lith. *aš kepù* (*dúoną*) 'I am baking (bread)'; *tù kepì* (*dúoną*) 'you are baking (bread)'; *jìs kẽpa* (*dúoną*) 'he is baking (bread)'. Both the Lithuanian and English sentences may have, but do not require, an object.

One of the main problems in earlier treatments of Indo-European ergativity is the assumption that the attested nominative case must reflect an earlier ergative case. In my view this assumption is completely unnecessary. I now propose that the attested nominative case was (except for the *o*-stem) the original indefinite case. When the original intransitive verb became active and transitive there was a shift in case functions. The old indefinite case became a nominative case and the old dative case split into a new accusative case, at the same time it retained its old dative function.

Furthermore it is clear that as the interpretation of the verb changes, the case with which it is used can change. Thus originally such apparent impersonal constructions were used with the Lithuanian nominative case, cf. e.g.,

Añt šakēlių	*añt*	*žaliūjų*	*vainìkai*	(*vainikùs*)	*kabìnta*
On branches	on	green	wreathes	(wreathes)	hung
Prep. gen.	prep.	gen.	nom. pl.	(acc. pl.)	neut. participle

122

'Wreathes are hung on green branches' (Paulauskienė, 1979, 105). In the older form of the sentence the subject *vainìkai* 'wreathes' was in the nominative plural which is interpreted as the subject of the neut. participle. Later as the feeling of *kabìnta* 'hung' shifts from intransitive to transitive it becomes possible to use an accusative case *vainikùs* 'wreathes' which is then felt as an object. In Lithuanian in addition to the older form *láiškas rãšoma* 'a letter is written' with *láiškas* 'letter' in the nominative case one finds now also *láišką rãšoma* 'a letter is written, one is writing a letter' with *láišką* in the accusative case (See Ambrazas, 1979, 17).

In Lithuanian one can find examples of the old non-diathetic sentences, and the newer active sentences:

(Etymological old non-diathetic type):

Tě̃vo	*dúota*	*dúona*
By father	given	bread
gen. sg.	neuter	nom. sg. fem.

(A more recent version expressing concord would have the nom. sg. fem. participle *duotà*.)

(New active type sentence):

Tě̃vas	*dúoda*	*dúoną*
Father	gives	bread
nom. sg.	active transitive	acc. sg.

Although Lithuanian still has traces of the old non-diathetic sentences, these tended to fall under the influence of the new active transitive sentences in other Indo-European languages and adopted similar syntactic agreement. In Lithuanian the beginnings of this can be seen in such phrases where *rãšoma láišką* (acc. sg.) 'a letter is being written' starts to replace *rãšoma láiškas* (nom. sg.).

In the past I have suggested that the exclusive origin of the nominative case was the old indefinite case. I would modify this now to suggest that for all of the noun types except the *o*-stems this might be true. For the *o*-stems alone when the new active types were mixed up syntactically with the old non-diathetic types the ergative case *-os* moved into the nominative slot as well as being retained in the genitive slot. Following the accentual pattern of other stems it received stem-stress. In Hittite alone the identity of the *o*-stem nominative and genitive singular remains, cf. *antuḫšaš* 'man' (gen. and nom. sg.).

In Greek and Sanskrit the old non-diathetic verb (which became the mediopassive) fell completely under the influence of the new active verb so that we find a nominative subject and an accusative direct object for both the 3rd sg. active pres-

ent (Gr.) δίδωσι, (Skt.) *dádāti* 'gives' and the 3rd sg. middle aorist (Gk.) ἔδοτο, (Skt.) *ádita*. (For a further discussion of the middle endings see Schmalstieg, 1978, 17–18.)

Traces of the old grammatical relations can be seen in those forms with the -*t*- participle which are now felt as passive and used with a genitive of agent, cf. e. g., Skt. *pátyuḥ krītá* 'bought by the spouse', Gk. Διόσ-δοτος 'given by God' and further examples in Schmalstieg, 1978, 15–16. In fact, the notion of developing transitivity in the Indo-European languages explains the split between the active and passive use of various participial forms. The -*t*- participle, for example, retained its intransitive meaning in such verbs as IE *g^wṃ-tó-s* > Skt. *gatá-*, Gk. βατός 'gone', Lat. *(circum-)ventus*, etc. (Schmalstieg, 1978, 15), but adopted a passive meaning if the verb came to be perceived as transitive.

Many, if not most, Indo-European verbs could continue to be used as intransitives as well as transitives, so many of the participial constructions could have either an active or a passive meaning. Gonda, 1960, 65–66, has given ample evidence of such verbs, cf. e.g., Latin *tacitus* 'silent' and 'not spoken of', *potus* 'who has drunk', and also 'what has been drunk', Greek ἄγευστος 'not tasting, not having tasted' and 'tasteless'.

Jēgers, 1970, 81–84, lists such Baltic tool names as Lith. *káltas*, Latv. *kalts* 'chisel', Old Prussian *dalptan* 'durchschlag, a pointed instrument of iron and steel for making holes', Lith. *grą́žtas* 'borer, drill', *plàktas* 'big hammer', Lith. *spą́stai*, Latv. *spuôsts* 'trap', etc. In the same agent category belong, according to *Jēgers*, 84, Old Prussian *warto* 'house door', Lith. *vartai*, Latv. *vãrti*, Old Church Slavic *vrata* 'gate', Lith. *pláustas*, *kéltas* 'ferry', Lith. *aũtas*, Latv. *aũts* 'foot wrapping' etc. Jēgers, 84–85, seems to explain these as somehow derived from the passive meaning, but if one assumes the derivation to come from a pre-diathetic period an active meaning can be understood and the apparent problem of the passive nature disappears.

Babby, 1978, 19, writes that in Russian there is no semantic or syntactic motivation for deriving the so-called passive participles from deeper structures that have a subject and direct object. Babby, 20, would treat the 'passive participles' as deverbal stative adjectives. Furthermore, 17, they pattern syntactically and morphologically the same way that primary adjective stems do, they can function as the predicate of subjectless sentences and they are neutral with regard to tense' and voice. If Babby's interpretation is correct, and it seems to be so to me, then perhaps Russian participial expressions in -*to* retain the original Indo-European function of a voiceless (non-diathetic) adjective which was only later incorporated into the verbal paradigm in the various Indo-European languages.

Ambrazas, 1979, 62, writes that many of the Lithuanian attributive participles have neither diathesis nor temporal meanings and that the data from the history of the language and related languages leads one to the conclusion that a large proportion of them never had any such meaning. He writes further, 1979, 63, that the derivatives with the suffix -to- had a resultative meaning, near to that of the perfect.

In most Indo-European languages the participle in -ant- came to be felt chiefly as an active participle. In Hittite, however, it is usually active for intransitive verbs, but passive for transitive verbs. Cf. e. g., *akkant-* 'died, dead', *pānt-* 'having gone', vs. *kunant-* '(having been) killed', *dant-* '(having been) taken'. Note, however, that *adant-* can be understood as either '(having) eaten' or '(having been) eaten' and that *akkuant-* can be understood either as '(having) drunk' or '(having been) drunk'. Latin *pransus* and *potus* and Sanskrit *bhukta-* and *pīta-* furnish parallel semantic examples, although formed with the -t- participle. The passive meanings of the participles emerge when the new active counterparts arise.

The emergence of a former adverb as a preposition coming to support the simple case construction is a common linguistic phenomenon. Thus Latin preserves the old accusative with words such as (acc. sg.) *domum* 'house', *rūs* 'country', the names of towns and small islands, e.g., *Romam ire* 'to go to Rome'. But the more common and productive form is with the preposition, e.g., *ad urbem venire* 'to come to the city' (See Palmer, 1968, 286).

Although the usual agent of the passive in Lithuanian is the genitive case alone, in dialects one finds examples where it is supported by a preposition, e.g.:

Čià	*tù*	*gyvénsi*	*nuõ*	*výro*	*mylĕta*
Here	you	will live	by	husband	loved

'You will live here loved by your husband'. In this example the preposition *nuo* 'from' is added, although from the point of view of the standard language the *nuo* is not necessary (Academy Grammar, vol. 2, p. 601).

Thus in such Old Church Slavic examples as *simъ otъ Josifa rečenomъ = his ab Josepho dictis* 'these things having been said by Joseph' the *otъ* has come to support the simple genitive case by itself (See Schmalstieg and Paternost, 1977, 146−149, and Schmalstieg, 1976, 161).

Interesting examples illustrating just how the instrumental case could replace the genitive case come from Lithuanian as reported by Paulauskienė, 1979, 99:

... *kur̃*	*devýnis*	*mĕnesius*	*per̃*	*metùs*	*žĕmė*
... where	nine	months	in a	year	earth
					nom. sg.

ẽsti	*sniẽgo*	*(sniegù)*	*nuklóta...*
is	by snow	(with snow)	covered...
	gen. sg.	(inst. sg.)	nom. sg. fem. participle

'... where nine months in a year the earth is covered by (with) snow...' Note that in this example one can consider *snow* as either the agent for covering the earth or else as the instrument by which the earth is covered.

Daiktìnis	*ař*	*veiksmìnis*	*siñbolis*	*bùvo*	*ùžstelbtas*
Material	or	active	symbol	was	choked off

iř	*užtémdytas*	*žõdiniu*	*ãpvalkalu*	*(žõdinio ãpvalkalo)*
and	eclipsed	by verbal	cover	(by verbal cover)
		inst. sg.	inst. sg.	(gen. sg. gen. sg.)

'The material or active symbol was choked off and eclipsed by the verbal covering'. In this example the 'verbal cover' can be considered either the agent or the instrument of the choking off and eclipsing.

Bendrúomenės	*istòrijos*	*kūrìmas*
of the community	of the history	establishment
gen. sg.	gen. sg.	nom. sg.

neįžveĺgiama	*paslaptiñ*	*(neįžveĺgiamos paslaptiẽs)*		*prìdengtas...*
by an impenetrable	secret	(by an impenetrable secret)		(is) hidden...
inst. sg.	inst. sg.	(gen. sg.	gen. sg.)	nom. sg. past passive participle

'The establishment of the history of the community is hidden by an impenetrable secret...' Here also the 'impenetrable secret' can be considered either the agent or the instrument of the hiding.

This shows us how in Slavic the old *otъ* plus the genitive construction was finally replaced by the instrumental case so that the instrumental is encountered both in *napisano mnoju* 'written by me' and in *napisano karandašom* 'written with a pencil'. These are still distinguished in Lithuanian where we encounter *parašýta màno* 'written by me' (gen. sg.) vs. *parašýta pieštukù* 'written with a pencil' (inst. sg.) (Paulauskienė, 1979, 99).

Continuing with the notion that the earliest form of the Indo-European verb is intransitive one arrives at a natural interpretation of the origin of the nominative plus infinitive constructions. Thus Disterheft, 1980, 187, notes that voice is not morphologically marked for the infinitive in most of the Indo-European languages

(notable exceptions being Latin and Greek). According to Disterheft voice is only indicated syntactically by marking the relationship of the noun phrase to the infinitive. The patient is the object when the infinitive is active, but the subject when the infinitive is passive. I suggest that the verbs in such constructions are old intransitives which have come to be interpreted as passives as a result of the emergence of the new active voice. Note t e examples from various Indo-European languages:

Tokharian A:

wsā-yok-	*yats...*	*sūk*	*lkātsi*
gold-colored	skin (is)	pleasant	to see
	nom.		

'The gold-colored skin is pleasant to see' (Krause – Thomas, 1960, 79).

Vedic Sanskrit:

havyáir	*agnír*	*mánuṣa*	*īrayádhyāi*
by the sacrifices	Agni	of the man	is to be brought to life
inst.	nom.	gen.	inf.

'Agni is to be brought to life through the sacrifice of a man'.

Avestan: *gāuš jaⁱ dyāi* 'The cow is to be killed' (Brugmann – Delbrück, 1916, 923 – 924).

Hittite:

...*nepisas*	*daganzipas-a*	
heaven	earth	and
gen.	gen.	
uddār	*kattan arha*	*petummanzi*
word		bring-forth
nom.		inf.

'May the word of heaven and earth be brought forth'.

...*1*	*GA.KIN.AG*	*parsiwanzi*
one	cheese (?)	break
		inf.

'One cheese (?) should be broken' (Disterheft, 1980, 165).

Kiparsky, 1969, has given an excellent brief review of the vast literature on the subject as it concerns the Baltic and Slavic languages, and one must agree with him that the construction is retained from early Indo-European, although Tokharian and Hittite evidence seems to have escaped him. From dialect Russian Kiparsky, 1969, 142, gives the example: *рыба надо ловить* 'a fish is to be caught' < Old Russian *рыба на добѣ есть ловити* 'a fish is at this time to be caught'. From Vsevelod Miller Kiparsky quotes the example:

видать	*сова*	*по перью,*	*сокол*	*по*	*полёту*
to be recognized	an owl	by the feathers,	falcon	by	flight
inf.	nom.	prep. dat.	nom.	prep.	

'An owl is (to be) recognized by its feathers, a falcon by its flight'.

From Endzelīns, 1922, 409 (=1951, 553), para. 392, Kiparsky quotes the Latvian example:

nuosûnuojis	*akmins*	*gr̆ūti*	*kustinât*
covered with moss	stone	difficult	to move
	nom.		inf.

'A stone covered with moss is difficult to move'.

A typical Lithuanian example is furnished by the Academy Grammar, vol. 1, p. 183:

Kitíem	*laiškaĩ*	*rašýti*	*bùvo daũg*	*lengviaũ*
For others	letters	to write	was much	easier
dat. pl.	nom. pl.	inf.	past adv.	comparative
			tense	

'For others letters were much easier to write'.

Thus the use of the nominative case (mostly derived from the old indefinite case) as the patient of the apparently passive (although originally non-diathetic) infinitive is well represented in many Indo-European languages. Disterheft, 1980, 115, has argued that in the Rig-Veda the use of the passive voice with the negated infinitive is a reflection of a more archaic passive use of the infinitive. According to the theory which I present one would expect the earlier form of the intransitive verb to be understood as a passive, once the new transitive verb is developed.

The theory proposed here has important implications for the distinction between the Armenian transitive and intransitive perfect. The common feature of the two forms is that they are expressed by a periphrastic construction, but that in the intransitive perfect the subject is in the nominative case and in the transitive perfect the agent is in the genitive case. Note the following forms:

es cneal em;   *žamanek haseal ē*
I born was, i.e., I was born;   the time come has, i.e., the time has come;
Yisus ekeal ēr
Jesus come had, i.e., Jesus had come.

Note that such intransitive expressions are very similar to French *je suis né, je suis arrivé*. German *ich bin geboren, ich bin gekommen*, etc. But note the Armenian examples with a transitive perfect:

z-ayn	*nšan*	*arareal*	*ēr*	*nora*
this	miracle	accomplished	had	he
acc.	acc.	*eal*-participle		gen. sg.

'he had accomplished this miracle';

ēr	nora	hraman	areal
had	he	a promise	received
	gen.	acc.	*eal*-prt.

'he had received a promise' (Benveniste, 1971a, 156—157; Godel, 1975, 54).

Although in the examples given above the object of the transitive verbs is in the accusative case (*z-ayn nšan* 'this miracle', and *hraman* 'promise'), it seems probable that originally such forms were in the nominative. Thus, according to Benveniste, 1971a, 159:

z-gorc	gorceal	ē	nora
operam	factum	est	eius
acc.	acc.		gen.

'he accomplished this work' shows the replacement of an old nominative case by an accusative and was originally rather like the Latin *eius* (gen.) *facta* (nom.) *est opera* (nom.). The transitive government was adopted under the influence of the earlier *fecit* 'he accomplished'. The phenomenon is exactly comparable to the Lithuanian situation where *rãšoma láišką* replaces *rãšoma láiškas* under the influence of the prevailing transitive pattern.

According to Benveniste, 1971b, 175, "the form of the transitive perfect active in Armenian is distinguished from that of the perfect passive only if the object is specified as such by the particle *z-*; otherwise, the two forms coincide". Note the example from Mark 15,46:

ed	i	gerezmani	z-or	ēr p'oreal	i	vimē
he laid (him)	in	sepulchre	which one	had hewn	out of	a rock

i.e., he laid him in a sepulchre which one had hewn out of a rock. But if the particle *z-* is omitted, the expression *or ēr p'oreal* must be translated by the passive which corresponds exactly with the Greek: ὅ ᾖ λελατομημένον ἐκ πέτρας 'which was hewn out of a rock'.

An example from Luke 2,5:

Maremaw	handerj	z-or	xawseal	ēr	nma
'Mary	with	whom	espoused	had	to him'

i.e., 'with Mary whom one had espoused to him'. If again one deletes the *z-* from the relative pronoun the sentence would read: 'with Mary espoused to him' and corresponds exactly with the Greek σὺν Μαριάμ τῇ εμνηστευμένῃ αὐτῷ.

Benveniste, 1971b, 175, writes further: "Examples can be found in which nothing except the context allows us to decide whether the perfect is active or passive". Some examples:

Luke 19,15:

.....	*z-caraysn*	*oroc'*	*tueal*	*ēr*	*z-arcat'n*
.....	the servants	to whom	given	had	money

i.e., '... servants to whom he had given money'. Since the relative pronoun *oroc'* is genitive-dative-ablative plural it could logically be understood as the subject, i.e., 'who have given the money'. It is only the context which allows us to decide on the true agent of the action of giving.

John 3 : 24:

zi	*č'ew*	*ews*	*ēr*	*arkeal*	*z-yovhannēs*	*i*	*bant*
because	not	yet	had	thrown	John	into	prison

i.e., 'because they had not yet thrown John into prison'. On the other hand, if the object of the sentence *z-yovhannēs* 'John' is omitted, it is then translated 'for he was not thrown into prison yet', which corresponds exactly with the Greek οὔπω γὰρ ἦν βεβλημένος εἰς τὴν φυλακήν.

Typologically the Armenian syntactic shifts are extremely instructive. In the first place it is evident that the use of copulative verb with the -*eal* participle was originally only intransitive, as is evidenced by the older constructions such as *es cneal em* 'I was born'. Later by contrast with the new active constructions, e.g. *arnem* 'I make, do' such an original intransitive form as *arareal* 'accomplished' came to be understood as a passive and the old possessive genitive is understood as the agent. While it was still a passive one assumes with Benveniste, 1971a, 159, that the patient was in the nominative case. When the interpretation shifted from passive to active, following the pattern of the active verbs, the patient shifted to the accusative case. This is, as we have seen above, exactly what happened with the Indo-European medio-passive in such languages as Greek and Sanskrit.

Thus both the Vedic infinitive and the Armenian participles in -*eal* show complementary distribution, i.e., they originally denoted either (a) intransitive or (b) transitive passive. This renders it likely that the latter (b) developed from the former (a) through syntactic/semantic reanalysis at the moment when the new active voice was being created.

What Gołąb, 1975, 29, calls the 'activization' (the possibility of complementation by direct objects) is noted in the Slavic languages also. Gołąb writes that when a Pole is faced with a choice of translating an English agentless passive like *this house was built in 1915* with the literal *dom ten został zbudowany w 1915* or with the impersonal active *dom ten zbudowano w 1915*, a Pole will rather choose the latter construction.

The fundamental point of this paper can now be presented in schematic form:

Stage I (Old original stative forms)

1) *patér* $g^w\eta$-*tó*
'father   goes'
(indefinite   (stative [verb = adjective]
case)   intransitive)

2) *ovi*   *pek^w-tó*
'sheep   cooks'
(indefinite   (stative [verb = adjective]
case)   intransitive)

3) *ovi*   *pek^w-tó*   *patrós*
'sheep   cooks   by agency of father'
(indefinite   (stative   (ergative = genitive)
case)   intransitive)
        (verb = adjective)

Stage II (New developing durative)

4) *patér*   *g^{w}em-es (-et)*[2]
'father   goes'
(indefinite   (durative
case)   intransitive)

5) *ovi*   *pek^w-es (-et)*
'sheep   cooks'
(indefinite   (durative
case)   intransitive)

6) *pater*   *pek^w-es (-et)*   *ovi-m*
'father   cooks   (away at the sheep')
(indefinite   (durative   (dative-locative
case)   intransitive)   indirect object)

Stage III (Durative verb becomes active voice)

7) *patér*   *g^{w}em-es (-et)*
'father   goes'
(nominative   (intransitive
case)   active verb)

---

[2] On the basis of such Hittite 2nd and 3rd sg. preterit forms as *tar-na-aš* 'left, abandoned', etc. I assume that in thematic verbs the 3rd sg. could be expressed either by *-es* or *-et*. See Schmalstieg, 1980, 183.

8) *ovi   pek^w-es(-et)
'sheep   cooks'
(nominative (intransitive
case)   active verb)

9) *pater   pek^w-es (-et)   ovi-m
'father   cooks   sheep'
(nominative   (transitive   (accusative
case)   active verb)   case)

Stage IV (Some non-diathetic verbs are interpreted as passives)

10) *patér   g^wm̥-tó[3]
'father   went'
(nominative   (intransitive
case)   perfect)

11) *ovi   pek^w-tó
'sheep   (is, was) cooked'
(nominative   (transitive
case)   passive)

12) *ovi   pek^w-tó   patrós
'sheep   (is, was) cooked   by the father'
(nominative   (transitive   (genitive/instrumental/
case)   passive)   ablative)

The first shift is the shift of sentences of type (6) to those of type (9) where (a) the indefinite case turns into a nominative case, (b) the intransitive verb becomes a transitive and active verb and (c) the old dative-locative case becomes an accusative case. When sentences of type (6) pass to sentences of type (9) an active voice is created. This active voice causes the interpretation of sentences like (2) and (3) to change, i.e., instead of being interpreted as intransitives without diathesis they are now interpreted as transitive passives. In other words, sentences of type (2) and (3) become sentences of type (11) and (12). Thus all -t- participles were originally intransitive. Those with new active counterparts which take accusative objects come to be interpreted as transitive passives.

In conclusion then Lithuanian constructions which appear to show the passive use of the neuter participle (e.g., ... miškaĩ mylė́ta 'forests (were) loved') and the

---

[3] Differently from my earlier view I would now propose that the intransitives with the *-t- participle were originally construed with a nominative case and that a Sanskrit sentence such as rā́jā gr̥haṃ gataḥ 'the king has gone home' is older than the intransitive with the subject in an oblique case such as Lith. karãliaus namõ eĩta. The genitive case in an intransitive construction is a syntactic innovation on analogy with the transitive constructions.

nominative object of an infinitive, (e.g., *mèsà sveĩka válgyti* 'meat is healthy to eat {to be eaten}') reflect early Indo-European collocations prior to the formation of the transitive verb and the corresponding emergence of the passive voice.

REFERENCES

Academy Grammar: Lietuvių kalbos gramatika/Ed. by K. Ulvydas et al. — V., 1965, vol. 1; 1971, vol. 2.

Ambrazas V., 1979: Lietuvių kalbos dalyvių istorinė sintaksė. — V.

Babby L. H., 1978: Participles in Russian: Attribution, predication, and voice. — International Review of Slavic Linguistics, vol. 3, p. 5—25.

Benveniste E., 1971a: The passive construction of the transitive perfect (Original in BSL, vol. 48, p. 52—62). — In: Problems in General Linguistics (English trans. by Mary Elizabeth Meek). Coral Gables: Univ. of Miami Press, p. 154—161.

Benveniste E., 1971b: The linguistic functions of 'to be' and 'to have' (Original in BSL, 1960, p. 113—134). — In: Problems in General Linguistics (See previous entry), p. 163—179.

Brugmann K., Delbrück B., 1916: Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen. — Strassburg, Bd 2, T. 3, 2. Hälfte.

Disterheft D., 1980: The Syntactic Development of the Infinitive in Indo-European. — Columbus, Ohio: Slavica.

Endzelīns J., 1951: Latviešu valodas gramatika. — Rīga (=Latvian translation of his Lettische Grammatik, Riga, 1922).

Godel R., 1975: An Introduction to the Study of Classical Armenian. — Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag.

Gołąb Z., 1975: Endocentricity and endocentrization of verbal predicates: illustrated with Latin and Slavic material. — General Linguistics, vol. 15, p. 1—35.

Gonda J., 1960: Reflections on the Indo-European medium. — Lingua, vol. 9, p. 30—67.

Hirt H., 1937: Indogermanische Grammatik. — Heidelberg, T. 7, Syntax II.

Jēgers B., 1970: Remarks on some Baltic names of the type Lithuanian *káltas* 'chisel'. — In: Baltic Linguistics/Ed. by Thomas F. Magner and William R. Schmalstieg. University Park and London: Penn State University Press, p. 81—86.

Kiparsky V., 1969: Das Nominativobjekt des Infinitivs im Slavischen, Baltischen und Ostseefinnischen. — Baltistica, 1969, t. 5(2), p. 141—148.

Krause W., Thomas W., 1960: Tocharisches Elementarbuch. — Heidelberg, Bd. 1, Grammatik.

Matthews W. K., 1955: Lithuanian constructions with neuter passive participles. — Slavonic and East European Review, vol. 33, p. 350—371.

Palmer L. R., 1968: The Latin Language. — London: Faber and Faber.

Paternost J., Schmalstieg W. R., 1977: Slovanski edninski rodilnik kot izvor dejanja pri deležnikih na *-no-* in *-to-*. — Jezik in slovstvo, vol. 5, p. 146—149.

Paulauskienė A., 1979: Gramatinės lietuvių kalbos veiksmažodžio kategorijos. — V.

Petersen W., 1932: The personal endings of the Hittite verb. — American Journal of Philology, vol. 53, p. 193—212.

Schmalstieg W.R., 1976: The Slavic genitive singular as the subject of participles in -*no*-
and -*to*-. — Linguistica, vol. 16, p. 161—163.

Schmalstieg W.R., 1978: Lithuanian constructions of the type *jo būta* as a reflection of
the Indo-European middle voice. — Baltistica, 1978, t. 14, p. 15—19.

Schmalstieg W.R., 1980: Indo-European Linguistics: A New Synthesis. — University
Park and London: The Pennsylvania State University Press.

Woodcock E., 1959: A New Latin Syntax. — Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

SMULKMENA

L

Baltistai plačiai naudojasi ne tik A. Baranausko lingvistiniais veikalais, bet ir o raštų tekstais, kuriuose randa reikšmingų kalbos duomenų. Čia norima įspėti tyrinėtojus, kad vengtų A. Baranauskui priskiriamos knygelės „Paskutinis pamokslas"[1], kuri greičiausiai parašyta ne A. Baranausko. Joje gausu žemaitybių ir šiaip A. Baranauskui svetimų kalbos elementų. Tai aiškiai matyti kad ir iš šių pavyzdžių: 3. praes. *nikst* 5_3 'nyksta', *platin* 7_6 'platina', *szniak* 6_{35} 'šneka', *derg* 8_9 'dergia', *nor* 7_3 'nori', *negal* 54_{15} 'negali', *nebtur* 35_{15} 'nebeturi', *reikalau* 59_{29} 'reikalauja'; g. pl. *milencziu* 54_{19} 'mylinčių', a. pl. m. *norenczius* 56_8 'norinčius'; a. sg. *dransumą* 40_{20} 'drąsumą', n. sg. m. *isz gansdintas* 20_2 'išgąsdintas', *kwepans* 39_{23} 'kvepiąs', a. pl. *spanstus* 54_7 'spąstus', inf. *szwenst* 60_{33} 'švęsti', *neapkenst* 54_{16} 'neapkęsti', 3. fut. *ne drens* 58_{31} 'nedrįs', 3. praes. *pażinst* 27_8 'pažįsta', n. sg. f. *siunsdama* 44_{19} 'siųsdama'; *žmones...nusiminusis* 8_{7-8} 'žmonės ... nusiminę', *wargdienej... szunies wietoj łajkomis* 13_{21} '... laikomi'; 2. pl. imper. *Parskajtiket* 8_{13} 'perskaitykite'; 1. pl. fut. *darisem* 22_{26} 'darysime', 2. pl. *supraset* 8_{25} 'suprasite'; a. pl. m. *kurius* 8_{18} 'kuriuos'; *paklusniejei ir bajlingiejei kunigaj* 49_{31} 'paklusnieji ir bailingieji...'; adv. *apent* 8_{33} 'vėl', *artie* 48_{20} 'arti', *idant ... lengvesnej butu* 43_{26} '... lengviau ...', *pagal tejsibes* 22_{28} 'pagal teisybę'; *szmotas wiłku* 6_{33} 'daug vilkų'; *dowena* 44_8 'dovana', a. pl. *naujinas* 62_{2-3} 'naujienas', *kningas* 42_{29} 'knygas', *kuningus* 52_{15} 'kunigus', *piningus* 49_{29} 'pinigus', *sodnus* 57_2 'sodus', a. sg. *jaunumene* 7_{12} 'jaunuomenę', *słužma* 14_{33} 'tarnybą', n. pl. *rupesnej* 6_{15} 'rūpesčiai', g. pl. *žabankłu* 6_{19} 'žabangų', *mokestu* 8_4 'mokesčių', a. pl. *blewizas* 8_{11} 'blevyzgas', n. pl. m. *linksmus* 14_4 'linksmi'.

Kodėl ši knygelė buvo priskiriama A. Baranauskui ir ar ji turi ką bendra su juo, turėtų išaiškinti lietuvių literatūros žinovai.

Z. Zinkevičius

---

[1] Paskutinis pamokslas wiena žemajcziu kuniga priesz smerti... Antras spaudimas po jo smerties. Wilniuje, kasztu raszytojaus, spauda Jůzapa Zawadzkia. 1895.