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 pâsnig-ta 'it has snowed' or palý-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 pasnig-ë and palij-ë with the same meaning as their -t- participle counterparts (Paulauskienë, 1979, 108). Let us take such a sentence as the following:

Čià  grýbu  bá-ta  (buv-ë)
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 -ë 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:

Senû  miškaï  mylêta
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 mylēta ‘loved’ goes back on the subject miškai ‘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. miškai and the neut. sg. participle mylēta 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 rugiai ‘rye’ (nom. pl.) pjauta ‘(is) cut’ (neut. sg.) and Slavic batška ‘father’ (nom. sg.) ubita ‘(is) killed’ (neut. sg.), which lack grammatical concord, are inherited from ancient times.

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. ὄξ: ἄγαθὸν πολυκοιμαίη ‘the rule of many is not good’ (in which ἄγαθὸν ‘good’ is in the neut. sg. and does not agree with the fem. sg. πολυκοιμαίη ‘rule of many’); αὐτὸν ταῖς πολιτείαις ᾧ τυφανῖς ‘despotic rule is untrustworthy for the states’ (in which αὐτὸν ‘untrustworthy’ is in the neut. sg. and does not agree with the fem. sg. τυφανῖς ‘despotic rule’); Lat. varium et mutabile semper femina ‘woman is always diverse and changeable’ (in which

---

1 Ambrázas 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. Ambrázas 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 jō gyvėnta ‘he lived’ (jō ‘of him’) [gen. sg.], etc. had a possessive meaning similar to jō gyvėnimas ‘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. Ambrázas has tried insomuch 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* | bḥr-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. *ητομαί* ‘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:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{patér} & \quad \text{bher-es} & \quad \text{vīr-om} \\
\text{father} & \quad \text{is carrying} & \quad \text{the man} \\
(\text{nominative} & \quad (\text{progressive} & \quad (\text{direct object} \\
\text{subject of a} & \quad \text{aspect which} & \quad \text{of the active} \\
\text{transitive} & \quad \text{becomes transitive} & \quad \text{transitive verb} \\
\text{progressive} & \quad \text{and active} & \quad \text{in accusative case}) \\
\text{verb}) & \quad \text{voice}) & \\
\end{align*}
\]

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 (dūona) ‘I am baking (bread)’; tū kepl (dūona) ‘you are baking (bread)’; jis kēpa (dionq) ‘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.,

\[
\begin{align*}
Ańt & \text{ šakēliu} & ańt & \text{ žaliū{j}u} & \text{ vainikai} & \text{(vainikus)} & \text{ kabinta} \\
\text{On branches} & \text{ on} & \text{ green} & \text{ wreathes} & \text{(wreathes)} & \text{ hung} \\
\text{Prep. gen.} & \text{ prep. gen. nom. pl.} & \text{(acc. pl.)} & \text{ neut. participle} \\
\end{align*}
\]
‘Wreathes are hung on green branches’ (Paulauskienë, 1979, 105). In the older form of the sentence the subject vainikai ‘wreathes’ was in the nominative plural which is interpreted as the subject of the neut. participle. Later as the feeling of kabinta ‘hung’ shifts from intransitive to transitive it becomes possible to use an accusative case vainikūs ‘wreathes’ which is then felt as an object. In Lithuanian in addition to the older form lāiškas rāšoma ‘a letter is written’ with lāiškas ‘letter’ in the nominative case one finds now also lāiška rāšoma ‘a letter is written, one is writing a letter’ with lāiška 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):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tėvo</th>
<th>dúota</th>
<th>dúona</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By father</td>
<td>given</td>
<td>bread</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen. sg.</td>
<td>neuter</td>
<td>nom. sg. fem.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

(New active type sentence):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tėvas</th>
<th>dúoda</th>
<th>dúoną</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>gives</td>
<td>bread</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nom. sg.</td>
<td>active</td>
<td>acc. sg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>transitive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 rāšoma lāiška (acc. sg.) ‘a letter is being written’ starts to replace rāšoma lāiškas (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.) δόωσι, (Skt.) dádāti 'gives' and the 3rd sg. middle aorist (Gk.) ἐδώτο, (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. pátuyá kriitá ‘bought by the spouse’, Gk. Διώσ-δότος ‘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 *gʷm-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 ἄγενστος ‘not tasting, not having tasted’ and ‘tasteless’.

Jégérs, 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. grzętis ‘borer, drill’, plàktas ‘big hammer’, Lith. spāstais, Latv. spuōsts ‘trap’, etc. In the same agent category belong, according to Jégérs, 84, Old Prussian warto ‘house door’, Lith. vaštai, Latv. vārti, Old Church Slavic vрата ‘gate’, Lith. pláustas, kětgas ‘ferry’, Lith. aūtas, Latv. aūts ‘foot wrapping’ etc. Jégérs, 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’, pänt- ‘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 akkyant- can be understood either as ‘(having) drunk’ or ‘(having been) drunk’. Latin pransus and potus and Sanskrit bhukta- and pita- 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.:

\[ \text{Čià, tò, gytënsi, nuò, výro, mylèta} \]

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 simo otō Josifa rečenomō = his ab Josepho dictis ‘these things having been said by Joseph’ the otō 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:

\[ \text{... kuř, devynis, mënesius, pëř, metus, źemë} \]

... where nine months in a year earth

nom. sg.
\[ \text{ësti} \quad \text{sniëgo} \quad (\text{sniegù}) \quad \text{nuklóta…} \\
\text{is} \quad \text{by snow} \quad (\text{with snow}) \quad \text{covered…} \\
\text{gen. sg.} \quad \text{(inst. sg.)} \quad \text{nom. sg. fem.} \\
\text{participle} \]

‘… 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.

\begin{align*}
\text{Daiktinis} & \quad \text{ař} & \text{veiksminis} & \text{sīnlolis} & \text{būvo} & \text{užstelbtas} \\
\text{Material} & \quad \text{or} & \text{active} & \text{symbol} & \text{was} & \text{choked off} \\
\text{iř} & \quad \text{užtėmdytas} & \text{žūdiniu} & \text{āpvalkalu} & \text{(žūdinio āpvalkalo)} \\
\text{and} & \quad \text{eclipsed} & \text{by verbal} & \text{cover} & \text{(by verbal cover)} \\
\text{sg.} & & \text{inst.} & \text{inst. sg.} & \text{(gen. sg. gen. sg.)} \\
\end{align*}

‘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.

\begin{align*}
\text{Bendrūomenės} & \quad \text{istōrjos} & \text{kūrimas} \\
\text{of the community} & \quad \text{of the history} & \text{establishment} \\
\text{gen. sg.} & \quad \text{gen. sg.} & \text{nom. sg.} \\
\text{nežvelgiama} & \quad \text{paslaptiņ} & \text{(nežvelgiamos paslaptiēs)} & \text{pridengtas…} \\
\text{by an impenetrable secret} & \quad \text{(by an impenetrable secret)} & \text{(is) hidden…} \\
\text{inst. sg.} & \quad \text{inst. sg.} & \text{(gen. sg. gen. sg.)} & \text{nom. sg. past passive} \\
\text{participle} & & & \text{participle} \\
\end{align*}

‘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 otar 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 parašyta mânė ‘written by me’ (gen. sg.) vs. parašyta pieštukû ‘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 the examples from various Indo-European languages:

Tokharian A: wsā-yok- yats... sūk lkāṣi
gold-colored skin (is) pleasant to see
nom.

‘The gold-colored skin is pleasant to see’ (Krause—Thomas, 1960, 79).

Vedic Sanskrit:

havyāīr agnīr māṇuṣa īrayāḥhyāī
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: gauš jaí dyāī ‘The cow is to be killed’ (Brugmann—Delbrück, 1916, 923—924).

Hittite: ...nepīṣas dagānzipaš-a
, heaven earth and
gen. gen.
ūddār kattan arha petummanzi
word bring-forth
nom. inf.

‘May the word of heaven and earth be brought forth’.

...I GA.KIN.AG pārsiwanzi
one cheese (?) break
inf. 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 добы есть ловитьи ‘a fish is at this time to be caught’. From Vsevelod Miller Kiparsky quotes the example:

видать сова по перьям, 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:

\[
\begin{array}{ccccc}
\text{nuosūnuojis} & \text{akmins} & \text{grūti} & \text{kustināt} \\
\text{covered with moss} & \text{stone} & \text{difficult} & \text{to move} \\
\text{nom.} & \text{nom.} & \text{inf.} & \text{inf.} \\
\end{array}
\]

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

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

\[
\begin{array}{ccccc}
\text{Kitiems} & \text{laiškai} & \text{rašyti} & \text{buvo daug} & \text{lengviau} \\
\text{For others} & \text{letters} & \text{to write} & \text{was much} & \text{easier} \\
\text{dat. pl.} & \text{nom. pl.} & \text{inf.} & \text{past adv.} & \text{comparative} \\
\end{array}
\]

'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:

\[
\begin{array}{cc}
\text{es cneal em;} & \text{žamanek haseal ē} \\
\text{I born was, i.e., I was born;} & \text{the time come has, i.e., the time has come;} \\
\text{Yisus ekeal ēr} & \text{Jesus come had, i.e., Jesus had come.}
\end{array}
\]

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

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{z-ayn} & \text{nšan} & \text{arareal} & \text{ēr} \\
\text{this} & \text{miracle} & \text{accomplished} & \text{had} \\
\text{acc.} & \text{acc.} & \text{eal-participle} & \text{he} \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\text{he} \\
\text{gen. sg.}
\]
'he had accomplished this miracle';

\[
\begin{array}{ccccc}
\text{ēr} & \text{nora} & \text{hraman} & \text{areal} \\
\text{had} & \text{he} & \text{a promise} & \text{received} \\
\text{gen.} & \text{acc.} & \text{} & \text{eal-prt.} \\
\end{array}
\]

'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 (\text{z-ayn nšan} ‘this miracle’, and \text{hraman} ‘promise’), it seems probable that originally such forms were in the nominative. Thus, according to Benveniste, 1971a, 159:

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{z-gorc} & \text{gorceal} & \text{ē} & \text{nora} \\
\text{operam} & \text{factum} & \text{est} & \text{eius} \\
\text{acc.} & \text{acc.} & \text{gen.} & \text{gen.} \\
\end{array}
\]

'he accomplished this work' shows the replacement of an old nominative case by an accusative and was originally rather like the Latin \text{eius} (gen.) \text{facta} (nom.) \text{est opera} (nom.). The transitive government was adopted under the influence of the earlier \text{fecit} ‘he accomplished’. The phenomenon is exactly comparable to the Lithuanian situation where \text{rāšoma lāiška} replaces \text{rāšoma lāiškas} 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 \text{z-}; otherwise, the two forms coincide”. Note the example from Mark 15,46:

\[
ed \quad i \quad \text{gerezmani} \quad \text{z-or} \quad \text{ēr} \quad \text{p'oreal} \quad i \quad \text{vime}
\]

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 \text{z-} is omitted, the expression \text{or ēr p'oreal} must be translated by the passive which corresponds exactly with the Greek: \text{δ ἡ λευκομημένον ἐκ πέτρας} ‘which was hewn out of a rock’.

An example from Luke 2,5:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{Maremaw} & \text{handerj} & \text{z-or} \\
\text{Mary} & \text{with} & \text{whom} \\
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{xawseal} \quad \text{ēr} \quad \text{nma} \\
\text{espoused} & \text{had to him} \\
\end{array}
\]

i.e., ‘with Mary whom one had espoused to him’. If again one deletes the \text{z-} from the relative pronoun the sentence would read: ‘with Mary espoused to him’ and corresponds exactly with the Greek \text{σον Μαρίας τῇ εμνηστευμένῃ αὐτῷ}.

3. Baltistica XVIII (2)
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-cařaysn oroc’ tueal ěr 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 ěr 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 ὁ Ἰωάννης ἐπὶ τὰν ἱστορίαν.

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  
   \[g^\#\eta-t\-\-t\-\-]\]  
   ‘father  
   (indefinite (stative [verb = adjective]  
   case)  
   intransitive)

2) *ovi  
   \[pek^\#-t\-\-t\-\-]\]  
   ‘sheep  
   (indefinite (stative [verb = adjective]  
   case)  
   intransitive)

3) *ovi  
   \[pek^\#-t\-\-t\-\-]\]  
   ‘sheep  
   (indefinite (stative  
   case)  
   intransitive)

   (verb = adjective)

Stage II (New developing durative)

4) *patér  
   \[g^\#em-es (-et)^2\]  
   ‘father  
   (indefinite (durative  
   case)  
   intransitive)

5) *ovi  
   \[pek^\#-es (-et)\]  
   ‘sheep  
   (indefinite (durative  
   case)  
   intransitive)

6) *pater  
   \[pek^\#-es (-et)\]  
   ‘father  
   (indefinite (durative  
   case)  
   intransitive)

   \[ovi-m\]  
   (away at the sheep')  
   (dative-locative  
   indirect object)

Stage III (Durative verb becomes active voice)

7) *patér  
   \[g^\#em-es (-et)\]  
   ‘father  
   (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  pekʷ*-es(-et)
   ‘sheep  cooks’
   (nominative  (intransitive
   case)  active verb)
9) *pater  pekʷ*-es (-et)  ovi-m
   ‘father  cooks  sheep’
   (nominative  (transitive
   case)  (accusative
   active verb)  case)

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

10) *pater  gʷm-tó³
    ‘father  went’
    (nominative  (intransitive
    case)  perfect)
11) *ovi  pekʷ-tó
    ‘sheep  (is, was) cooked’
    (nominative  (transitive
    case)  passive)
12) *ovi  pekʷ-tó
    ‘sheep  (is, was) cooked’
    (nominative  (transitive
    case)  passive)
    patrós  by the father’
    (genitive/instrumental/
    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., ... miškaí mylēta ‘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 rājā ghram gatah ‘the king has gone home’ is older than the intransitive with the subject in an oblique case such as Lith. karāliaus namō ėta. The genitive case in an intransitive construction is a syntactic innovation on analogy with the transitive constructions.
nominative object of an infinitive, (e.g., mėsė sveika valgyti ‘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.
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Kodėl ši knygėlė buvo priskiriama A. Baranauskui ir ar ji turi ką bendra su juo, turėtų išaiškinti lietuvių literatūros žinovai.

Z. Zinkevičius

¹ Paskutinis pamoksas viena žemaičių kuniga priesį smerti... Antras spaudimas po jo smerties. Vilniuje, kasztu raszytojaus, spauda Jūzapa Zawadzkia. 1895.