

Axel HOLVOET

*The Institute of the Lithuanian Language, Vilnius***ONCE MORE THE BALTIC GENITIVE OF AGENT***

The discussion on the Baltic genitive of agent, launched by Schmalstieg's 1978 article on the origin of the Lithuanian construction *jo būta*, which he regards as a reflection of an Indo-European ergative clause model, has given occasion to a considerable number of publications, in which the authors have been concerned not only with producing new evidence in favour of their respective views, but also with clarifying their earlier positions in view of the many misunderstandings that have accreted to the issue (cf., e.g., Schmalstieg 1993; Ambrazas 1994). These having been cleared away, it seems that the positions of the authors involved in the discussion, and in particular those of its main protagonists, Schmalstieg and Ambrazas, have now been formulated clearly enough. It is unlikely that complete agreement will ever be reached, but on some points the views of the scholars participating in the discussion have come closer to each other. In the following, I will also try to clarify and motivate some of the ideas I have advanced in earlier publications (Holvoet 1994a; 1995).

In a number of publications, Schmalstieg has advocated the view that the Baltic genitive of agent was inherited as such from Indo-European, and that the Lithuanian passive constructions of the type *jo parašytas laiškas*, *jo čia būta* are a reflection of an Indo-European structure in which the verb form, subsequently reanalysed as passive, was originally indifferent with regard to diathesis, and the case forms reflect an ergative pattern, the genitive reflecting an Indo-European genitive-ergative. A different view was proposed by Ambrazas (1990), who assumes that Common Baltic constructions with predicative participles (now passive, but originally unmarked for diathesis) were expanded with genitives of agent originating as possessive genitives with a participle that, at that time, had not yet lost its nominal character. The main points of divergence can thus be summed up as follows: Schmalstieg regards the agentive genitive as an inherited feature reflecting an IE ergative pattern; as a corollary of this, Schmalstieg regards the intransitive type *jo būta* as a later development based on the transitive constructions, the only ones where an ergative case could originally appear. Ambrazas regards the introduction of an originally possessive genitive of agent as a Common Baltic process (with close parallels in other

* Prof. Vytautas Ambrazas kindly agreed to read a preliminary draft of this article. Though his comments will certainly have helped the author to gain a better understanding of the issues involved, and of prof. Ambrazas' views in particular, the responsibility for all shortcomings of the article lies solely with the author.

branches of IE), but sees no reason to assume the intransitive type (*jo būta*) to be secondary: as (in agreement with Schmalstieg) he assumes the participles in *-to-* to have been unmarked for diathesis, he thinks a different treatment of transitive and intransitive constructions unlikely (Ambrasas 1990, 213–4).

In earlier publications (Holvoet 1994a; forthcoming), I have not been concerned with the evaluation of the ergative hypothesis as an explanation for the Baltic genitive of agent, but only with the question whether the Baltic genitive of agent should be regarded as inherited or whether there is evidence for its rise in the separate history of the Baltic languages. I have tried to show that the evidence of Latvian is of crucial importance for a correct understanding of the Baltic genitive of agent and its development.

As is known, there is plenty of evidence in Baltic for a possessive interpretation of the genitive of agent. It is already mentioned in Fraenkel (1928, 95–6), and repeated in Ambrasas (1990, 196–7, 209–10). First, there is the use of the possessive forms of the personal and reflexive pronouns in Lithuanian (*mano, tavo, savo* rather than *manęs, tavęs, savęs*), and the corresponding use of the possessive pronouns instead of the personal pronouns in Latvian (*dziesma mana padziedāta*). No one disputes the importance of the possessive genitive for the explanation of the Baltic genitive of agent, and Schmalstieg (1999) now also puts more emphasis on the role of the possessive genitive, alongside the putative genitive-ergative, as a possible source of agentive genitives in Baltic. However, the statement of the possessive character of the agentive genitive in Baltic is in itself too vague to enable a reconstruction of the rise of genitives of agent. A look at the Latvian constructions with agentive genitives suffices to make it clear that the problem is not only one of semantics (i.e., of the different meanings, agentive, possessive etc., which the Indo-European and Baltic genitive may assume) but also one of syntax. The most important feature of the Latvian genitive of agent is not so much that it is possessive, but that it is adnominal.

I have attempted to draw attention to the relevance of the Latvian constructions with genitives of agent in earlier publications (Holvoet 1994a; forthcoming). Here I will once more repeat the main points of my argument.

Latvian has a genitive of agent with adnominal participles, as in *tēva celtā māja* ‘the house built by father’. This genitive of agent cannot be used in the passive proper, at least in the passive derived by means of the auxiliary *tikt* (or its rarer equivalents *tapt, kļūt*): there is no construction **māja tika tēva celta* ‘the house was built by father’. There is, however, a construction with a genitive of agent determining a passive participle in predicative use: *māja ir tēva celta* ‘the house was built by father’. This, however, is not a passive construction proper, but a copular construction. This can be seen from the fact that the genitive of agent cannot be separated from the participle: one cannot say **tēva tika celta māja* (which would correspond to Lith. *tėvo buvo pastatytas namas*) or **māja tika celta tēva* (Lith. *namas buvo pastatytas tėvo*), even though the order of sentence constituents is otherwise quite free in Latvian. This means that the

Latvian genitive of agent is not a complement of the passive form of the verb, but a part of a nominal constituent, from which it cannot be extracted:

[[*tēva celta*] *māja*]
 [*māja* [*ir* [*tēva celta*]]]

The Latvian genitive of agent should therefore be compared to 'incorporated agent phrases' of the type we find in English *The project is state-controlled* (Keenan 1985, 263–4). The incorporation is, of course, incomplete (there are a few lexicalised instances of complete incorporation, such as *paštaisīts* 'self-made' from *paša taisīts*), but even if it is incomplete, the effect with regard to the constituent structure of the sentence is practically the same. The difference is that the agent phrase appears as a distinct word, in a case form that can otherwise occur as a complement of a verb, so that we could conceive a structure like [*māja* [*ir* [*tēva celta*]]] undergoing a reanalysis in the course of which the genitive of agent would be extracted from the nominal constituent [*tēva celts*] to become a complement of the verb. Complete incorporation (as in English *man-made, state-controlled*) would, of course, be irreversible.

I assume the construction [*māja* [*ir* [*tēva celta*]]] to have developed from the construction with a participle in adnominal use [[*tēva celta*] *māja*], and the latter to have arisen, by a shift in constituent structure, from [*tēva* [*celta*] [*māja*]]. The genitive (or the possessive pronoun) was originally a possessive modifier of the noun phrase consisting of the passive participle and a noun. The original idea of possession could be weakened in the sense of its being understood as authorship. As long as the syntactic relationship remained unaltered, the whole construction was ambiguous. As soon as the shift in constituent structure occurred, the original possessive interpretation was completely abandoned.

One of the possible explanations for the Lithuanian passive constructions with the genitive of agent would involve a further step, viz., the transfer of the genitive of agent from the copular construction with a passive participle to the passive proper. This process would have involved, first of all, a second shift in constituent structure:

[*namas* [*buvo* [*tėvo pastatytas*]]]
 → [*namas* [*buvo* [*tėvo*] *pastatytas*]]

From a part of a nominal constituent, the genitive of agent became a complement of the verb. This change was reflected in the possibility of various new patterns of word order. The genitive of agent ceased to be restricted to the position preceding the participle and could occupy any position with regard to the verb: *tėvo buvo pastatytas namas*, *namas buvo pastatytas tėvo* etc. These different patterns of word order reflect, of course, different patterns of topicalisation, whereas in the original construction [*namas* [*tėvo pastatytas*]] this pattern was invariable.

Such a reconstruction seems quite plausible in itself, but it implies that, with regard to the possibility of introducing genitives of agent, the structure of Latvian passive

constructions is more archaic than that of the Lithuanian ones. Such a situation is rather unusual, as we are accustomed to find more archaic constructions in Lithuanian than in Latvian. On the whole, Lithuanian has retained much more archaic participial constructions than Latvian, as can be seen from a perusal of Ambrazas (1990). Nevertheless, there are undoubtedly also cases, less numerous, where Latvian has been more conservative, and this may be one of them. It is quite easy to explain the Lithuanian agented passive as a further development of a state of affairs retained in Latvian, the more since the Lithuanian genitive of agent also shows clear traces of having once been adnominal. Lithuanian, however, shows only morphological evidence for the original possessive character of the agentive genitive, whereas Latvian has also retained syntactic evidence for it. On the other hand, it seems a priori less likely that Latvian should once have had agented passives but subsequently lost them. Nevertheless, a situation in which Latvian has retained a more archaic construction than Lithuanian is not quite common. It is therefore not astonishing that the alternative theories so far proposed do not take the evidence of Latvian seriously into account. This is the case even with Ambrazas' theory, though it is also based on the assumption of a possessive origin of the agentive genitive.

But there is also one fact that seems to cast some doubt on the archaic character of the Latvian situation with regard to the genitive of agent, and that is the curious correspondence to analogous constructions in Baltic Fennic. It is striking that in Estonian, as in Latvian, a genitive of agent can be added to adnominally used passive participles, as in *minu ostetud püksid* 'trousers bought by me', but not to passive constructions, which are always agentless. A look at the situation in Finnish is quite revealing, even though the correspondence is less exact here than in the case of Estonian. Finnish grammars distinguish a special agentive construction, which is not based on the passive participle but on the so-called 3rd infinitive. In some descriptions, this 3rd infinitive is referred to as an 'agentive participle' when it occurs in this function¹. In certain dialects, the situation is similar to that observed in

¹ Liukkonen (1994) draws a parallel between these Finnish constructions and the Baltic constructions with *-m-* participles, e.g. *laiskurin syömä leipä* and Lith. *tinginio valgoma duona*, *perunan kuorima veitsi* and Lith. *bulvės skutamas peilis*. There can obviously be no genetic identity between Fennic *-ma/-mä-* and Baltic *-ma-*, but Liukkonen suggests a convergence due to areal contacts. The correspondence is striking indeed, but it is not immediately relevant to the question of the Baltic dative of agent. Though in Holvoet (1995) I suggested a link between the Lithuanian and Latvian constructions of the type illustrated by Latv. *lapu vīstamais laiks* 'the time of the withering of the leaves' and the rise of the agentive genitive in Lithuanian passive constructions, I no longer maintain this view because passives based on the *-ma-* participle are dialectally restricted in Lithuanian, and it is rather to the constructions with *-ta-* participles that we must look as a possible source for the agented passive of modern Lithuanian. It should be noted that Liukkonen seeks to enhance the impression of a Fennic-Baltic parallel by stating that the Fennic nouns in *-ma/-mä*, though basically verbal nouns, may also function as passive participles. But such a functional description of the forms under discussion seems to be based exclusively on the functional correspondence of the constructions referred to here to the Baltic constructions, where the *-ma-* forms are undoubtedly passive participles. It does not follow from this correspondence that, from the point of view of Fennic language structure, *tekemä* in *vierahan tekemä* 'of a stranger's making' should be interpreted as a passive participle.

Estonian, viz., the passive participle is used instead of the ‘agentive participle’. The following example (Hakulinen 1955, 267) contains both varieties:

Onko liekku vellon tehty vaiko vierahan tekemä?
 is: INT fire brother: GEN. made or stranger: GEN make: 3INF?
 ‘Was the fire lit by (your) brother or by some stranger?’

As the 3rd infinitive, as any other infinitive, was originally a nominal form, viz., a kind of verbal noun, it is clear that the original structure of an agentive construction like *vierahan tekemä* must have been something like ‘of a stranger’s making’. An agent phrase of this type was obviously not at home in a passive construction, but could be used adnominally or in the position of a predicate nominal. One could hardly imagine the genitive used in this construction being transferred to passive constructions, because the verb form with which it combines does not lend itself to predicative use. The situation is completely different if the passive participle is used in the agentive construction instead of the ‘agentive participle’. In Estonian, the passive participle is used both in copular constructions with the agentive genitive and in the perfect tense system of the impersonal-passive. Thus, we have *minu ostetud püksid* ‘trousers bought by me’, and, the combination of agentive genitive and participle being shifted to the position of nominal predicate, *püksid on minu ostetud* ‘the trousers were bought by me’. The latter construction, however, is not passive: though partial homonymy is observed here, the copular construction with the passive participle is distinguished from the perfect forms of the passive by the retention of the nominative in the negative construction: *püksid ei ole minu ostetud*, as opposed to the use of the partitive in the passive construction: *pükse ei ole ostetud*². One could imagine one construction influencing the other, and the genitive of agent being transferred at least to the perfect tense forms of the passive. Actually, this has not taken place, and the passive has remained agentless.

In Latvian, the conditions for the genitive of agent to be transferred from copular constructions to the passive were about as favourable as in Estonian, or slightly more so. However, this process has not taken place here either. The possibility of this transfer would have been initially restricted to the system of the perfect tense forms (the system of the *infectum* having a synthetic form in Estonian and a special auxiliary, usually *tikt*, in Latvian). No differences comparable to those observed in Estonian could rise between the copular construction and the passive, as these do not differ with regard to case and agreement features. From the system of the *perfectum*, the genitive of agent could have spread to that of the *infectum*: *māja ir tēva celta* → **māja tika tēva celta*. But such a process has not occurred.

² Traditionally, there is also a second difference, viz. with regard to the presence or absence of agreement in the auxiliary. Past tense forms would show agreement in the copular construction, e.g., *püksid olid minu ostetud*, whereas in the passive there was originally no agreement: *püksid oli ostetud*. Nowadays, however, agreement is usually observed here: *püksid olid ostetud* (Lembit Vab a, personal communication).

Though the Latvian copular constructions with genitives of agent are not characterised by a special form such as the Finnish agentive participle, they nevertheless stand clearly apart functionally both from the dynamic and the stative passive. Though they show a certain superficial similarity to the stative passive (*Zustandspassiv*) with the copula *būt* (such as *Durvis ir atvērtas* ‘the door is open’), they are distinguished from it by the fact that they do not refer to a state ensuing from a previous action. In fact, the construction with the agentive genitive refers neither to the situation in which the action is performed (as in the dynamic passive), neither to the state resulting from that action (as in the stative passive). The relation of authorship existing between the agent and the object (or the result of the action) is inherently timeless, though, of course, it comes into being only at the moment of completion of the action.

It is clear that the correspondence between Latvian and Baltic Fennic is not a coincidence, but it is not clear how exactly it is to be interpreted. The influence of Baltic Fennic could merely have contributed to the retention of the original situation as it existed in Common Baltic and hampered further developments such as took place in Lithuanian. On the other hand, it cannot be excluded that the model we observe in Latvian took the place of an older one that was closer to that of Lithuanian. Let us therefore look at the alternative models, actually advanced for Lithuanian only, the evidence of Latvian being largely left out of consideration, and examine how they can be reconciled with the Latvian data.

Let us first turn to the question how the possessive character of the agentive genitive is to be interpreted. Several possibilities may be taken into account. First, we should mention the interpretation of Benveniste (1952 [1966]), who was one of the main adherents of the possessive view of the genitive of agent in Indo-Iranian and other IE languages³. In Benveniste’s view, the Indo-Iranian construction *mana (mama) kṛtam* was a predicative possessive construction corresponding to the possessive constructions *habeo* or *mihi est* and functionally corresponding to the Romance or Germanic compound tense forms based on the verb ‘have’ (*j’ai écrit, I have written, ich habe geschrieben* etc.). In principle, the Lithuanian constructions with a genitive of agent can perhaps also be explained in this way if we assume the construction ‘genitive + *būti*’ to have been a regular predicative possessive functionally corresponding to the model ‘dative + *būt*’ attested in modern Latvian. For Proto-Baltic, we would then have to reconstruct a model of the type **jo (yra) namas* ‘he has got a house’. On the basis of a transitive construction of the type *jo pastatytas namas* ‘domus ei aedificata est’⁴ an intransitive construction *jo čia*

³ Benveniste’s interpretation of the Indo-Iranian construction *mana (mama) kṛtam* has not remained unchallenged, cf. Cardona 1970. But Benveniste was undoubtedly right in drawing attention to the existence of quasi-passive possessive constructions based on possessive constructions of the type *mihi est*, cf. Holvoet 1994b and fn. 5.

⁴ Note that, in Latin, the corresponding constructions were also originally based on the expression *mihi est*, e.g., *nulla tuarum audita mihi neque visa sororum* (Vergil, *Aeneid* I 326) ‘I haven’t heard or seen any of your sisters’, which, after the replacement of *mihi est* by *habeo*, yielded the Romance compound tense forms of the type *auditum (-am) habeo, visum (-am) habeo*.

būta could have arisen. Parallels for this would be the Romance or Germanic compound perfect of intransitive verbs (of the type **statum habeo*) or the North Russian perfect of the type *u nego uechano, u syna ženenos*. A development of this type cannot be excluded: though 'DAT + *būti*' is better attested in Baltic, there are also constructions like *jo gera galva* etc. (Jablonskis 1957, 571–2), and anyway constructions of both types must probably be assumed for Indo-European, with or without meaning difference (cf. Watkins 1966)⁵. Such an explanation would not imply that the putative possessive genitive in the type *jo būta* was an ADNOMINAL genitive, though it stands to reason that the same possessive genitive could also be used adnominally. In course of time, the possessive element was lost and the construction became an ordinary agented passive.

But the possessive interpretation proposed in Ambrazas (1990, 209–10) evidently differs from the model outlined by Benveniste, even though Benveniste's explanation of the possessive origin of the passive perfect is cited as a parallel (Ambrazas 1990, 208). Ambrazas' account is not very explicit as to how exactly the possessive nature of the agentive genitive should be understood. The function of the *-to* form is described as substantival, and *būta* in *jo būta* is interpreted as 'what has been' (in the same way as, say, *sukta* 'what is crooked' *šilta* 'what has become warm'). A possessive genitive, Ambrazas argues, could be added to a participle regardless whether this participle was derived from a verb that is, from the contemporary point of view, transitive, or from an intransitive verb: the distinction, if it did exist, was not relevant here.

The further stages of the development adumbrated here are not specified, and they are not easy to reconstruct. There seem to be two problems. First, how was the subject *rugiai* in *tėvo pasėta rugiai* introduced; and, secondly, how can we explain the semantic development of constructions with verbs that are, from the present-day point of view, intransitive?

We can understand the hypothetic Proto-Baltic construction underlying *tėvo pasėta* as 'that what was sown by father'. We can then easily reconstruct a predicative construction *rugiai tėvo pasėta* as meaning 'the rye was sown by father', or rather, as the passive interpretation of the participle was a later development, 'father sowed the rye'. If *pasėta* were understood as being substantival, then such a construction (in terms of constituent structure: [*rugiai* [*tėvo pasėta*]]) would not presuppose an adnominal use of the participle. But the intermediary stage between the nominal construction *tėvo pasėta* and *rugiai tėvo pasėta* must have been a copular construction if *pasėta* was really substantival. Thus we arrive at a situation quite similar to that just described for Latvian.

⁵ In Latvian, this construction does not seem to be attested: here we find only the dative. Modern Latvian has a kind of possessive perfect with the passive participle, based on the possessive construction *man ir* 'mihi est': *mums viss ir padarīts* 'omnia nobis facta sunt', 'we have done everything' (cf. Holvoet 1994a). Lithuanian does not have this construction; instead, it has a construction based on the verb *turėti*, e.g., *jis turi pasistatęs namą*. It is not obvious why Common Baltic should have used the construction 'GEN + *būti*' as the basis for a possessive perfect rather than the construction *mihi est* or the verb corresponding to Lith. *turėti*, OPr. *turīt* etc. 'have'. But the degree of likelihood of the existence of 'GEN + *būti*' as an expression for 'habere' in Common Baltic is of minor importance anyway, because it is not the possessive, but the adnominal character of the genitive that matters here.

The alternative is a substantival *būta* 'what has been' combining with a possessive genitive. It is not evident why a genitive should appear here. If a noun of this type acquired a predicative function, one would rather expect it to combine with a nominative: the expressions '*X has been*' and '*X = that which has been*' seem to be synonymous. A (subjective) genitive would be conceivable on the assumption of a semantic shift 'that which has been' → '(the fact of) being'. Apparently Ambrazas' explanation partly rests on the indeterminacy of the *-to* forms, which could either be *nomina actionis* or *nomina acti*.

The explanation of the forms in *-ta* as equivalents of *nomina actionis* seems to work less well in the case of transitive verbs (or, as both Ambrazas and Schmalstieg would prefer, verbs that are transitive from the present-day point of view). If *pasėta* was equivalent to '(the act of) sowing', then where does the nominative in *rugiai pasėta* come from? Despite Ambrazas' insistence on the irrelevance of the distinction between transitive and intransitive verbs, the formulation of one single rule accounting for the introduction of the possessive genitive in both cases seems to involve switching between two different semantic interpretations of the *-to* forms. It is true that, the possibility of such a switch being granted, no separate explanation is needed to account for the introduction of the genitive of agent in the 'transitive' type, because it can be explained by a simple reanalysis: an original *tėvo rugiai pasėta*, with a constituent structure [[*tėvo rugiai*] *pasėta*], is reanalysed as [*tėvo*[*rugiai pasėta*]] under the influence of the 'intransitive' *tėvo gulėta*. The reanalysis involved is of a slightly different kind than that described in the above reconstruction based on a state of affairs as found in Latvian, and actually does not presuppose an intermediate stage such as that attested in Latvian. This explanation would therefore allow us to disregard the evidence of Latvian; at any rate, the evidence of Latvian would not contradict it. The problem with this interpretation, however, is that the categorial identity between *gulėta* and *rugiai pasėta* seems to arise no earlier than at the moment when the passive construction comes into existence, and the possessive genitive ceases to be possessive. Now it is precisely the categorial identity between *gulėta* and *rugiai pasėta* that seems to be a precondition for the reanalysis described here. It could be objected that the processes speculated about are so remote in time, and the forms involved so obscure as to their precise semantic nature, that it would be unreasonable to demand of a reconstruction that it should specify whether the *-to* forms were *nomina actionis* or *nomina acti*, or even to assume this distinction to have been essential in the period considered. Nevertheless, an explanation more explicit as to the syntactic and semantic mechanisms involved would be more satisfactory.

On the other hand, Ambrazas' reconstruction is based on a careful examination of the distribution of constructions with passive participles in the Lithuanian dialects. The passive constructions with agreement of the participles, as attested in the modern standard language, e.g., *namas tėvo pastatytas*, is based on the Western Aukštaitian and Žemaitian dialects (Ambrazas 1990, 191–2). In the East- and Southern Aukštaitian dialects the model with agreement of the participle is virtually unknown; instead, these dialects have

the construction with the neuter participle, *tėvo rugiai pasėta*, occurring alongside the intransitive model *tėvo gulėta* (A m b r a z a s 1990, 207). It is apparently difficult to explain the model without agreement of the participle on the basis of a construction with an adnominal participle ([*namas [tėvo pastatytas]*]), where we would rather expect agreement. This suggests that, in these dialects, the introduction of the agentive genitive was not associated with the adnominal use of the participle.

Of course, the evidence of the modern dialects is important and may not be disregarded. But does this evidence actually contradict the assumption of the transfer of the agentive genitive from constructions with adnominal participles? A m b r a z a s (1990, 201–2) compares the model *rugiai sėta* with the copular constructions with non-agreeing neuter adjectives such as *svetimas daiktas nemiela*, apparently an archaic IE model (cf. *varium et mutabile semper femina* etc.). There is no need to assume a difference between the predicative constructions with passive participles on the one hand and copular constructions on the other as far as agreement features are concerned. One would therefore expect the difference between the existing participial constructions *čia gulėta, rugiai pasėta* on the one hand and a new construction *rugiai tėvo pasėti* (arising from *tėvo pasėti rugiai*) to be levelled out. Nothing prevents us from assuming that, when an adnominal participial phrase as in [[*tėvo pasėti*] *rugiai*] was transferred to the position of a predicate nominal, it lost its agreement features under the influence of the already existing constructions with non-agreeing participles of the type *rugiai pasėta*. It is quite possible that an important part in this levelling process was played by the constructions with intransitive verbs (*čia gulėta*).

Let us now turn to a discussion of Schmalstieg's alternative view, assuming the agentive genitive to be original, with the possessive genitive as a possible subsidiary source of agentive genitives. If Schmalstieg's hypothesis is correct, then the Baltic genitive of agent was, from the very start, a genitive of agent rather than a possessive genitive, as it arose from the Indo-European ergative; as the genitive was also the case expressing possession, the adnominal agentive genitive was reinterpreted as a possessive genitive, whereas the agentive genitive as a complement of passive verbs was lost because it was not supported by Fennic models. A fact that would not seem to be in favour of such a reconstruction is that Lithuanian actually shows more morphological evidence for an adnominal-possessive status of the genitive than Latvian. There is an exact correspondence between Lithuanian *namas mano pastatytas* (with the special possessive form of the personal pronoun) and Latvian *māja ir mana celta* (with the possessive pronoun), but Latvian has also *māja ir manis celta*, where *manis* is the form used with verbs and prepositions but not in possessive function, whereas a construction with the corresponding form *manēs* (**namas manēs pastatytas*) is not used in Lithuanian. If Latvian inherited the genitive of agent as a complement of the verb but restricted it to adnominal constructions, then *manis* in *māja ir manis celta* is an archaism. One would expect such an archaism to be echoed by Lithuanian, which, however, is not the case. It is thus more probable that (*māja ir*) *mana*

celta is older than *manis celta*, which is in harmony with the fact that the construction with the possessive pronoun is now extinct and has completely been ousted by that with the non-possessive genitives *manis*, *tevis*, *sevis*.

Once the genitive of agent had been introduced in the passive construction, it could also be introduced in passive constructions derived from intransitive verbs or, in other words, in what is commonly called the impersonal passive. Why this happened is not clear. Liukkonen (1995) has recently suggested that this process can be compared to the personalisation of the impersonal-passive in Fennic. But neither is the Lithuanian process really comparable to that of Fennic, nor is a genetic link between both phenomena plausible, as pointed out by Christen (1998).

The process is not in itself unparalleled, and it is mainly the exceptional expansion of the agented impersonal passive that calls for an explanation. Languages that have impersonal passives usually admit the possibility of providing them with an agent phrase; the resulting constructions are grammatically correct, but hardly ever used because there is no functional motivation for them. Frajzyngier (1982, 281) cites Dutch *Er wordt door de jongelui gedanst* 'dancing is being done by the young people' and suggests there might be an additional shade of meaning (possibly existential) associated with this passive. But such constructions remain exceptional because the addition of an agent phrase in an impersonal passive is in contradiction with the principal functional motivation of the impersonal passive, which is the wish not to specify, or the impossibility of specifying, the agent. In Lithuanian, however, constructions with passive participles were assigned specific functions in the system of evidential forms. In both living Baltic languages, this system comprises the so-called oblique mood, expressed by active participles; in Lithuanian, there are additional evidential meanings for which passive participles are used (Ambrazas, ed. 1997, 282, 371; Ambrazas 1990, 227–8). This subsystem of the evidential is a development peculiar to Lithuanian⁶, and it provided a functional motivation for agented impersonal passives restricted to this language.

Schmalstieg (1999) notes that many genitives of agent are historically derived from adnominal possessive genitives, and concludes that the possessive genitive might be, alongside the agentive genitive which must also be ancient, an independent source for the genitives of agent found in the modern IE languages and, more particularly, in Lithuanian. At the same time, he expresses his scepticism with regard to a possessive interpretation of such adjectival phrases as Greek *αἴγλα διόσδοτος* 'Zeus-given, brightness' and asks: 'Could one imagine that *αἴγλα διόσδοτος* [...] originally meant 'Zeus' (God's) given brightness [...]?' (Schmalstieg 1999, 30). The answer is: probably not.

⁶ In Latvian, passive participles are also used in evidential meaning, but they do not convey other types of evidential meaning than the active participles; they are also a means of expressing the oblique mood. They seem to be functionally equivalent to active participles with indefinite zero subjects, e.g., *varēts redzēt* = *varējis redzēt* '[it is reported that] one could see', *viņš atrasts* = *viņu atraduši* '[it is reported that] he was found/they found him'. The passive participles used in the oblique mood thus seem to function as an impersonal variety of the oblique mood.

In the Latvian example cited above, the possessive meaning must have been lost at the moment when the shift in constituent structure from [*tēva* [*celta* [*māja*]]] to [[*tēva celta*] *māja*] occurred. A similar shift could underlie the Greek adjective *διόσδοτος*, though I do not reject alternative explanations of the agentive genitive in Greek. In the article to which Schmalstieg is referring, I was concerned only with Latvian, where the status of the genitive in *tēva celts* is practically the same as that of the Greek genitive *Διός* in *διόσδοτος*, though the complete incorporation reflected by the prosodic features of the Greek adjective has not occurred. Let us now consider the reasons for what I here call incorporation, i.e., the impossibility of extracting the genitive from the adjectival phrase. My contention is that, in Latvian, this phenomenon can be explained by assuming that a shift in constituent structure occurred in nominal phrases where a genitive of agent and a participle simultaneously determined a substantive, and where the genitive was possessive with regard to the substantive and at the same time agentive with regard to the participle: [*tēva* [*celta* [*māja*]]] → [[*tēva celta*] *māja*]. As a result of this shift, the possessive meaning was lost, but the syntactic consequences of the original adnominal status of the genitive were retained. I cannot explain the impossibility of extracting the genitive from the participial phrase if the genitive was originally agentive. In the latter case, why should it not occur as a complement of the verb?

An answer to this objection could be that Latvian originally had a genitive of agent as a verbal complement, but that it was ousted by prepositional phrases with *nuo*, which were subsequently ousted from the literary language altogether under the influence of purists. This is suggested by Schmalstieg (1999), who disbelieves the traditional explanation according to which the construction with *nuo* is a borrowing from German, not organically connected with the genuine Latvian genitive of agent, and assumes, in agreement with Gāters (1993, 297), that the agent phrases introduced by *nuo* could have arisen spontaneously, without foreign influence, from those with the genitive, as can be observed in other languages, where, for instance, a prepositional ablative phrase is substituted for an ablative etc. Agentive complements expressed by the mere genitive could have fallen into disuse in the passive construction proper, but have been preserved in adnominal participial phrases. A similar explanation could be proposed for Greek *διόσδοτος*. If, as Schmalstieg (1999, 26) suggests, Greek added the preposition *ὑπό* to an original genitive of agent, and agentive complements expressed by the mere genitive fell into disuse, then this must have led to a fossilisation of adjectival phrases with the mere genitive, which came to be interpreted as instances of incorporation of the agent phrase.

The Greek and Latvian cases are not quite similar, however. If the retention of isolated genitives of agent in compounds of the type *διόσδοτος* seems quite natural, it is not very likely that the substitution of a prepositional phrase for the mere genitive in Latvian would not have affected agentive genitives in adnominal participial phrases (*tēva celtā māja*), or in participial phrases functioning as predicate nominals in copular constructions (*māja ir tēva celta*), if it had once been general. Genitives of agent can be restricted to

constructions with adnominal participles, without spreading to passive constructions proper; but if genitives of agent occur both as agent complements with passive verbs and with adnominal passive participles, then their status in both positions does not fundamentally differ, and replacement with a prepositional phrase in one position would also affect genitives of agent in the other. The only explanation one could give would involve a re-analysis of the genitives of agent with adnominal participles as possessive genitives under the influence of Fennic. Agentive genitives would then have been replaced with prepositional phrases, with the exception of those used with adnominal participles; in constructions of the type *māja ir tēva celta* the genitive was also interpreted as possessive, and therefore escaped the process of expansion with a preposition. The weakest point in such a reconstruction is the type *māja ir tēva celta*; The assignment of a specific status to the type *māja ir tēva celta* results from its being an intermediary stage in the evolution from an adnominal agent phrase to an agentive complement with the verb. If a language has agentive complements in the passive construction, one would hardly expect it to accord this type a special treatment (unless it was set apart by some formal feature such as complete incorporation, as in the above-cited English example *The project is state-controlled*). Lithuanian, for instance, admits the word order pattern *Namas yra tėvo pastatytas*, but there is no evidence for the existence of a distinct variety with the genitive as a part of the participial phrase ([*namas [yra [tėvo pastatytas]]*]).

It must be emphasised that the Latvian facts adduced here are not sufficient to disprove Schmalstieg's hypothesis, just as they are no conclusive evidence against Ambrazas' reconstruction of the rise of agentive out of possessive genitives. The situation in Fennic does not seem to be relevant to the interpretation of the Lithuanian agented passive, as noted above. On the other hand, the situation in Latvian cannot be correctly understood without that of Fennic being taken into account. The effect of Fennic influence could have been that it prevented the rise of an agented passive from the 'agentive construction' with the passive participle, but one cannot rule out the possibility of an inherited construction underlying the agentive passive having been lost. But even if the Latvian evidence is not conclusive, it reveals a few problems in the reconstruction of the Baltic genitive of agent that are still awaiting a solution.

DAR KARTĄ APIE BALTŲ KALBŲ VEIKĖJO KILMININKĄ

Santrauka

Straipsnyje aptariamos dvi pagrindinės baltų kalbų veikėjo kilmininko kilmės hipotezės: V. Ambrazo pateiktas veikėjo kilmininko aiškinimas iš posesyvinio kilmininko (remiantis Fraenkelio ir kitų ankstesnių tyrinėtojų iškeltomis mintimis) ir W. R. Schmalstiego siūlymas susieti šį reiškinį su (hipotetiniu) ergatyviniu prokalbės sakinio modeliu. Posesyvinės kilmės pėdsakai konstrukcijose su veikėjo

kilmininku yra neabejotini, ir Schmalstiegas savo naujausiose publikacijose taip pat yra linkęs posesyviniam kilmininkui kaip vienam iš veikėjo kilmininko šaltinių suteikti nemažą reikšmę. Tačiau tiksliai rekonstruoti raidos kelią, vedusį nuo posesyvinio prie agentyvinio kilmininko, nelengva. Aptiriamos kelios su ligi šiol pateiktomis rekonstrukcijomis susijusios problemos, ypatingas dėmesys skiriamas rekonstruojamo posesyvinio kilmininko sintaksinei interpretacijai.

Straipsnyje daugiausia remiamasi latvių kalbos duomenimis: šioje kalboje veikėjo kilmininkas su veiksmožodžiu ligi šiol negali užimti veikėjo papildinio pozicijos, bet su dalyviu visada priklauso vienai vardažodinei grupei, iš kurios negali būti perkeltas: [[tėva celta] māja], [māja [ir [tėva celta]]] (iš pirmykštės struktūros [tėva [celta [māja]]]). Priėmus veikėjo kilmininko posesyvinės kilmės hipotezę, latvių kalbos konstrukcija įtikimiausiai išaiškinama kaip tarpinis etapas tarp pirmykštės konstrukcijos su posesyvinio pažyminio kilmininku ([tėva [celta [māja]]) ir vėlesnės pasyvinės konstrukcijos su veikėjo papildinio kilmininku ([tėvo [[buvo pastatytas] namas]]). Kadangi lietuviškoji konstrukcija išlaikė tik morfologinių pirmykščio posesyvumo pėdsakų (plg. posesyvines formas *mano, savo, kieno pastatytas*), o latviškoji – ir sintaksinių, pastaroji atrodo archajiškesnė. Atvirkštinė raida (pasyvinių konstrukcijų su veikėjo papildiniu išnykimas latvių kalboje) bendrosios tipologijos atžvilgiu mažiau įtikima, bet arealinės tipologijos sumetimais tokio proceso galimybė visiškai neatmestina, kadangi latviškos konstrukcijos su veikėjo kilmininku struktūros požiūriu labai panašios į atitinkamas Pabaltijo suomių kalbų konstrukcijas, ir galėtų būti jų paveiktos. Jeigu latvių kalbai būdinga padėtis nėra antrinio, Pabaltijo suomių kalbų paveikto proceso rezultatas, tada latvių duomenys bent iš dalies prieštarauja ir Ambrazo, ir Schmalstiego pateiktoms rekonstrukcijoms. Kaip ten bebūtų, rekonstruojant baltų veikėjo kilmininko raidą, į latvių kalbos duomenis verta atsižvelgti, kadangi jie padeda geriau suvokti kai kurias su šia rekonstrukcija susijusias problemas.

REFERENCES

- Ambrzas V., 1990, Sravnitel'nyj sintaksis pričastij baltijskix jazykov, Vilnius.
- Ambrzas V., 1994, On the interpretation of Lithuanian constructions with neuter passive participles, – *Linguistica Baltica*, III, 7–11.
- Ambrzas V. (ed.), 1997, Lithuanian grammar, Vilnius.
- Benveniste E., 1966, La construction passive du parfait transitif, – *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris*, XLVIII, 1952, 2; here cited after: *Problèmes de linguistique générale*, Paris, 176–186.
- Cardona G., 1970, The Indo-Iranian construction *mana (mama) kṛtam*, – *Language*, XLVI, 1–12.
- Christen S., 1998, Unpersönliche Konstruktionen und sekundäre Personifizierung, – *Linguistica Baltica*, VII, 51–61.
- Fraenkel E., 1928, Syntax der litauischen Kasus, Kaunas.
- Frajzyngier Z., 1982, Indefinite agent, passive and impersonal passive: a functional study, – *Lingua*, LVIII, 267–290.
- Gäters A., 1993, Lettische Syntax. Die Dainas, hrsg. v. H. Radtke, Frankfurt a. M. etc.
- Hakulinen L., 1955, Razvitie i struktura finskogo jazyka, II: Leksikologija i sintaksis, perevod s finskogo Ju. S. Eliseeva, Moskva.
- Holvoet A., 1994a, Notes on the Latvian Passive, – *Linguistica Baltica*, III, 131–140.
- Holvoet A., 1994b, Notes on the possessive perfect, – *Lingua Posnaniensis*, XXXVI, 43–48.
- Holvoet A., 1995, On the evolution of the passive in Lithuanian and Latvian, – *Analecta Indoeuropaea Cracoviensia I. Safarewicz memoriae dicata*, ed. W. Smoczyński, Cracoviae, 173–182.
- Holvoet A. (forthcoming), Impersonals and passives in Baltic and Baltic Fennic, – Ö. Dahl & M. Koptjevskaja-Tamm (eds.), *The Circum-Baltic languages. Their contacts and typology*.
- Jablonskis J., 1957, Linksniai ir prielinksniai, – Id., *Rinktiniai raštai*, I, sudarė J. Palionis, Vilnius, 549–672.

Keenan E. L., 1985, Passive in the world's languages, – T. Shopen (ed.), Language typology and syntactic description, II: Complex constructions, Cambridge, 243–281.

Liukkonen K., 1994, Pastabos dėl baltų-slavų ir vakarinių uraliečių kalbų neveikiamųjų dalyvių vartojimo, – Baltistica, XXVIII (2), 27–30.

Liukkonen K., 1995, *Jo būta*, – Linguistica Baltica, IV, 209–210.

Schmalstieg W. R., 1978, Lithuanian constructions of the type *jo būta* as a reflection of the Indo-European middle voice, – Baltistica, XIV (1), 15–19.

Schmalstieg W. R., 1993, *Tėvas dirbta?! – A misinterpretation*, – Linguistica Baltica, II, 39–45.

Schmalstieg W. R., 1994, Again the Baltic genitive of agent, – Linguistica Baltica, III, 13–19.

Schmalstieg W. R., 1999, Further thoughts on genitive constructions, – Baltistica, XXXIV (1), 23–35.

Watkins C., 1966, Remarks on the genitive, – To honor Roman Jakobson, The Hague, 2191–2198.