

The Indo-European genitive of agent with finite verbs and participles*

WILLIAM R. SCHMALSTIEG

The Pennsylvania State University

*Examples of the use of the finite verb and the genitive with agent function are given from Old Indic, Old Persian, Tocharian, Greek and Slavic. It is suggested furthermore that the genitive object of certain verbal classes, e.g., Indo-European verbs with the suffix *-ē- may originally have functioned as an agent and that the etymological subject was the patient.*

In this paper I should like to give some examples of the genitive of agent (or perhaps better, genitive of source) with finite verbs in some Indo-European languages other than Baltic¹. The etymological possessive interpretation is always possible for passive participle constructions, but it would seem to me to be unnecessary to have one explanation for the finite verb constructions and a second explanation for the passive participle constructions, although I suppose that in principle the constructions with finite verbs could be explained as being analogical to those with the participles.

First of all I would quote the example of the use of the genitive of agent with a finite verb from Old Persian (Cardona 1970: 2; Kent 1953: 133):

- (1)
- | | | | |
|--|------------------|----------------|--------------------|
| <i>avaīy</i> | <i>ūvjīyā</i> | <i>arikā</i> | <i>āha</i> |
| NOM. PL. MASC. | NOM. PL. | NOM. PL. MASC. | 3 PL. IMPERF. |
| the | Elamites | unfaithful | were |
| | | | |
| <i>u-tāšām</i> | <i>Auramazdā</i> | <i>naiy</i> | <i>ayadiya</i> |
| CONJ.-GEN. PL. MASC. | NOM. SG. MASC. | NEG. | 3 SG. PSV. IMPERF. |
| and by them | Ahuramazda | not | was revered |
| ‘The Elamites were unfaithful and Ahuramazda was not revered by them.’ | | | |

Note the Old Indic example with a finite verb (Jamison 1979: 134):

* I should like to thank herewith Prof. Vytautas Ambrazas and Prof. Algirdas Sabaliauskas for reading and commenting on earlier versions of this paper. I should also like to thank Prof. Giedrius Subačius for transcribing the passage from Rhesa’s Bible in the Chicago Newberry Library. Although I have not mentioned him directly in this paper, I should like to express my thanks to Prof. Axel Holvoet, with whose conclusions I frequently disagree, but whose articles have been helpful to me in revising and formulating my own thoughts. His 2001 article quoted in the references was the immediate stimulus for this paper.

¹ Haudry (1977: 409) writes that the subjective genitive and the genitive of belonging go back to the same origin as the genitive of agent, viz. the genitive of source, which when used with the passive participles denotes the author of the action and is opposed to the instrumental which denotes the element in contact, the object possessed or the instrument of the process.

- (2) *idām tyāt* *pātram* *indrapānam,* *īndasya*
 NOM. SG. NEUT. NOM. SG. NOM. SG. GEN. SG.
 this that cup Indra's drink by Indra
- priyām* *amṛtam* *apāyi*
 NOM. SG. NEUT. NOM. SG. NEUT. 3RD SG. PSV. AOR.
 dear immortal was drunk
 'This very cup, Indra's drink, dear, immortal, was drunk by Indra.'

A Tocharian B example of the genitive of agent is given below (Krause, Thomas 1960: 83):

- (3) *srukor* *aiśaumyepi* *olypo* *[ri]toy(tä)r*
 NOM. SG. GEN. SG. ADV. 3RD SG. MIDDLE OPTATIVE
 death by wise (man) very is to be sought
 'eher dürfte der Tod von einem Weisen gesucht werden'
 'death ought rather to be sought by a wise man.'

Now it is well known that in the history of languages in the course of time the preposition comes to support the simple case ending. Typically language teachers tell their students that such and such a preposition requires such and such a case or cases, but in fact historically it is usually just the reverse. The preposition (as some kind of etymological adverb) supports an original case. The replacement of Lat. *īre Romam* by *īre ad Romam* 'to go to Rome' is well known, but there are many other examples also. For example, Krys'ko (1997: 121–122) writes that for Russian during the process of the formation of the direct object category the contrast between object and circumstantial forms is strengthened as a result of which the accusative of spatial object which combines the lexically locative and the functional object categories, i.e., marked both by circumstantiality and object quality, is gradually replaced by the preposition *čerez* 'through' plus case form. Interestingly enough Krys'ko predicts that the simple accusative of object of verbs of motion will gradually be replaced by the preposition plus object construction as it has already happened with certain constructions, e.g., *perelezt' čerez zabor* 'to climb over the fence', *pereletet' čerez more* 'to fly across the sea'.

In Greek the preposition ὑπό 'by' has come to support the genitive case in the sense of agent. Thus:

- (4) ἡνάγκασμαι ὑπὸ τῶν γεγενημένων... τούτου κατηγορεῖν
 1 SG. PSV. AOR. PREP. GEN. PL. GEN. PL. GEN. SG. INF.
 I am forced by the happenings... this one to accuse
 'I am forced by what has happened to accuse this man.' (Goodwin, Gulick 1958: 261.)

Paul Andersen (1991: 123) showing how in Greek the introduction of an agent can change the interpretation of an active intransitive construction to a passive construc-

tion gives the following examples (Herodotus 3, 15, 4):

- (5)

αἷμα	ταύρου	πιών	ἀπέθανε	παρὰχρημα
ACC. SG.	GEN. SG.	NOM. SG. MASC. PAST ACT. PART.	3 SG. AOR.	ADV.
blood	of bull	having drunk	died	on the spot

'Having drunk the bull's blood he died on the spot.' (Herodotus 7, 213, 2)
- (6)

ἀπέθανε	ὑπὸ	Ἀθηναίᾳ	ἀνδρὶ	Τραχινίου
3 SG. AOR.	PREP.	GEN. SG.	GEN. SG.	GEN. SG. MASC.
died	by	Athenades	man	Trachinian

'He was killed by a Trachinian (called) Athenades.'

With regard to Old Church Slavic Vaillant wrote (1964: 189) that the agent of a passive verb may be rendered by the instrumental or *otb* plus the genitive. Vaillant (1964: 195) gives the example from Matthew 3.6:

- (7)

kr̥štaax̥	sę	otb	nego
3 PL. IMPERF.	REFL. PTCL.	PREP.	GEN. SG.
were baptized		by	him

'They were baptized by him.'

The addition of *otb* merely strengthens the original genitive of agent meaning.

Above I have given evidence for the use of an agentive genitive with a finite verb in Old Persian, Old Indic, Tocharian, Greek and Slavic. It seems to me then that an Indo-European origin for the construction is quite likely.

Adhering to the notion that unmotivated syntax has its origin in motivated semantics, I propose that the unmotivated genitive case which is required by certain verbs is the reflection of an earlier agentive meaning. From the synchronic point of view one would say that such and such a verb requires a certain case, but there is no motivation for that. In many constructions, then, one can understand the subject as originally being the object (or patient) of the action or state and the genitive object as the agent or the source of the action or state. When the Indo-European language shifted from ergative typology to nominative-accusative typology, the original patient came to be felt as a subject and the analysis of the old ergative type sentences was changed.

Thus, for example, certain Old English constructions are traditionally called 'impersonal', although Visser (1963: 20) considers this term a misnomer. According to Visser (1963: 23): "This construction is not infrequently accompanied by a complement in the form of a noun or pronoun in the genitive... or by a preposition (*for, of, æt, to* etc.) + noun... Since it is convenient to have a name to refer to the complement in the form of a (pro)noun in the genitive it will be called CAUSATIVE OBJECT, as in the majority of cases it expresses the cause or the occasion of the action or state denoted by the verb it qualifies." Visser's term 'causative object' is very appropriate since it fits with the notion that the genitive is an agent or a source producing the action or state. Example:

- (8) *him* *sceamode* *ðæs* *mannes*
 DAT. SG. 3 SG. PRET. GEN. SG. MASC. GEN. SG.
 to him it shamed of that man
 'he was ashamed of that man.'

This 'impersonal construction' with a 'causative object' was probably preceded by a personal construction also with a 'causative object'. In Old English a dative object replaced an original nominative subject. Compare the Gothic example with a cognate verb (Luke 9.26):

- (9) *saei...* *skamaiþ* *sik* *meina*
 NOM. SG. 3 PRES. REFL. GEN. SG.
 whoever shames himself of me
 'whoever is ashamed of me' (Streitberg 1919: 131)

According to Erhart (1980: 182) Indo-Iranian fourth class verbs (those in *-ya*) were originally stative, but some had developed into passives already in the Indo-Iranian period. Let us compare the following sentence from Old Indic (Macdonell 1916: 319):

- (10) *ánnasya* *trpyati*
 GEN. SG. 3RD SG. PRES.
 with food he refreshes himself
 'He refreshes himself with some food.'

According to the text-book interpretation the verb *trp-* governs the genitive case, but note that this verb belongs to the Indic fourth class and that one could reverse the syntactic interpretation assuming a genitive agent (or in Visser's terms, a causative object) and a nominative patient. One could then understand the sentence as: 'the food refreshes him'. Consider now the following Latin example:

- (11) *pudet* *mē* *tui*
 3 SG. PRES. ACC. SG. GEN. SG.
 shames me you
 'I am ashamed of you.' (Bennett 1945: 140)

This also could be understood as: 'you shame me'. Compare the Old English example (8) and Gothic example (9) above. Hermann (1926: 286–287) connects the Latin verbs in **-ē-* with the Lithuanian stative verbs in *-ė-* which frequently require a genitive object, cf. the Lithuanian sentence from Basanavičius:

- (12) *o* *jėi* *tù* *manęs* *taip* *bjaurėsi*
 CONJ. CONJ. NOM. SG. GEN. SG. ADV. 2 SG. PRES.
 but if you by me so are repelled
 'but if you are so repelled by me.'

The verb *bjaurėtis* 'to be repelled', is an *-ė-* stem verb (< **-ē-*). This could be understood as: 'but if I repel you so'.

Other Lithuanian examples include:

- (13) *Vaikas* *svečiū* *drōvisi* (inf. *drovėtis*)
 NOM. SG. GEN. PL. 3 PRES.
 child by guests is made shy (DŽ 1993: 13)
 'The child is made shy by the guests, i.e., the child is shy in the presence of the guests.'

This could also be reversed and understood as 'The guests make the child shy'.

- (14) *Manęs* *visi* *bōdis* (inf. *bodėtis*)
 GEN. SG. NOM. PL. 3 PRES.
 by me everyone is annoyed (LKŽ₁ 966)
 'Everyone is annoyed by me' which could be understood as 'I annoy everyone'.

The verbs in examples (9) through (14) above all belong to the same Indo-European class of stative verbs and all here take genitive objects, or in Visser's term 'causative objects'. See also Ambrazas (2001a: 29–34) for many other examples and somewhat similar conclusions.

In my view an analysis of the genitive of agent cannot be separated from an analysis of the instrumental with which it competes in certain syntactic collocations². Note the following Lithuanian sentence (Paulauskienė 1979: 99):

- (15) *žemė* *ėsti* *sniegū* (*sniėgo*) *nuklōta*
 NOM. SG. 3 PRES. INSTR. SG. GEN. SG. NOM. SG. FEM.-T-PART.
 earth is with snow (by snow) covered
 'The earth is covered with (by) snow.'

In this case the use of the instrumental *sniegū* would denote that snow is considered the instrument, whereas use of the genitive *sniėgo* would denote that snow is the agent

² Now one may apply a similar dichotomy to the **-o* stem nouns. Then the nominative singular in **-s* (probably an old ergative) may be considered the source of the action as opposed to the nominative singular in **N* (= **-m* or **-n*, probably an old instrumental) which may be considered the instrument. The reason for the assignment of animate nouns to the **-s* morphological category is that they are more likely to function as the source of the action.

This may explain then why such Latin nouns as *gladium* 'sword', *scutum* 'shield', *caelum* 'sky' have older alternate nominatives singular *gladius*, *scutus*, *caelus*. Cf. also Gk. ζυγόν 'plow' beside ζυγός. Originally the choice of the nominative singular depended on the speaker's perception of the function of the subject, viz., either as source (with the ending **-os*) or instrument (with the ending **-oN*). One is, of course, familiar with the phenomenon of gender change in the adjective, viz. Lat. *bon-us*, *bon-um*, *bon-a*, etc., but for the noun I presuppose different original functions for the nominative singular forms **-os*, **-oN*, **-ā*, although at the moment I would have no explanation for the difference between **-oN* and **-ā*, for the latter of which Haudry (1977: 449) suggests an original instrumental function. He compares the form of the **-ā* stem instrumental function and nominative singular in the Latin sentences (1) *miles sagitta hostem vulnerat* 'the soldier wounds the enemy with an arrow' and (2) *militis sagitta hostem vulnerat* 'the soldier's arrow wounds the enemy'. This would explain why the same root may appear in related languages as masculine or neuter **-o* stems or (mostly feminine) **-ā* stems.

or the source of the action. It should be noted that the agentive use of the genitive is not restricted to animate beings. Other examples quoted by Paulauskienė (1979: 99) include:

- (16) *Daiktinis* *aĩ* *veiksminis* *simbolis* *buvo* *užstelbtas*
 NOM. SG. CONJ. NOM. SG. NOM. SG. 3 PRET. NOM. SG. -T- PART.
 material or active symbol was choked off
- iĩ* *užtėmdytas* *žodiniu* *apvalkalu* (*žodiniu* *apvalkalo*)
 CONJ. NOM. SG. -T- PART. INST. SG. INST. SG. GEN. SG. GEN. SG.
 and eclipsed verbal covering (verbal covering)
 'The material or active symbol was choked off and eclipsed by the verbal covering.'
- (17) *Bendruomenės* *istorijos* *kūrimas* *yra*
 GEN. SG. GEN. SG. NOM. SG. 3 PRES.
 of the society of the history establishment is
- neižvelgiama* *paslaptim* (*neižvelgiamos* *paslapties*) *pridengtas...*
 INST. SG. INST. SG. GEN. SG. GEN. SG. NOM. SG. MASC. -T- PART.
 with an impenetrable secret (by an impenetrable secret) hidden
 'The establishment of the history of the community is hidden with (by) an impenetrable secret.'

One must say that here the author and the instrument (or perhaps source and path) are not clearly differentiated, although in most cases the Lithuanian language would differentiate quite clearly (Paulauskienė 1979: 99). Still even with verbs in *-ėti* one notes the competition between the genitive and the instrumental, cf. the following example with (14) above:

- (18) *Kai* *jisai* *siĩgo,* *visi* *juo* *bodėjosi*
 CONJ. NOM. SG. 3 PRET. NOM. PL. INSTR. SG. 3 PRET.
 When he was sick everybody with him was annoyed
 'When he was sick, everyone was annoyed with him.' (LKŽ₁ 967)

In example (3) above I have given a Tocharian example with a genitive of agent. But in addition to the genitive in Tocharian the instrumental (for inanimate) and the perlocative (for animate) cases may function as instrument and agent cases also. Note the following example from Tocharian A (Krause, Thomas 1960: 84; Lane 1947: 49):

- (19) *mā* *poryo* *tskāmsaṃtār* *mā* *wāryo*
 ADV. INSTR. SG. 3 PL. MIDDLE PRES. ADV. INSTR.
 not by fire are burned not by water

<i>sikaṃtār</i>	<i>mā</i>	<i>lāñcsā</i>	<i>pārtsi</i>	<i>yāteñc</i>
3 PL. MIDDLE PRES.	ADV.	PERLATIVE PL.	INF.	3 PL. PRES.
washed away	not	by kings	to take	can be
'They are not burned by fire, not washed away by water, cannot be carried (away) by kings...'				

I have noted above in Greek examples (4) and (6) the genitive of agent governed by the preposition *ὑπό*. The Greek dative functions as instrumental, since Greek has not inherited the instrumental from Proto-Indo-European. Thus similar to the Lithuanian competition of genitive and instrumental is the Greek competition of the genitive with the dative. Note the examples from Schwyzler (1966: 526):

- (20) *ἐδάμην* *ὑπό* *χερσὶ* *ποδώκεος* *Αἰακίδαο*
 3 SG. PSV. AOR. PREP. DAT. PL. GEN. SG. GEN.SG.
 was slain by hands of swift-footed Aeacus
 'He was slain by the hands of swift-footed Aeacus.' (Iliad II, 860)
- (21) *σῶ* *ὑπό* *δοῦρι* *πόλιν* *πέρεθαι*
 DAT. SG. PREP. DAT. SG. ACC. SG. MIDDLE INFINITIVE
 thy by spear city to be laid waste
 'city to be laid waste by thy spear' (Iliad XVI, 708)

As with the genitive case the preposition *ὑπό* merely comes to strengthen the original instrumental. The fact that *ὑπό* is used with both the genitive (with agentive meaning) and the dative (with instrumental meaning) shows that the original difference in meaning was determined by the case and not the preposition.

The use of the instrumental with the passive (as contrasted with the genitive as in sentence [2] above) is attested in Old Indic (Jamison 1979: 131):

- (22) *adbhīr* *góbhir* *mṛjyate*
 INSTR. PL. INSTR. PL. 3 PRES.
 with water with cows is wiped
 'He is wiped with water (and) cows (= milk).'
- (23) *sá* *mṛjyámānaḥ* *kavībhiḥ...*
 NOM. SG. MASC. NOM. SG. MASC. PSV. PART. INSTR. PL.
 he (= Soma), being wiped by the kavis...

According to Haudry (1977: 414) the use of the instrumental as an agent in Old Indic is a result of the extension of the subject of origin to the subject of instrument. Haudry writes that this results from the fact that *ṛṣayo hinvanti* 'the seers incite' and the innovation *matayo hinvanti* 'the thoughts incite' are parallel, so that the parallel to *matībhir hitá* 'incited by the thoughts' would be *ṛṣībhir hitá* 'incited by the seers'.

In Russian the competition between the genitive of agent and the instrumental is evident in this example from the Igor Tale, cf. the Jakobson reconstruction (1966: 170):

- (24) *Poskěpani* *sabljami* *kalenymi* *šelomi*
 NOM. PL. MASC. PAST PSV. PART. INSTR. PL. INSTR. PL. NOM. PL.
 cleft with sabers tempered helmets
- Ovarьskii* *otъ* *tebe,* *Jarъ* *ture* *Vъsevolode!*
 NOM. PL. MASC. PREP. GEN. SG. VOC. SG. VOC. SG. VOC. SG.
 Avar by you Fierce Bull Vsevolod!
 'Cleft with tempered sabers are [their] Avar helmets – by you, Fierce Bull Vsevolod!'

In modern Russian, of course, this distinction has been lost and correspondingly such modern Russian phrases as (25) and (26):

- (25) *napisano* *mnoju*
 NOM. SG. NEUT. PAST PSV. PART. INSTR. SG.
 'written by me'
- (26) *napisano* *karandašom*
 NOM. SG. NEUT. PAST PSV. PART. INSTR. SG.
 'written with a pencil'

would be rendered in Lithuanian by (27) and (28) respectively, see Paulauskienė (1979: 99).

- (27) *parašyta* *màno*
 NOM. SG. NEUT.-T-PART. GEN. SG.
 'written by me'
- (28) *parašyta* *pieštukù*
 NOM. SG. NEUT. -T- PART. INSTR. SG.
 'written with a pencil'

In modern Russian we see a development parallel to that of Old Indic, viz. the replacement of (*otъ* plus) the genitive by the instrumental.

The competition between the genitive and instrumental is also encountered in the Old Indic sentences quoted from Patañjali by Wackernagel and Debrunner (1954: 582):

- (29) *idam* *aheḥ* *sr̥ptam*
 ADV. GEN. SG. NOM.-ACC. SG. NEUT. -T- PART.
 here serpent crawled

- (30) *ihāhinā* (= *iha* + *ahinā*) *sqptam*
 ADV. INSTR. SG. NOM.-ACC.SG.NEUT. -T-PART.
 here serpent crawled
 'The serpent crawled here.'

In modern Armenian the participle in *-c* is used with a genitive of agent which apparently does not go back to Indo-European times and must be considered an innovation, differently from the use of the genitive with the participle in *-l* which is most likely ancient. Note the modern Armenian example (Fairbanks and Stevick 1975: 227):

- (31) *im* *barekami* *grac* *girk'ə* *hetak'əkir* *ē*
 POSS. PRON. GEN. SG. PAST PART. NOM. SG. NOM.SG. 3 PRES.
 my by friend written book interesting is
 'The book written by my friend is interesting.'

Such a sentence could be translated into Lithuanian with almost exactly the same syntactic structure:

- (32) *màno* *bičiūlio* *parašyta* *knygà* *yrà* *įdomi*
 POSS. PRON. GEN. SG. PAST PART. NOM. SG. 3 PRES. NOM. SG.
 my by friend written book is interesting

With the participle in *-c* we also encounter the instrumental usage in Armenian (Tumanjan 1962: 58):

- (33) *angin* *k'arov* *šarac*
 ADJ. INSTR. SG. PAST PART.
 valuable with stone studded
 'studded with valuable jewels'

Cf. Lith.

- (34) *pàpuoštas* *bràngakmeniais*
 NOM. SG. INSTR. PL.
 'adorned with jewels'

One argument for the possessive origin of the genitive of agent in Baltic is the accepted use of the possessive pronouns Lith. *màno*, Latv. *mana* 'my, by me' and Lith. *tàvo*, Latv. *tava* 'your (sg.), by you (sg.)' as agents, rather than the standard genitives Lith. *manės*, Latv. *manis* 'my, by me' and Lith. *tavės*, Latv. *tevis*. There are, of course, exceptions. Endzelīns (1923: 384) notes the vacillation between Latv. *dziēsma mana padziēdāta* 'the song sung by me' and later in the same place *manis jaūna padziēdāta* 'a me juvenco cantata, sung by me, a young (fellow)'.

Vilius Gaigalaitis writes (1998: 81): *Mano tėvas ir motina buvo gryni lietuvininkai, juose nebuvo nei lašelio svetimo kraujo ir aš esmi savo lietuviškumą ir lietuvišką kalbą motinos pienu įžindęs*. 'My mother and father were pure Lithuanians, in them there wasn't a drop of foreign blood and I have imbibed my Lithuanian nationality and Lithuanian language along with my mother's milk'. Still we encounter here such sentences as the following (1998: 69):

- (35) *lankiausi Kretingoje ir kai kada manęs*
 1 SG. PRET. LOC. CONJ. ADV. ADV. GEN. SG.
 I visited in Kretinga and at one time by me
- aptarnaujamoje Gargždu parapijoje*
 LOC. SG. FEM. PRES. PSV. PART. GEN. PL. LOC. SG.
 having been served Gargždai in parish
 'I visited Kretinga and the Gargždai parish which had once been served by me.'

Another example (1998: 134):

- (36) *mėnesinis organas, manęs redaguojamas*
 NOM. SG. MASC. NOM. SG. GEN. SG. NOM. SG. MASC. PRES. PSV. PART.
 monthly organ by me edited
 'the monthly organ edited by me'

In Marcel Proust's *La prisonnière (Kalinė)* translated into Lithuanian by Pranas Bieliauskas (1998: 180) we encounter the example:

- (37) *baronas lydimas Brišo, manęs*
 NOM. SG. NOM. SG. MASC. PRES. PSV. PART. GEN. SG. GEN. SG.
 the baron accompanied by Brichot by myself
- ir Sanjeto...*
 CONJ. GEN. SG.
 and by Saniette...
 (= le Baron... suivi de Brichot, de moi, et de Saniette... [Proust 1984: 328]).

Žulys (1969: 170) gives the examples from Vaižgantas:

- (38) ... *kokio tavęs esama lipšnaus*
 GEN. SG. GEN. SG. PRES. PSV. PART. GEN. SG.
 what you are sweet
 '...what a sweet (person) you are'

- (39) *Ir* *manęs* *tesama* *malonaus*
 CONJ. GEN. SG. PRES. PSV. PART. GEN. SG.
 and I still am pleasant
- jos* *akims,* *ne* *širdžiai*
 GEN. SG. DAT. PL. CONJ. DAT. SG.
 her to eyes, not to heart
 'And I am still pleasant to her eyes, not to (her) heart.'

Žulys writes that such a usage of *manęs* and *tavęs* is probably not a deviation from grammaticality, but free variation, although without a special investigation it is difficult to decide, because the double genitive with these pronouns is rare.

It might be suggested that, at least in the Klaipėda region examples, German influence plays a role in the use of *manęs* and *tavęs* where one would expect *mano* and *tavo* according to the rules of the standard language. One might propose the following scenario. In standard German in such collocations as *mein Buch* 'my book' and *das von mir geschriebene Buch* 'the book written by me' the possessor and the agent respectively are expressed in a different way. Perhaps this led to the tendency to express them differently in Baltic dialects also. Still such an explanation does not seem likely to me. I might also point out the existence of dialect German *das Buch von mir* for 'my book'. I don't know if this type of expression was common in Klaipėda German or not, but there would seem to be little reason for distinguishing between the two Lithuanian constructions on the basis of German influence.

Perhaps, however, the choice of *mano* and *tavo* instead of *manęs* and *tavęs* in standard Lithuanian is conditioned by the fact that with verbal nouns the agent is expressed with the possessive pronoun, whereas the patient is expressed with the usual genitive case. My colleague Prof. Vytautas Ambrazas has pointed out to me (personal communication) that *mano (tavo) išnaudojimas* 'my (your) exploitation' means that I am (you are) exploiting someone. On the other hand *išnaudojimas manęs, tavęs* 'the exploitation of me (you)' means that somebody is exploiting me (you). Similarly *mano (tavo) baimė* 'my fear' < *aš (tu) bijau* resp. *bijai* 'I (you) fear (someone or something)', but *manęs (tavęs) baimė* 'fear of me (you)' < *bijo manęs / tavęs* '(someone) fears me (you)'. For further discussion see Ambrazas (2001b). This would seem to correspond with the English usage of *my fear* (I am experiencing the fear) and (56) *fear of me* (somebody else is afraid of me).

In Latin according to Menge (1955: 54) typically the possessive pronoun expresses the subjective genitive, e.g., *epistulae tuae* 'your letters, i.e., letters from you', *nostra origo* 'our origin, i.e., where we come from', etc. On the other hand the genitive of the personal pronoun *mei* 'of me', *tui* 'of you (sg.)', *sui* (3rd reflexive), *nostri* 'of us' *vestri* 'of you' is customarily used to express the objective genitive, e.g., *memoria nostri* 'memory of us', *misericordia tui* 'compassion for you', *invidia tui* 'jealousy of you', *ratio vestri* 'concern for you', although sometimes one encounters the possessive pronoun in an objective meaning, e.g., *meam quoque rationem habere debetis* 'you must also have concern for me'.

Next I should like to mention briefly several Lithuanian conundrums. The first is the translation of Luke 7.30. In the Greek we encounter οἱ δὲ Φαρισαῖοι καὶ νομικοὶ τὴν βουλὴν τοῦ θεοῦ ἠθέτησαν εἰς ἑαυτοὺς μὴ βαπτισθέντες ὑπ' αὐτοῦ (Nestle e.a., eds., 1981) = Lat. *Pharisaei autem, et legis periti consilium Dei spreverunt in semetipsos, non baptizati ab eo* (Nestle, ed., 1971), which in the King James English translation is: 'But the Pharisees and lawyers rejected the counsel of God against themselves, being not baptized of him'.

I note here Rhessa's (1824: 84) edition:

(40)	<i>Bet</i>	<i>Parizeuszai</i>	<i>ir</i>	<i>raszte:</i>	<i>mokiti</i>
	CONJ.	NOM. PL.	CONJ.	LOC. SG.	NOM. PL.
	But	the Pharisees	and	in writing	learned
	<i>paniekinno</i>	<i>Diewo</i>	<i>roda</i>	<i>priesz</i>	<i>sawe</i>
	3 PRET.	GEN. SG.	ACC. SG.	PREP.	ACC.
	rejected	God's	advice	for	themselves
	<i>ir</i>	<i>nedawesi</i>	<i>jo</i>	<i>kriksztiti</i>	
	CONJ.	3 PRET.	GEN. SG.	?	
	and	did not allow	by him	to baptize? [to be] baptized?	

The syntactic analysis of the above sentence is not easy. Prof. V. Ambrazas writes (personal letter dated 2002/01/15) that this expression is a hapax having no analogy in the living language or in other written sources, but that perhaps it is the result of a mixture of two constructions: *nesidavė krikštyti* 'did not submit to baptism' and *nebuvo jo krikštyti* 'were not baptized by him'.

Another curious Lithuanian example comes from Mark 1.9 in the 1823 Tilžė New Testament (LKŽ_{vi} 588):

(41)	<i>Krikštydinosi</i>	<i>nuo</i>	<i>Jono</i>	<i>Jordane</i>
	3RD PRET. REFLEXIVE	PREP.	GEN.	LOC.

The King James English translation is: 'was baptized of John in Jordan'³. The Greek original (Nestle e.a., eds., 1981) has the passive ἐβαπτίσθη εἰς τὸν Ἰορδάνην ὑπὸ

³ Probably the construction in (69) above would seem incorrect to a speaker of contemporary Lithuanian, but if it is incorrect should the prestigious Lithuanian Academy Dictionary have left the phrase without some comment about its syntactic inappropriateness? I might add that the King James translation of the same phrase seems incorrect to me as a speaker of contemporary American English. I would say rather 'baptized by him in the Jordan'. I note, however, that the *Webster's Third New International Dictionary* (p. 1565) gives the archaic use of *of* as a function word to indicate the agent or doer of an act or action. What seems wrong to one generation may have been appropriate for another generation. Native intuitions of grammaticality are notoriously difficult to establish and languages can lose syntactic constructions characteristic of a prior period. Compare the following sentence ascribed to Jonas Jablonskis (LKŽ_{viii} 108) *Tik jo apsimetimas negyvo (tik jo negyvo apsimetimas) lokį iš čion nuvarė* 'only his pretending to be dead (his not being alive pretending) chased the bear away from here'. Prof. Algirdas Sabaliauskas (letter dated 2001 05 17) wrote that the above sentence sounded odd to him and that he would use an instrumental here (*Jo apsimetimas negyvo... man keistai skamba. Aš čia pavartočiau įnagininką*). Sabaliauskas suggests that the use of the instrumental may be conditioned by the influence of Russian. In this case apparently the influence of a foreign language would have rendered an etymologically correct native usage incorrect.

Ἰωάννου and Latin (Nestle, ed., 1971) has *baptizatus est a Ioanne in Iordane*. Probably the best translation of *Krikštydinosi* would be, however, something like 'had himself baptized' but one notices the agent genitive used (with the reinforcing preposition *nuo*) with a finite verb. The use of Lith. *nuo* (see Ulvydas, ed. 1971: 601; Fraenkel 1929: 113–114) and Latv. *no* plus the genitive to denote agent with the past passive participle is customarily ascribed to Polish and German influence respectively, but the fact that both languages chose cognate prepositions for the agentive construction seems remarkable. My own view is that German and Polish may have been catalytic forces perhaps easing the way, but in fact the appearance of a preposition to support an earlier simple case ending is quite normal and the construction would not have arisen if it were contrary to the general tendencies of development of these languages. In general, however, it seems to me that if one encounters a linguistic feature which is not in harmony with some preconceived notion, one can usually blame it on the influence of some neighboring language.

One notes with a corresponding instrumental (LKŽ_{VI} 588; Luke 7.29 in the Berlin Bible 1931):

(42)	<i>Ir</i>	<i>krikštydinosi</i>	<i>Jono</i>	<i>krikštu</i>
	CONJ.	3RD PRET. REFLEXIVE	GEN.	INSTR.
	And	was baptized	of John	with the baptism

The King James English translation is: 'being baptized with the baptism of John'. The Greek original (Nestle e.a., eds., 1981) has βαπτισθέντες τὸ βάπτισμα Ἰωάννου and Latin (Nestle, ed., 1971) has *baptizati baptismo Ioannis*.

In conclusion I would say that there is ample evidence in the Indo-European languages for a genitive of agent which does not have its origin in the possessive. Perhaps there is even evidence in Lithuanian if the examples given above are considered. This is again not proof that the genitive of agent with participles is inherited from Indo-European and indeed such a genitive may have its origin in a possessive construction, and be a later completely independent phenomenon. Still I see no way of absolutely proving either view.

ABBREVIATIONS

DŽ = *Dabartinės lietuvių kalbos žodynas*, ed. St. Keinys et al., Vilnius: Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidykla, 1993.

LKŽ = *Lietuvių kalbos žodynas* 1–19, Vilnius: Mintis; Mokslas; Mokslo ir enciklopedijų leidykla.

REFERENCES

- AMBRAZAS, V. 2001a: Lietuvių kalbos adverbalinis genityvas. *Acta Linguistica Lithuanica* 44, 3–39.
 AMBRAZAS, V. 2001b: Lietuvių kalbos pasyvo raidos bruožai. *Acta Linguistica Lithuanica* 45, 11–38.
 ANDERSEN, P. K. 1991: *A new look at the passive*. Frankfurt am Main etc.: Peter Lang. (Duisburg Papers on Research in Language and Culture, 11.)
 BENNETT, C. E. 1945: *New Latin grammar*, Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
 CARDONA, G. 1970: The Indo-Iranian Construction *mana* (*mama*) *kṛtam*. *Language* 46, 1–12.
 ENDZELIN, J. 1923: *Lettische Grammatik*, Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
 ERHART, A. 1980: *Struktura indoiranských jazyků*. Brno: Univerzita J. E. Purkyně.

- FAIRBANKS, G., STEVICK, E. W. 1975: *Spoken East Armenian*. Ithaca, New York: Spoken Language Services, Inc.
- FRAENKEL, E. 1929: *Syntax der litauischen Postpositionen und Präpositionen*, Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- GAIGALAITIS, V. 1998: *Atsiminimai*, Klaipėda: Klaipėdos universiteto leidykla.
- GOODWIN, W.W., GULICK, C.B. 1958: *Greek grammar*, Waltham, Mass., Toronto, London: Blaisdell and Co.
- GOVE, PH. B. et al., eds. 1966: *Webster's Third New International Dictionary*, Springfield, Massachusetts: G. & C. Merriam Company.
- HAUDRY, J. 1977: *L'emploi des cas en védique*, Lyon: Editions L'Hermès.
- HERMANN, E. 1926: *Die subjektlosen Sätze bei Homer und der Ausdruck der Tätigkeit, des Vorgangs und des Zustands. Nachrichten von der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen*, Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung.
- HOLVOET, A. 2001: Once more the Baltic genitive of agent. *Baltistica* 35 (1), 45–58.
- JAKOBSON, R. 1966: La geste du Prince Igor'. Id., *Selected Writings*, Vol. 4, The Hague, Paris: Mouton, 106–300.
- JAMISON, S. W. 1979: The case of the agent in Indo-European. *Die Sprache* 25: 129–143.
- KENT, R. G. 1953: *Old Persian: Grammar, texts, lexicon*. 2nd ed., New Haven. (American Oriental Series, 33.)
- KRAUSE, W., THOMAS, W. 1960: *Tocharisches Elementarbuch*. Vol. 1, Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- KRYS'KO, V. B. 1997: *Istoričeskij sintaksis russkogo jazyka: Ob'ekt i perexodnost'*, Moscow: Indrik.
- LANE, G. 1947: *The Tocharian Punyavantajātaka: Text and translation*. New Haven. (= Publications of the American Oriental Society. Offprint series, 21.)
- MACDONELL, A. A. 1916: *A Vedic grammar for students*. Bombay–Calcutta–Madras: Oxford University Press.
- MENGE, H. 1955: *Repetitorium der lateinischen Syntax und Stilistik*, Leverkusen: Gottschalksche Verlagsbuchhandlung.
- NESTLE, E., ed. 1971: *Novum Testamentum Latine*, Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.
- NESTLE, E. et al., eds. 1981: *Novum Testamentum Graece*, Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.
- PAULAUŠKIENĖ, A. 1979: *Gramatinės lietuvių kalbos veiksmazodžio kategorijos*, Vilnius: Moksas.
- PROUST, M. 1984: *La prisonnière*. Edition du texte, chronologie, introduction, bibliographie par Jean Milly, Paris: Flammarion.
- PROUST, M. 1998: *Kalinė*. Lithuanian translation by P. Bieliauskas, Vilnius: Alma littera.
- RHESA, M. L. 1824: *Biblia, Tai eſti: Wiffas Szwentas Ráſztas Sėno ir Naujo Teſtamento, Lietuwifzkay pėrfiatytas, iſz naujo Pėrweizdetas Ir ketwirta Karta iſzspáustas*, Tilžėje: Rásztais iszspáustas per Endriki Post.
- SCHWYZER, E. 1966: *Griechische Grammatik*. Vol. 2. *Syntax und syntaktische Stilistik*. Vervollständigt und herausgegeben von Albert Debrunner, Munich: C. H. Beck.
- STREITBERG, W. 1919: *Die gotische Bibel*, Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- TUMANJAN, Ė. G. 1962: *Očerki istoričeskogo razvitija padežnyx form novoarmjanskogo literaturnogo jazyka*, Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Akademii nauk SSSR.
- ULVYDAS, K., ed. 1971: *Lietuvių kalbos gramatika 2. Morfologija*, Vilnius: Mintis.
- VAILLANT, A. 1964: *Manuel du vieux slave*. Tome I. *Grammaire*. Seconde édition revue et augmentée, Paris: Institut d'Etudes Slaves.
- VISSER, TH. F. 1963: *An historical syntax of the English language*, Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- WACKERNAGEL, J., DEBRUNNER, A. 1954: *Altindische Grammatik*. Vol. II, 2. *Die Nominalsuffixe*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht.
- ŽULYS, V. 1969: Vadinamųjų nekaitomųjų įvardžių vieta lietuvių kalbos gramatinėje sistemoje. *Baltistica* 5 (2), 167–177.

William R. Schmalstieg

The Pennsylvania State University, School of Languages
302 A Burrowes Bldg., University Park, PA 16802, USA
wxs1@psu.edu

Gauta 2002 05 24