William R. SCHMALSTIEG
The Pennsylvania State University

FURTHER THOUGHTS ON GENITIVE CONSTRUCTIONS*

In a series of thought-provoking and thoughtful articles H o l v o e t (1995, 181; 1994, 139) suggests that the passive voice arose only in the separate history of the Baltic languages. I have written elsewhere (1995) about the agentive use of the genitive case in various Indo-European languages, but I should like to repeat here and expand a little bit on the notions expressed in my earlier publication.

Now according to H o l v o e t (1995, 174): "In Latvian an agentive complement, expressed by the mere genitive, can be added only to adnominal passive participles". Note the following example[1]:

(1) mātes   adīti   cimdi
     (gen. sg.)   (nom. pl. masc. -*t*- part.)   (nom. pl.)
     by mother   knitted   gloves

'gloves knitted by mother (mother-knitted gloves)'

The sequence of agentive genitive and participle may also be transferred to the predicate, yielding a resultative passive, thus:

(2) cimdi   (ir)   mātes   adīti
     (nom. pl.)   (3rd pres.) (gen. sg.)   (nom. pl. masc. -*t*- part.)
     gloves   (are)   by mother   knitted

'the gloves have been knitted by mother'

---

[1] It was interesting for me to learn that Prof. Juris D r a g u n s (who, however, has lived in the United States many years) finds that the omission of *no* 'from' before the agent is a purism and not natural. In addition he finds that without the obvious contextual implication he could understand *mātes adīti cimdi* as a possessive 'mother's knitted gloves'.

Holvoet writes further that the *dainas* have no full passive construction with an agentive complement, but that such was introduced by German authors on a German model with Latv. *no* 'from' reflecting German *von*, e.g.,

(3)

cimdi	tika	adīti	no	mātes
(nom. pl.)	(3rd pret.)	(nom. pl. masc. -*t*- part.)	(prep.)	(gen. sg.)
gloves	were	knitted	by	mother

Such constructions have been ousted from the literary language mainly on the authority of Endzelīns, according to Holvoet.

In his book on the syntax of the Latvian *dainas* G ā t e r s (1993, 296) writes that, as with the agentless passive, the copula is only used if a special tense, mood or the negative must be expressed, e.g.:

(4)

Laba,	čakla	tā	meitiņa,
(nom. sg. fem.)	(nom. sg. fem.)	(nom. sg. fem.)	(nom. sg.)
good,	diligent	that	maiden
Kas	nav	mātes	lutināta
(nom. sg.)	(3rd pres. neg.)	(gen. sg.)	(nom. sg. fem. -*t*- part.)
who	is not	by (her) mother	spoiled

'That maiden is good and diligent who is not (has not been) spoiled by her mother'.

(5)

Tāda	biju	triju	teikta,
(adj.)	(1st sg. pret.)	(gen. pl.)	(nom. sg. fem. -*t*- part.)
Such	I was	by three	praised
Tāda	piecu	izvaināta	
(adj.)	(gen. pl.)	(nom. sg. fem. -*t*- part.)	
Such	by five	censured	

'Such was I (when) praised by three, such was I (when) censured by five'.

According to G ā t e r s (1993, 296) one encounters sporadically the expression of agent by *no* 'from' plus the genitive. The same meaning can be expressed by the Baltic genitive so that after the weakening of the original possessive meaning of the genitive with the passive participles it became possible to replace this with a prepositional phrase.

Examples from G ā t e r s (1993, 297):

(6)

Žēli	raud	sērdienīte,	No	bajāra	bildināma
(adv.)	(3rd pres.)	(nom. sg.)	(prep.)	(gen. sg.)	(nom. sg. fem. pres. psv. part.)
bitterly	sobs	orphan girl,	by	boyar	courted

'Courted by the boyar, the orphan girl cries bitterly'.

(7) trīcēja   sērdienīte,   No   bajāra   bildināta
    (3rd pret.) (nom. sg.)   (prep.) (gen. sg.) (nom. sg. fem. -t- part. part.)
    trembled   orphan girl, by   boyar   courted

'Courted by the boyar, the orphan girl trembled'.

In Old Lithuanian also one encounters examples of the genitive of agent supported by the cognate preposition *nuõ* 'from' (F r a e n k e l 1947, 66):

(8) pastatitas   nuog   Pona   Christusa
    (nom. sg. masc. -t- part.) (prep.+ptcl.)   (gen. sg.) (gen. sg.)
    established   by   Lord   Christ

Similarly in contemporary Lithuanian dialects we find:

(9) čià   tù   gyvénsi   nuo   výro   myléta
    (adv.) (nom. sg.) (2nd sg. fut.)(prep.) (gen. sg.) (nom. sg. fem. -t- part.)
    here   you   will live   by   husband   loved

'Here you will live loved by your husband' (LKG II 601). It is usual to ascribe the Lithuanian use of *nuõ* to Polish influence, but this seems the natural development of the preposition coming to support the case. In the Lithuanian and Latvian use of the cognate preposition to express the agent we may see the influence of Polish and German respectively as a catalytic agent crystallizing the natural tendency of many Indo-European languages to replace a simple case construction with a preposition plus case construction.

According to H o l v o e t (1995, 177): "In the Indo-European languages with a literary tradition of long standing (Greek, Latin, etc.), only the agentless passive occurs at the earliest recorded stage; the full passive with an agentive complement is a later development".

This is true, but still such passives are attested and from the point of view of case assignment one can compare the ancient Greek example:

(10) eí   tis   etimãto   hupò   toũ   démou
     (conj.) (nom. sg. masc.) (3rd sg. psv. aor.)(prep.)   (gen. sg.)
     if   anyone   was honored   by   the   people

(G o o d w i n, G u l i c k 1958, 261).

with a possible Lithuanian translation:

(11) jéigu   kàs   bùvo   tautõs   pàgerbta
     (conj.) (nom. sg. masc.) (3rd pret.) (gen. sg.) (neut. nom.-acc. sg. -t- part.)
     if   anyone   was   by people   honored

In Greek the agentive genitive case has been strengthened with the addition of the preposition *hupó* much as the East Baltic genitives were sometimes strengthened by (Lith.) *nuo* and (Latv.) *no* respectively. The early use of the genitive case in agent function without a preposition is attested in such ancient Greek compound adjectives as *diósdotos* 'given by Zeus, Zeus-given'. Phonologically the Greek 3rd sg. middle aorist ending *-to* corresponds exactly to the Lithuanian *-ta*, which is called a neuter participle, although I see no reason not to connect it directly to the Greek ending *-to*. I ascribe both of these apparent passives to an original ergative construction, which only came to be interpreted as passive with the advent of the active voice in the preterit tenses.

H o l v o e t (1995, 175) notes Ambrazas' criticism that the occurrence of a genitive subject in intransitive *-t-* participial constructions does not correspond to the expected case distribution in ergative languages. This is, of course, true, but there is at least one parallel for this in Western Georgian dialects, where the ergative has come to function as the subject of an intransitive verb (B o e d e r 1979, 443; S c h m a l s t i e g 1995, 18). Undoubtedly the Georgian dialect situation is a later development from the more original ergative situation in which the ergative case functioned as the agent only with transitive verbs. Nevertheless the situation furnishes a parallel to the Lithuanian development where the genitive, in my view, originally restricted to agency with (apparent) passivized transitives, comes to be used as the subject of intransitives. I see a parallel to this also in Old Armenian where the genitive subject (agent), which was originally limited to use with transitive verbs in the perfect tense, comes to be used as the subject of intransitives (see S c h m a l s t i e g 1995, 15–16). This common and parallel development could be used as an argument that subjecthood plays an inherent role in human languages and there tends to be a leveling out of the morpho-syntactic classes by which subjects are expressed in transitive and intransitive constructions. See also M i c h e l i n i (1981, 54) with his completely justified criticism of my 1978 publication in which I expressed the erroneous view that the use of the genitive with an intransitive participle is of early date. According to Michelini: "Costruzioni di questo tipo sono, piú probabilmente, dovute ad 'analogia' sulle costruzioni passive correspondenti ad attive con verbo 'transitivo'". Thus I give up completely the ideas expressed in 1978 and now agree with Michelini's criticism.

In addition I am inclined to reject the objection that there is no evidence that the intransitive *-t-* participle constructions at an earlier epoch had a nominative subject. I would say that there is indeed evidence that not only in Lithuanian but in other ancient Indo-European languages the grammatical subject could agree in case, num-

ber and gender with an intransitive -*t*- participle. Note the following syntactic collocations in which there is agreement in case, number and gender with the subject of the intransitive -*t*- participle:

(12)　Pràeitas　　　　　　　　　laĩkas
　　　(nom. sg. masc. -*t*- part.)　(nom. sg.)
　　　Past　　　　　　　　　　 time

(= Lat. *praeteritum tempus* with a cognate intransitive -*t*- participle)

(13)　Pràeitą　　　　　　　　　nãktį　　　　　pasnìgo
　　　(acc. sg. fem. -*t*- part.)　(acc. sg.)　　(3rd pret.)
　　　Last　　　　　　　　　　night　　　　　it snowed

　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　(LKŽ II 1100).

On the other hand a later genitive subject could give such a collocation as:

(14)　Pràeita　　　　　　tik　　　valandõs
　　　(neut. sg. -*t*- part.)　(adv.)　(gen. sg.)
　　　Passed　　　　　　only　　hour

'Only an hour passed'.

The difference is somewhat reminiscent of the possible Old Indic collocations ascribed by W a c k e r n a g e l, D e b r u n n e r (1954, 582) to Pāṇini:

(15)　gato (mṛto)　　　　　　　'yam　　　　　　　(cf. [12] above)
　　　(nom. sg. masc. -*t*- part.)　(nom. sg. masc.)
　　　went (died)　　　　　　　this one

　　as opposed to;

(16)　gatam (mṛtam)　　　　　　anena
　　　(nom. sg. neut. -*t*- part.)　(instr. sg. masc.)
　　　went (died)　　　　　　　this one

Collocation (16) can be compared with collocation (14) above, although the subject in the Old Indic example is in the instrumental rather than the genitive. The old original syntactic agreement between the -*t*- participle and the modified word can be illustrated by the Lithuanian collocation (to be compared with [15] above):

(17)　tetušė̃lį　　　radaũ　　　　mir̃tą
　　　(acc. sg.)　　(1st sg. pret.)　(acc. sg. masc. -*t*- part.)
　　　father　　　　I found　　　 dead

　　　'I found father dead' (LKŽ VIII 269).

The later genitive subject can be illustrated by:

(18)   jõ   nùmirta   pràeitą   rùdenį

         (gen. sg.)   (neut. -*t*- part.)   (acc. sg. masc. -*t*- part.)   (acc. sg.)

         he   died   last   fall

(LKŽ VIII 272).

This example is to be compared with Old Indic example (16) above, the difference being, of course, that in Old Indic the subject is in the instrumental case and that in Lithuanian in the genitive case. Note furthermore that in the respective collocations Old Indic *mr̥-t-* corresponds exactly to Lith. *mir̃-t-* both in form and function.

In Old Indic, as we have seen above, there is evidence for etymological syntactic agreement between the subject and the -*t*- participle itself and the use of the instrumental with the neuter of the -*t*- participle. But there is also evidence for the use of the genitive (as in Lithuanian). W a c k e r n a g e l , D e b r u n n e r (1954, 582) quote from Patañjali the following sentences:

(19)   ihāhiḥ   (= iha + ahiḥ)   sr̥ptaḥ

         (adv.)   (nom. sg. masc.)   (nom. sg. masc. -*t*- part.)

         here   serpent   crawled

(20)   ihāhinā (= iha + ahinā)   sr̥ptam

         (adv.)   (instr. sg.)   (nom.-acc. sg. neut. -*t*- part.)

         here   serpent   crawled

(21)   idam   aheḥ   sr̥ptam

         (adv.)   (gen. sg.)   (nom.-acc. sg. neut. -*t*- part.)

         here   serpent   crawled

'The serpent crawled here'.

The older construction is represented by sentence (19) with the subject in the nominative case and grammatical agreement with the -*t*- participle. Later, as evidenced in sentence (20), the instrumental, and, as evidenced in sentence (21), the genitive came to have subject function also (S c h m a l s t i e g 1997, 404–405).

But I think that many Lithuanian adjectives in -*t*- have their origin in participles, e.g. *šáltas* 'cold' (< *šálti* 'to freeze [intr.]') and *šiltas* 'warm' (< *šìlti* 'to become warm') in such expressions as (22) *óras šáltas* 'the weather is cold' and (23) *óras šiltas* 'the weather is warm', etc. It has been suggested to me that such an expression as:

(24)   teñ   àš   ilgaĩ   šalaũ

         (adv.)   (nom. sg.)   (adv.)   (1st sg. pret.)

         there   I   for a long time   froze

'I froze there for a long time';

could be paraphrased by:

(25) teñ   màno   ilgaĩ   šálta
     (adv.)   (gen. sg.)   (adv.)   (nom.-acc. sg. neut. -t- part.)

Sentences (24) and (25), however, understand the first person singular pronoun as the experiencer of 'freezing'. One can suggest that a sentence such as:

(26) àš   esù   šáltas
     (nom. sg.)   (1st sg. pres.)   (nom. sg. masc. -t- part.)
     I   am   cold;

in which the first singular pronoun is not the experiencer, but the subject, i.e., the sentence means 'I am a cold person (unfriendly, not easily approachable)' retains the earlier syntactic relationships. In view of the phonological identity of the participles in -t- with the adjectives in -t- it seems to me likely that the two formants reflect an original common morpheme, which only in the course of time, in some cases came to have separate (but similar) meanings. The older meaning is retained in collocations (22), (23) and (26).

In addition I assume that the Indo-European participles were all originally intransitive and that the passive interpretation of some participles is a later development. This explains, for example, the fact that Old Indic *bhuk-ta* can denote either 'one who has eaten a meal' or 'the thing eaten' and that Latin *potus* can mean either 'who has drunk' or 'what has been drunk'. Cf. also the apparently curious distribution of the Hittite participles in -ant-, viz. active for intransitive, but passive for transitive (see S c h m a l s t i e g 1995, 3–8).

According to H o l v o e t (1995, 176) "the Baltic agentive genitive is genetically a possessive genitive <...> And a possessive genitive dependent exclusively on an adjective does not seem probable". But would the *diós-* in Greek *diósdotos* 'given by Zeus, Zeus-given' have been a possessive genitive? Note the following examples from Pindar:

(27) ὅταν   αἴγλα   διόσδοτος   ἔλθῃ
     (conj.)   (nom. sg.)   (nom. sg.)   (3rd sg. subj.)
     whenever   brightness   Zeus-given   comes

'whenever Zeus-given brightness comes' (Pythian Ode 8, line 96);

(28) οἶδεν   δὲ   διόσδοτον   ἀρχάν
     (3rd sg. perf.) (part.)   (acc. sg.)   (acc. sg.)
     knows   Zeus-given   beginning (Fragment 137, line 3)

'knows (its, i.e., life's) Zeus-given beginning'.

Could one imagine that αἴγλα διόσδοτος (= Lith. *Diẽvo dúotas ryškùmas, blizgesỹs*) originally meant 'Zeus' (God's) given brightness' or that διόσδοτον ἀρχάν (= Lith. *Diẽvo dúotą prãdžią*) originally meant 'Zeus' (God's) given beginning'?

H o l v o e t (1995, 177) continues that such a Latvian construction as (29) *tavi duoti lakatiņi* does not mean *'your given kerchiefs', but rather 'the kerchiefs you gave'. If I understand Holvoet correctly, he assumes here a semantic shift from possessive adnominal modifier to agentive modifier. But in Lithuanian at least it is possible to imagine a syntactically parallel sentence which is still ambiguous. Thus:

(30) Atnèšk   sàvo   prirašýtus   lapùs,
     (2nd sg. imperat.)   (gen. sg. refl.)   (acc. sg. masc. past psv. part.)   (acc. pl.)
     bring   your/by you   having been written full   papers
     bèt   palìk   švariùs   ant   súolo
     (conj.)   (2nd sg. imperat.)   (acc. pl.)   (prep.)   (gen. sg.)
     but   leave   clean   on   bench

The sentence can be translated either as: 'Bring the papers which you have written on here, but leave the blank ones on the bench'; or as 'Bring your papers which have been written on here, but leave the blank ones on the bench'.

I definitely agree with H o l v o e t 's (1995, 179–180) notion that the objective genitive with the participles is an innovation of Baltic. Thus, for example, he writes that such a construction as:

(31) lapu   vîstamais   laiks
     (gen. pl.)   (nom. sg. masc. pres. psv. part.)   (nom. sg.)
     of the leaves   withering   time

'the time of the withering of the leaves' was originally analyzed as (32) [*lapu* [*vîstamais laiks*]] and as a result of a reinterpretation came to be understood as (33) [[*lapu vîstamais*] *laiks*] where *lapu vîstamais* is interpreted as a nominalization o' (34) *lapas vîst* 'the leaves are withering'.

In a similar vein A m b r a z a s (1990, 84–85) writes that participles from trar sitive verbs which define the means, place or time of an action can be combine. with a genitive of object. He gives the following examples from Lithuanian:

(35) thesos   mums   sakomassis   Szodis
     (gen. sg.)   (dat. pl.)   (nom. sg. masc. pres. psv. part.)   (nom. sg.)
     of truth   to us   telling   word

'the word telling us the truth';

30

(36) gélmês   jeszkomas   Szwinnas
     (gen. sg.)   (nom. sg. masc. pres. psv. part.)   (nom. sg.)
     of depth   seeking   lead

'sounding lead'.

According to A m b r a z a s (1990, 85) such constructions, which correspond to each other exactly in Latvian and Lithuanian, are based on the ancient adnominal genitive, which with the deverbative adjectives in *-mo was reinterpreted as the object of the action denoted by them. This is evident from the possibility of the use of the genitive with and without the participles in similar constructions, cf. Latv.

(37) acu/mutes   mazgājamais   ūdens
     (gen. pl.)/(sg.)   (nom. sg. masc. pres. psv. part.)   (nom. sg.)
     of the eyes/mouth   washing   water

'water for washing the eyes/mouth'.

Thus I agree completely with Ambrazas regarding the origin of the objective genitive[2].

Similarly the adnominal genitive which could be interpreted as the subject of the action expressed by the participle the genitive was turned into a *genetivus auctoris*. Thus Latvian:

(38) auzu   plaukstamā   làikâ
     (gen. pl.)   (loc. sg. masc. pres. psv. part.)   (loc. sg.)
     of oats   blossoming   at the time

'at the time of the blossoming of the oats';

(39) ap   rudzu   ziêdamu   làiku
     (prep.)   (gen. pl.)   (acc. sg. masc. pres. psv. part.) (acc. sg.)
     about   of the rye   blossoming   time

'about the time of blossoming of the rye'.

In these examples also, where the genitive is the performer of the action of an intransitive participle I would definitely agree with Ambrazas.

There are even examples (possibly of later origin) where a relationship of place is observed between the genitive of the noun and the participle, e.g.:

---

[2] H a u d r y (1977, 66) writes that the objective genitive is definitely secondary with regard to the subjective genitive. Certain objective genitives may derive from a subjective genitive through the reinterpretation of a subjective genitive corresponding to the subject of a passive. Thus an Old Indic sequence such as vṛdhé...aryáḥ 'for the increase of the *arí*' is ambiguous with regard to either the subjective interpretation, viz., *arír vardhate 'the *arí* are increased' (passive) or the objective interpretation *vardhayatyarím '(he) increases the *arí*' (active or causative).

(40) debess   braucamā   diena

    (gen. sg.)   (nom. sg. fem. pres. psv. part.)   (nom. sg.)

    of heaven   traveling   day

'day of traveling to heaven, ascension day';

(41) tautās   ejama   diena

    (gen. sg.)   (nom. sg. fem. pres. psv. part.)   (nom. sg.)

    of the people   going   day

'day when the bride leaves the parents' household'.

Such collocations as those expressed in (40) and (41) assure us of the late nature of many of these genitives which seem to depend on the intransitive participle. Nevertheless in contemporary Lithuanian, at least, both the objective and subjective genitive can co-exist in a single collocation, note the correct translation of the slogan 'exploitation of man by man' is (42) *žmogaus* (gen. sg.) *išnaudojimas žmogaus* (gen. sg.), see K r u o p a s (1963, 24; 1998, 410).

It might be appropriate here to point out that B e n v e n i s t e (1966, 180) tried to show that the meaning of the Old Persian perfect was possessive, thus he claims that (43) **mana* (gen. sg.) *pussa* (nom. sg.) *astiy* (3rd sg. pres.) 'of me is a son, I have a son' is similar to (44) **mana* (gen. sg.) *krtam* (neut. sg. -*t*- part.) *astiy* (3rd sg. pres.) 'of me is done, I have done'. Disputing B e n v e n i s t e, C a r d o n a (1970, 2) gives an example of a finite passive verb accompanied by a genitive with agent function (K e n t 1953, 133):

(45) avaiy   ūvjiyā   arikā   āha

    (nom. pl. masc.)   (nom. pl.)   (nom. pl. masc.)   (3rd pl. imperf.)

    the   Elamites   unfaithful   were

    utā   šām   Auramazdā   naiy   ayadiya

    (conj.) (gen. pl. masc.)   (nom. sg. masc.)   (neg.)   (3rd sg. imperf. psv.)

    and   by them   Ahuramazda   not   was revered

'The Elamites were unfaithful and Ahuramazda was not revered by them'.

The genitive of agent strengthened with the preposition *otъ* is also known with finite passives in the Slavic languages:

Note the Old Church Slavic example from V a i l l a n t (1964, 195 [Matthew 3:6]):

(46) krъštaaxǫ   sę   otъ   nego

    (3rd pl. imperf.)   (refl. ptcl.)   (prep.)   (gen. sg.)

    were baptized   by   him

'They were baptized by him'.

In Old Russian one encounters the example (SRJ 177):

(47) Knjazъ Dmitrei…   postrigъsja   v   černьci   i
     (nom. sg. masc.)   (3rd sg. pret.) (prep.) (nom./acc. pl.) (conj.)
     Prince Dmitri   was shorn   into   monks   and

     vъ   sximu   ot   episkopa   Rostovьskogo   Ignatija
     (prep.) (acc. sg.) (prep.) (gen. sg.) (gen. sg. masc.) (gen. sg.)
     into   schema   by   bishop   of Rostov   Ignatius

'Prince Dmitri was admitted into the strictest monastic order (schema) by Ignatius, Bishop of Rostov'.

Benveniste (1971, 159) compares Old Armenian:

(48) nora   ē   handerj
     (gen. sg.)   (3rd pres.)   (nom. sg.)
     of him   is   clothing

Lat. *eius est vestimentum* 'id.' = *habet vestimentum* 'he has clothing' with;

(49) nora   ē   gorceal
     (gen. sg.)   (3rd pres.)   (participle)
     of him   is   done

Lat. *eius est factum* 'id.' = *habet factum* 'he has done'.

According to the rule in Old Armenian the intransitive perfect has a nominative subject and such a sentence as:

(50) na   ekeal   ē
     (nom. sg.)   (past. part.) (3rd pres. aux.)
     he   come   has (is) . 'He has come';

is normal, whereas:

(51) nora   ekeal   ē
     (gen. sg.)   (past part.)   (3rd pres. aux.)
     by him   come   has (is)   'He has come'

(Weitenberg 1986, 10–11);

is exceptional, based on the transitive pattern, just as the use of the genitive as the subject of Lithuanian intransitive neuter participles is based on the transitive pattern. Thus, to illustrate with Latin morphology, one would say that (52) *is est ventus* (cf. French *il est venu*) is more or less normal (Leumann et al. 1965, 325), whereas (53) *eius est ventum* is a later innovation encountered in Old Armenian, cf. (51) above and Lithuanian: (54) *jõ* (gen. sg.) *eĩta* (neut. sg. -*t*- part.) 'he went'.

Did the genitive case originally have two meanings, viz. agent and possession or did the first meaning develop from the second separately in the history of the various Indo-European languages? S a x o k i j a (1985, 5–11) mentions an impressive number of languages in which the 'logical subject' (as she terms it) is expressed by particles or affixes which also express nominal possession, e.g., Eskimo, Aleut, Hungarian, the Malayo-Polynesian languages, Uralian, Northern Caucasian and some North American Indian languages. According to H a u d r y (1977, 409) the expression of the author of an action as the 'possessor' is, indeed, conceivable. Another possibility is that there is a common meaning in the notion of 'source' as suggested by D a n y l e n k o (forthcoming). H a u d r y (1977, 409) writes: "En fait, c'est à la source commune du génitif subjectif et du génitif d'appartenance qu'il faut faire remonter le génitif d'agent: c'est un génitif d'origine, qui auprès des participes passifs désigne l'auteur de l'action". Since in the history of the languages of the world it is so common for the notion of possession to pass to the notion of source or origin of an action, it is impossible to know whether the widely attested agentive use of the genitive in the Indo-European languages is the result of separate parallel development or whether it is to be traced back to the common proto-language. The genitive use as a source of the action of the finite (passive) verb and the occurrence of the morpheme *-s to denote both the genitive and the nominative case, suggests to me that the agentive usage is early (see S c h m a l s t i e g, forthcoming). Quite possibly the use of the genitive to denote the performer of the action does not have a single etymological syntactic source.

REFERENCES

A m b r a z a s V., 1990, Sravnitel'nyj sintaksis pričastij baltijskix jazykov, Vilnius.

B e n v e n i s t e É., 1966, Problèmes de linguistique générale, Paris.

B e n v e n i s t e É., 1971, Problems in general linguistics, transl. by M. E. Meek, C. Gables, University of Miami Press.

B o e d e r W., 1979, Ergative syntax and morphology in language change: The South Caucasian languages, – Ergativity, ed. by F. Plank, London, New York, 435–480.

C a r d o n a G., 1970, The Indo-Iranian construction mana (mama) kṛtam, – Language, XLVI, 1–12.

D a n y l e n k o A., (forthcoming), The cases of agent and instrument in Old Ukrainian: Some implications of the general theory of ergativity.

F r a e n k e l E., 1947, Sprachliche, besonders syntaktische Untersuchung des kalvinistischen litauischen Katechismus des Malcher Pietkiewicz von 1598, Göttingen.

G ā t e r s A., 1993, Lettische Syntax: Die Dainas, Frankfurt am Main.

G o o d w i n W. W., C. B. G u l i c k, 1958, Greek grammar, Waltham etc.

H a u d r y J., 1977, L'emploi des cas en védique, Lyons.

H o l v o e t A., 1994, Notes on the Latvian passive, – Linguistica Baltica, III, 131–140.

Holvoet A., 1995, On the evolution of the passive in Lithuanian and Latvian, – Analecta Indoeuropaea Cracoviensia I. Safarewicz memoriae dicata, ed. by W. Smoczyński, Cracoviae, 173–182.

Kent R. G., 1953, Old Persian: Grammar, texts, lexicon, 2nd ed., New Haven (= American Oriental Series, XXXIII).

Kruopas J., 1963, Dabartinės lietuvių kalbos vystymosi tyrinėjimas, – Lietuvių kalbotyros klausimai, VI, 21–30 (Reprinted in: J. Kruopas, Rinktiniai raštai, ed. by S. Keinys et al., Vilnius, 1998, 407–416).

Leumann M., J. B. Hofmann, A. Szantyr, 1965, Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik, Munich.

· LKG – Lietuvių kalbos gramatika, I (1965), II (1971), III (1976), Vilnius.

LKŽ – Lietuvių kalbos žodynas, II (1969), VIII (1970), Vilnius.

Michelini G., 1981, La linguistica testuale e l'indoeuropeo: il passivo, Brescia. ·

Saxokija M. M., 1985, Posessivnost', perexodnost' i ėrgativnost', Tbilisi.

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., 1995, A student guide to the genitive of agent in the Indo-European languages, – Journal of Indo-European Studies, Monograph Number Fourteen, Washington.

Schmalstieg W. R., 1997, The origin of the neuter nominative-accusative singular in *-om*, – Journal of Indo-European Studies, XXV, 401–407.

Schmalstieg W. R., (forthcoming), Lithuanian and Indo-European parallels, – Journal of Indo-European Studies.

SRJ – Slovar' russkogo jazyka XI–XVII vv., ed. by D. N. Šmelev et al., XIII, 1987, Moscow.

Vaillant A., 1964, Manuel du vieux slave, I, Grammaire, Seconde edition revue et augmentée, Paris.

Wackernagel J., A. Debrunner, 1954, Altindische Grammatik, II 2, Die Nominalsuffixe, Göttingen.

Weitenberg J. J. S., 1986, Infinitive and participle in Armenian, – Annual of Armenian Linguistics, VII, 1–26.