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 constitutad 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'.

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 *gʷn̥tō-s', Skt. matá- 'thought', Goth. munds, Lith. miñtas, Skt. srutá- 'flowing', etc. (See Thumb—Hauschild, 1959, 360–362.) Cf. also Gk. hrutós 'flowing', Skt. mṛtā-s, Avestan morṣta- 'dead', Skt. sattā-s 'sitting', Skt. sthitā-s, Gk. statós 'standing', Skt. bhūtā-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. pātyuḥ kriśā '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 louomai '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 praṭāh srṣṭāḥ ‘the beings created by him’, Avestan dāwindxta sūno ‘eaten by a dog’, ka’niṇa anupaṛta maśyāṃq ‘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’, soōl phōnēs prosphthegktōs ‘addressed by thy voice’, hápanta gār soi t’āmā nouthetēmata keinēs didaktō ‘for all the admonitions to me from you are taught by her’ (Schwyzer, 1966, 119), Gothic (John 6, 45) jah wair’s hand allai laisaidai gudis = Gk. kal ἔσοντα πάντες δεδικτηθεῖον ‘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 dimidae 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 otō 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-bitō (or *u-bijendō) Jaropolka ‘killed by Jaropolk’ was replaced by *u-bitō otō Jaropolka, cf. the modern Slovene equivalent ubiti 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 évarkōς; aoxta-wahrscheinlich ein Archaismus ist, der die alte Einförmigkeit des Vokalismus im alten athematischen Medium unabhängig bezeugt. Ursprüngliche 3. Sg. *éughw-ō (später erneuert in *éughw-ťo und schließlich thematisiert)→Verbaladjektiv *éughw-tós. Wir können das gleiche, nicht ablautende Verhalten im lat. ŭsus < *oit-tós im Verhältnis zu dem alten Medium ŭlor (vgl. alat. Infin. oitier, osk. ŭtiu < *oit-ion- wie alat. pac-iō gebildet) beobachten. Daher ist es wahr- scheinlich richtig, ŭsus < *oit-tós im Ablaut zu vergleichen mit gr. oĭσ-τός, mit der Zur- zel des Futurs oĭσω, oĭσωμα < *oit-se/σ-. 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-: kṛtā“.

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., tatam 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’; nā tvāvam indra kāś canā nā jātō nā janisyate ‘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 *antuhiša-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. žmogau-s stó-ta as far as inflectional endings are concerned. The same ending is retained in the 3rd sg. middle aor. Gk. (ē-do-)to, Skt. (ā-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. ὤρ-το ‘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 ḍṛṣṭa- ‘par moi vu’ du sanskrit, avec le participe passif et l’instrumental, donne le prétérit ‘j’ai vu’ du néo-indien...; le vieux-perser avayā kram ‘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 tiji( from the root tija- ‘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 cākṛé ‘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:
Dual 2nd person 3rd person
pres. act. bhāvatath bhāvatath
pres. middle bhāvēthē bhāvētē
imperf. middle ābhavēthām ābhavētām
perfect cakrāthuḥ cakrātuḥ

Thus the ending -ṭhāḥ 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 -āḥ (< *-es) gives -ṭhāḥ. (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 antuḥśaś ‘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 -tā) 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 -tā 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 -tā 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 dirbita), jo ārīama ‘he plows’ (present of jo ārīa), etc. were created. The analogy worked in the following direction: jis dirbo: jo dirbita: 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. 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 pret-
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In which nora 'he, of him' is the subject in the genitive case, (128) oroč teseal ēr zna 'who had seen him' in which oroč 'who, of whom' is in the gen. (Dat. -abl.) plural; (129) nora bereal é '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: "mgeš šeučamia cvvari '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): rşākmits lānte pespiritu pelaikanše cākkār 'the law wheel turned by the king of the Þsi’s', nī no yārē ṛāksusa 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 aśaumye gi olypo ritoytār 'sooner might death be sought after by a wise man'.
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