

THE SLAVIC GENITIVE SINGULAR AS THE SUBJECT OF
PARTICIPLES IN -NO- AND -TO-

Hirt, 1934, 119, notes the use of the genitive case in Indo-European as the subject of a passive participle and gives the examples Greek $\Delta\omega\delta\epsilon\delta\omicron\tau\omicron\varsigma$ 'von Gott gegeben', poetic $\epsilon\pi\alpha\gamma\epsilon\iota\iota\ \text{A}\lambda\gamma\iota\epsilon\iota\omicron\upsilon$ 'erschlagen von Ai', Sanskrit $\text{p}\acute{\text{a}}\text{t}\text{j}\text{u}\text{h}\ \text{k}\acute{\text{r}}\acute{\text{i}}\acute{\text{t}}\acute{\text{a}}$ 'vom Gatten gekauft', $\text{t}\acute{\text{a}}\ \text{a}\text{s}\text{j}\text{a}\ \text{p}\text{r}\acute{\text{a}}\text{j}\acute{\text{a}}\text{h}\ \text{s}\text{r}\acute{\text{s}}\text{t}\acute{\text{a}}\text{h}$ 'die von ihm geschaffenen Wesen'. The use of the genitive case as the subject of the Lithuanian -t- participles is well known. Cf., e.g., $\text{T}\acute{\text{a}}\ \text{k}\text{n}\text{y}\text{g}\acute{\text{a}}\ \text{b}\acute{\text{u}}\text{v}\acute{\text{o}}\ \text{b}\acute{\text{r}}\acute{\text{o}}\text{l}\acute{\text{i}}\text{o}\ \text{p}\acute{\text{e}}\text{r}\text{s}\text{k}\text{a}\text{i}\text{t}\text{y}\text{t}\text{a}$ 'the book was read (through) by the brother'.

In Slavic in addition to the use of the instrumental as the logical subject of an object with the passive participle we also find the preposition otz plus the genitive case. Vondrák, 1908, 382, gives the OCS example from Suprasliensis, 344, 7: $\text{s}\text{i}\text{m}\text{s}\ \text{otz}\ \text{J}\text{o}\text{s}\text{i}\text{f}\text{a}\ \text{r}\acute{\text{e}}\text{c}\acute{\text{e}}\text{n}\text{o}\text{m}\text{s}$ 'his ab Josepho dictis'. Lomtev, 1956, 383, quotes the Old Russian example $\text{u}\text{b}\text{i}\text{t}\text{s}\ \text{otz}\ \text{J}\text{a}\text{r}\text{o}\text{p}\text{o}\text{l}\text{k}\text{a}$ 'killed by Jaropolk'. Note also (Šaxmatov, 1916, 37): $\text{A}\check{\text{s}}\text{c}\check{\text{e}}\ \text{k}\text{l}\text{j}\text{u}\check{\text{c}}\text{i}\text{t}\text{s}\ \text{k}\text{o}\text{m}\text{u}\ \text{otz}\ \text{t}\text{o}\text{j}\text{a}\ \text{l}\text{o}\text{d}\text{i}\text{j}\text{a}\ \text{v}\check{\text{t}}\ \text{n}\text{e}\text{i}\ \text{u}\text{b}\text{i}\text{e}\text{n}\text{u}\ \text{b}\text{y}\text{t}\text{i},\ \text{i}\text{l}\text{i}\ \text{b}\text{i}\text{e}\text{n}\text{u}\ \text{b}\text{y}\text{t}\text{i}\ \text{otz}\ \text{n}\text{a}\text{s}\check{\text{z}}$ 'if it happens that someone from that boat should be killed or beaten by us', (Šaxmatov, 1916, 42): $\text{Otz}\ \text{R}\text{i}\text{m}\text{a}\ \text{b}\text{o}\ \text{p}\text{r}\text{i}\text{-}\check{\text{s}}\text{b}\text{d}\check{\text{s}}\ \text{v}\check{\text{z}}\ \text{V}\text{i}\text{z}\text{a}\text{n}\text{t}\text{i}\text{j}\text{u}\ \text{u}\text{m}\text{o}\text{l}\text{e}\text{n}\check{\text{z}}\ \text{b}\text{y}\text{s}\check{\text{t}}\ \text{otz}\ \text{ž}\text{i}\text{v}\text{u}\check{\text{s}}\check{\text{c}}\text{i}\check{\text{x}}\ \text{t}\text{u}\ \text{s}\check{\text{z}}\text{t}\text{v}\text{o}\text{r}\text{i}\text{t}\text{i}\ \text{s}\text{i}\text{j}\text{a}$ 'having come from Rome to Byzance he was asked to do these things by (the people) living there'.

I propose that originally in such Slavic constructions the genitive case itself was sufficient to denote the logical subject of an action with the passive participle. The preposition otz was added only later to reinforce the etymological meaning as the source of the action. One notes the spread of prepositions to reinforce the case meanings elsewhere in the Slavic languages. Originally, for example, the locative case itself was sufficient to denote the locative meaning, cf., e.g., Old Russian $\text{b}\text{y}\check{\text{s}}\ \text{p}\text{o}\check{\text{z}}\text{a}\check{\text{r}}\ \text{v}\text{e}\text{l}\text{i}\text{k}\check{\text{z}}\ \text{K}\text{y}\text{e}\text{v}\check{\text{e}}\ \text{g}\text{o}\text{r}\text{o}\check{\text{d}}\check{\text{e}}$ 'there was a great fire in the city of Kiev'. See Toporov, 1961, 12. Today, of course, in contemporary standard Russian one finds that the locative case is always governed by a preposition. In Old Russian the instrumental case could be used with sociative meaning without the preposition sz, cf. Old Russian (Novgorod 1st Chronicle 6717): $\text{a}\ \text{s}\text{o}\text{b}\text{o}\text{j}\text{u}\ \text{p}\text{o}\text{j}\text{a}\ \text{s}\text{y}\text{n}\text{a}\ \text{s}\text{v}\text{o}\text{e}\text{g}\text{o}\ \text{K}\text{o}\text{s}\text{t}\text{j}\text{a}\text{n}\text{i}\text{n}\text{a}\ \text{i}\ \text{p}\text{o}\text{s}\text{a}\text{d}\text{n}\text{i}\text{k}\text{a}\ \text{D}\check{\text{z}}\text{m}\text{i}\text{t}\text{r}\text{a}$ 'and he took his son Constantine and his posadnik Dmitri with him'; $\text{i}\text{d}\text{j}\text{a}\ \text{n}\text{a}\ \text{C}\text{a}\text{r}\text{b}\text{r}\text{a}\text{d}\ \text{m}\text{a}\text{l}\text{o}\text{j}\text{u}\ \text{d}\text{r}\text{u}\check{\text{z}}\text{i}\text{n}\text{o}\text{j}\text{u}$ 'attacking Constantinople with a small družina'. The examples are from Mrázek, 1964, 20, 21. Lomtev, 1956, 403-404, gives many more examples.

One may suppose that a construction such as $\text{u}\text{b}\text{i}\text{t}\text{s}\ \text{otz}\ \text{J}\text{a}\text{r}\text{o}\text{p}\text{o}\text{l}\text{k}\text{a}$ which would be equivalent to Lith. $\text{J}\text{a}\text{r}\text{o}\text{p}\text{o}\text{l}\text{k}\text{o}\ \text{u}\check{\text{z}}\text{m}\check{\text{u}}\text{s}\text{t}\text{a}\text{s}$ 'killed by Jaropolk' may have originally been $\text{*u}\text{b}\text{i}\text{t}\text{s}\ \text{J}\text{a}\text{r}\text{o}\text{p}\text{o}\text{l}\text{k}\text{a}$ in prehistoric times. The preposition otz came to be required also at a prehistoric date so that none of the Slavic languages retains this old original function of the genitive which was taken over by the instrumental case. The instrumental was originally probably considered the agent

or means rather than the source of the action. One may note, however, that the genitive case itself could function as the means or instrument into historic times, cf., e.g., the example napoen vina 'given to drink with (of) wine'. See Stokes, 1963, 89.

In addition to the preposition otz we also find the preposition u in certain Russian constructions where I presuppose originally only the genitive case. This would explain such dialect examples as the following (Borkovskij and Kuznecov, 1963, 399): u nego uexano (=on uexal 'he left'), u volkov iděno (=volki tut xodili 'wolves have walked here'); u nix ešče ne ljaženo (=oni ešče ne legli 'they still haven't lain down yet'); u nego vypito (=on vypil 'he has drunk'); u stada tut paseno (=stado tut paslos 'the herd has pastured here'); u kuric rasklevano (=kuricy rasklevali 'the hens have pecked'); u nas moločeno (=my lotili 'we have threshed').

Omitting the preposition u the syntactic agreement would be exactly the same as in certain modern Lithuanian constructions:

<u>Russian</u>	<u>Lithuanian</u>
*ego uexano	jo nuvažiuota
*volkov iděno	vilką eita
*ix ešče ne ljaženo	jų dar negulta, neatsigulta
*ego vypito	jo išgerta
*stada paseno	bandos ganyta
*kuric rasklevano	vištų sulesta
*nas moločeno	mūsų kulta

Note that in the reconstructed Russian examples and the Lithuanian examples the neuter singular form of the participial ending is used. Note also that these participles are formed from intransitive as well as transitive verbs in both languages.

I conclude then that Slavic as well as Greek, Sanskrit and Lithuanian may originally have used the genitive case as the subject of participles in *-t- and *-n-.

REFERENCES

- Borkovskij, V. I. and P. S. Kuznecov (1963): *Istoričeskaja grammatika russkogo jazyka*. Moscow AN SSSR.
- Hirt, Hermann (1934): *Indogermanische Grammatik. Syntax I. Part 6*. Heidelberg, Carl Winter.
- Lomtev, T. P. (1956): *Očerki po istoričeskomu sintaksisu russkogo jazyka*, Moscow. Izdatel'stvo moskovskogo universiteta.
- Mrázek, Roman (1964): *Sintaksis russkogo tvoritel'nego*. Prague. Opera universitatis Purkynianae brunensis. Facultas Philosophica 94.

- Stokes, A. D. (1963): Xrestomatija po drevnej ruskoj literature. Letchworth, Hertfordshire. Bradda Books. Copy produced from Gudzij, N. K. 1962. Xrestomatija po drevnej ruskoj literature XI-XVII vekov. 7th ed. Moscow.
- Toporov, V. N. (1961): Lokativ v slavjanskix jazykax. Moscow. Izdatel'stvo AN SSSR.
- Šaxmatov, A. A. (1916): Pověšť vremennyx let. Vol. 1. Introduction, Text and Notes. Petrograd (=Leningrad). Izdanie Imperatorskoj Arxeografičeskoj Komissii.
- Vondrák, Wenzel (1908): Vergleichende Slavische Grammatik. Vol. 2. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht.

Povzetek

SLOVANSKI RODILNIK EDNINE KOT OSEBEK DELEŽNIKOV NA -NO- IN -TO-

Avtor obravnava slovanske konstrukcije s predlogom otz tipa ubits otz Jaropolka/simz otz Josifa rečenomz (predložni rodilnik je osebek trpnega deležnika na -n/-t). Zaradi litovskih konstrukcij, v katerih je brezpredložni rodilnik osebek deležnika na -t-, domneva prvotno brezpredložno konstrukcijo +ubits Jaropolka tudi za slovanščino. Enako tvorbo poznata še grščina in sanskrt.

Iz ruske konstrukcije s predlogom u, npr. u volkov iděno, tudi rekonstruira prvotno +volkov iděno in jo vzporeja z litovskim vilku eita. V praslovanščini se je tvorila z deležnikom na -n/-t, v litovščini z deležnikom na -t-, v obeh pa ima deležnik obliko srednjega spola.