

The Latin *nomina agentis* in *-tor*

LUCIE PULTROVÁ (*Prague*)

1.1 The principal, though not the only, way of formation of the *nomina agentis* in Latin is the derivation by the suffix *-tor*, *-tōris*. This marked, with respect to the function clearly defined suffix is, beside Latin, productive also in Greek and Indo-Iranian languages; it is recorded in Hittite;¹ still, it is not easy to reconstruct. It comes in two ablaut variants: **-tér-* and **-tor-*, and with the following specifics in individual languages:

- in Greek, the nouns formed by the suffixes **-tér-* and **-tor-* have also a different ablaut grade in the root: δοτήρ, -τήρος – δώτωρ, -ορος; beside that there are also secondary hybrid forms: δωτήρ, -τήρος;²
- in Vedic, we find the *nomina agentis* with the difference in accent (on the root × on the suffix); the vocalism of the root, originally perhaps different in both types, had, however, become the same: *dátar-* – *dātár-*; but beside that the nouns formed this way show the difference in government: the nouns in *-tár-* (< **-tér-*) govern the accusative, the nouns in *-tar-* (< **-tor-*) the genitive;
- in Avesta, on the contrary, a difference in the grade of the root remains, and so does a difference in government (similarly as in Vedic);
- in Latin, only the type *-tor*, *-tōris* is recorded;
- in Hittite, only two or three words of this type are recorded; their suffix corresponds to the original **-tor-*.³

¹ Besides, in Slavic languages there is to be found the variant *-tel'ь* (Czech *-tel*). Cf. e.g. KARL BRUGMANN, *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik*, II,1 (*Lehre von den Wortformen und ihrem Gebrauch*), Strassburg 1906, p. 336ff. (hereafter BRUGMANN 1906).

² See e.g. ÉMILE BENVENISTE, *Noms d'agent et noms d'action*, Paris 1948, p. 29 (hereafter BENVENISTE 1948).

³ See e.g. EVA TICHY, *Zur Rekonstruktion der Nomina agentis auf *-tér- und *-tor-*, in: *Rekonstruktion und relative Chronologie. Akten der VIII. Fachtagung der Indogermanisten*, Prague 1977, p. 101.

There have long been two opinions regarding the reconstruction of the PIE *nomina agentis* of this type; one group of researchers presume the existence of two different accent-ablaut paradigms already in PIE, the other suggest the existence of one original paradigm giving eventually rise to the both types present in individual languages.⁴ Tichy in her special study on this topic (1992, p. 412) regards both the variants as possible; as regards the two different paradigms, the following types are reconstructed:⁵

- 1) hysterodynamic, i.e. with the stress on the suffix in the strong cases, on the ending in the weak cases; the root is then always in the zero grade: acc. *R(z)-tér-m, gen. *R(z)-tr-és;⁶
- 2) akrostatic, i.e. with the stressed root in the full grade and the unstressed suffix in the *o*-grade: acc. *R(é)-tor-m, gen. *R(é)-tor-(e/o)s.

It must be said, however, that the hysterodynamic paradigm was reconstructed exclusively on the basis of the form recorded in the Indo-Iranian languages. The Hittite nouns of this type are not recorded, and the Greek and Latin *nomina agentis* even contradict this theory. (Supposedly) unequivocal hysterodynamic paradigm is to be found in the kinship nouns such as *ph₂-tér (> *pitár*, πατήρ, *pater*...; in the weak cases the suffix is always in the zero grade -tr-: Gr. πατρός, Lat. *patris*). The Greek and Latin *nomina agentis*, however, have a different paradigm: in the weak cases -τήρ-,⁷ or -tōr-. In Vedic, moreover, the situation is slightly problematic: firstly, the relevant nouns are recorded in the texts mostly only in the nominative and the accusative (which always have a stressed suffix), the weak cases are, on the contrary, recorded very scarcely and practically no noun is recorded in all

nischen Gesellschaft, Leiden 31. August – 4. September 1987, (hrsg.) ROBERT S. P. BEEKES – ALEXANDER LUBOTSKY – JOSEPH J. S. WEITENBERG, Innsbruck 1992, pp. 411-420, here p. 411 (hereafter TICHY 1992); MARGARET M. T. WATMOUGH, *The suffix -tor-: agent-noun formation in Latin and the other Italic languages*, in: Glotta 73, 1995/96, pp. 80-115, here p. 81 (hereafter WATMOUGH 1995/96); ELISABETH RIEKEN, *Untersuchungen zur nominalen Stammbildung des Hethitischen*, Wiesbaden 1999, p. 263f. (hereafter RIEKEN 1999); BENVENISTE 1948, p. 10; and others.

⁴ The references to the studies by individual supporters of the respective theories are listed by TICHY 1992, p. 412, notes 4 and 5.

⁵ E.g. RIEKEN 1999, p. 265; TICHY 1992, p. 412; EVA TICHY, *Die Nomina agentis auf -tar- im Vedischen*, Heidelberg 1995, p. 47 (hereafter TICHY 1995).

⁶ R(z) = the root in the zero grade, R(é) = the root in the full grade.

⁷ Even with the secondary lengthening in the weak cases, cf. e.g. JERZY KURYŁOWICZ, *L'apophonie en indo-européen*, Wrocław 1956, p. 63f.

cases in the texts;⁸ what is more, the weak cases of the type *dātár-* cannot be formally distinguished from the same cases of the type *dátar-*. What, however, provides unequivocal evidence of a stressed ending in the weak cases (and thus of the hysterodynamic paradigm) is the Avesta gen. *-trō* < **-tr-és* (in contrast with the gen. *-tarš* < **-tr-s* of the akrostatic paradigm).⁹

Should we really want to reconstruct the PIE paradigm (merely) on the basis of the Indo-Iranian form as hysterodynamic, we must add that at least in Greek (as for Latin see the 2.1.3 below) the paradigm of the nouns in **-tér* had settled as mesostatic:¹⁰ nom. **R(z)-tér*, acc. **R(z)-tér-m*, gen. **R(z)-tér-(e/o)s*.

Whether the both paradigms have originally issued from a single common paradigm I do not dare to claim;¹¹ but the conceivable division is definitely Proto-Indo-European, and this is why – since we shall research Latin forms – we need not tackle this issue.

1.2 Benveniste¹² saw a semantic difference between *nomina agentis* in **-tér-* and **-tor-*: the noun formed by the suffix **-tor-* denotes according to Benveniste the author of the action (“l’auteur”), characterized through the action he has (objectively) performed; on the other hand, the noun with the suffix **-tér-* denotes “l’agent”, the agent, who has the intention, talent or need to participate in an activity. The relation between these two variants of the suffix is according to Benveniste parallel to the relation between the suffixes **-ti-* and **-tu-*, which derive the *nomina actionis*: the nouns in *-ti-* should denote an objective action, realized by the subject, the nouns in *-tu-* then the action to which the subject is determined.

The examples given by Benveniste in favour of this distinction are in themselves not very persuasive in the opinion of many later researches (e.g. Seiler¹³ says that the differences in meaning suggested by Benveniste are so

⁸ See TICHY 1995, p. 49ff.

⁹ See e.g. RIEKEN 1999, p. 264.

¹⁰ The existence of the mesostatic paradigm for PIE is not generally accepted; cf. e.g. ROBERT S. P. BEEKES, *The Origins of the Indo-European Nominal Inflection*, Innsbruck 1985, p. 174.

¹¹ TICHY (1992, p. 412) suggests the amphidynamic paradigm, i.e. with the stressed root and the unstressed suffix in the *o*-grade in the strong cases and with the stress on the ending in the weak ones: acc. **R(é)-tor-m*, gen. **R(z)-tr-és*.

¹² BENVENISTE 1948, p. 62 and 111-112 (conclusion).

¹³ HANSJAKOB SEILER, *Zum Zusammenhang von Nomina actionis, Nomina agentis und Eigennamen*, in: *o-o-pe-ro-si. Festschrift für Ernst Risch zum 75. Geburtstag*, (hrsg.)

subtle that it would be surprising for such system to function and to sustain for such a long time).

The difference between the two suffixes was recognized by Tichy (1992, p. 414ff.),¹⁴ but, in my opinion, quite differently from Benveniste.¹⁵ Her research was done predominantly on the basis of Vedic material. The Vedic suffix *-tar-* (< **-tor-*) has according to Tichy “generelle Funktion” and she calls the nouns formed thereby “habituellem Agens” (i.e. the author is named after his habitual activity) or “generalisierter Agens” (rare; the noun brings a generally valid statement about a subject). In contrast with that the Vedic suffix *-tár-* (< **-tér-*) allegedly has “relativierende Funktion” and the nouns formed thereby are described by Tichy as “aktueller Agens” (the author is denoted by a concrete, real action he has performed, is in the middle of performing or shall perform) or “potentieller Agens” (the hypothetical author, in the collocations such as “there is no one, who would not...”) or “okkasioneller Agens” (the author is described by an action he repeatedly performs).

2.1 Latin, as has been mentioned earlier, forms *nomina agentis* only in *-tor*. Nevertheless, these *nomina agentis* in *-tor* are formally problematic, since they actually correspond to neither of the two reconstructed paradigms (the vocalism of the root, long *-ō-* in the weak cases).

The synchronic description would be quite easy here: they are formed as if from the supine stem (or from the PPP stem, it depends on which term we prefer) by the suffix *-ōr-* + the endings of the 3rd declination. The diachronic description, however, is not that simple; moreover, this suffix is extremely productive in Latin,¹⁶ and that naturally makes the formal diachronic analysis of the so-formed words more difficult – analogy plays very important part in such cases.

From a functional point of view it may seem at first sight quite illogical to derive active *nomina agentis* from the passive anterior participles; the truth is, however, that the morphonologic structure of these formations is appar-

ANNEMARIE ETTER, Berlin – New York 1986, pp. 60-71, here p. 60f.; cf. also MICHÈLE FRUYT, *Noms de procès en latin. Évaluation des positions benvenistiennes dans „Noms d’agent et noms d’action en indo-européen“*, in: *Aspects of Latin. Paper from the Seventh International Colloquium on Latin Linguistics, Jerusalem, April 1993*, (ed.) HANNAH ROSÉN, Innsbruck 1996.

¹⁴ For more detail see TICHY 1995.

¹⁵ Although WATMOUGH 1995/96, p. 81, says that “Benveniste’s conclusions have been corroborated, but refined by Tichy”.

¹⁶ The boundless possibilities of usage of this suffix in Latin were commented on already by KAREL ČUPR, *Latinská nomina agentis a jejich české ekvivalenty*, in: *Listy filologické* 104, 1981, pp. 152-166.

ently in accord with no exceptions.¹⁷ How is the PPP formed in Latin? According to a common explanation, the Latin PPP issued directly from the original PIE adjectives with the reconstructed structure **R(z)-tós*. However, only a minor part of them could actually be reconstructed in this way; for the major part, the perfect passive participles are apparently formed only analogically (as the means of formation of passive perfect) to the relevant active perfect forms.¹⁸ *Nomina agentis* in *-tor*, as has been said earlier, have the identical root form to the relevant PPP, with no exception. Therefore, if we were to define – after having excluded apparently analogical formations such as e.g. *doctor* etc. – an “original” structure, then it should look rather than **R(é)-tor* probably as **R(z)-tor*. There is no need saying that such a structure is nonsensical, or apparently unoriginal (it does not contain the full grade). Another problematic point then is the lengthening of the *-ō-* vowel in the suffix in the weak cases.

2.1.1 Watmough (1995/96, p. 84) simply says that the structure of the Latin *nomina agentis* is an Italic innovation: “*R(é)-tor* = PIE rule × *R(PPP)-tor* = Italic rule”. He thinks that the Latin *nomina agentis* in *-tor* were “formed to the same stem as the perfect participle passive”. That means that according to Watmough Latin borrowed from the protolanguage the suffix **-tor-*, but not the concrete nouns derived by this suffix. It is however quite difficult to imagine in practice that Latin would not have had any *nomina agentis* in its prehistoric period. The more acceptable idea is that, in Latin, the nouns borrowed from the protolanguage later analogically assimilated to the forms of PPP. There are more records in Latin of the cases when the whole word-formative type formally assimilates to another one to be better incorporated in the system: e.g. participles in *-nt-* have the following structure in Latin (with the variation in the verbs of the 4th conjugation): “present verbal stem + *-nt-*” – but they were undoubtedly primary verbal derivatives (i.e. the suffix was bound on the root, either directly, or through a thematic vowel) in PIE; similarly the already mentioned Latin PPP were formed to a great extent analogically, this time to the forms of active perfect (see the note 18). In both the

¹⁷ The identical situation is in Vedic, see TICHY 1995, p. 33.

¹⁸ For the details on the topic see LUCIE PULTROVÁ, *The Formation of the Latin Perfect Passive Participles*, in: *Graecolatina Pragensia* 21, 2006 (2007), pp. 101-139. In brief, beside the perfect forms that Latin had inherited directly from the PIE (namely original root aorists, reduplicated perfects and *s*-aorists), there are the PPP that are the direct successors of the PIE **R(z)-tós*. On the other hand, beside the perfect forms that Latin had formed as neologisms (simple perfects, *u-/v*-perfects, some reduplicated perfects and some *s*-perfects) we can find the PPP constructed purely analogically.

cases the analogy is easy to explain – it is evidently led by the tendency to make the verbal system more transparent. Also *nomina agentis*, and above all so productive a type, could perhaps be regarded as an element of the verbal system; what remains rather unclear, however, is why they should like to assimilate just to the passive verbal forms. Here, we should not presume a “systemic” analogy, but rather one based purely on the phonetic similarity (i.e. to the even more productive type also with the dental suffix).

2.1.2 Even though the analogical assimilation is doubtless, otherwise – as has already been said – we cannot explain the examples such as *doctor* and the like (i.e. those with the root neither in the full nor in the zero grade), it is nevertheless, in my opinion, pertinent to ask the question about the original form: Do the Latin *nomina agentis* issue originally from the PIE *R(é)-*tor-*, or from the PIE *R(z)-*tér-*? The form of the root of Latin nouns will not – out of the earlier mentioned reasons – be of much help, it is too much veiled by analogy. For the analogy of this type (i.e. with the forms of PPP), however, to be able to function, there must first exist a group of forms that already show some similarity (in our case, the agreement in the form of the root + *-t-*); such a group may then induce the other forms to assimilate analogically. In other words, in the given case the process easiest to imagine is the following: both the formations had originally the root in the zero grade, i.e. *R(z)-*t-*. Later, the forms of the Latin PPP, partly in an effort to better fit in the perfect system, change (analogically assimilate to the active perfect forms, see above the note 18) and, consequently, also *nomina agentis* assimilate to the new forms of PPP.

The other option is, however, almost equally possible: the Latin *nomina agentis* could have had originally even the full grade R(é). Practically, there is a relatively large group of the PIE roots which yield the same form in Latin, regardless of the fact whether they had originally been in the full or the zero grade. This actually applies to all the roots with the exception of the following types: *CeH(C)*, *Ceu(C)*, *Cei(C)*, *Cer(C)* and *CeRH*.¹⁹ Beside that we must count with the fact that in the closed syllables (unless we have some direct inscriptional evidence) we often cannot state with certainty whether the vowel was long or short in Latin (e.g. *tractus*, or *trāctus*?), and whether it thus has issued from the full or the zero grade (this applies to the roots *Céh₂C* / *Ch₂C*, *CéuC* / *CuC* and *CeiC* / *CiC*). Therefore, even if the original form of the root of the Latin *nomina agentis* was R(é), there would still exist an important group of words with the root identical with PPP. The following de-

¹⁹ The symbol C in the beginning substitutes for 1-3 consonants; it is irrelevant for our purposes.

velopment would then be the same as the one described earlier: first, the PPP assimilate to the forms of active perfect (this analogy may make the PPP even closer to the possible *nomina agentis* with R(é)) and, consequently, *nomina agentis* would “complete” the assimilation.

Both the suggested developments are in principle possible and it cannot be decided which (and which original form of the root – R(z), or R(é)) is more probable.

2.1.3 Regarding the Latin form of the suffix, it testifies at first sight clearly to the variant *R(é)-*tor*; what remains problematic, however, is the lengthening of the vowel *-o-*. According to the up-to-now defined Latin sound laws, the form *R(é)-*tor*, gen. *R(é)-*tor*-(*e/o*)s should theoretically yield in Latin e.g. ***fēctor*, ***fēctoris* or ***pīstor*, ***pīstoris*; the hysterodynamic paradigm *R(z)-*tér*, gen. *R(z)-*tr-és* then ***facter*, ***facteris* or ***pīster*, ***pīstris*,²⁰ the conceivable mesostatic paradigm (i.e. *R(z)-*tér*, gen. *R(z)-*tér*-(*e/o*)s) then probably ***facter*, ***facteris* or ***pīster*, ***pīsteris*. None of these corresponds to the actual Latin state (*factor*, *factōris*; *pīstor*, *pīstōris*).

Watmough (1995/96, p. 81, note 4) suggests that the long *ō* in the weak cases is due to the analogical equalizing within the paradigm – assimilation to the form of the nominative (where, originally, prior to the Latin shortening in the final syllables, the suffix was long). However, analogy within the paradigm in Latin works rather vice versa: usually, the nominative assimilates to the weak cases (e.g. **mér-ti-s* > **mérs* > *mors* according to gen. **mṛ-téi-s* > *mortis*). Such explanation thus remains somewhat unconvincing; shortening and lengthening of vowels in Latin never takes place haphazardly. In the given case, such lengthening would, moreover, destroy the natural tendency to the columnal stress (the paradigm *fáctor*, ***fáctoris* would be much easier after all).

We can find more similar suffixes, that is those which have long *-ō-* in the weak cases in Latin: the abstracts of the type *honor/-ōs*, *honōris*, the comparatives in *-ior/-ius*, *-iōris* and various types of suffixes with the ending *-ō*, *-ōnis*. But then, according to the up-to-now formulated sound laws, Latin long *ō* may theoretically issue only from the combination of a vowel and a laryngeal, which is, understandably, out of question here.

Without trying to make conclusions valid for Indo-European languages in general, the following situation is worth noticing: in Latin we have e.g. the suffix *-mō*, *-minis*, and beside that also *-mō*, *-mōnis*; similarly, the suffix *-us*

²⁰ The conceivable vocalization *r > or* is not very likely, not even in the roots ending in a consonant – the phonetic groups such as *ctr*, *ptr* etc. are common in Latin.

(< -os), -eris/-oris and beside that -ōs, -ōris. The mere existence of these oppositions suggests that the relevant types of words must have been stressed differently (there is no difference in the phonetic structure of the suffixes). Thus, in the suffixes with the long -ō- the stress on the suffix in the weak cases may be assumed. Incidentally, according to Rix²¹ the comparatives in -ior, -iōris (< PIE suffix *-iēs-) have the very proterodynamic paradigm (i.e. the stress in the strong cases on the root, in the weak ones on the suffix).

In my reflections I build on the fact that Latin actually never had the up-to-now generally accepted archaic accent on the first syllable.²² The classical Latin ante/penultimate accent is not that distant from the PIE movable accent, as it may seem at the first sight – on the contrary, the transition from the PIE accent to the Latin one is relatively effortless and fluent (I am planning a special study on this issue). When teaching Latin language, we commonly state: if the penultimate is long, the stress falls thereon (“it stops thereon”). From a diachronic point of view, however, it is naturally more correct to invert the definition: the stress had originally been where there is the long vowel in Latin (in the relevant cases, i.e. unless it is the vowel with e.g. the supplementary lengthening or the vowel yielded by the monophthongization of *o*-diphthong etc.).

That in the given cases the suffix undergoes lengthening owing to the stress I consider highly probable. If our hypothesis is correct, the situation is, however, more complicated in respect to the change of the timbre *e* to *o*; the stressed suffixal **é* (perhaps only before sonants or even more restrictedly before *r*, *n*) would then in Latin lengthen into *ō*. The problem is we have no material for comparison, and therefore we cannot validate the theory. If we look at the situation from the synchronic point of view, it is true that we have no suffix with the group -*ēr*- in Latin, the suffixes with the group -*ēn*- only with -*ēn*- in the place of the original -*esn*- or -*īn*- (-*iēnus* yielded by dissimilation from *-*iīnus*). Should we want to look at the situation diachronically, we would have to start from such PIE word types which are, with at least relative accord, regarded to have been proterodynamic or mesostatic (i.e. with the stressed suffix in the weak cases). That applies more or less only to *ei*- and *eu*-stems, which cannot help us in dealing with our question – both

²¹ HELMUT RIX, *Historische Grammatik des Griechischen*, Darmstadt 1976, p. 167.

²² I presented my view exhaustively in the monograph LUCIE PULTROVÁ, *The Vocalism of Latin Medial Syllables*, Prague 2006. I consider the theory to be unconvincing, as it is based solely on the vocalic alternations of the type *faciō* – *cōnficiō*, which have been, in my opinion, wrongly interpreted – according to the new theory, the Latin “reduced” vowels do not result from the position of the archaic Latin accent, but stand in the place of the original zero-grades.

the diphthongs undergo rigorous monophthongization (the truth is, however, that Latin diphthong *eu* merged with *ou* already in the oldest times). The possible development of the suffixial *-é-* in Lat. *-ō-* thus remains purely hypothetical and the idea stems in fact only from the existence of the couples *-mō*, *-mōnis* × *-mō*, *-mōnis* or *-us* (< *-os*), *-eris/-oris* × *-ōs*, *-ōris*. On the other hand, there is no proof to the contrary, either – the suffixes with the groups *-ēr-* or *-ēn-* practically do not exist in Latin, and neither do the types which have *-en-* / *-er-* in the place of the original stressed **-én-* / **-ér-* in the suffix.

Summing up the previous reflections, we may assume that the long *-ō-* in the earlier listed suffixes and also in the presently researched suffix *-tor*, *-tōris*, issues from the original stressed **-é-*, and that the Latin nouns of the type *factor* are in fact formally much closer to the ablaut type **R(z)-tér*. Suppose that was the case, then the analogical assimilation of the presumed other type with the short *-tor-* would be more than easy and quite predictable. All in all, the fact that in Latin, in contrast with e.g. Greek, we have just one type of the *nomina agentis* with the suffix **-te/or-*, need not mean that one ablaut type had not developed into Latin; more probably, the phonetic development of both the types yielded the same final form.

2.2 Some more comments regarding the semantic characteristic of Latin names in *-tor*: According to Benveniste (1948, p. 57), the nouns in *-tor* in Latin fulfill both functions which Greek and Indo-Iranian languages express by two distinct suffixes **-tor-* and **-tér-*. By “both” functions I mean on the one hand the author of the action characterized through the action he has (objectively) performed (that is in fact adjective, or even participle usage), on the other hand agent who has the intention, talent or need to participate in an activity. Also the accusative (in the participial **R(é)-tor*), or genitive (in the nominal **R(z)-tér*) government corresponds to this division recorded in Indo-Iranian languages. The same classification is given by Kuryłowicz.²³ Tichy (1992, p. 414ff.) however, as has been already said earlier in 1.2, came to completely different results; according to her classification what would correspond to the participles would sooner be the formation in **-tér-* (“aktueller Agens” = the author is described by the concrete, real action he has performed, is performing or shall perform); the nouns in *-tor* should on the other hand bring permanent characteristics; accusative × genitive government does not fit this classification.

²³ JERZY KURYŁOWICZ, *L'accentuation des langues indo-européennes*, Wrocław – Kraków 1958, p. 54.

2.2.1 The semantics of Latin *nomina agentis* in *-tor* in particular was researched by M. Fruyt.²⁴ In accordance with the traditional view she classes them into two groups; the first comprises the names of occupations or functions, the second group consists of certain “quasi-participles”, which can either substitute PPA (e.g. PLAUT. Poen. 74: *cupienti liberorum, osori mulierum*), or fill the unoccupied position in Latin of anterior active participle (Fruyt supplies as an example only the noun *victor*, e.g. CIC. Tusc. 5,56: *civili bello victor, iratus, ...*) – see Fruyt 1990, p. 62f. On the p. 64 she lists also some records of the accusative (i.e. verbal) government of the nouns in *-tor* in Latin.

Fruyt speaks about the “grammaticalization”, “participialization” of the nouns in *-tor*; she seems to regard the “participial” type as the younger one, issued from the actual *nomina agentis*. With respect to the situation in other IE languages it is, however, more correct to regard the both types as original ones, which, conversely, secondarily merged in Latin.

2.2.2 In addition to the participial nature of some Latin nouns in *-tor*: Especially significant, in my opinion, are the cases where the noun in *-tor* stands in the place of the participle in the construction of ablative absolute. Even in this kind of structures we can distinguish two types of usage:

a) The noun in *-tor* denotes a function, i.e. does not have the verbal relevance; it is as if in the construction the (non-existing) participle of the verb *esse* was left out (similarly as in e.g.. *Cicerone consule* etc.):

me (te) actore (e.g. CIC. Verr., actio secunda, 5,179) = “me (you) as the plaintiff”²⁵

Artemidoro reciperatore (CIC. Verr., actio secunda, 3,70) = “when Artemidoros was the recuperator”

subscriptore C. Rutilio Rufo (CIC. div. in Caec. 69) = “when C. Rutilius Rufus was the coplaintiff”

many instances with the nouns *praetore, dictatore*

“*me doctore*” ... *id est “dum ego doctor sum”* (PRISC. gramm. III, 215)

²⁴ MICHÈLE FRUYT, *La plurivalence des noms d'agent latins en -tor: lexique et sémantique*, in: Latomus 49, 1990, pp. 59-70 (hereafter FRUYT 1990).

²⁵ The absolute ablatives with the nouns in *-tor* in the place of the participle were excerpted from the electronic database *Bibliotheca Teubneriana Latina II*.

b) The noun in *-tor* has verbal relevance and as such it expresses clearly also the time relation; that is either anteriority (ba), or contemporariness (bb):

- ba) *te (me, Hannibale...) auctore (passim, even in the oldest authors) = “on your advice”*
eo deprecatore (CAES. Gall. 1,9,2), te deprecatore (CIC. fam. 15,15,2) = “following his (your) intercession”
eodem gladiatore latore (CIC. p. red. in sen. 18) = “following the proposal of the same gladiator”
te monitore (např. CIC. Verr., actio secunda, 3,155) = “having been cheered by you”
te scriptore (CIC. fam. 5,12,4) = “if (when) you (will) have written it”
te laudatore (OV. epist. 21,33) = “that you have paid compliments”
me (Gyge, Thessalo...) victore (passim, např. OV. fast. 5,577) = “after I (will) have won”
Nereo genitore (PROP. 3,7,67) = “begotten by Nereus”
- bb) *consule (Attalo, quo...) adiutore (passim, the oldest records in Cicero) = “with the consul’s help”*
minime (!) largitore duce (LIV. 6,2,12) = “because the leader did not indulge in spending”
illo cultore deorum (LUCAN. 8,478) = “when he was serving to the gods”
comissatore Lyaeo (MART. 9,61,15) = “when Bacchus was carousing there”
nullo rectore (TAC. hist. 3,25,1) = “having no one to guide them”
acerrimo instinctore belli Iulio Valentino (TAC. hist. 4,68,5) = “Iulius Valentinus instigated to war most forcefully”
Sexto Didio fautore effecit... (FRONTO 2,7,19) = “with the help of Sextus Didius he managed to...”
asino vectore fugiens (APUL. met. 6,29) = “she is leaving (carried) on an ass”
Paulo succentore (AMM. 19,12,13) = “Paulus seconded to that”
Siculo ductore (SIL. 14,37) = “led by Siculus”

Fruyt’s idea of the “participialization” of *nomina agentis* (instead of the reversed process – the merging of the two different types into a single one; see above 2.2.1) is supported by the fact that these constructions are only scarcely recorded in the oldest authors (practically only with the noun *auctor*); here, the objection must be made, however, that the number of recorded absolute ablatives in the archaic texts in general is negligible in comparison

with the classical texts. As regards the tense of these “quasi-participles”, it seems (to the extent that this could be said having so little evidence) that the older usage is that of anterior participles. The structures listed under bb) are as if half way between the structures under a) and ba).

2.3 Summing up the earlier mentioned reflections, we have to admit that they do not lead to any unequivocal statements regarding the form and the origin of Latin nouns in *-tor*. I am inclined to say that formally the Latin nouns in *-tor* (disregarding, of course, the analogical processes) are closer to the PIE **R(z)-tér-* than to the **R(é)-tor-* and that apparently – same as in other languages – two semantically different types had originally existed also here; due to the phonetic development in Latin, they had become so close in form that they eventually merged. The semantic characteristic of these nouns is corresponding: in Latin, we have an evidently prevalent and productive type of *nomina agentis*, and beside that the “participial” type, which – and this is of interest – has often (and probably originally) the significance of anterior participle.

What is nevertheless good to demonstrate on the example of the Latin nouns in *-tor*: the traditional classification of deverbatives into the nouns and the adjectives is practically of no relevance. These categories are, as regards deverbatives, absolutely permeable (cf. e.g. *particeps*, *sapiens* and many others; this, however, does not apply to non-deverbatives!) and from the diachronic point of view this division is apparently absolutely irrelevant. Besides, also Leumann in his study on Latin word-formation²⁶ lists Latin nouns in *-tor* among verbal adjectives with a note that they were usually used in apposition, i.e. quasi-adjectivally. The only reasonable classification is the one into the nouns which could be called “agentive” (that is in fact the names of persons, the names of the (people) acting, or capable of the action) and “non-agentive” (the names of places, instruments or means, abstracts, etc.). A terminological problem occurs, as – to my knowledge – English does not have a single superior term for substantives and adjectives; therefore I suggest a new, hopefully clearly understandable, term for deverbative substantives and adjectives: *verbalia*. The specific feature of “agentive” *verbalia* is that they express verbal voice (active / passive / or medial).

²⁶ MANU LEUMANN, *Gruppierung und Funktionen der Wortbildungssuffixe des Lateins*, in: IDEM, *Kleine Schriften zur lateinischen, griechischen, indogermanischen und allgemeinen Sprachwissenschaft*, Zürich 1959, pp. 84-107, here p. 95.

The “agentive” verbalia can be classified into three main subgroups: 1) “agentive verbalia” in the more restricted sense of the word, i.e. “participles” (the action denoted thereby is limited as to the time, and does not express a permanent feature of the substance as other adjectives do); 2) “non-actual agentive verbalia” (they characterize the substance by describing its relation to some action, and that as a feature more or less permanent; they often express repetitiveness or high measure); 3) “modal agentive verbalia” (they describe the relation of the action to the substance as possible, necessary, appropriate etc.; regarding the meaning, they correspond to the structure of a modal verb – can, may, must etc. – and the relevant full verb).²⁷

From the traditional point of view, i.e. if we apply this classification only to adjectives, some positions remain unoccupied in the Latin system (i.e. if we presume the existence of an active and a passive subtype of each type in the system of “agentive” adjectives in Latin). The unoccupied positions are the following: ad 1) anterior active participle, present (and future) passive participle; ad 2) neutral active non-actual adjectives of action (Latin has only the types in *-ulus* and *-āx*, which are expressive, they have the negative tinge of “too much”), any passive non-actual adjectives of action; ad 3) any active modal adjectives (Latin has only the adjectives of passive possibility and necessity). The Latin nouns in *-tor* (or *nomina agentis* as such – it is not a single type in Latin) in fact complement this system in all the mentioned unoccupied active positions: “who did sthg.”; “who (usually) does sthg.”; “who should be doing sthg./ is destined to do sthg.”. The “agentive” deverbative substantives and adjectives thus form a single complementary system in Latin.

²⁷ For more details see LUCIE PULTROVÁ, *The Latin Adjectives of Action*, in: *Listy filologické* 129, 2006, pp. 271f.

SUMMARY

The article is concerned mainly with the form, but also with the semantic characteristics of the Latin *nomina agentis* in *-tor*. Based on the equivalent formations in other IE languages, two different accent-ablaut paradigms were suggested for the PIE period; however, the Latin forms – if we follow the up-to-now formulated sound laws – can be derived from neither of them. Therefore a hypothesis has been set forth claiming that the PIE stressed *é in the suffix could regularly yield *ō* in Latin (cf. also *-ōs*, *-ōris*; comp. *-ior*, *-iōris*; *-ō*, *-ōnis*). The article completes the existing semantic analyses of the Latin nouns in *-tor* (which function in the texts not only as the *nomina agentis*, but also as quasi-participles) by researching the cases where the nouns in *-tor* stand in the place of the participle in the constructions of ablative absolute. The article concludes by general comment on the continuity of the category of the “agentive” deverbative substantives and adjectives (for which the author has suggested the overall working title of *verbalia*).

RESUMÉ

Latinská *nomina agentis* na *-tor*

Článek se zabývá zejména formou, ale i sémantickou charakteristikou latinských činitelských jmen na *-tor*. Na základě ekvivalentních formací v jiných indoevropských jazycích byla pro praindoevropské období navržena dvě různá ablautová paradigmata; latinské tvary však – vycházíme-li z dodnes formulovaných hláskoslovných zákonů – nejsou jednoduše odvoditelné ani z jednoho z nich. Proto byla formulována hypotéza, že by se praindoevropské přízvučné *é v sufixu mohlo do latiny vyvíjet pravidelně jako *ō* (srv. i *-ōs*, *-ōris*; komp. *-ior*, *-iōris*; *-ō*, *-ōnis*). K dosud provedeným sémantickým rozborům latinských jmen na *-tor* (která vystupují v textech nejen jako *nomina agentis*, ale i jako jakási participia) přispívá článek doplněním případů, kdy jména na *-tor* vystupují na místě participia ve vazbě ablativu absolutního. Článek je uzavřen obecnou poznámkou o spojitosti kategorie „agentních“ deverbativních substantiv a adjektiv (pro něž je navržen souhrnný pracovní termín *verbalia*).