

Jörundur Hilmarsson

## The elements *-ñ-* and *-ññ-* in Tocharian present and subjunctive classes

### §1. Subjunctive class VII: The material

Subjunctive class VII with the marker *-ñ-* and thematic conjugation, as listed in the handbooks, is claimed to be found with two verbs in West Tocharian, whereas in East Tocharian it is much more frequent, being found with 22 verbs (or even 25 verbs, cf. §3 and §3.2).

§1.1 The two West Tocharian verbs generally assumed to exhibit subjunctive VII forms are *weñ-* 'to speak, say' and *lä(n)t-* 'to go (out)'. The former has the following attested forms (common variations are not listed):

- subj. 1sg. *weñau*, 2sg. *w(e)nt*,<sup>1</sup> 3sg. *wem*, 1pl. *weñem*, 2pl. *weñcer*,  
3pl. *w(e)ñem*
- opt. 1sg. *weñim*, 3sg. *weñi*
- inf. *wentsi*, ger. II *welle*, abstr. II *welñe*, nom. ag. *weñenta*, vb. adj.  
*weñmo*
- imp. 2sg. *poñ*, 2pl. *poñes*, *pontso*

These forms are mostly regular, except that the 3sg. subj. *wem* has suffered an unexpected(?) shortening which could either be ascribed to an allegro articulation of this extremely frequent form, or it could be interpreted as regularly reflecting earlier *\*weññäm* with loss of *-ä-* and subsequent assimilation and simplification of *-ññm* to *-m*.<sup>2</sup> In the gerundive II *welle*, and

<sup>1</sup> Stein 42.2. 1a3 *w(e)nt-meśca*, cf. Couvreur 1954: 87.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. the same type of change in presents of class XII, e.g. *käskan-me* 'scatters them', *māntam* 'damages' with *-an-* and *-am* resp. from *\*-āññäm*.

the abstract II *welñe* the nasal has been lost as is not infrequent in such formations in Tocharian, cf. the ger. II *rilye* and the abstr. II *riñe* to the verb B *rin-* 'to leave, give up', etc. The change of *ñ* to *n* before a non-palatal dental is normal in West Tocharian, wherefore the infinitive *wentsi*, cf. subj. XII 3sg. B *käskantär* 'he scatters' < \**käskañtär*, etc. For a full discussion of the paradigm of BA *weñ-*, see Winter 1977; further details are discussed in §7, §9.2 and §10.

§1.1.1. The second West Tocharian verb assigned subjunctive VII conjugation appears to have been misjudged. While B *weñ-* is certainly thematic in its subjunctive and, therefore, could fit the requirements for being seen as a subjunctive VII,<sup>3</sup> the 1sg. subj. *lannu* to B *lä(n)t-*, recently revealed by George-Jean Pinault<sup>4</sup>, is clearly athematic from a synchronic Tocharian point of view. The discovery of this form (discussed in §1.1.2) necessitates a revision of the classification of the subjunctive of this verb: it is not of class VII, but must – in spite of the sequence *-nn-* < \**-ntn-*, comprising a nasal infix and a nasal suffix – be seen as an athematic subjunctive of class I. None of the forms of the attested paradigm excludes such an interpretation, while the 1sg. *lannu* demands it. The forms are as follows (common variations not listed):

- subj. 1sg. *lannu*, [2sg. *lat*,]<sup>5</sup> 3sg. *laṃ*
- opt. 2sg. *lyñit*, 3sg. *laṃñiñi*, 1pl. *läññam* (for *läññem*\*), 3pl. *laññem*
- inf. *lantsi*, abstr. II *lalñe*
- imp. 2pl. *platstso*

The 3sg. form *lañ-c* of Lévi A 4 a1, as interpreted by Krause 1952: 282, is not

<sup>3</sup> But see below, esp. §9.2 for a different evaluation of B *weñ-*.

<sup>4</sup> This form is found in the Paris text PK AS 17 D a4, discussed by G.-J. Pinault at the 'Fachtagung "Tocharisch"' of the *Indogermanische Gesellschaft* in Berlin, September 1990.

<sup>5</sup> The 2sg. *lat* is found only in 384 S a4. As pointed out by Adams (p.c.), this form may well be a preterite and not a subjunctive. Indeed, *lat* would be a regular preterite form, while in the subjunctive one might expect \**lant* (or \**lannät*). Adams remarks furthermore: "I can only surmise that the *yāmmar* of the last pāda of the previous śloka influenced [Krause's] decision [that *lat* is a subjunctive]. However, one should note the change of persons between the two ślokas and there seems to be no reason why that change from first to second person might not have been accompanied by a change of tense as well."

certain. Even if correctly seen as a 3sg. subjunctive, the nasal may have been secondarily palatalized before the following enclitic *-c*. That is to say, the subjunctive stem *lännä-* from *\*länt-nä-* is athematic. It must be classed as a class I subjunctive in final *-n-ä-* on a par with such class I subjunctives as B *sainä-* 'to lean on', *sinä-* 'to be oppressed', *rinä-* 'to leave', etc., cf. also A *klinä-* 'to be obliged' and *asinät* 'insatiable' to a subjunctive I stem *sinä-* otherwise not attested in East Tocharian: the regular subjunctive is of class VII, i.e. A *siñä/a-*.

§1.1.2. The final *-u* of B *lannu* is synchronically an athematic ending, cf. such athematic subjunctive I forms as B *āyu* (with enclitic: *ayu-ne*) 'I shall give', *kelu* 'I shall endure', *kewu* 'I shall pour', *teku* 'I shall touch', etc., as against thematic subjunctive II forms such as B *āksau* (with enclitic: *aksau-ne*) 'I shall pronounce', *šarpau* 'I shall indicate', etc. In spite of this, B *-u* has often been explained as reflecting a thematic ending historically, i.e. an I.-E. *\*-ō*, cf. e.g. Pedersen 1941: 141 (for further literature on this subject and other explanations of this ending, cf. Van Windekens 1982: 260–261). Likewise, the present writer has argued for the identity of B *-u* with I.-E. *\*-ō*, assuming that *-u*, which regularly should have been lost (cf. B *okt*, A *okät* < *\*oktō*), was here restored on the analogy of thematic forms where the ending was preserved in the latter half of the diphthong *-au* (Hilmarsson 1986: 47–48; cf. already Pedersen 1941: 141). Pinault, presenting the form B *lannu* at the afore-mentioned Berlin Tocharian Conference, also opted for a derivation of *-u* here from a thematic *\*-ō* < *\*-o-H<sub>2</sub>*. In his opinion, apparently, the verb B *lä(n)t-* preserves the original thematic conjugation with alternation of a non-palatal and palatal nasal before the thematic *\*e* and *\*o* resp., whereas the verb B *weñ-* has generalized the palatal variant (as have all the East Tocharian forms). However, as already pointed out above, none of the subjunctive forms of *lä(n)t-* require positing a palatal *-ñ-* (the palatal seen in the optative forms has, of course, been affected by the optative marker); furthermore, as argued in §4 below, generalization of either the palatal or the non-palatal variant does not take place in the ascertainably thematic paradigms of Tocharian (pres.

classes II, VIII, IX, etc.).

Within Tocharian, the B final *-u* corresponds to A *-m*. This has led some scholars to suggest that *-u* had developed from an earlier *-m* (Sieg & Siegling 1921: VI n.2, Couvreur 1938: 243 sq., et al.), a view that was vigorously rejected by Pedersen 1941: 141, Van Windekens 1982: 261. Recently, however, Winter (1990) has convincingly argued for a change of morpheme-final *\*-m* to B *-w* when followed by a palatalized nasal. This change did not take place if the *\*-m* was preceded by *i*. Through an application of such a rule, Winter is able to account for the element *-w-* in the suffix B *-wñe-* as reflecting an earlier *-m-*. Furthermore, through this rule, he is able to explain the 1sg. ending B *-u* < *\*-aw* as reflecting earlier *\*-ām* < *\*-ṃ*, regularly developed and preserved in the position before the enclitic first person pronoun, and generalized from that position as the proper 1sg. ending. In the optative / imperfect the *\*-m* was preceded by *-i-*, and, therefore preserved as such (e.g. *cāmpim* 'may I be able', *yapim* 'may I enter', etc.). The only counter-example would be the monosyllabic B *yam* 'I go'. This word, however, had been reshaped into a morphophonemically disyllabic *lyamā* in the same manner as the originally monosyllabic B *ek* 'eye', *kem* 'earth', etc. (cf. the adjectives B *ekaṣṣe*, *kenaṣṣe*), whereby *yam* would not have had a morpheme-final *-m* anymore, and, therefore, would have been unaffected by Winter's rule. In my opinion, Winter has provided here the best account for the 1sg. final B *-u* that has been proposed, confirmed, as it is, by the development of morpheme-final *-m(-)* to *-w(-)* before a palatal nasal in other categories (Winter *op. cit.*). B *lannu*, therefore, should not be considered a thematic form reflecting *\*-n(H)-ō*. Rather, as already indicated in §1.1.1, it is athematic, and reflects *\*-n(H)-ṃ*.

§1.1.3. Subjunctive VII thus seems to be found with only a single verb in West Tocharian, i.e. *weñ-* 'to speak'.<sup>6</sup> The second verb always assumed to form such a subjunctive, i.e. *lä(n)t-* 'to go out', has been misjudged, and must be seen as forming an athematic subjunctive of class I.

<sup>6</sup> Again I refer to §9.2 for a different evaluation of this verb.

§1.2. In East Tocharian the situation is quite different. Here 22 verbs form subjunctives of class VII and the imperfects discussed in §3.2 bring the total up to 25 verbs. The following forms are attested:

- subj. act. 1sg. *kärkñam*, *wākñam*, 2sg. *li(p)ñät*, 3sg. *okñäš*, *kärkñäš*,  
*tä[nk]ñ(ä)š*,  
 med. 1sg. *riñmār*, *señmār*, 2sg. *(nā)kññtār*, *riññtār*, 3sg. *arāñtar*  
 [sic], *oñtar* [sic], 3pl. *arñantar* [sic; also *arña///*], *nākñantrā*,  
*siñantrā* 'be oppressed',  
 opt. act. 1sg. *läññim*, *šärpñim*, *sākñim*, 1pl. *kläñkñimä[s]*,  
 med. 1sg. *ar[ñ]imār*, 3sg. *[r]iññtrā*,  
 ger. *arñäl* [bis], *älñäl*, *träñkñäl*, *nākñlye*, *r(i)ñ[ä]l*, *siñäl* 'be satisfied',  
 abstr. *arāñlune*, *eñlune*, *(k)[uñlu](ne)* <sup>7</sup>, *riñlune* [bis], *siñlune* 'be  
 satisfied', *siññlune* 'be oppressed',  
 vb.adj. *pärkñämm* [sic],

and the verb *weñ-* 'to speak' that has the following forms:

- subj. 1sg. *weñam*, 3sg. *weñäš*, 3pl. *weñeñc*,  
 opt. 3sg. *weñiš*,  
 ger. *weñläm*,  
 abstr. *weñlune*  
 imp. 2sg. *peñ*, 2pl. *peñäs*

None of these forms are unexpected. The final of the imperative singular A *peñ* is regularly depalatalized as seen by such pairs as A *wašem* vs. B

<sup>7</sup> This must be the form behind *uñlu-* cited by Sieg & Sieglings & Schulze 1931: 378. It occurs in 359, 29, a Sanskrit-Tocharian parallel text, where Sanskrit *dānam vā yadi vā [hav]yam* is translated with Toch. A *el pat kñpre pat nu [-uñlu](ne)*. Toch. B *ku-* is the semantic and etymological equivalent of Skt. *hu-* 'to pour, offer'; although less frequent in East than in West Tocharian, the verb *ku-* 'to pour, offer' is met with there also. Attested are a present VIII (and a pertinent imperfect) and a preterite III. A *(k)[uñlu](ne)* bears witness to a subjunctive of class VII, as indeed would be expected; East Tocharian subjunctives of class VII are regularly matched by West Tocharian ones of class I: B *ku-* forms a subj. I. (1sg. act.) *kewu*, (3sg. med. *kutär*), cf. the list of such correspondences in §3 below.

*weśeñña* 'voice', A *lwem* vs. B *lwāññe* adj. 'animal', etc., and the plural form *penās* has drawn its non-palatal nasal from the singular, cf. Winter 1977: 154 = 1984:195, Hilmarsson 1986: 316–319 = 1987[89]: 79–82.

## §2. Causatives or non-causatives?

The handbooks claim that the East Tocharian subjunctives of class VII are causative as well as non-causative, cf. Van Windekens 1982: 225. Pinault 1989: 144 notes that the subjunctive VII is "fréquent en A, notamment dans la conjugaison causative". Krause & Thomas 1960: 231, after observing that subjunctive VII is seen "teils bei Grundverben, teils als Ko. zu den Kausativen", find that it is often difficult to decide whether a particular form is to be interpreted as a causative or a non-causative, and that the only ascertainable example of a causative is the form A *wākñam* 'I shall split'. This does not prevent them, however, from listing the following forms as causatives: A *eñlune*, *kärkñāš*, *länñim*, *li(p)ñāt*, *šärpñim*, and possibly *tränkñāl*, beside *wākñam*. Inspection of these forms in their paradigmatic as well as in their textual context reveals that from a formal as well as a semantic point of view not only *wākñam*, but also *li(p)ñāt*, *okñāš*, *eñlune*, and (formally) *sākñim*, must definitely be defined as causatives. Other listed causative forms are either ambiguous or definitely not causative.

§2.1. Witness first *wākñam* in 215 b1 *šäptäñicām koṃ śla klop wrašäl špät pā(k) – – p wākñam ci* 'On the seventh day with pain [and] suffering I shall split you into seven parts ...'. The verb is transitive, followed by the object *ci* 'you', and, therefore, cannot be classified with the intransitive non-causative *wāk*- 'to break, be broken', which, indeed, forms a subjunctive V (A *wākaš*, B *wākam*). As a causative an East Tocharian subjunctive VII fits perfectly in a paradigm with pres. VIII (A 3sg. med. *wākāštrā*) and pret. III (A 3pl. act. *wākār*).

§2.1.1. Also *li(p)ñāt* must be defined as a causative formally as well as semantically. In its context, A 126 b2 *mā li(p)ñāt ñi* 'you will not leave me',

this form is transitive, whereas the non-causative is always intransitive 'to be left, remain'. The non-causative paradigm shows the following forms: pret. I (3pl.) *lepar*, past ptc. *lipo*, matched in the corresponding West Tocharian paradigm by pret. I *l(i)pa*, past ptc. *lipo* (MQ for *lipau\**). In this paradigm West Tocharian has a subjunctive V (3sg. med. *lipātrā*), which one might also have expected to find in the East Tocharian non-causative paradigm. Formally, therefore, the subjunctive VII does not fit as a non-causative, whereas it fits perfectly as a causative in the company of the preterite III *lyepäs* and past ptc. *lyalypu*. Causatives of this verb are not attested in West Tocharian, apparently.

§2.1.2. The form A *okñāš* is not listed by Krause & Thomas 1960: 231 among the East Tocharian causative subjunctives of class VII; cf. however, *o.c.*, p. 207 note, and Thomas & Krause 1964: 86, where it is classified as causative. The context of this *hapax legomenon* clearly indicates a causative (Germ. 'wird fördern'): 217 a5 *okñāš ñāktas napenäs sām onkraci* 'immortality will make gods and humans increase'. Formally, this form is hardly non-causative, cf. the West Tocharian subjunctive V stem *aukā-*, which would require a corresponding form in East Tocharian. A causative (i.e. presumably causative: the context is fragmentary) West Tocharian subjunctive is attested in the 3pl. form *aukem*.<sup>8</sup> This form is classed by the handbooks as a subjunctive II, but one must bear in mind that in the third person plural the athematic class I has generalized the thematic final *-em*. B *aukem* could therefore be deemed a subjunctive I. As seen below, such subjunctives regularly match the East Tocharian subjunctive VII.

§2.1.3. Krause & Thomas 1960: 231 do not list A *sākñim* 'I would leave behind' (?) among the causative subjunctives VII, but Thomas & Krause 1964: 152 classify it as causative. Although its context is too broken to reveal its meaning with certainty (123 b4 /// *sk· : koṃ ñkāt sākñim*), and therefore prevents a semantic decision as to whether this form is causative or not, the

<sup>8</sup> Actually, Couvreur 1954: 83 doubts the existence of this form – and not without reason. The attested optative *ausimar*, however, would still confirm the existence of either subjunctive I or II.

paradigmatic pattern of this verb in East and West Tocharian indicates a causative. Thus East Tocharian has a non-causative present IV, subjunctive V, and preterite I, and West Tocharian has a matching past participle [(sa)sākau]. A subjunctive VII does not fit here, whereas it does in the causative paradigm where East Tocharian attests to a present VIII, with which a subjunctive VII is compatible.

§2.1.4. Other alleged causative forms are less certain. The context of *länñim* 'I would hang' [37 b3 *raṃ länñim kos ne ///* ] cannot reveal whether this form is causative or not. One may guess that Krause & Thomas have classed it as causative because of the preceding *raṃ* that might be interpreted as the final of a word in the oblique singular (cf., e.g. *oñkaṃ* 'man'), but a locative singular is no less probable which would make *länñim* an intransitive non-causative. Note that although no subjunctive is attested to the corresponding West Tocharian non-causative verb, the present I (B *länkamane* 'hanging' intr.) would normally imply a West Tocharian subjunctive I, which would be the expected correspondence of the East Tocharian subjunctive VII, cf. below. However, the causative pres. VIII B (3pl. med.) *länksenträ*, A (3pl. act.) *länkseñc*, could imply an East Tocharian subjunctive VII.

§2.1.5. The verb *kärk-* 'to bind' has in West Tocharian only one non-causative form, the past participle *kärkau*, implying a preterite I. In an overwhelming majority of cases such preterites are accompanied by subjunctives of class V. The causative past participle *kekkärkū* corresponds to A *kakärku*, which is accompanied by a preterite III (A *šarkr-äm*). Such preterites, in turn, are commonly accompanied by subjunctives of class VII. For that reason, and the fact that West Tocharian forms a (formally causative) present VIII (MQ *kärskemene* for *kärksemane*\*) beside the past participle *kekkärkū*, which can imply subjunctive I, the counterpart of the East Tocharian subjunctive VII, it would seem correct to classify A *kärkñam*, *kärkñäṣ*, as causatives in form, as do Krause & Thomas (*l.c.*). Semantically,



however, neither Tocharian language seems to differentiate between causatives and non-causatives of the verb *kärk-*, cf. A 4 a4 *tsmār kärkñās* '(lit.) will fasten root' translating Skt. *mūlam badhnāti*, and 326 a5 *kärkñam prākār ki[nt-]* 'I shall bind firmly [the kiṃnara?]'.<sup>9</sup>

§2.1.6. According to Krause & Thomas 1960: 209 n.2 the verb *šärp-* 'to indicate, demonstrate' has no non-causative forms in either Tocharian language. B pres. VIII 3pl. *šärpsentär-ne* (17 Š b1) ptc. *šärpsemane* (103 Š a6), etc., could be either causative or non-causative formally, unless one takes the initial palatalization to be a causative indicator, which it absolutely need not be in a class VIII present. This pres. VIII is accompanied by a preterite III, and with that combination one might have expected to find a subjunctive of class I (cf. Krause 1952: 182–183 for a list of verbs with such a paradigmatic pattern). However, *šärp-* is an exception in this group and forms a subjunctive II (cf. 33 Š b6 *šärpau-me*)<sup>9</sup>. In East Tocharian this verb forms a present VIII which could but need not be seen as causative any more than the corresponding present VIII of West Tocharian (A 63 a1 *läntunešim kär-parām šärpseñc* 'they showed [respect for his] royal dignity', 254 b3 *nimiṣšinās ris šärpäsmām* 'indicating the artful cities'). The optative *šärpñim* (A 217 b7 *šärpñim ślok* 'I would recite [lit. demonstrate] the verse') is not causative semantically and its subjunctive VII stem could be seen as the match of the West Tocharian subjunctive II stem *šärpā/é-*, even if it is regularly a B subjunctive I that corresponds to A subjunctive VII, for in the case of the verb B *šärp-*, as indicated above, the subjunctive II formation is unexpected, whereas subjunctive I would fit the pattern. A further indication that A *šärpñim* is indeed a non-causative comes from the forms A 463 a4 (frgm.) *šärpäši* – and 353 a5 *šä(r)p(ā)[š]lune*, both of which appear to be causatives from a formal point of view – that is derivations from a causative subjunctive

<sup>9</sup> Interestingly, the rhyming verb B *yärp-* 'to heed, observe' is also an exception, having the same stem-formational pattern as does *šärp-*: the internal *-j-* of KVāc. 12 b4 *[ai]rpittona* beside the *-š-* of other attested forms of the privative B *airpätte\** 'unconcerned, unheeding' definitely indicates a derivation from a subjunctive II stem and not from a subjunctive I, cf. Hilmarsson 1991 (and 1992fc.) for a discussion of this privative and its formation as against the interpretation of K. T. Schmidt 1986: 75, 76 n.5, and 130.

IX stem. That need not exclude the possibility that A *šārpñim* might be a formal causative as well though, for double causative formations do occur. A *šārpñim* would therefore have to be judged formally as probably non-causative, but a causative cannot be entirely ruled out. Semantically, it is simply non-causative.

§2.1.7. As indicated by Krause & Thomas 1960: 231 A *trānkñāl* is ambiguous. To A *trānk-* 'to be attached' a subjunctive I is attested (e.g. 3sg. med. *trānktār*, abstr. *trānklune*). Therefore, the subjunctive VII *trānkñāl* might be seen as a causative form as would match the causative past participle *cacrānku*. On the other hand, a non-causative *trānkñā-* beside non-causative *trānkä-* is not a unique phenomenon in East Tocharian, cf. below. West Tocharian shows only a non-causative paradigm; it is not entirely comparable to the East Tocharian one though, for it (i.e. the former) has generalized a full grade e-vocalism: subj. I *treñkä-*. In its context A *trānkñāl* appears to be non-causative rather than causative: A 144 b2 /// *ñākcyās Kulewāsam trānkñāl nasam* 'I shall be attached to the heavenly ladies'.

§2.1.8. The 3sg. act. A 302 a1 *tä[nk]ñ(ä)š* is not mentioned in Krause & Thomas 1960: 231, but classed as a causative in Thomas & Krause 1964: 104. Again, as in the case of A *trānk-* above, a non-causative subjunctive VII *tānkñā-* co-exists here beside a subjunctive I *tānkä-* (A *tānklune*). There is no semantic difference between the causatives and the non-causatives of this verb in either East or West Tocharian. In West Tocharian a class II present is attested which must be seen as formally non-causative, whereas the also attested present VIII must be seen as causative formally. The subjunctive I B *tānkä-* could be seen as accompanying either of these present stems, but more probably the former. Although A *tānkñā-* is semantically ambiguous as regards the question of being causative or non-causative, there is no doubt that it is matched by a West Tocharian subjunctive of class I.

§2.1.9 Not listed by Krause & Thomas 1960:231, but classed as a

causative by Thomas & Krause 1964: 99, is A *klānkñimā(s)* of 349 b2 /// (*kra*)nt *mārkampal klānkñimā(s)* 'we would doubt the (goo)d Law'. Semantically, it cannot be decided whether this is a causative or a non-causative form. In West Tocharian only non-causative forms of *klānk-* are attested: present and subjunctive I. This could indicate preterite I, which in turn is attested in East Tocharian as the only (formally) ascertainable non-causative. The subjunctive VII A *klānkñā-* could be seen as the match of the West Tocharian subjunctive I as would be normal (§3). There is a formal causative East Tocharian present VIII (*klānkāssi*) attested, however, and the possibility cannot be excluded that it was accompanied by a subjunctive VII. A *klānkñimā(s)* is therefore ambiguous.

§2.1.10. The abstract A *eñlune* has been an apple of some dispute. According to Krause & Thomas 1960: 231 it is formed to a causative subjunctive VII stem that ought to be accompanied by a present VIII, but the attested present stem, in their opinion, is actually of class IX. They assume (*o.c.*, p. 211) that the stem *eñ-* of *eñlune* reflects earlier *\*enāñ-*. Winter 1977: 154 (= 1984: 199 n.2) suggests that *eñlune* with the stem form *eñ-* for expected *enäs-* (cf. the well-attested *enāšlune*) might have been influenced by *weñ-* 'to speak', as 'to speak' and 'to instruct' "appear to be similar enough semantically to make analogical interference seem possible" (Winter *l.c.*).

In an analysis of the verb A *en-* (pres. VIII *enäs-*), B *en-* (pres. IX *énāšk-*) 'to instruct' (Hilmarsson 1987), I came to the conclusion, which I still believe is essentially correct, that this verb constitutes formally the causative counterpart of the non-causative A *ents-* (pres. XI *entsäs-*), B *erik-* (pres. IX *erikāšk-*) 'to seize, grasp' (the phonological details are discussed extensively in my cited paper). Semantically ('to grasp' vs. 'to make grasp, instruct'), as well as formally (note the accentuation in West Tocharian), this seems a satisfactory interpretation. The co-existence of the subjunctive VII abstract A *eñlune* with the subjunctive VIII abstract *enāšlune* is an archaism that fits into the paradigmatic pattern beside a present VIII (ptc. *enāsmām*), while the subjunctive VIII reflects the spread of such formations in the causative at the

cost of other and more original formations. The subjunctive VII stem abstract A *\*aṅk-ñä-lune* would regularly result in A *\*aṅñälune* > *\*aṅñälune* > *\*aṅñälune* > *\*eṅñälune* > *\*eṅñälune* > *eṅlune*.

§2.1.11. A *pärkñäm* of 81 b5 /// *k ñi wlalune pärkñämm ātāk tāṣ riyam* : appears to be a verbal adjective (or agent noun), formed to a subjunctive VII to the verb A *prak-* / *pärk-* 'to ask'. A tentative translation of this line might be: '... my requested death will take place(?) in the city'. No causative forms are attested to this verb in either Tocharian language. West Tocharian has a present VIII accompanied by subjunctive I, and preterite III. East Tocharian has an identical pattern with well attested subjunctive I forms. A subjunctive VII stem beside a subjunctive I stem in East Tocharian need not, in my opinion, be seen as an indication of a causative. In the preceding paragraphs further instances of subjunctive I stems co-existing with subjunctive VII stems have been met with, cf. *tärik-* (§2.1.8) and *trärik-* (§2.1.7).

§2.2. To sum: Causative subjunctives VII are certainly found with the verbs *wāk-*, *lip-*, *ok-*, and *sāk-*, and quite probably with *kärk-*. On the other hand, the causative subjunctive VII forms to the verbs *länk-*, *šärp-*, *tränk-*, *tärik-*, *klärik-*, and *pärk-* are ambiguous. The form *eṅlune* was seen as formed to a causative subjunctive VII stem.

### §3. West Tocharian correspondences of A subj. VII

In the preceding text it has been indicated several times that the East Tocharian subjunctive VII is regularly matched by subjunctive I in West Tocharian. The material is as follows:

A: Non-causative subj. VII

A *aṛñä/a-* 'to call forth'

A *ālñä/a-* 'to keep away'

A *oñä/a-* 'to meet; start'

A *kuñä/a-* 'to pour' (cf. ftn. 7)

B: Non-causative subj. I

B *erä-*

B *älä-*

B *aunä-*

B *kewä-, kuwä-*

A <i>nākñä/a</i> - 'to reproach'	B <i>nākä</i> -
A <i>riñä/a</i> - 'to leave'	B <i>rinä</i> -
A <i>siñä/a</i> - 'to be satisfied'	different stem [subj. I <i>soyä</i> -]
A <i>siñä/a</i> - 'to be oppressed'	B <i>sinä</i> -
A <i>señä/a</i> - 'to lean on'	B <i>sainä</i> -
A: Causative subj. VII	B: Causative subj. I
A <i>eñkñä/a</i> - 'to instruct'	B <i>eñkä</i> - (see §2.1.10)
A <i>okñä/a</i> - 'to make grow'	B <i>aukä</i> - (see §2.1.2)
A <i>kärkñä/a</i> - 'to bind'	not attested, but see §2.1.5
A <i>lipñä/a</i> - 'to leave'	not attested, but see § 2.1.1
A <i>wākñä/a</i> - 'to split'	not attested, but see § 2.1
A <i>sākñä/a</i> - 'to leave behind'	not attested, but see §2.1.3
A: Subj. VII: Causative or not?	B: Non-causative subj. I
A <i>klänkñä/a</i> - 'to doubt, contest'	B <i>klänkä</i> - (see §2.1.9)
A <i>tänkñä/a</i> - 'to impede'	B <i>tänkä</i> - (see §2.1.8)
A <i>träñkñä/a</i> - 'to be attached'	B <i>trenkä</i> - (see §2.1.7)
A <i>pärkñä/a</i> - 'to ask'	B <i>pärkä</i> - (see §2.1.11)
A <i>läñkñä/a</i> - 'to hang'	not attested, but see §2.1.4
A <i>šärpñä/a</i> - 'to indicate'	B <i>šärpä</i> - subj. II, but cf. §2.1.6

Only the verb A *we-ñ*- follows a different pattern: the subjunctive VII A *weñä/a*- is matched by a West Tocharian subjunctive VII *weñä/e*-, cf. §§1.1–1.2, but also §7, §9.2, and §10 below.

§3.1. It is noticeable that of the 22 East Tocharian verbs known to form subjunctives of class VII 11 have a root final *-k* (*eñk*-, *ok*-, *kärk*-, *klänk*-, *tänk*-, *träñk*-, *näk*-, *pärk*-, *läñk*-, *wäk*-, *säk*-) and 6 have a root final vowel with (or without) an *n*-extension generalized from an *n*-present (*o-n*-, *ku(-n)*-, *ri-n*-, <sup>1</sup>*si-n*-, <sup>2</sup>*si-n*-, *se-n*-). In this pattern *ar*-, *āl*-, and *lip*-, *šärp*-, are exceptional. For A (and B) *we-ñ*-, see §7, §9.2, and §10.

§3.2. Beside the subjunctive VII formations listed in §3, three East Tocharian verbs have imperfect forms that seem to be derived from subjunctives of class VII. These are 3sg. act. *tsākñā* 'was lit, burned', and (immediately following in the same text, 295 a3) *wātñā* of unknown meaning, and 3pl. med. *tpukñānt* 'they hid' in unclear context (possibly causative).

These imperfects are generally taken as formed to subjunctive VII stems (e.g. Sieg & Siegling & Schulze 1931: 387, Lane 1953) as would fit well in the case of *tsākñā* to *\*tsākñā/a-* accompanying a present VIII (*tsākāštār*) and a preterite III (*tsāksānt*), and in the case of *tpukñānt* to *\*tpukñā/a-* if seen as accompanying the causative present VIII infinitive *tpukāssi*. The etymological and paradigmatic connections of *wātñā* are unknown.

The attested optative A 3pl. *tsāsintār*, indicating a subjunctive I (rather than II), does not necessarily render the interpretation of *tsākñā* as formed to a subjunctive VII incorrect. We have seen that there are further instances where subjunctive VII co-exists with subjunctive I, cf. *pärkñā/a-* ~ *pärkä-*, *tānkñā/a-* ~ *tānkä-*, *tränkñā/a-* ~ *tränkä-*; furthermore *siñā/a-* ~ *sinä-*\* (as in the privative *asināt*). For a further discussion of this phenomenon, cf. §8.2.

#### §4. The suffix characterizing subjunctive VII

No explanations of this class of subjunctives have been able to account satisfactorily for the combined facts of a palatalized suffixal *-ñ-* in the entire paradigm and a thematic conjugation. Thus Pedersen 1941: 197–198 stated simply that *-ñ-* has been generalized, and Lane 1959: 175–176, more decisively asserted that *-ñ-*, having originated in the position before (I.-E.) *\*e*, was generalized also before *\*o*, cf. more recently Pinault 1989: 144. This solution was criticized by Van Windekens 1982: 226, who, pointing to the present class III union vowel B e, A a (and present IV B o, A a), would have expected the *o*-variant of the thematic vowel to have been generalized, if at all. In my opinion, however, the problem of the present III (and present IV) union vowel has not yet been solved with certainty, and there are several reasons for not seeing therein the simple thematic vowel. But Van Windekens' criticism is justified for a different reason, namely, the fact that thematic verbal classes in

Tocharian (present [and subjunctive] classes II, VIII, IX, X, XI) do preserve the distinction between palatalized and non-palatalized consonants in the position before the two alternants of the thematic vowel. There are no signs of generalizations in either direction. It therefore seems extremely unlikely that there has occurred such a generalization in subjunctive class VII. Van Windekens' own solution is to propose that the subjunctive VII is based on old present stems in *\*-neu-* > Toch. *\*-ñu-*; after the loss of *\*-u-* in open syllable the thematic vowel was added to the remaining (palatalized) *\*-ñ-*. Even though there are several lexical correspondences to be found between subjunctive VII formations and *n*-present formations in other Indo-European languages (cf. esp. §11), Van Windekens' proposal is inaccurate. For one thing, *-u-* < *\*-eu-* is not syncopated in East Tocharian.

§4.1. In my opinion, a more viable solution to this problem is to posit an underlying *\*-n-je/o-*. This, of course, has occurred to scholars before, e.g. Lane 1959: 176, Van Windekens 1982: 226, but only to be instantly rejected on the grounds that the resulting Common Toch. *\*-ñyǎ/æ-* ought to have resulted in a suffix form with a geminate, *\*-ññǎ/æ-*, at least in post-vocalic position. However, it can be maintained that at least some nasal geminates inherited from Common Tocharian were simplified in East Tocharian, cf. §9sq. Apart from occurrences in loanwords, the attested geminates, such as seen in *kapsīññāši* 'bodily', or the perlicative *kapsīññā* 'on the body', are due to a late (post-apocope) and secondary assimilation of *-ñy-* from a syncopated *\*-ñiy-*, as verified by the nominative *kapsāñi* that bears witness to a non-assimilated *-ñy-*. The *-ññ-* found in present class XII (e.g. *tuñkiññant* 'loving') may result from a late assimilation of *\*-ñy-* < *\*-ñiy-*, but could also reflect original *\*-ñy-* as discussed in §9sq.; the same applies in the West Tocharian present class XII. A form like A *ṣāññune* 'nature' has suffered a late assimilation, cf. *ṣāñi* 'own, self', etc., etc.

#### §5. Suffixal *-ñ-* in other verbal stems

Beside subjunctive class VII, suffixal *-ñ-* is found in the present and

subjunctive XII and preterite V. Any evaluation of the origins of subjunctive class VII must take into account the possibility that these categories could be related, or that their formation could be of relevance for the judgement of class VII.

§5.1. According to the handbooks, present class XII, formed with the thematic suffix *-ññ-* in both languages, counts primary verbs (deverbatives) as well as denominatives, cf. Krause 1952: 100–103, Krause & Thomas 1960: 216–217. One gains the impression that East and West Tocharian are quite parallel in this respect. Van Windekens 1982: 89 differs here in that he considers the “so-called” primary verbs to be denominatives originally. Subjunctive class XII, far less frequent than present XII, is similarly described, cf. Krause 1952: 146–147, Lane 1959: 178–179, Krause & Thomas 1960: 233, Van Windekens 1982: 223. Preterite V accompanies a few verbs that form presents and subjunctives of class XII as well as the verb BA *weñ-* ‘to speak’, cf. Krause 1952: 191, Krause & Thomas 1960: 253, Van Windekens 1982: 180–184.

This description may not be entirely accurate. Its main fault is that it does not draw a sharp enough line between truly deverbative and denominative formations. As so often in Tocharian, insufficiently understood sound changes (and morphological processes) have blurred the view to relatively simple solutions. In the following a somewhat detailed account of these classes will be given, the material will be sifted and some obscure details discussed.

§5.2. In West Tocharian the verbs forming presents of class XII are clearly to be divided into two groups: deverbatives and denominatives. In most cases the deverbatives do not form subjunctives of class XII nor do they form preterites of class V. There are exceptions to this, though. At least one primary verb appears to have extended the nasal element to the past participle (B *tsetskāññoṣ*, §5.3.7), and in one case a primary verb appears to have the nasal element in the subjunctive stem (*sukaññiyenträ*, §5.3.5). The



denominatives of present class XII, on the other hand, form subjunctives of the same class and preterites of class V – that is, they have the element *-ññ-* in all their stems in as far as that can be determined.

### §5.3. Deverbatives. The material is as follows:

§5.3.1. *käsk-* ‘to scatter’ with pres. XII well attested (e.g. 3sg. act. 46 Š a7 [kǎ]skan-me, 3sg. impf. med. 22 Š b5 *käskaññītār-ne*), but subj. V (e.g. 3sg. med. 9 Š b8 *käskātrā*), pret. I (e.g. 3pl. med. 5 Š a2 *käskānte*); this verb is not attested in East Tocharian.

§5.3.2. *klänts-* ‘to sleep’ with pres. XII (e.g. 3sg. act. 14 Š b3 *lkäntsān-[n](e)* (sic)), subj. V (e.g. 3sg. opt. Lévi K 12 b1 *klantsoṛ*, abstr. II Y 3 b4 *klantsālñe*), not attested in the preterite. The corresponding A *klis-* (< \**klāñs-*) forms a pres. VI (3sg. act. *klisnāṣ*), subj. V (3sg. act. *klesāṣ*), and – to judge by the past participle *kliso* – preterite I.

§5.3.3. *mānt-* ‘to hurt, damage’<sup>10</sup> with pres. XII (e.g. 3pl. act. 35 MQ b2 [mǎ]ntaññem, 3sg. med. 92 Š b6 [mǎ]ntantrā), subj. V (e.g. 3sg. med. 331 S a1 *māntatār-ne*, inf. 596 Š b5 *māntatsi*), pret. I (e.g. 1sg. act. Berlin Fragm. *mantāwa*). As indicated in footnote 10, a pres VI (3sg. act. *mintanaṃ*) seems to have co-existed with the pres. XII. The corresponding A *mānt-* forms a pres. V (1sg. act. *māntām*), subj. V (abstr. II *māntlune*), pret. I (3sg. med. *māntat*).

§5.3.4. *wäsk-* / *wāsk-* intr. ‘to move’ with pres. XII (e.g. 3sg. 606 Š 2 *wāskantrā*), subj. V (e.g. privative H 149. 296 b8 *awāskatte*), pret. I (e.g. 3sg. med. 606 Š 1 *wāskāte*). The present is attested six times (always in the third person singular): four times with the root vocalism *-ä-*, twice with *-ā-*; it seems likely that the *-ā-*-vocalism is analogical to that of the subjunctive stem,

<sup>10</sup> The semantic range of this verb may have been much wider than indicated here, cf. Thomas 1987: 173 commenting on the present VI form B *mintanaṃ* that translates Skt. *sic-* ‘to sprinkle’. It would take us too far from the scope of this paper to delve into that problem here.

cf. discussion of this problem in Hilmarsson 1991: 39sq. In East Tocharian the corresponding verb has a class VI present (3sg. med. *wāsārkātār*), subj. V (abstr. II *wāsklune*), pret. I (3sg. med. *wāskat*).

§5.3.5. *suk-* is translated with 'to hang down, dwell' by the handbooks, cf. Krause 1952: 300 "[Skt.] 'vi-lamb-', 'herabhängen', 'verweilen'", Krause & Thomas 1960: 256 list "1. *suk-* [= A] 'überbringen'" and "2. *suk-* 'herabhängen, verweilen'". In my opinion it is not necessary to assume two different roots. Formally, all the attested forms can be united under one heading, and their meanings can be seen as emanating from a single semantic nucleus, cf. below. Attested are pres. VI 3sg. act. *suknaṃ* with the participle med. *suknāmane*, subj. XII 3pl. opt. med. *sukaññiyenträ*, and the causative present IX 3pl. *ṣukāskem*. Disregarding the optative form for a moment, it seems clear that we here have a paradigm of the type B *kärs-* 'to know': pres. VI *kärsānā-* and/or *kärsnā-*, subj. V *kärsā-* / *kärsā-*, pret. I *śārsā-*, causative pres. IX *śārsāṣṣā-/ske-*. That is, one may assume a paradigm with pres. VI *sukānā-* and/or *suknā-*, subj. V. [*sāukā-* /] *sukā-*, pret. I. *ṣukā-*, causative pres. IX *ṣukāṣṣā-/ske-*. In such a paradigm, the optative XII *sukaññiyenträ* is unexpected. However, we have already seen in the case of B *mānt-* that a present XII and a present VI formations could exist side by side in West Tocharian. Furthermore, the present XII formation of B *klānts-* and *wāsk-* are matched by present VI formations in East Tocharian, and the verb A *suk-* forms a present of class VI. This indicates, in my opinion, that the deverbative present XII formations in West Tocharian are derived from earlier and/or co-existing present VI formations. In other words, it would not be unique to find a present XII *sukaññā/e-* beside a present VI *sukānā-* and/or *suknā-*. The optative form *sukaññiyenträ* would still not be quite expected. It was indicated above that while deverbatives could form presents of class XII, they usually did not form subjunctives of class XII (or preterites of class V). The optative derives from the subjunctive stem, wherefore B *sukaññiyenträ* would presuppose a subjunctive XII. However, there is at least one instance in Tocharian where one finds a form functioning as an optative but still deriving

from the present stem, i.e. being actually an imperfect formally, viz. B 1sg. opt. med. *taccimar* 'I would place', formed as an imperfect to an (unattested) present stem *\*tāttā-*, but definitely not to the attested subjunctive V stem *tāttā-*. Therefore, even if *sukaññiyentrā* is taken as an optative, it would still be possible that it is formally an imperfect. This form occurs in a bilingual text as a gloss to Skt. *abhipralambeyu* (= 'uḥ), definitely an optative formally. It should be noted, however, that in Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit optatives are frequently used as past indicatives (i.e. as imperfects or aorists), cf. Edgerton 1985a: 160–162; therefore, the equation in 530 D b2 *abhipralambeyu* • *sukaññiyentrā*, even if formally an optative on the left side, could be an imperfect in meaning, whereby the Tocharian form on the right side could be seen as not only an imperfect in meaning but also in form. I realize that this is a hypothetical proposition, but it is surely defensible, and it has the advantage that the clearly deverbative *sukaññiyentrā* can be accommodated within the expected pattern of deverbative class XII verbs, cf. Krause 1952: 103 (but see also p. 146) who takes *sukaññiyentrā* as an imperfect. However, one must not lose sight of the possibility that in this case the class XII formation has been extended to the subjunctive.

§5.3.5.1. A few words are in order concerning the meaning of B and A *suk-*, and the question whether one is to reckon with one *suk-* or two homophonous verbs. In 44 Š b3 (: *pa*)*lsk(a)lñ(e)nta ceu (mā) tn(e) šukāskem waiptāyar [:]* 'the thoughts do (not) make him hesitate here' (cf. Sieg & Siegling 1949: 65 for the translation and emendations), the causative *šukāskem* appears to translate Skt. *vilambayanti* 'lassen zögern' (Thomas 1983: 214). Its meaning 'to make hesitate' could be seen as an aspect of 'to cause to be suspended, (lit.) cause to be hanging loose in the air'. This could match the non-causative of our bilingual 530 D b3 *abhipralambeyu* • *sukaññiyentrā* 'they were (or would be) suspended, hanging'. On the other hand, H 149. 44 a2 [= b2, for verso should be recto] ///*sarnene eñkoṣ tumem cwi pyapyaim suknam uppālā* might be translated with '...having taken [the garlands] in their hands; thereupon, they hand to him the lotus flowers' rather than with '...[...];

thereupon, his lotus flowers hang down' (Broomhead 1962a: 193). A translation with 'to hand to / over' would be supported by the only instance of our verb in East Tocharian, A 77 a4 /// *tmäṣ cesäm ānkaräs lāntse s[u]knāmām trā[n]käṣ* 'thereupon, handing the tusks to the queen, he says' (Sieg 1952: 15). However, a connection with the meaning 'to hang, be suspended' of *sukāññiyenträ* and 'to cause to be hanging' of the causative *śukāskem* could be established, if B *suknaṃ* and A *s[u]knāmām* do not express the idea of 'handing something over' but rather that of 'holding something aloft toward someone'. Unfortunately, the context of B *suknāmane*, cited by Krause & Thomas 1964: 256, is unknown to me. It is not mentioned by Krause 1952. That is to say, one might see all the occurrences of B and A *suk-* as belonging to a single verb, forming two kinds of present stems: pres. VI *suknā-* (transitive) 'to hold aloft toward someone', and pres. XII *sukāññä/e-* (intransitive) 'to be aloft, hang loose in the air'. The two different present formations may have arisen through the need to distinguish between transitive and intransitive usage. As argued below, the present XII formation is derived from the present VI stem through a *-je-/jo-* suffix.

§5.3.6. *kāw-* (*kawā-ññ-*) 'to crave, want' is ambiguous. It forms a present XII (e.g. 3pl. med. 24 Š b2 *ka[w]āññenträ*), accompanied by a subj. V (inf. *kāwatsi*, Thomas & Krause 1964: 179), pret. I (3sg. med. 34 MQ a2 *kawāte-ne*), and past ptc. *kakāpau*. East Tocharian has correspondingly a subj. V (abstr. II *kāplune*) and pret. I (3pl. act. *kāpar*). The handbooks class this verb as a denominative to B *kāwo* 'craving' (Krause 1952: 227, etc.), cf. the adjective B 516 MK b4 *k[aw]ātse*. Now, a subjunctive V and a preterite I are quite unexpected in a denominative paradigm; on the other hand, a present VI that could have been expected as an accompaniment to subj. V and pret. I would have had the form *\*kāunā-* (whether from *\*kāwnā-* or *\*kāwānā-*), and a (secondarily formed) present XII derivative of that stem ought to have yielded *\*kāuñ(ñ)ä/e-* (?; hardly *\*kāwāññä/e-*), not the attested *kāwāññä/e-*. One has two choices then: first, either there are two verbs, one denominative yielding the present stem XII *kāwāññä/e-*, and the other a primary verb providing the non-

present stems; these two verbs could then be seen as suppletively filling out the paradigm in question. Or, second, a deverbative present XII *\*kāuñ(ñ)ä/e-*, formed to a non-attested (but for system-reasons likely to have existed) present VI *\*kāunā-* (< *\*kāwnā-* or *\*kāwānā-*) came under the influence of the nominal stem *kāwā-* (B *kāwo*) whereby its stem was changed from *\*kāuñ(ñ)ä/e-* to *kāwāññä/e-*. I prefer the second alternative, which seems to me the simpler; therefore, I class the present XII *kāwāññä-* / *kāwāññe-* as a primary, deverbative formation.

§5.3.7. *tsäkāññ-* is listed as *tskän-* in all our handbooks, although Krause 1952: 191 remarks that the root form is uncertain. As noted by Winter 1984: 118, however, the participial form *tsetskāññoṣ* / *tsetskāññōṣ*, bearing in mind the alignment with other forms with a preterite extended by *-ññ-*, should indicate a stem *tskāññ-*, i.e. a pre-syncope *tsäkāññ-*. Winter (l.c.) thereupon assumes that this verb is denominative, parallel to *skwaññ-* 'to be happy', etc. There are reasons to believe, however, that this is not so, and that this verb is a primary one.

B *tsäkāññ-* occurs only twice in identical contexts: 73 Š b1 (ca)kkarwisa mittarwisa tsetskāññoṣ tañ ālīne and 75 H a2 cakkarwisa mittarwisa tsetskāññōṣ tañ aline. This has been understood to mean 'your palms are characterized<sup>11</sup> by the wheels (du.) [and] the mittärs (du.; = 'sun-discs?')' with our verb given the meaning 'to characterize, have as a trait'. There is no reason to believe that this is not the correct or concrete meaning. It might be suggested though that the sense 'to characterize' has developed from or is an aspect of an original 'to draw out, make to stand out, show off'. Such an interpretation would allow a connection of this otherwise isolated verb with the East Tocharian verb *tsäk-* 'to draw out', whose correspondence in West Tocharian has been ousted by the verb *sälk-* 'to draw out / forth'. This connection might appear speculative were it not for the fact that it is morphologically favoured by the paradigmatic pattern: A *tsäk-* forms a

<sup>11</sup> Formally, B *tsetskāññōṣ* could be defined as a dual, cf. Winter 1984: 118. Through some lapsus this form is neither discussed nor mentioned in my recent book on the Tocharian duals (Hilmarsson 1989).

present of class VI (3sg. med. *tsäknātār*), subjunctive V (1sg. med. *tskāmār*), and preterite I (3pl. act. *tsakar*). It has been shown above, how the West Tocharian deverbatives forming presents of class XII either have beside them nasal presents of class VI (B *māntānā-* beside *māntāññā/e-*, *suknā-* beside *sukāññā/e-*) or are matched in East Tocharian by nasal presents of class VI (B *klāntsāññā/e-* beside A *klisnā-*, B *wāskāññā/e-* beside A *wāsāñkā-*, again B *sukāññā/e-* beside A *suknā-*). The present XII B *\*tsākāññā/e-* beside present VI A *tsäknā-* would harmonize with this pattern: the isolated West Tocharian participial form *tsetskāññoṣ* shows the generalization of the *-ññ-* element from the present stem. The present stem XII *\*tsākāññā/e-* is to be associated with an original present VI B *\*tsäkānā-*, the match of A *tsäknā-* 'draw out'. Through such an interpretation, Van Windekens' association of what he lists (1976: 534) as B *tskän-* with BA *tsäk-* 'to burn' cannot be maintained: this latter verb has an entirely different paradigmatic structure, forming a present VIII in both languages, which enters in no relationship with the presents of class XII.

§5.3.8. A present XII *plākāntār* to B *plāk-* 'to be of accord' (Krause 1952: 102, 264) is non-existent, cf. Couvreur 1954: 84 who asserts that this form is to be read (*sklo*)*kāntār*, cf. below. Further deverbative ("primary") presents of class XII listed by Krause 1952: 102 and Krause & Thomas 1960: 216–217 are: *arcaññ-*, *celeññ-*, and *tserēññ-*. Of these the last is certainly denominative, the second probably, and the first possibly. They will be treated with the denominatives below.

§5.4. West Tocharian denominative verbs forming presents of class XII with the suffix *-ññ-* have the characteristic that non-presentic stems – if attested – also have suffixal *-ññ-*. In most cases the underlying nominal stems are attested. As will be seen these nominal stems are almost always *n*-stems. The material is as follows:

§5.4.1. *āñmāññ-* 'to wish' is attested only in its present XII stem (e.g. 1sg. med. H add. 149. 88 a9 (*a*)*ñmāññemar*). This verb is quite clearly

denominative, though, formed to B *āñme* 'wish', the same word as B *āñme* 'self'. This latter noun has class V,2 inflection, i.e. nom. sg. *āñme*, obl. sg. *āñm*; plural is not attested. The original paradigm of *āñme* 'wish' must have been identical. This inflectional class comprises old *n*-stems with nom. sg. in *\*-ēn*, acc. sg. in *\*-en-ŋ*. Such an accusative singular resulted in zero in Tocharian: the ending was lost regularly, and the remaining suffixal element that ought to have remained as *\*-āñ* was lost as well, possibly because of the Tocharian tendency to mark only nouns denoting rational beings with an oblique nasal marker. One may therefore with certainty posit a nominal *n*-stem B *āñmān-*, and it is to this stem that the verbs B *āñmāññä/e-* is formed through *-je-* / *-jo-* suffixation.

§5.4.2. *kwipeññ-* 'to be ashamed' has a present XII (e.g. 3pl. med. Lévi K 2 b6 *kwipeññentär*); no subjunctive is attested, but the preterite is of class V with suffixal *-ññ-* (3sg. med. 44 Š b7 *kwipeññate*). The general opinion seems to be that this verb is formed to the noun *kwipe* 'shame' (e.g. Krause 1952: 243); this may be so, of course, even though *kwipe* appears not to be an *n*-stem: *kwipeññä/e-* to *kwipe* may have been looked upon as *lareññä/e-* to *lāre* 'love' (see below). However, the adjective *kwipassu* 'shameful', parallel in formation to *tāñkwassu* 'loving' to the *n*-stem *tāñkwān-*, could indicate an *n*-stem *\*kwipān-*. Note that the suffix B *-ssu* forms adjectives to substantives without causing changes in their stem-formational suffixes, cf. *lāklessu* to *lākle* 'pain', *spelkkessu* to *spelkke* 'enthusiasm'. To *kwipe* one would then expect *\*kwipessu*, not the attested *kwipassu*. Given that there existed an *n*-stem *kwipān-* to the radical *kwip-*, it is conceivable that an alternant *\*kwipen-* was found in that paradigm besides. To such a form the denominative *kwipeññä/e-* could have been formed regularly.

§5.4.3. *tāñkwāññ-* 'to love' forms a present XII (e.g. act. ptc. 78 Š a3 *tāñwaññēñcä*, 2sg. impf. act. 297 T b3 *tāñkwaññet* [for 'it]), subjunctive XII (e.g. inf. [all.] 112 S a5 *tāñkwaññtsis*) with imperative V (2sg. act. 515 MQR b6 *ptāñwāññe*), but no preterite is attested. Correspondingly, East Tocharian

has a present XII (e.g. inf. 269 b5 *tuñkiññtsi*), subjunctive XII (abstr. II [gen.] 214 b2 *tuñkiññluneyis*), but a preterite is probably not attested: the form 311 a1 *tuñkiññā* 'he loved' is more likely to be an imperfect than a preterite, cf. Thomas 1957: 77. It is clear that B *tāñkwāññā/e-* and A *tuñkiññā/a-* are formed to the noun represented by B *tāñkw*, A *tuñk* 'love'. Since these East and the West Tocharian forms are formal equivalents (A *tuñk* has -u- < -ā- through labial umlaut before the following -ñk- < \*-ñkw-; and the suffixal A -iññ- reflects earlier \*-ä'iññ- < \*-āññ-, cf. e.g. Winter 1977: 149sq.), it is necessary to project the formation of the verb back to Common Tocharian times. Although no plural of the noun B *tāñkw*, A *tuñk*, is attested with the consequence that its stem formation cannot be directly seen due to apocope, this noun is clearly of class II,2 (Krause & Thomas 1960: 121-122) and, therefore, an *n*-stem, cf. the parallel B *ṣāñkw*, A *ṣuñk* 'throat' that has the *n*-stem plural form B *ṣāñkwanma*. One may therefore safely posit a Common Toch. *n*-stem *\*tāñkwān-* to which *\*tāñkwāññā/æ-* would be a regular denominative formation.

§5.4.4. *yākāṃṣāññ-* 'to feel disgust, loathe' forms a present XII (e.g. 3pl. med. Lévi K 3 a5 *yākāṃṣāññentrā*), subjunctive XII (abstr. II PK AS 17 K a6 *yākāṃṣāññl(ñ)e* [cf. Pinault 1988: 142], 8 Š b7 *yākāṃṣāññē* < *\*yākāṃṣāññē* [cf. Krause 1952: 147 note]), but a preterite is not attested. This verb is assumed to be formed to the noun B *yākāṃṣe* 'disgust, loathfulness', Krause 1952: 277. A plural in -enta is attested in 571 MQR b2 *lwāsāts yākāṃṣentā* 'the loathfulnesses of animals', which would not point immediately to an *n*-stem but rather to an *o*-stem or an *s*-stem. Lacking an *n*-stem, the denominative *yākāṃṣāññā/e-* would then have to be seen as analogically formed to *yākāṃṣe* after *āñmāññā/e-* beside *āñme*, etc. However, as pointed out by Krause & Thomas 1960: 124 note 2, there are instances of double plural formations, on the one hand in B -enta (*palskalñenta*, *pelaiknenta*), and, on the other hand, in B -i (class V: *palskalñi*, *pelaikni*). It might be suggested that B *yākāṃṣe* is a further word that could form a plural in -i beside -enta; if so, this word could be classed with *āñme*, etc., as a class V,2 noun, having had an obl. sg. form *\*yākāṃṣe* (cf.



*yakaṃṣ?*) from earlier *\*yākāṃṣān-*, which would have supplied the denominative *\*yākāṃṣāññā/e-*. – For formal reasons, B *ykāśāññe* (Broomhead 1962b: 323), 572 MQR b3 *ykāś[sā](ññe)*, 325 M a3 *ykāśālñe* (sic! For *\*āññe*, cf. Pinault 1988: 141) 'sexual pleasure, intercourse' with a derived adjective in e.g. H 149. add. 8 a2 *ykāśāññeṣṣe prayok* 'sexual intercourse' (cf. also PK NS 53 a1-2, Pinault, *l.c.*) should be kept distinct and apart from *ykāṃṣe*, etc., even though one might argue for a semantic relationship as does Pinault, *l.c.* Indeed, if Pinault is correct in interpreting *ykāś(s)āññe* as derived from *\*ykāsse*, an adjective in *-sse* to an underlying noun *\*ykā* [Pinault suggests *\*ykā(s)*], as seems well motivated (cf. Adams 1989: 15 note 7), a relationship of this family with that of *ykāṃṣe* would be only a very remote possibility.

§5.4.5. *lāreññ-* 'to hold dear' forms a present XII and is met with only once: 3pl. med. 245 MQR b3 *lareññentrā*. Subjunctive and preterite are not attested. As indicated by Krause 1952: 280 this verb is denominative to the adjective B *lāre* 'loving'. More precisely, one might say it is formed to the *n*-stem *lāren-*; for the *n*-stem flection of *lāre*, note obl. sg. masc. *lareṃ*, nom. pl. masc. *lareñ*, obl. pl. masc. *lare(nā)ṃ*, gen. pl. masc. *lareñāṃts*.

§5.4.6. *wināññ-* 'to take pleasure in, enjoy' forms a present XII (e.g. 3pl. med. 11 Š b4 *wināññentrā*), subjunctive XII (e.g. abstr. II 231 M a1 *winālñe* < *\*wināññlñe*), but no preterite is attested. As suggested by Krause 1952: 291 this verb is denominative to B *wina* / *wīna* 'pleasure, liking'. As far as I have been able to establish this noun never occurs in the nominative: all occurrences are in the oblique (there are also a few instances of secondary case forms, e.g. the comitative 613 X a6 *winampa*), and the gender is unknown. It is therefore impossible to tell its stem formation with certainty. It could be a neuter plural of class I (types B *pwāra* 'fires', or *āsta* 'bones', *mīsa* 'meat') or even a singular of class I (type B *pīlta* 'leaf, petal'); it might be a neuter plural of class II (type B *stāna* 'trees'); and it might be a feminine singular of class VI,3bα,β (type B *kantwo*, obl. *kantwa* 'tongue', *māskwo*, obl. *māskwa* 'impediment', or B *yasa* 'gold', *śarka* 'music'). This last type

continues an *n*-stem flection historically, and should our word belong here (nom. sg. fem. *wino\**, obl. sg. *wina*), its stem at some stage in Common Tocharian would have to be posited as *\*winān-*, which would then have yielded the denominative verb B *wināññā/e-* regularly.

§5.4.6.1. The East Tocharian word corresponding to B *wina* / *wīna* semantically, i.e. *wañi*, is not a formal match, and will not occupy us here. There is, however, an East Tocharian verb that might possibly be seen as a formal and semantic match of the West Tocharian one. The 2sg. med. *wiñtār* of A 70 b6 /// *ywārckā lmo oki wiñtār šakk ats*, translated by Sieg 1952: 44 with '...wirst du dich wie zwischen ... befindlich bestimmt erfreuen' with reference to Skt. *vane tvām ramayiṣyanti* (Kern, *The Jātaka-Mālā* by Ārya-Śūra, Boston 1891, esp. p. 57 line 21), is classed (with a question mark) by Sieg & Siegling & Schulze 1931: 378 as a subjunctive of class VII. A fitting verbal root is lacking in both languages: one would then expect B *win-*, A *wi-n-*, cf. B *sin-*, A *si-n-* 'to be oppressed' with A subj. VII *siñā/a-*, etc. Semantically, an association with B *wināññā/e-* appears optimal, formally there are difficulties, cf. below. The form A *nwiññāt* for which Sieg & Siegling & Schulze 1931: 380 (also Poucha 1955: 303) suggest the analysis *nu wiññāt*, is interpreted by Couvreur 1955-56: 81 as an imperfect medium to a verb A *nw-* 'to suffer'. That verb, however, attested in the preterite 3sg. *nwāt* (222 b4) could not have an imperfect in *-ññ-*. The line in question runs as follows: 222 a7 (: ) *kūl(e)yaṃ pāltsāk cacrañku mrosāñkātsi mā nwiññāt* : It might be translated as 'having attached [his] thought [on]to the woman, he did not take pleasure [in] renouncing', or (on the lines of Couvreur) '..., he did not bear renouncing', cf. also K. T. Schmidt 1969: 470. Both interpretations would seem possible, but as the verb A *nw-* would be formally excluded, the first would seem preferable. As an imperfect, A *wiññā-* would be regular to the present stem *wiññā/a-* of A *wiñtār*. The question is then, whether A *wiññā/a-* can match B *wināññā/e-* formally. Evidently, a Common Toch. *\*wināññā/æ-* would be expected to yield A *\*winā'ññā/a-* > *\*wineññā/a-*. However, by haplology this form could have resulted in the attested A

*wiññä/a-*. Note that Krause & Thomas' statement (1960: 216) that *-ññt-* (after the syncope of *-ä-*) resulted in *-nt-* in both languages is probably incorrect in as far as East Tocharian is concerned. It is true that A *śewiñtār* 'yawns' appears to show this change, but *śukaṣiñtār* 'feels happy' does not, cf. also *tuñkiñtsi* 'to love', *kāṣiñtsi* 'to scold'. The *-ñ-* of *wiññtār* would therefore not be irregular.

§5.4.7. *säkwäññ-* 'to feel happy' forms a present XII (e.g. 3pl. med. 11 Š b5 *s[ka]w[ä]ññenträ*) and a subjunctive XII (inf. 239 MQR a6 *skw[ä]ñtsi*) with no attested preterite. As indicated by Krause 1952: 301 this verb is denominatively formed to B *sakw* 'happiness, pleasure'. More precisely, one might say that to the Common Tocharian *n*-stem *\*säkwän-* (cf. B plural *skwanma*) was formed the verb *\*säkwäññä/æ-* which yielded the West Tocharian verb regularly. For A *śukaṣiññä/a-* which is quite differently formed, cf. below.

§5.4.8. *sklokäññ-* 'to be in doubt' forms a present XII (3sg. med. PK 12 J a5 (*sklo*)*käñtār*, cf. Couvreur 1954: 84), but is not attested in the subjunctive or preterite. It is clearly denominative to B *sklok* 'doubt'. That is, Common Toch. *\*sklokän-* (cf. B pl. *sklokanma*) produced the verb *\*sklokäññä/æ-*.

§5.4.9. *tserēññ-* 'to deceive' forms a present XII (e.g. 3sg. med. 11 Š b2 *tserenträ*), a subjunctive XII (inf. *tserentsi*, Thomas & Krause 1964: 263); the past participle 282 MQ b3 *tsetsemū* indicates the presence of a preterite V *\*tserēññä-*. Clearly denominative, this verb has been associated with the noun B fem. pl. tantum *tserekwa* 'deceit', whose singular form would have been B *\*tserēk* or *\*tserēkw*, cf. Winter 1977: 134 and 149. Winter (l.c.) apparently assumes that the verb *tserēññä/e-* derives from a non-*n*-stem *\*tserēk(w)-* through the addition of a suffixal element *-ññä/e-*, whereby the sequence *-k(w)ññ-* was assimilated to *-ññ-* (as in BA *weñ-* 'to speak', cf. below). This view was heavily criticized by Van Windekens 1982: 182 who claimed that

such assimilation did not take place in Tocharian as was proven by the verb B *tānkwaññ-* to the noun *tañkw*, etc. However, Van Windekens failed to acknowledge the difference in structure of the verbs *tsereññ-* and *tānkwaññ-*. The latter is based on a disyllabic nominal stem (Common Toch. *\*tānkwān-*) and therefore accented on the vowel preceding *-ññ-*, while the former is based on a trisyllabic nominal stem (Common Toch. *\*tsæræk(w)än-*), and therefore accented on the syllable preceding the vowel before *-ññ-*: that vowel in turn suffered syncope, whereby *-k(w)-* became contiguous to the following *-ññ-* and assimilation occurred. No such thing happened in *\*tānkwaññä/æ-*, of course. The assimilation in BA *weñ-* has similar reasons (here the accent followed the element *-ññ-*), as will be discussed below. The lack of assimilation in forms of the East Tocharian subjunctive VII, such as *wākñam*, etc., can be due to system pressure: the stem in final *-k-* is evident in all other forms of the paradigm. – It must not be denied, though, that an *n*-stem neuter *\*tsæræk(w)än-* is not what one would expect in the face of the plural B *tserekwa*. Winter's explanation of B *tsereññä/e-* as formed by the addition of suffixal *-ññ-* to the stem underlying B *tserekwa* may therefore hold true, in which case *-ññ-* must be seen as having exceeded its boundaries as a denominative formant to original *n*-stems. At any rate, one must assume that the underlying nominal stem – barring *\*tsæræk(w)än-* – had a final *\*-ä-*, i.e. *\*tsæræk(w)ä-*.

§5.4.10. *celeññ-* 'to appear, shine forth(?)' forms a present XII (3sg. med. 74 Š a3 *celenträ*, 3pl. impf. med. 107 S a1 *celeñiyentär*), but subjunctive and preterite are not attested. This verb is taken as deverbative by Krause 1952: 102, and Krause & Thomas 1960: 217. As the West Tocharian deverbatives of class XII all have a stem form in *-äññ-*, however, while the denominatives vary between *-äññ-*, *-aññ-*, and *-eññ-* (*kwipeññ-*, *läreññ-*, *tsereññ-*), it seem advisable to take *celeññ-* as a denominative even though there is no noun to which one might point as a basis. This is also the view of Winter 1980[81]: 128, who suggests a derivation from a non-attested *\*celek(w)-*. I would posit *\*celek(w)än-* or simply *\*celen-*. As pointed out by

Couvreur 1954: 82 and Winter (*l.c.*), against Krause 1952: 48 followed by Van Windekens 1980[82]: 286–287, a connection with *celāmāññana*, (*celā*)*miññana*, fem. pl. to an adjective *celāmo\**, is not certain. Its meaning is not quite ascertainable (“hervorstechend(?)”), and its non-umlauted first syllable is unexpected.

§5.4.11. *ārcāññ-* ‘to deign, be obliged’ forms a present XII (3sg. med. Lévi U 18 b1 *arcantrā* [translating Skt. *arhati*]), subjunctive XII (imp. V 2sg. med. *porcaññar*), but no preterite is attested. Because of an alleged subjunctive V stem *ārkā-*, co-existing with the subjunctive XII *ārcāññā/e-*, the paradigmatic structure of this verb has not been properly understood: it is mostly taken as suppletive, e.g. Krause 1952: 221, K. T. Schmidt 1969: 100, Van Windekens 1976: 621; those who have expressed their opinion on its origins have suggested it represents a loan from some Indic (e.g. Van Windekens, *l.c.*) or Iranian (Isebaert 1980: 48) source. The interchange of *-c-* and *-k-* in an indigenous Tocharian word is certainly not phonologically expected.

The stem *ārk-* is attested twice in available texts according to Krause 1952: 221. An inspection of these two occurrences reveals that *ārk-* is probably not a verbal stem at all. This was seen by Winter 1984: 119, whose interpretation is largely accepted here. First, in 584 MQ a3 ///[va] *arkaṃ yopu nauṣ rī(ne)* the text is too fragmentary to allow any certain conclusions as to the function (and sense) of *arkaṃ*. Note that *arkaṃ* here, allegedly a third person singular subjunctive V form, occurs beside *yopu*, a subjunctive I in the first person singular, meaning ‘I enter’. The occurrence of a 3sg. and a 1sg. verbal forms side by side is somewhat quaint, but this might, of course, be understandable, if the text was more complete. The second instance is in a quite perfect text: 331 S b2 *tanāpate šamāneṃ šwātsis kākātār tompok weṃ-ne ašari nīs šesketstse (ne)sau ška yatsi arkaññ mā š campau makte ka š preke karsar ška kamp<sup>ā</sup> • taisēṃ weweñu tākaṃ ot ka šamānentse mant yatsi rittetār •* ‘[If] a host invites a monk to eat, [and] at the same [time] says to him: “Master, I am alone, and I cannot go [out] on account of a reception (= *arkaññ*) then. Just [let] know the time yourself, [and] come then!”, if he says so, then surely it is

proper for a monk to go thus'. The word *śka* is taken to mean 'then' (more in an emphatic than a temporal sense) rather than 'close by' as suggested by Winter (*o.c.*, p. 120). Although it is not discussed by Winter, his suggestion that B \**ār*k (yielding the "causalis" *arkañ*) has the meaning 'respectful reception of a guest' (being a loanword from Indic, cf. Skt. *argha*- 'respectful reception of a guest') would be applicable in the other instance of \**ār*k as well. The line 584 MQ a3 *arkaṃ yopu nauṣ rī(ne)* could be translated: 'in the city I shall first enter the reception' or 'before I shall enter the reception in the city'. This interpretation of the stem *ār*k- renders invalid Couvreur's suggestion that *arkañ* is a verbal present form (Couvreur 1954: 86). – It is unclear whether \**ār*k is also to be found in 497 Š b7 *arkants[e tsāñ]wale*, and whether a related word is to be seen in B *arkiye* of 176 M b2 *[s]i[kṣapatā]ntse spā arkiye [pu]tk[a]lñe nesalle ṣ[ai]*, and 373 Qu frgm. d *arkye pelai(kn)e*.

Thus there is no verbal stem B *ār*k-, and the paradigm of B *ārcāññ*- is a quite regular one, showing a present and subjunctive stem of class XII; it is presumably denominative, as indicated by the root-final -c-, and would have had a preterite of class V. The noun from which *ārcāññ*- is derived in Tocharian is not attested, but one might suggest an *n*-stem \**ārcān*-, ultimately deriving from an Iranian source, cf. Isebaert 1980: 48, Winter 1984: 119.<sup>12</sup>

§5.5. In East Tocharian the situation is considerably different. Among the present and/or subjunctive formations of class XII there are no primary deverbative formations of the type B *māntāññä/e*-, whereas denominatives of the type B *tārkwāññä/e*- are well attested. Furthermore, East Tocharian has a different kind of deverbative formation, which I term here "secondary", of the type A *ākṣiññä/a*-, with the element -*ññ*- found in the subjunctive stem and the preterite stem. In a couple of instances, it is obscure whether to judge the pres. / subj. stems as denominative or primary deverbative, but as there is no clinching supporting evidence for the latter, they will here be seen as denominative.

<sup>12</sup> While Adams (p.c.) agrees that *ār*k- and *ārc*- have nothing to do with each other etymologically, he suggests that *ār*k- is still a verbal stem that, used impersonally, has the meaning 'it is necessary'; and he takes *arkiye* as a derived adjective 'necessary'.

§5.5.1. Denominatives. The material is as follows:

§5.5.1.1. A *tuñkiññ-* 'to love' forms a present XII and a subjunctive XII; a preterite is not attested. For a discussion of this stem and the corresponding West Tocharian one, deriving from the Common Tocharian noun *\*tāñkwān-*, see §5.4.3.

§5.5.1.2. A *wiññ-* 'to take pleasure in, enjoy' is possibly found in the 2sg. med. subj. XII *wiññār* and the 3sg. impf. med. *wiññāt*. It is possibly to be associated with B *wināññ-*, and thus derived from a Common Tocharian noun *\*winān-*, cf. discussion in §5.4.6 and §5.4.6.1.

§5.5.1.3. A *sūkaṣiññ-* 'to feel happy' forms a present (or a subjunctive) of class XII (3sg. med. 51 b3 *sūkaṣiññār*). It is clearly formed in a manner different from B *sākṡwāññ-* which is denominative to *\*sākṡwān-* (cf. §5.4.7). A *sūkaṣiññā/a-* must be associated with the adjective A *sūkaṣi*, formed with the suffix A *-ṣi* or rather *-a-ṣi*, i.e. with the "union-vowel" *-a-* (possibly on the analogy of A *klopaṣi* to *klop* 'pain') for expected *-ä-* > zero. In East Tocharian the suffix *-ṣi*, unlike its West Tocharian counterpart *-ṣṣe*, has been extended with a nasal element which is seen overtly in most case forms, cf. Krause & Thomas 1960: 145 listing the following forms: masc. obl. sg. *-ṣi*, *-ṣim*, *-ṣinām*, gen. sg. *-ṣināp*, nom.pl. *-ṣiñi*, obl.pl. *-ṣinās*, gen.pl. *-ṣināśśi*, fem. nom.sg. *-ṣi*, *-ṣim*, obl.sg. *-ṣi*, *-ṣim*, *-ṣinām*, *-ṣyām*, *-ṣṣām*, gen.sg. *-ṣine*, nom.pl. *-ṣināñ*, *-ṣṣāñ*, obl.pl. *-ṣinās*, *-ṣṣās*, gen.pl. *\*-ṣināśśi*. One can therefore assume that the adjective A *sūkaṣi* implies an East Tocharian nominal stem *\*sūkaṣin-* which would have been the basis of the denominative verb A *sūkaṣiññ-*.

§5.5.1.4. A *ṣewiññ-* 'to yawn' forms a present XII (3sg. med. 6 a6 *ṣewiññār*) and a subjunctive XII (abstr. II 12 b6 *ṣewiññlune*); no preterite is attested. This verb is classed as primary by Krause & Thomas 1960: 216.

However, there is no obvious Tocharian verbal root to which this East Tocharian stem could be attached – in particular there is no primary nasal present stem in either Tocharian language from which A *śewiññ-* could be seen as derived in the same manner as the West Tocharian deverbative presents of class XII are derived from primary nasal presents. The formation of A *śewiññ-* – deverbative or denominative – is therefore at best ambiguous.

In order to decide the issue, one might want to turn to etymological considerations. Van Windekens 1941: 131 (repeated 1976: 479) suggested a connection with OHG. *anagiwēn* 'to yawn', *gēwōn* 'to yawn, gape' and that A *śew-* reflected an I.-E. *\*ghēi-y-*; he did not define that preform, however, nor its purported relationship with the Germanic words. It must not be overlooked that I.-E. *\*gheH<sub>i</sub>-* 'to yawn, gape' is extensively attested in Germanic and the only formation in *\*-y-* (beside OHG. *anagiwēn*, etc.) seems to be Gmc. *\*gīwaz* > OE. *giw*, *gēow* 'vulture' from *\*ghiH<sub>i</sub>-yo-*.<sup>13</sup> It is unlikely that OHG. *anagiwēn* is denominative. Rather, one might assume that it has a non-organic hiatus filling *-w-* and that it should be seen as a by-form to OHG. *gīen* from an Indo-European stative *\*ghH<sub>i</sub>-éH<sub>i</sub>-* (for that form and a definition of further stems formed to the root *\*gheH<sub>i</sub>-* [e.g. OHG. *ginēn* < *\*ghi-né-H<sub>i</sub>-ti*] see Rasmussen 1989: 52). OHG. *gēwōn* may also have such a non-organic *-w-*, while its formation could be seen as denominative, cf. Lat. *hiāre* 'to yawn' < *\*ghi-e-H<sub>i</sub>-jé/ó-*. Similarly, Russ. Church Slav. *zěvati* 'to yawn', Czech *zívat* 'id.', etc., must be seen as secondary intra-Slavonic iterative/durative formations to OCS. *zějō* 'I yawn, gape' < *\*gheH<sub>i</sub>-e/o-*. That is to say, verbal forms with *\*-y-* as found in Germanic and Slavic are secondarily formed in both branches, and therefore cannot be associated with a purported Tocharian verbal stem in *\*-y-*. Thus, Van Windekens' etymology is probably to be rejected as it stands. It could regain its value in a modified form though, for, as pointed out by Adams (p.c.), one could for Tocharian start from a verbal noun *\*gheH<sub>i</sub>-yṗ* 'gaping, yawning' that spawned a denominative verb 'to yawn'. That is, *\*gheH<sub>i</sub>-yṗ* > Common Toch. *\*świwān-* that produced the

<sup>13</sup> Olcel. *gjá* 'fissure in the earth; lecherous life', MHG. *giude* 'revelling', Mod.G. *vergeuden* 'squander, dissipate' presumably do not belong with the same root as OHG. *anagiwēn*.



denominative verb A \**śaiwāññ-* > \**śaiwā<sup>i</sup>ññ-* > *śewiññ-*.

§5.5.1.5. A *slānkiññ-* is of uncertain meaning. Its only attestation is a subjunctive XII abstract 50 a1 *slānkiññlune*. There is no apparent word, verb or noun, in either Tocharian language with which this stem might be associated. It is not surprising then that no explanation of it has been offered. Van Windekens (1976) even omits any mention of it, as do Krause & Thomas (1960). The following remarks are therefore necessarily speculative.

I suggest *slānkiññä/a-* is related to the adjective/adverb A *slākkār*, B *slakkare*. These latter are glossed by Thomas & Krause (1964: 158, 260) with "schlaff, niedergeschlagen, traurig", but Thomas 1974: 88 (cf. also Thomas 1983: 155, 1984: 22, 121) shows that at least in one context (TX 3 a1) B (*sla*)*kk(a)r(e)* translates Skt. *capala-* which, according to the dictionaries, has the meaning "sich hin und her bewegend, beweglich, schwankend, rasch bei der Hand, flüchtig" and as an adverb "schnell, rasch". Such a translation is adopted by Van Windekens 1976: 430.

The context of A *slānkiññlune* is as follows: 50 a1 /// *śla slānkiññlune omlaṃ ākrunt swāsā(smām?)*. Should this word be related to A *slākkār*, this text could perhaps be translated with 'with dejection(?) shedding hot tears', if the old meaning assigned to A *slākkār*, B *slakkare*, i.e. 'dejected, sorrowful', is maintained, but should Thomas be correct in rendering this pair of words with 'quick' (*vel sim.*), the text could be translated 'instantly [lit. with haste] shedding hot tears'.

Beside the semantic problems there are, of course, grave phonological problems. The geminate of A *slākkār* and B *slakkare* (beside *slakare*) is unexplained. The East Tocharian word is a *hapax legomenon* while the West Tocharian one occurs three times, twice with *-kk-* (9 Š b2, TX 3 a1) and once with *-k-* (H 149. 15 b4). In order to connect A *slānkiññä/a-* with A *slākkār*, one must either assume that *-kk-* somehow reflects earlier *-nk-* with unexplained assimilation, or that there is some other reason for the gemination and that *slānkiññä/a-* has a nasalized radical syllable as against a non-nasalized one in A *slākkār*. Assuming that the latter is the case, and turning to the

etymological family of A *slākkār*, B *slakkare*, one finds that forms with a radical nasal alternate with forms without a nasal. Thus, there is e.g. Gk. *λαγρός* 'schlaff, schwächig, dünn' beside *λαγγών* 'Zaudern', Lat. *laxus* 'lax' beside *languē* 'I am lax, relaxed', OIcel. *slakr* 'lax' beside *slakki* 'broad depression (in landscape)', etc.

As regards the formation of A *slānkiññā/a-* there is no reason to see it as a primary deverbative formation. I would suggest that it is denominative to an unattested *n*-stem *\*slānkān-*, whether or not related to A *slākkār*, B *slak(k)are*.

§5.5.1.6. A *kāṣiññ-* 'to revile, express scorn' forms a present XII (inf. 300 a6 *kāṣiñtsi*, impf. 28 a5 *kāṣiññ[ā](t)*), subjunctive XII (opt. 3sg. 354 b1 *kāṣiññitrā*), and preterite V (past ptc. *kākṣiñu*). Unfortunately, this verb appears to stand completely isolated in Tocharian and any etymological association is quite uncertain. There are therefore no ascertainable indices that would guide us as to its formation. Krause & Thomas 1960: 216 take it as a primary verb of present class XII (type B *māntāññā/e-*), but, as we have seen, that would be unique in East Tocharian: the other East Tocharian present XII verb classed as primary by Krause & Thomas, i.e. A *śewiññā/a-*, was analysed above as denominative. Besides, primary deverbatives have not extended their *-ññ*-element outside of the present stem. There is, of course, nothing that forbids interpreting *kāṣiññā/a-* as a denominative. However, I prefer seeing in this verb a "secondary" deverbative of the type A *ākṣiññā/a-*, cf. §5.5.2.3 below.

§5.5.2. As indicated in §5.5., East Tocharian has no traces of deverbatives of the type B *māntāññā/e-*. There is, however, a deverbative formation of subjunctive class XII in East Tocharian that might be termed "secondary" deverbatives. This is the type A *ākṣiññā/a-*. In all essentials its formation was explained by Winter (1977, esp. p. 151sq.). He suggests that in the East Tocharian verb deriving from Common Toch. *\*wæk(w)ññā/æ-* (my notation) > *\*wæññā/æ-*, i.e. A *\*waññā/a-* > *\*wayññā/a-* (Winter actually posits *\*wayñ-*; for an account of this verbal stem and the phonological problems

involved, cf. §7 and §§9–9.3 below), the *-yññ-* was abstracted and analogically extended to the simple thematic stem A *\*ākšā/a-* (cf. B subjunctive II *ākšā/e-*), producing a new subjunctive XII stem A *ākšiññā/a-* (< *\*ākšā-yññā/a-*). This extension was facilitated through the semantic association of the verbs A *weñ-* ‘to speak’ and A *āks-* ‘to proclaim’. Let us now examine in detail those East Tocharian verbs of subjunctive class XII that yield to a definition as “secondary” derivatives.

§5.5.2.1. A *ākšiññā/a-* ‘to proclaim’ forms a present XI (e.g. 1sg. *āksisam*), but a subjunctive XII (e.g. 1sg. 217 a7 *ākšiññam*), imperative V (e.g. 2sg. 20 b2 *[p]āk[š]iññā-ni*), preterite V (e.g. 3pl. *ākšiññār*). The formation of its stems in *-ññ-* was described above on the basis of Winter’s suggestion.

§5.5.2.2. A *krāšiññā/a-* occurs only once, perhaps twice. The handbooks (Krause & Thomas 1960: 233, Thomas & Krause 1964: 98, etc.) give the meaning “verdrießen, verdrießlich sein”. Etymologically it is probably correctly associated with the verb B *krās-* ‘to feel irritated, vexed, be upset’ with non-causative present IV *krosotār* (K. T. Schmidt 1982: 371 n.62), preterite I *krāsa*, to which one would expect a subjunctive V *\*krāsā-* (cf. also the noun *krāso* ‘irritation’). An expected East Tocharian non-causative pendant would also be of present class IV and subjunctive V (i.e. A *\*krasatār*, *\*krāsā-*), etc. On the other hand, the West Tocharian causative is of class IX (3sg. *krāsāššām*) to which one might expect East Tocharian to respond with a causative of present class VIII *\*krāsāšā/a-*; the subjunctive stem (regularly or frequently) accompanying causative presents of class VIII was of class II or I (Krause & Thomas 1960: 207–208, §376). Thus, to a putative causative pres. VIII A *\*krāsāšā/a-* one might expect a causative subjunctive II *\*krāsā/a-*. It is my suggestion that the subjunctive XII A *krāšiññā/a-* is formed to an earlier subjunctive II *\*krāsā-* through extension by the element *-yññ-* in the same manner as *\*ākšā-* was extended to *ākšiññā/a-*. – For a discussion of the etymology of BA *krās-*, see my other paper in the present number of *TIES*.

§5.5.2.3. A *kāṣiññā/a-* 'to revile, express scorn' was briefly discussed in §5.5.1.6 above; an interpretation of this verb as a primary deverbative was rejected as that would have made it quite unique in East Tocharian. It was conceded that a denominative formation would be possible, but preference was given to classing it as a "secondary" deverbative of the type A *ākṣiññā/a-*. My reason for that is the palatal sibilant preceding the suffixal *-iññ-*. Such an interpretation would imply that there was indeed a verbal base whose subjunctive was of class II *\*kāṣā-* that was extended to *kāṣiññā/a-* as *\*ākṣā-* to *ākṣiññā/a-*. A drawback to this suggestion is the fact that *kāṣiññā/a-* is a present stem as well as a subjunctive stem, whereas *ākṣiññā/a-* is only a subjunctive stem accompanied by a quite different present stem (*āksis-*). Thus there is still much to be discovered concerning A *kāṣiññā/a-*.

§5.5.2.4. A *kñāññā/a-* appears to be a subjunctive XII stem to a verb A *kñā-* of unknown meaning. It is attested four times: a subjunctive XII 3sg. middle 352 a1 *kñāñtār* (hardly a subjunctive I, as tentatively suggested by Krause & Thomas 1960: 253, but – were it not for the preterite V forms – conceivably subjunctive VII), preterite V 3sg. middle *kñ[ā]ññā[t]*, 3pl. middle *kñāññānt*, past participle *kākkñāññu*. No corresponding verb is found in West Tocharian, and none of the handbooks has ventured a guess as to its meaning. Still, with due reserve, I would suggest a connection with A *kñā-* 'to know', *āknats* (B *aknātsa* 'ignorant'), *kñas-* 'to recognize, know', and *kānts-* 'to confess, recognize'. The verbal root or stem behind A *kñāññā/a-*, I suggest, had the meaning 'to acknowledge, recognize', *vel sim*. Such a translation fits well in three of the four occurrences of this verb, while the fourth context is too fragmentary to admit of a translation. Thus, 111 a5 /// [y]peṣiñi wrasañ *kñāññānt riṣakām* would mean 'the people of the country recognized / acknowledged the Ṛṣi', 218 b4 *ṣotreyo lyāklyāṣ lykāly pūk kākkñāññu* would mean 'by means of the sign having gradually acknowledged all', and 352 a1 (*Ḳ*)cne sām a[m]tuṣ *kñāñtār sām etṣṣā(1)* /// would mean '[if] he thereupon recognizes him, that understanding...' (i.e. lit. 'whom [if] he thereupon

recognizes, that grasping...'). The fourth context (217 a2) is too incomplete to yield any sense.

Should this be a correct guess, prompted by the "Gleichklang" of A *knā*-, *kñas*-, etc., one can turn to questions of the formation of *kñāññā/a*-. First, however, a few words are in order concerning its proposed Tocharian relatives.

§5.5.2.4.1. A *knā*- 'to know' is attested only in its present stem, which is of class VI, i.e. *knānā*- (2sg. act. *knānat*, participle *knānmām*). In my opinion, this present stem is more or less equivalent to that of Ved. *jānāti* 'knows, recognizes', and has – as the Vedic form – reshaped an original I.-E. *\*ǵṇ-n-eH<sub>3</sub>-*, although in a different manner. While Vedic *jānāti* for expected *\*janāti* reflects as if *\*ǵṇH<sub>3</sub>-n-eH<sub>3</sub>-*, Tocharian A *knānā*- reflects as if *\*ǵṇ-n-eH<sub>3</sub>-* > Proto-Toch. *\*kānnā*- > *\*kānā*- plus a reintroduced presentic *-nā*-, because the stem *\*kānā*- had the appearance of being the simple root form unmarked with a present suffix. The resulting *\*kānānā*- gave the East Tocharian present stem *knānā*- regularly. One might want to consider a different possibility, namely that A *knānā*- could be quite parallel to Ved. *jānāti*. Having been reshaped from *\*ǵṇ-n-eH<sub>3</sub>-* to *\*ǵṇH<sub>3</sub>-n-eH<sub>3</sub>-* that new form would have yielded Common Toch. *\*kānānā*- if a laryngeal (or: if *H<sub>3</sub>*) is reflected by *-ā*- in the position C<sub>ṽ</sub>\_\_C. To judge by A *kānts*-, as discussed below, a laryngeal (*H<sub>3</sub>*) in that position appears to have yielded zero, however, so that one may have to reject this alternative. An in-depth study of this problem cannot be undertaken here, though.

§5.5.2.4.2. A *ākñats*, B *akñātsa* 'ignorant, unknowing' is usually equated with Gk. *ἄγνωτος* and Skt. *ājñāta*-, cf. e.g. Van Windekens 1976: 224. In my opinion that equation is not as self-evident as it might appear. For one thing, the Greek and Indic forms have the meaning 'unknown' while the Tocharian ones mean 'ignorant'. A comparison with Gk. *ἄγνως* (gen. sg. *ἄγνωτος*) 'ignorant; unknown' might be more appropriate for that reason. Second, the Tocharian forms reflect a final *\*-tsā* as if from I.E. *\*-t-iH<sub>2</sub>* (made into an

*n*-stem in Tocharian [as if *\*-t-iH<sub>2</sub>-n* or the like, cf. pl. B *aknātsaṇ*]) and is, therefore, not identical in formation with the Greek and Indic forms. Third, it seems rewarding to take *\*-tsā* as a Tocharian suffix forming agent nouns to the subjunctive stem of Tocharian verbs. That is, B *aknātsa*, A *āknats*, would imply and derive from a subjunctive I (or V) *\*knā-*, in the same manner as B *wapāttsa* 'weaver' derives from the subjunctive V stem *wāpā-* to the verb *wāp-* 'to weave'. It should be noted, however, that it is possible that one would have to posit a derivation of these agent nouns from the respective preterite stems of their verbs: the accent of B *wapāttsa* agrees with that of the preterite I *wāpā-* rather than with that of the subjunctive V *wāpā-*. We cannot delve into that problem here, though. That is to say, B *aknātsa* and A *āknats* would, from the standpoint of Tocharian, imply a subjunctive I or V *\*knā-* (or a preterite I *\*knā-*). Such stem(s) would fit well with the present VI stem A *knānā-*, which, as argued above, is the (indirect) continuation of the Indo-European present stem *\*ǵṇ-n-eH<sub>3</sub>-*. That present stem was accompanied by a root aorist *\*ǵneH<sub>3</sub>-* (cf. Gk. ἔγνω) that would have produced the putative preterite I stem *\*knā-*, while a perfect stem *\*ǵégnoH<sub>3</sub>-* would have produced the subjunctive stem *\*knā-*.

§5.5.2.4.3. A *kñas-* has the meaning 'to know, recognize, be familiar (with)'. Until recently this verb was known from only one text: 340 b5 *sām kñasāṣ tu* (= *kñasāṣt tu*) *vāsavagrām ṣūk[ṣ]am*, translated by Sieg (1952: 38) "Bist du bekannt im Dorfe Vāsavagrāma?". The form *kñasāṣt\** is a second person singular present, for the context virtually precludes seeing it as a preterite as hesitatingly favoured by Pinault 1990: 131 (and tentatively contemplated by Sieg & Siegling & Schulze 1931: 435) on account of the newly discovered past participle form A *kñasu* – if not taken as an adjective in *-u* – (76 YQ 1.4 1/2 [recto] a1 *tām nu mā kñasu* 'having not recognized this'). This alleged participle would imply that the *-s-* of *kñas-*, at least in synchronic Tocharian terms, is root-final. This does not seem to be seriously detrimental to the by now commonly accepted interpretation of *kñas-* as the equivalent of Hitt. *ganeš-*, both deriving from I.-E. *\*ǵnēH<sub>3</sub>-s-* with a presentic *-s-*, cf. esp.

Jasanoff 1988: 227sq. The presentic *-s-* has been generalized in all stems of this East Tocharian verb, a phenomenon that need not be of great antiquity, cf. below.

The formal status of A *kñasu* as a participle is somewhat precarious, however. The past participle is regularly reduplicated in East Tocharian. There are two types of exceptions from this. First, there is no reduplication when the participle accompanies preterites of class I to verbs with a "weak" radical vocalism (*ä, i, u*), in which cases the nominative singular masculine final is *-o*, cf. e.g. A *mārso* to *mārs-* 'forget', *mālko* to *mālk-* 'to fold', *lmo* to *lām-* 'to sit', etc. Second, there is no surface reduplication in verbs beginning with a vowel or in several verbs beginning in *y-* or *w-*, cf. e.g. A *aru* to *ar-* 'to produce, call forth', *yāmu* to *yām-* 'to do', *wasu* to *wās-* 'to dress', etc. The superficial lack of reduplication in this latter type is due to contraction. It is clear that a participle A *kñasu* fits in neither category. Unless one is willing to accept a completely anomalous participial formation here, one may prefer to accept Pinault's alternative suggestion (1990: 131 n.6) that A *kñasu* is an adjective in *-u*, formed in a similar manner as A *prasku* 'timid, frightened' to the verb *pārsk-* 'to be afraid' (present IV *praskatār*, but past participle *pārsko*).

Formally, A *kñasāšt\** has been classed as a non-causative present XI, Krause & Thomas 1960: 216, Thomas & Krause 1964: 98. This would have a parallel in the non-causative present XI A *entsās-* (cf. §2.1.10) while the two other members of that class have an element *-sis-* not *-sās-*, viz. *āksis-* and *oksis-*. Conversely, there is a single causative present XI and here we find the element *-sās-*, viz. A *swāsās-* 'to make rain'. Formally, A *kñasās-* could thus be seen as either a non-causative or a causative. The causative frequently does not differ from the non-causative semantically.

§5.5.2.4.4. A *kām̐ts-* (pres. VIII[?] *kām̐tsās-*) is a further difficult form, but can hardly be separated from the ones discussed above, cf. Van Windekens 1976: 204–205. Its meaning is quite definitely 'to confess, admit, (Germ.) bekennen'. It is attested five times, e.g. 300 b4 *kāntsāsamtrā mañk rutāñkāmtrā triślune* 'we confess the guilt [and] remove the error' (cf. 309 b6

*mañk kām̐tsāsa(mtrā?)*), 236 a1 *klesāśśi nākām kām̐[sā](samtrā?)* 'we confess the *klesā*-blame' (cf. 126 b4 (*nā*)*kām śñi nu kōyal mā kām̐tsā(štār?)* 'why does he not confess his blame?').

If A *kām̐tsā-s-* is to be associated with the Indo-European root *\*ǵneH<sub>3</sub>*, as seems inevitable, it can only be derived from the zero grade of that root, which would imply that a laryngeal (or at least *\*H<sub>3</sub>*) is lost after a syllabic resonant (or, more precisely, after a syllabic nasal); that is, the sequence *CpH<sub>3</sub>C* results in Tocharian (A) *CānC* or *CnāC* (cf. thus Lindeman 1987: 302, Adams 1988: 32) and not in *CnāC* as I have previously assumed on numerous occasions<sup>14</sup>. Adams (*l.c.*, also p. 46 n.27) derives A *kām̐ts-* from an I.E. *\*ǵnE-ske/o-*, but a preform *\*ǵpH<sub>3</sub>-s(k)e/o-* (or even a reduplicated *\*ǵi-ǵpH<sub>3</sub>-s(k)e/o-*) is more probable. The sequence *-ām̐ts-* in the East Tocharian form has a secondary *-t-* inserted between *-n-* and *-s-*, as is well-known in both Tocharian languages. However, the *-ns-* must be a secondary sequence here, for an original sequence of *\*kāns-* would through palatal epenthesis have yielded A *\*kā̐ns-* > *\*kis-* (cf. A *klis-* < *\*klāns-* versus B *klānts-* 'to sleep'). That is, one must posit Common Toch. *\*knās(k)V-* (or *\*kā-knās(k)V-*) > A *\*knāsV* (or *\*kāknāsV-*) from which the attested root form A *kām̐ts-* resulted after the operation of syncope and *t*-insertion.

This explains only the root form of our verb though, but not the stem form *kām̐tsās-*, which appears to have added a suffixal *-ās-* to the present VIII stem *kān(t)-s-*. This is highly irregular in the East Tocharian present system, where *-ās-* is known only in the verb *winā-s-* 'to express respect for' and verbs of the type *lyā-s-* 'to rub off' where the *-ā-* is root final. Contrarily, subjunctives of class IX (i.e., A class VIII) form their causatives in East Tocharian by adding a suffixal *-ās-* to the verbal root in question. It is conceivable that A *kām̐tsās-* may have to be classified as a subjunctive causative (cf. the causative subjunctive *klisāšlune* to A *klis-* 'to sleep', whose *-s-* is the present suffix as the *-s-* of *klānts-*) with the causative meaning no different from the non-causative one. The difficulties in interpreting all the occurrences

<sup>14</sup> This does not necessarily imply that a sequence of *CiHC* or *CuHC* developed in the same manner. Here, I still hold that the laryngeal (at least *H<sub>2</sub>* and probably *H<sub>3</sub>*) is reflected (directly or indirectly) as Toch. *ā*.



of this verb as subjunctives rather than as presents is perhaps not insurmountable. At any rate, Van Windekens' suggestion that the verbal stem A *kāntsā-* reflects I.-E. *\*ǵeṇa<sub>3</sub>to-* (VW's notation), secondarily enlarged with *\*-iā-*, does not harmonize with the expected patterns of Tocharian word-formation.

§5.5.2.4.5. We can now return to the question of the formation of A *kñāññā/a-*, for which we have posited the meaning 'to acknowledge, recognize'. I would suggest the following situation and development:

The Indo-European root *\*ǵneH<sub>3</sub>-* produced three different present stems in Tocharian: I.-E. *\*ǵṇ-n-eH<sub>3</sub>-* produced A *knānā-* (§5.5.2.4.1), I.-E. *\*ǵneH<sub>3</sub>-s-* produced A *kñāsā-* (§5.5.2.4.3), and I.-E. *\*(ǵi-)ǵṇH<sub>3</sub>-sk-* produced A *kānts-* (§5.5.2.4.4). An Indo-European perfect *\*ǵe-ǵnoH<sub>3</sub>-* resulted in Common Toch. *\*kāknā-* (depalatalization in the reduplication syllable so as to harmonize with the radical initial; accent on the second syllable in polysyllabic forms) which produced the subjunctive V stem (really subjunctive I) *knā-* through the loss of the reduplication syllable as always in the subjunctive (regular before a single consonant, analogical before a double consonant). This stem is witnessed in the subjunctive derivatives B *aknātsa*, A *āknats* (§5.5.2.4.2). This subjunctive stem served initially all three Tocharian present formations – a situation that was bound to change. To A *kānts-* was created the new subjunctive *kānts-ās-* (causative?), while A *knānā-* continued to be served by the subjunctive *knā-*\* (unfortunately unattested, but probable in view of B *aknātsa*, A *āknats*). As a subjunctive to A *kñās-* the form *knā-*\* with a non-palatal *-ñ-* was not felt to be clear enough, and therefore acquired analogically a palatal *-ñ-* and was changed to *\*kñā-*. When A *ākṣā-* was extended to *ākṣā-yññā/a-* > *ākṣiññā/a-* (§5.5.2), the subjunctive *\*kñā-* followed suit and was extended to *\*kñā-yññā/a-*. The presence of three palatal *-ñ-*'s in this form caused a dissimilatory loss of the palatal epenthesis which led to the actual form *kñāññā/a-*. As in the case of *āks-* (and *oks-*, cf. below) the element *-ññ-* was extended to all non-presentic stems.

§5.5.2.5. One further East Tocharian verb should be discussed here, although it does not actually have an attested present or subjunctive XII. A *ok(s)-* 'to grow' [B *auk-*] forms a present XI (e.g. 3sg. 4 a6 *oksış*). No non-causative subjunctive is known (for the causative subjunctive VII A *okñāš*, see §2.1.2). The preterite, however, is of class V: 3sg. 372 b2 *okšiññā*, accompanied by the past participle *okšiññu\** (e.g. obl. sg. masc. 243 a3 *okšiññunt*). It seems likely that there was a subjunctive XII *\*okšiññā/a-*, which would make the non-causative paradigm of this verb quite parallel to that of A *āks-*. Winter 1977: 138, 146, argues convincingly that the element *-ññ-* in the preterite stem of A *ok(s)-* is of a secondary nature, as seen by the fact that beside the past participle *okšiññu\** there is an isolated adjective *okšu* 'old', matching the West Tocharian past participle *aukšu* 'grown'. In my opinion, the *-ññ-* extension in this verb is secondary not only in the preterite but also in the putative subjunctive stem *\*okšiññā/a-*. It may be suggested that the original subjunctive here was of class II *\*okšä-* and that this stem was extended to *\*okšiññā/a-* on the analogy of *\*ākšä- → ākšiññā/a-* because of their identical structure: vowel + *kšä-*.

§5.5.3. To sum: Beside the marker *-ñ-* characterizing subjunctives of class VII, frequent in East Tocharian but perhaps found only with the verb *weñ-* in West Tocharian (but see §7 and §§9–9.3 below), an element *-ññ-* is found in abundance in East as well as in West Tocharian, characterizing presents and subjunctives of class XII, and preterites of class V. The distribution of this suffixal element is only partly identical in East and West Tocharian:

(1) Common to both languages, and therefore assuredly of Common Tocharian or more ancient origins, are the denominatives. They are, in principle, formed to underlying *n*-stems, and they have generalized the element *-ññ-* in all stem forms, as far as can be seen. Thus,

Verb in -ññ-

Nominal basis

B *āñmāññä/e-* 'to wish'*āñmān-* 'wish'B *kwipeññä/e-* 'to be ashamed'*\*kwipen-* (?) 'shame'(also preterite V *kwipeññā-*)B *tāñkwāññä/e-* 'to love'*tāñkwān-* 'love'(also subjunctive XII *tāñkwāññä/e-*, imperative V *ptāñwāññē*)B *yākāmṣāññä/e-* 'to loath'*\*yākāmṣān-* (?) 'loathing'(also subjunctive XII *yākāmṣāññä/e-*)B *lāreññä/e-* 'to hold dear'*lāren-* 'loving'B *wināññä/e-* 'to enjoy'*winān-* 'pleasure'(also subjunctive XII *wināññä/e-*)B *sākwāññä/e-* 'to feel happy'*sākwān-* 'happiness'(also subjunctive XII *sākwāññä/e-*)B *sklokāññä/e-* 'to be in doubt'*sklokān-* 'doubt'B *tsereññä/e-* 'to deceive'*\*tserek(w)ān-* (?) 'deceit'(also subjunctive XII *tsereññä/e-*, past participle *tsetsemū*)B *celeññä/e-* 'to make an appearance'*\*celen-* (?) 'appearance(?)'B *ārcāññä/e-* 'to deign, be obliged'*\*ārcān-* (?) 'obligation(?)'(also imperative V *porcaññar*)A *tuñkiññä/a-* 'to love'CT *\*tāñkwān-* 'love'(also subjunctive XII *tuñkiññä/a-*)A *wiññä/a-* ← *\*wineññä/a-(?)* 'to enjoy' CT *\*winān-* 'pleasure'(imperfect *wiññä-*, subjunctive XII *wiññä/a-*)A *sūkaṣiññä/a-* 'to feel happy'A *sūkaṣin-* 'happy'A *śewiññä/a-* 'to yawn'CT *\*śæiwān-* (?)(also subjunctive XII *śewiññä/a-*)A *slāñkiññä/a-* ← *\*slāñkän-* 'dejection'(?), 'haste'(?). A *\*slāñkän-* 'dejection'(?), 'haste'(?). [attested is the subjunctive XII *slāñkiññä/a-*]

(2) Primary deverbatives are attested only in West Tocharian. These are based on Tocharian nasal presents of class VI (or VII). In principle the

element *-ññ-* is found only in the present while the subjunctive is of class V and the preterite of class I. Still, there is one instance where the *-ññ-* may have been extended to the subjunctive as well (*sukaññiyenträ*), and in one case it is found in the past participle (*tsetskäññoṣ*). Thus,

Verb in <i>-ññ-</i>	Nasal present basis
B <i>käskäññä/e-</i> 'to scatter'	~ not attested
B <i>kläntsäññä/e-</i> 'to sleep'	cf. A <i>klisnā-</i> 'to sleep'
B <i>mäntäññä/e-</i> 'to hurt'	B <i>mintānā-</i> 'to sprinkle'
B <i>wäskäññä/e-</i> 'to move'	cf. A <i>wäsāñkā-</i> 'to move'
B <i>sukäññä/e-(*-)</i> 'to be (held) aloft'	B <i>suknā-</i> 'to hold aloft'
B <i>kāwäññä/e-</i> ← <i>*kāwäññä/e-(?)</i> 'to crave' ~ not attested	
B <i>tsäkäññä/e-*</i> 'to draw out, make visible' cf. A <i>tsäknā-</i> 'to draw out'	
(attested is only the past participle <i>tsetskäññoṣ</i> )	

(3) No primary deverbatives of the West Tocharian type (2) are attested in East Tocharian. Here, however, there is a different type of deverbatives that I have termed "secondary" deverbatives. This exclusively East Tocharian type shows the element *-ññ-* in the subjunctive and preterite stems, but not in the present stem (there may be an exception to this: A *käṣiññä/a-*). As shown by Winter (1977: 151sq.) this element has been abstracted from the verb A *weñ-* 'to speak' and added to the subjunctive II stem of the verbs in question. Actually, Winter is concerned with only the verb *āks-* with the subjunctive II *\*ākṣä- → āḱsiññä/a-*, and assumes that the semantic affinity of the verbs A *weñ-* 'to speak' and A *āks-* 'to proclaim' was the decisive factor causing the transfer of the suffixal element. This seems to me quite plausible, but, as seen in the preceding paragraphs, there are more verbs than only *āks-* that experienced such a change of their subjunctive (and preterite) stem(s). Beside the *verba dicendi*, the verb A *oks-* 'to grow' (attested in the preterite but not in the subjunctive) and *krās-* 'to vex' have joined this group. Thus,

Subjunctive in <i>-ññ-</i>	Subjunctive (II or I) basis
A <i>ākṣiññä/a-</i> 'to proclaim'	cf. B <i>ākṣä/e-</i> 'to proclaim'

A *krāṣiññā/a-* 'to vex'

unattested

A *kāṣiññā/a-* 'to revile'

unattested

A *kñāññā/a-* 'to recognize' (?)\**kñā-* ← \**knā-* 'to know'A *okṣiññā/a-* \* 'to grow'cf. past participle B *aukṣu*  
'grown', A adjective *okṣu* 'old'

### §6. Remaining problems

Nearly all verbal forms and formations exhibiting the thematic markers *-ñ-* and *-ññ-* have now been sorted and classified. There still remains one problem of that order though, for a decision as to the status of the verb BA *weñ-* has been avoided and postponed so far in this paper. As seen in §1.1.3 B *weñ-* is anomalous in that it appears to be the only West Tocharian verb of subjunctive class VII. Other remaining problems concern primarily the origins and history of these formations. An intricate problem centers around the question of a possible morphological relationship between the subjunctive VII and the present or present/subjunctive class XII. This is in turn linked to the question of the phonological history of the markers *-ñ-* and *-ññ-*: it was argued in §§4-4.1 that the palatal nasal and the thematic conjugation must indicate formations in *\*-je-/jo-*, but why then a simple *-ñ-* on the one hand and a geminate *-ññ-* on the other? Furthermore, while the East Tocharian class XII deverbatives (type A *ākṣiññā/a-*) are clearly a late formation, the East and West Tocharian class XII denominatives might reflect an Indo-European formation as has been suggested by some scholars. But are the West Tocharian class XII deverbatives an innovation? Finally, one might ask whether the East Tocharian subjunctives of class VII are an innovation or of Indo-European origins.

### §7. BA *weñ-* and its classification

We first turn our attention to the verb BA *weñ-* 'to speak, say'. While the handbooks have asserted that two West Tocharian verbs form subjunctives of class VII, i.e. the verbs B *weñ-* and *länt-* 'to go out', it has now become clear through the discovery of the 1sg. subj. B *lannu* (§1.1.1-§1.1.3) that this

latter verb is not of class VII. B *weñ-* would then be the only West Tocharian verb in this class, which is somewhat suspicious and would be favoured only by the fact that B (as A) *weñ-* has a single *-ñ-* in all its forms and never has a geminate. In class VII, as we have seen, a single *-ñ-* is the class marker, while in class XII the marker is a geminate. At least five arguments favour the classification of the subjunctive of B (and A) *weñ-* as of class XII. The first is, as already mentioned, the isolation of B *weñ-* in class VII, while in class XII it would have the company of many other West Tocharian verbs. Second, the verb *weñ-* in East and West Tocharian shows the nasal element not only in the subjunctive as would be expected of a class VII verb, but also in the preterite and the past participle as is the rule with class XII denominatives and "secondary" deverbatives. Third, as convincingly argued by Winter (1977: 147sq.), it is likely that BA *weñ-* was previously a present stem as well. This complies with class XII practices. Fourth, as shown by Winter (o.c.) and discussed in §5.5.2sq. above, East Tocharian class XII deverbatives have been influenced by A *weñ-* whose nasal element and conjugation they have borrowed and added to their original class II subjunctive stem. As these deverbatives are unequivocally of class XII, their basis, i.e. the verb that lent them their suffix and conjugation, must surely have been of class XII as well. Fifth, in all probability BA *weñ-* is denominative in formation and is in no way associated with a primary nasal present, cf. §10. Indeed, the argument of the single nasal of BA *weñ-* as against the geminate of class XII is probably inconclusive: formally, the subjunctive A *weñä/a-* must have had a geminate. This is shown by the vocalism *-e-* of A *weñ-* which is the result of monophthongization after the epenthesis of *-i-* before a following *-ññ-*, i.e. A *\*waññä/a-* > *\*wa<sup>i</sup>ññä/a-* > *\*weññä/a-*; it is also indirectly shown by the geminate of the "secondary" deverbatives (A *ākṣiññä-*, but see §9.3 end). The reason for the subsequent degemination of *\*weññä/a-* to *weñä/a-* as against the non-degemination of *ākṣiññä/a-* will be discussed in §§9-9.3.

#### §8. Subj. VII and the West Tocharian class XII deverbatives

If the nasal of *weñ-* has been degeminated, one may wonder whether the

single nasal of subjunctive class VII is also the result of degemination, in which case there might possibly be an historical relationship between that class and class XII. Class VII subjunctives are integrated into primary verbal paradigms. Therefore, a formational connection with class XII denominatives would be plainly excluded. A connection with the East Tocharian "secondary" deverbatives is also extremely unlikely as these are a late and analogical formation and show the nasal element in the preterite and past participle as well. On the other hand, a connection with the West Tocharian deverbatives (type *kāskāññā/e-*) might be more viable. Although class VII is a subjunctive class while the West Tocharian class XII deverbatives are a present class exclusively (the exceptions are irrelevant, cf. §5.3sq.), both appear to be derived from nasal presents: the West Tocharian class XII *kāskāññā/e-* type has clear connections with Tocharian *sef*-verbs of nasal present classes VI and VII, while the East Tocharian class VII subjunctives with a vowel preceding the nasal (type *siñā/a-*, *riñā/a-*) have clear connections with *aniṭ* nasal presents that have been extended with a further *s-/sk*-marker (cf. A *sināštār*, *riñāštār*). Actually, there is a Tocharian pattern, or rather there are outlines of a pattern into which the East Tocharian subjunctive class VII seems to fit on a par with the West Tocharian class XII deverbatives.

§8.1. While numerous Tocharian *sef*-verbs form nasal presents of class VI (e.g. B *wārpanatār* / *wārpnātār*, A *wārpnātār* 'enjoys') accompanied by non-nasal subjunctives of class V (e.g. BA *wārpā-*), a few such nasal presents have acquired further suffixal extensions: on the one hand, extension by (the thematic) *-s(k)-* (e.g. B *pāknāsk-*, A *pāknās-* 'to intend', B *källāsk-* < *\*kālñāsk-* 'to bring', A *yomnās-* 'to reach') with the old present VI relegated to subjunctive function (e.g. B *pāknā-*, A *yomnā-*) or with the old subjunctive intact (e.g. B *kālā-* / *kālā-*); on the other hand there is extension by (the thematic) *-i-* (e.g. B *kāskāññ-* to *\*kāskāñā-* 'to scatter', cf. above; as already indicated this particular type is not attested in East Tocharian) with the old *ā*-subjunctive intact (e.g. B *kāskā-* / *kāskā-*).

A widely parallel pattern is found with a few verbs that can be said to

be Tocharian *aniṭ*-verbs. There are no *aniṭ* nasal presents as such, but roots that formed (from a Tocharian point of view) *aniṭ* nasal presents have – as did some of the *seṭ*-root nasal presents – extended these presents, on the one hand, with (thematic) *-s(k)-* (e.g. B *rināsk-*, A *rinās-* ‘to leave’, A *klinās-* ‘to be obliged’, *sinās-* ‘satisfy’) while the old nasal present – as in the case of the *seṭ*-verbs – has been relegated to subjunctive function (e.g. B *rinā-*, A *klinā-*, *sinā-*\* [in *asināt* ‘unsatisfied’], for this East Tocharian formation, see further below); on the other hand, it may be suggested that there was a parallel extension by (thematic) *-j-*, whereby presents in *-ñyā/æ-* were formed. While the *seṭ*-formation in *-äñyā/æ-* (derived from *\*-änā-*) has survived as a type in the West Tocharian class XII deverbative presents, the *aniṭ*-formation in *-ñyā/æ-* has been entirely replaced in its presentic function in both Tocharian languages by a formation in *-s(k)-* (e.g. B *ers-*, A *ars-* ‘call forth, produce’) while the older *j*-extended present has been relegated to the function of subjunctive<sup>15</sup> which is the way chosen by East Tocharian (e.g. A subj. VII *arñā-*), as against West Tocharian where the original non-nasal subjunctive is preserved (e.g. B *erä-*).

The parallelism suggested here can be schematized thus:

*seṭ*-present    *seṭ*-subjunctive ~ *aniṭ*-present    *aniṭ*-subjunctive

#### Type I

<i>-nā-</i>	<i>-ā-</i>	~	<i>-nā-</i>	<i>-ä-</i>
A <i>kālpnā-</i>	A <i>kālpā-</i>	~ replaced	A <i>trāñkā-</i>	(or type III)
		by pres. VIII		
B <i>wārpñā-</i>	B <i>wārpā-</i>	~ replaced	B <i>erä-</i>	(or type III)

#### Type II

<i>-nās(k)-</i>	<i>-ā- / -nā-</i>	~	<i>-nās(k)-</i>	<i>-ä- / -nā-</i>
A <i>yomnās-</i>	A <i>yomnā-</i>	~	A <i>klinās-</i>	A <i>klinā-</i>
			A <i>sinās-</i>	A <i>sinā-</i> * ( <i>asināt</i> )

<sup>15</sup> But note the imperfects A *tpukñā-*, *tsākñā-*, *wātñā-*, discussed in §3.2 and §8.2, and the participial derivative B *auñento*, A *oñant* ‘beginning’, discussed in §8.3.



B <i>päknāsk-</i>	B <i>päknā-</i>	~ B <i>rināsk-</i>	B <i>rinā-</i> , <i>lāntnā-</i>
B <i>källāsk-</i>	B <i>kālā-</i> / <i>kālā-</i>	~ B <i>yānmāsk-</i>	B <i>yopā-</i> / <i>yāpā-</i>

## Type III

- <i>ñy-</i>	- <i>ā-</i>	~ - <i>ñy-</i>	(- <i>ā-</i> /) - <i>ñy-</i>
A unattested type		~ A replaced	A <i>arñā-</i> , <i>siñā-</i> (but see §8.2 (A <i>trāñkā-</i> type I?) and §8.3)
B <i>kāskāññ-</i>	B <i>kāskā-</i>	~ B replaced	(B <i>erā-</i> type I?) (but see §8.3)

Or again, *seṭ*-presents in -*nā-*

- (a) survived accompanied by subjunctives in -*ā-*;
- (b) were extended to -*nās(k)-* in which case the old subjunctives in -*ā-* either survived or were replaced by the original presents in -*nā-*
- (c) were extended to -*ñy-* accompanied by the old subjunctives in -*ā-*

while, on the other hand, *anīṭ*-presents in -*nā-*

- (a) were always replaced; their original subjunctives in -*ā-* may have survived in the types B *erā-*, A *trāñkā-*, but these forms are ambiguous: they may belong with the forms under (c) below
- (b) were extended to -*nās(k)-* in which case the old subjunctives in -*ā-* either survived or were replaced by the original presents in -*nā-*
- (c) were extended to -*ñy-*; no such presents survive (except apparently in the forms of the imperfects discussed in §3.2 and §8.2; also B *auñento*, A *oñant* of §8.3) for they have all been replaced by -*s(k)-* presents; their original subjunctives in -*ā-* may have either survived in the types B *erā-*, A *trāñkā-* (but these forms are ambiguous: they may belong with the forms under (a) above) or they have been replaced by the presents in -*ñy-*

§8.2. The imperfect forms A *tpukñānt* 'they hid', *tsākñā* 'was lit' and *wātñā* '?', discussed in §3.2, are usually interpreted as formed to subjunctive VII stems (e.g. Sieg & Siegling & Schulze 1931: 387, Krause & Thomas 1960: 220). However, normally the imperfect is formed to present stems and not to subjunctive stems. It therefore seems permissible to see in A *tpukñānt*, *tsākñā*, and *wātñā*, formations to a previous present stem in *\*-ñä/æ-* that has otherwise been relegated to subjunctive function in East Tocharian. In the light of such an interpretation the optative A *tsāsintār*, formed to a subjunctive I stem *\*tsākä-*, would be quite regular beside the original present stem underlying the imperfect *tsākñā*.

§8.3. A further indication of the previous existence of a present in thematic *-ñy-* might be seen in B *auñento*, A *oñant* 'beginning, commencement', which must be derived from a present participle to the verb B *aun-*, A *on-* 'to begin'. This form is important in two ways. First, it appears to be the only West Tocharian remnant of a present in *-ñyä/æ-*, and, second, it shows degemination of (*\*-ñy- >*) *\*-ññ-* to *-ñ-* and thus adds support to the hypothesis suggested in the following paragraph that *-ññ-* yielded *-ñ-* in the position before the accent.

### §9. The relationship of *-ñ-* and *-ññ-*

The question, whether there could be a morphological relationship between the East Tocharian subjunctive VII and the West Tocharian deverbative present XII, has now been answered in the positive. The former reflects an earlier present in *-ñy-* that has replaced a still earlier unextended *aniʃ* nasal present, whereas the latter is a present in *-ñy-* that has replaced an earlier (partly co-existing) unextended *seʃ* nasal present. A fundamental phonological issue has been avoided, however, namely the question how *-ñy-* could have resulted in *-ñ-* in class VII, as against *-ññ-* in class XII (but see §4 and §4.1). There appear to be two possibilities to explain this discrepancy. One is the assumption of two different variants of the same suffix, i.e. *\*-n-i-* versus *\*-n-ij-* and the other is the assumption of a difference in accentuation.

§9.1. As pointed out in §4.1 the commonly held opinion that *\*-ñj-* ought to appear as a geminate *-ññ-* in Tocharian is not necessarily correct – at least not absolutely correct as far as East Tocharian is concerned. However, there are not many relevant examples to be found, whereby one might judge the issue. As far as I can see, *-ñ-* < *\*-ñy-* is found primarily in the subjunctives VII of the type A *riñä/a-*, etc., that, in my opinion, due to their constant palatal, must reflect earlier *\*riñyä/æ-* as argued in §§4–4.1. Since these subjunctives are the case in point here, their testimony is relative though. However, A *oñant*, supported by B *auñento* (§8.3), makes the assumption of such a change reasonably attractive. Most other instances of ascertainable or likely Common Tocharian *\*-ñy-* have suffered depalatalization (and presumably [cf. below] degemination) that has spread to internal position from post-apocope final position where it was regular, cf. A *klyomim* fem. ‘noble’, pl. *klyomināñ*, A *śomim* ‘girl’, obl. *śominām*, A *ārkiñ* fem. ‘white’, obl. *ārkinām*, etc.; this type constitutes what I term Category I [A *-m* = B *-ññV*] in my investigation of the development of *-j-* and *-ij-* in Tocharian, Hilmarsson 1986: 316sq. = 1987[89]a: 79sq. Here one might have expected *\*klyomiññāñ*, *\*śomiññām*, *\*ārkiññām*, if a geminate is the regular outcome of *\*-ñy-* after the accent (cf. discussion below).<sup>16</sup>

In most cases A *-ññ-* results from a late post-syncope assimilation of *\*-ñy-* < *\*-ñiy-*. Thus, as pointed out in §4.1 forms like A *kapsiññāñsi* ‘bodily’ or the perlicative *kapsiññā* ‘on the body’ reflect earlier *\*kapsiñiyā(-)* > *\*kapsiñyā(-)* as proven by the nominative singular *kapsañi* where apocope prevented the syncope of the suffixal *-i-*. The same goes for the geminate of a word like A *śāññune* ‘nature’ as seen by the form *śāñi* ‘own, self’, etc. One might then be tempted to explain the geminate of the East Tocharian class XII denominatives of the type A *tuñkiññä/a-* ‘to love’ in the same manner, and from there on also the West Tocharian deverbatives of that class. However, that would mean separating the East Tocharian subjunctive VII formation that can only have *\*-ñy-* and not *\*-ñiy-*, from the West Tocharian class XII

<sup>16</sup> Of course the type A *yokañi* ‘thirsty’, B *eñkwaññe* ‘male’, my Category II (o.c.), is not relevant for the resolution of our problem here, for this type reflects *\*-ñiy-* not *\*-ñy-*.

deverbatives, a morphologically equivalent formation. For that reason, even though it could theoretically reflect *\*-ñiy-*, I prefer to derive the class XII suffix *-ññ-* from *\*-ñy-* as well, opting for the solution that *\*-ñy-* resulted in East Tocharian *-ñ-* if followed by the accent, but *-ññ-* if preceded by the accent.

§9.2. This solution has also the advantage that one is thereby able to accomodate A *weñä/a-* as a class XII subjunctive (and class V preterite) in spite of its non-geminate. Furthermore, B *weñä/e-*, supported by B *auñento*, with its non-geminate might indicate that this rule was valid for that language as well. It should be noted that such an accentual explanation in order to account for the single *-ñ-* of B *weñä/e-* is contemplated by Winter 1977: 149, albeit in a setting somewhat different from that assumed here. His suggestion that the subjunctive stem B *weñä/e-* is accented on the radical syllable and therefore has *-ñ-* for expected *-ññ-* on the analogy of the preterite stem *weñä-* is, in my opinion unnecessary. Although not directly observable, all subjunctive forms of this verb must have had suffixal accent: the loss of accented *-ä-* in 2sg. *w(e)nt*, 3sg. *wem*, 2pl. *weñcer*, inf. *wentsi*, and the verbal adjective *weñmo*, has clear parallels in the corresponding forms of the verb *klyaus-* 'to hear' (subj. II stem *klyauṣä-* / *klausé-*) and several other verbs.

§9.3. To sum: (1) Common Toch. *\*-ñy-* was assimilated to *\*-ññ-* that thereupon split in two variants depending on the position of the accent. If followed by the accent it was degeminated; if preceded by the accent it was preserved as a geminate. Not all geminate *-ññ-* are of this origin though, e.g. the sequence *\*-ñiy-* suffered syncope (always in East Tocharian except when followed by a final to-be-apocopated vowel, but positionally determined in West Tocharian) after which the resulting cluster *\*-ñy-* was assimilated to *-ññ-*. (2) The East Tocharian subjunctive VII in *-ñ-ä/a-* reflects Common Toch. *\*-ñy-ä/ä > \*-ññ-ä/ä-* with the accentuation to be expected of a disyllabic Tocharian thematic stem. Of course, East Tocharian does not show

the accent, but if one is to judge by the disyllabic thematic verbal stems of West Tocharian it must have been on the thema-vowel. The West Tocharian deverbative class XII in *-ǎññ-ǎ/e-* reflects Common Toch. *\*-ǎñy-ǎ/ǣ- > \*-ǎññ-ǎ/ǣ-* with the accentuation to be expected of a trisyllabic thematic stem. The East and West Tocharian denominatives similarly reflect Common Toch. *\*-Vñy-ǎ/ǣ-*. The East Tocharian "secondary" deverbatives acquired their *-ññǎ/a-* from the verb A *weñǎ/a-* apparently before the geminate was simplified in that word. However, since *weñ-* has no geminate in either West or East Tocharian, it would seem likely that degemination occurred in pre-accentual position already in Common Tocharian. The geminate in the East Tocharian deverbatives (type *ākṣiññǎ/a-*) would therefore more easily be analogical to that of the type *tuñkiññǎ/a-*. As for the verbal stem B *weñǎ/e-*, A *weñǎ/a-*, even though it is of class XII, it must as a disyllabic thematic stem have had suffixal accent and therefore regular degemination. For a note on its etymology, cf. §10.

#### §10. Notes on the Indo-European background

The denominatives of present and subjunctive class XII have long been recognized as such, cf. e.g. Pedersen 1941: 170, Van Windekens 1944: 244, Couvreur 1947: 62. The Tocharian type B *tāñkwāññǎ/e-*, A *tuñkiññǎ/a-* to Common Toch. *\*tāñkwāñ-* 'love' is certainly reminiscent of Gk. *ὀνομαίνω* to *ὄνομα* 'name', etc., and can probably be traced back to Indo-European.

Amongst these Tocharian denominatives the verb BA *weñ-* stands apart in that it has a structure different from that of the other denominatives. Its subjunctive stem counts only two syllables (Common Toch. *\*wæñyǎ/ǣ- < \*wæk(w)ñyǎ/ǣ-*) and it is accented on the thematic vowel. It reflects I.-E. *\*uok\*-n-je/o-* as in OHG. *giwahanen* 'mention', MHG. *gewehenen*, MHG.

*erwähnen*, cf. Lane 1953: 287, and Winter 1977: 134 with discussion.<sup>17</sup>

§10.1. The East Tocharian "secondary" deverbatives of class XII (type *ākṣiññā/a-*), as repeatedly pointed out above, and explained by Winter 1977, are a late creation, although this has not been recognized by Van Windekens, e.g. 1982: 223.

§10.2. The West Tocharian primary derivatives of class XII (type *käskāññā/e-*) are derived from *seṭ*-root nasal presents. As shown in §8sq. they are formationally related and parallel to the East Tocharian subjunctives of class VII. These latter reflect earlier presents derived from *aniṭ*-root nasal presents.

While in the past, scholars have usually not distinguished between the different types of formations within the Tocharian present and subjunctive class XII<sup>18</sup>, attention has been called to its probable association with not only denominatives of the type Gk. *ὀνομαίνω* but also with verbs of the type Skt. *iṣanyāti* 'urges, presses forward', cf. Pedersen 1941: 170, Van Windekens 1944: 244; note also Pinault as cited in the preceding footnote. This type has been studied by Jasanoff (as cited by Melchert 1984: 116) in Indo-European Studies IV (Harvard University; *non vidi*). By Jasanoff's analysis, apparently, the Indic formation in *-anyā-* is related to the Hittite duratives in *-anna-* /

<sup>17</sup> The assimilation of *-(k(w)ñ-* to *-ññ-* as seen in Common Toch. *\*wæk(w)ñyā/æ-* to *\*wæññā/æ-* (later degeminated to *\*wæññā/æ-*) has a parallel in B *tsereññ-* 'to deceive' to B *tserekwa* pl. 'deceit' (cf. §5.4.9). It is true that one might have preferred to find anaptyxis in *\*wæk(w)ñyā/æ-* to *\*wæk(w)ññyā/æ-* and thereupon a development to B *\*wek(w)ññā/e-*, but, as pointed out by Adams (p.c.) this verb, because of its frequency, may have experienced a sort of *allegro* development, an irregular shortening, as indeed witnessed at a later stage of West Tocharian when the allomorph *wñā-* arose in the preterite beside the regular *wēñā-*. Contrarily, I do not think that one can view the degemination of *\*weññ-* to *wēñ-* as such an *allegro* process.

<sup>18</sup> A notable exception is Pinault 1989: 141 who indicates two sources of the verbs of this class, denominatives in *\*-n-ye/o-* and deverbatives in *\*-p(H)-ye/o-* (cf. Ved. *-āyā-*); Adams 1988: 74-75 asserts that class XII is originally a denominative formation that has in both Tocharian languages been extended to "primary" verbs, but o.c., p. 102 fn. 47 he admits the possibility that *\*-n-ye/o-* was already deverbative in Proto-Tocharian" and that "there seems to be some sort of relationship between the verbal stem formatives *-nā-* and *-āññ-*...". But Van Windekens 1982: 89 still claims that the so-called primary verbs of class XII are in reality denominative.

-*anni*- and is a secondary formation of *-je-* / *-jo-* derivatives of nasal infix presents. García-Ramón, 1986: 503–507 and esp. 512–513, discusses at some length the relationship of nasal infix presents and verbs in *\*-n-je/o-* in Greek and Indo-Iranian. Accepting the equation of Ved. *iṣṇāti* ‘urges, sets in motion’ with Gk. *ἰνᾶω* ‘I clean out, pour out’ (secondarily thematicized), he argues for the relationship of this verb (I.-E. *\*His-néH₂-*) with Ved. *iṣanyāti* ‘urges, presses forward’ and Gk. *ιαίνω* ‘I warm, quicken’ (I.-E. *\*His(H₂)-ṇ-je/o-*). As a further likely example of that type he mentions Ved. *mṛṇāti* (attested is *mṛṇīhi* ‘crush!’), Gk. *μάρναμαι* ‘I fight’ in relation to Gk. *μαραίνομαι* ‘I disappear, fade away’ (I.-E. *\*mṛ-n(-H₂)-je/o-*). It seems probable that the West Tocharian class XII primary deverbatives with their clear connections to the Tocharian *sej*-root nasal presents are of the same type as these Greek and Indic verbs. Whether there is a straight historical connection between the Tocharian and Greek–Indo-Iranian (and Hittite) formations is less clear but seems entirely possible. Such a connection is supported by the fact that the verbs forming subjunctives of class VII in East Tocharian – and these are, as we have seen, the *aniṣ* counterpart of the West Tocharian deverbatives of class XII – have striking etymological correspondences among formations in *\*-n-je/o-* and, in general, among nasal presents in other Indo-European languages, especially Greek and Indo-Iranian.

§11. It is certainly striking that many of the Tocharian verbs forming subjunctive VII can be associated with Indo-European nasal present verbs or verbs that show indications of a previous nasal formation. Thus A *arāñtār* ‘he will produce, he will call forth’ would reflect *\*H₁-n(-H₂)-je-<sup>19</sup>*, cf. Gk. *ὄρνυμι* ‘I arise’, Ved. *ṛnvāti* ‘arises, moves’; A *riñtār* ‘he will leave’ would reflect

<sup>19</sup> Actually, there is no evidence that this root was a *sej*-root in Indo-European: Vedic and Greek point decidedly to a present in *\*-neu-* / *-nu-*. Toch. A *arñä-* could indicate a refashioned Pre- or Proto-Toch. *\*H₁-n-H₂-je-* (with loss of laryngeal before yod in internal syllable, cf. Pinault 1982), or a refashioned *\*H₁-n-je-*. Cf. the parallel process assumed to have taken place in Arm. *yatnem* ‘I arise’ by Klingenschmitt 1982: 161–162.

\**Hri-n(-H)-je*<sup>20</sup>, cf. Gk. *ῥίπνω* 'I set in motion, excite' (Ved. *riṇāti* 'makes flow, lets go', *riṇvati* 'id. '); A *siṇlune* 'satiation' would reflect \**si-n(-H<sub>2</sub>)-je*<sup>21</sup>, cf. Ved. *ásinvan* 'insatiable'; A *siñantrā* 'they will be oppressed' would reflect \**si-n(-H<sub>1</sub>)-jo*<sup>22</sup>, cf. Lat. *sinō* 'I let be, put down'; A *señmār* 'I shall rely' (probably lit. 'I shall be bound', cf. my analysis of this verb in the forthcoming *Festschrift Ji*, Peking) would reflect \**sH<sub>2</sub>i-n(-H<sub>2</sub>)-jo-*, cf. Ved. *sināti*, *sinóti* 'binds'; furthermore, while A *klinrar* 'you shall be obliged to' agrees with B *klin-ne* 'he must' in its subjunctive I formation, and thus retains an unextended nasal stem, one might for system reasons have expected (a co-existing?) subjunctive VII \**kliñtār*, reflecting \**kli-n(-H)-je-*, cf. Gk. *κλίνω* 'I incline, lean', Av. *sriṇu-* 'to lean'. Cf. furthermore, A *wākñam* 'I shall break' ~ Gk. *ἄγνυμι* 'I break', A *eñlune* 'instruction' < \**erikñ-* ~ Ved. *asñóti*

<sup>20</sup> Ved. *riṇāti* 'lets flow', *riṭi-* 'stream', etc., appear to indicate a *sef*-formation \**HreiH-*; a correctly formed \**Hri-n-H-* could therefore have produced Pre- or Proto-Toch. \**Hri-n-H-je-* as possibly seen in A *riñā-*; in view of Ved. *riṇvati*, a present in \*-*neu-* / -*nu-* has been formed secondarily, and \**Hri-n-u-* (extended in Tocharian with an -*s-* / -*sk-* suffix) could be the basis of B *riñāṣṣā-* / *riñāske-*, A *riñāṣā-* / *riñāsa-*. The vocalism of BA *ri-* with -*i-* for expected -*ā-* is due to a morphophonological rearrangement in the Tocharian verbal system: Common Toch. -*i-* came to function as the (zero grade) alternant to the full grade Common Toch. -*æi-*. That did not affect verbal roots with non-umlauted *ā*-vocalism.

<sup>21</sup> Only in Indic and Tocharian do we find nasal infix present formations of this verb. Vedic *ásinvan* indicates \*-*neu-* / -*nu-*, while Tocharian A *siñā(-s)-* and *siñā-* point to \**si-n-u(-s)-* and \**si-nH<sub>2</sub>-je-* respectively, cf. below. It is clear that the *a/ā*-vocalism of cognate forms in other languages (cf. Pokorny 1959: 876) indicates that a *H<sub>2</sub>* is involved here and one might therefore surmise an earlier formation in \*-*neH<sub>2</sub>-* / -*nH<sub>2</sub>-*. Contrarily, the corresponding and cognate West Tocharian verb *soyā-*, which does not show any traces of a nasal formation, does not have a stem final -*ā-*, i.e. appears not to be a *sef*-root, and this seems to be confirmed by the East Tocharian past participle *sasyu* 'satiated', whose lack of *ā*-umlaut suggests a stem in final -*ā-*, not -*ā-*. B *soyā-*, A *sasyu*, indicate either \**seH<sub>2</sub>j(e)-* or \**sH<sub>2</sub>j(e)-* (with vocalization of the laryngeal). An expected nasal present would be \**sH<sub>2</sub>j-n-ci-/i-* which in Vedic may have been replaced by \**sH<sub>2</sub>j-n-cu-/u-*. But a zero grade \**sH<sub>2</sub>j-* could have been metathesized to \**siH<sub>2</sub>-* and this new zero grade could have produced a nasal present \**si-n-eH<sub>2</sub>-/-H<sub>2</sub>-*. Such a present, could then have been replaced by a present in \*-*neu-* / -*nu-* which would also account for the Vedic form. Toch. A *siñā-s-* could reflect \**si-n-u-* extended with an *s*-suffix, while *siñā-* would preserve traces of the older formation: \**si-n-H<sub>2</sub>-je-*. For the vocalism of A *si-*, see preceding footnote; The absence of initial palatalization is due to the generalization of a non-palatal initial in nasal present formations.

<sup>22</sup> As in the preceding verbal root, a metathesis may have taken place in the root \**seH<sub>2</sub>j-* 'to yield, let go'; that is, instead of expected nasal present \**sH<sub>2</sub>-nei-/i-*, a new \**si-n-eH<sub>2</sub>-/-H<sub>2</sub>-* was produced as a consequence of the creation of the zero grade \**siH<sub>2</sub>-* metathesized from \**sH<sub>2</sub>j-*. To the present \**si-n-H<sub>2</sub>-* was formed \**si-n-H<sub>2</sub>-je-* as found in Toch. A *siñā-*, while B *siñāṣṣā-* / *siñāske-*, A *siñāṣā-* / *siñāsa-* reflect a \**si-nu-* (extended with an *sk-/s*-suffix), a replacement of \**si-nH<sub>2</sub>-* as in the other verbs above. Again for the vocalism of BA *si-*, see the final remarks in two preceding footnotes. Lat. *sinit* reflects a thematicized \**si-n-H<sub>2</sub>-e-ti*, cf. Rasmussen 1989: 58.



'attains', A *lipñāt* 'you will leave (behind)' ~ Ved. *limpāti* 'smears', OCS. *pri-linoti* 'to stick', and possibly still others.<sup>23</sup>

Jörundur Hilmarsson  
Linguistics Department  
University of Iceland

## References

Adams, D. Q.

1988 *Tocharian Historical Phonology and Morphology*. American Oriental Series, Volume 71. New Haven.

1989 "Marginalia to the Tocharian Lexicon II", *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 3, pp. 5-19.

Broomhead, J. W.

1962a *A Textual Edition of the British Hoernle, Stein, and Weber Kuchean Manuscripts. With Transliteration, Translation, Grammatical Commentary and Vocabulary*. A Dissertation Submitted in Candidature for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy. Cambridge.

1962b *British Hoernle, Stein and Weber Textual Edition of Manuscripts*. Vol. II. Vocabulary. Cambridge.

Couvreur, W.

1938 "La désinence -au et le morphème -oy-, -i- du koutchéen", *Bulletin de la Société de linguistique de Paris* 39, 2, pp. 243-246.

1947 *Hoofdzaken van de Tochaarse dialect- en Vormleer*. Leuven.

1954 [Review of] W. Krause's *Westtocharische Grammatik*. Bd. I: *Das Verbum*. Heidelberg. In: *Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen* 208, Nr. 1/2, pp. 79-92.

1955-56 "Bemerkungen zu Pavel Pouchas *Thesaurus linguae tocharicae dialecti A*", *La Nouvelle Clio* VII-VIII, pp. 67-98.

---

<sup>23</sup> I would like to thank my colleague Douglas Q. Adams who read and commented on a preliminary version of this paper.

Edgerton, F.

- 1985a *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary*. Volume I: *Grammar*. Kyoto. [Reprint of Yale 1953]

García-Ramon, J. L.

- 1986 "Griego ἰάουμαι", in: Annemarie Etter (hrsg.), *o-o-pe-ro-si*. Festschrift für Ernst Risch zum 75 Geburtstag. Berlin - New York. Pp. 497-514.

Hilmarsson, J.

- 1986 *Studies in Tocharian Phonology, Morphology and Etymology with Special Emphasis on the o-vocalism*. [Dissertation Leiden]. Reykjavík.
- 1987 "Analysis of the Tocharian verb B *en-* (*enäsk-*), A *en-* (*enäs-*) 'to instruct'", *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 1, pp. 49-58.
- 1987[89] "Reflexes of I.-E. \**suH<sub>2</sub>pto-* / *-ōn* 'sunny' in Germanic and Tocharian", *Die Sprache* 33,1, pp. 56-78.
- 1987[89] "On the History and Distribution of Suffixal *-y-* / *-iy-* in Tocharian", *Die Sprache* 33,1, pp.
- 1989 *The Dual Forms of Nouns and Pronouns in Tocharian*. TIES Supplementary Series, Volume 1, Reykjavík.
- 1991 *The Nasal Prefixes in Tocharian: A Study in Word Formation*. TIES Supplementary Series, Volume 3, Reykjavík.
- 1992fc "The Nasal Prefix and the Privative in Tocharian", in: B. Schlerath (ed.), *Fachtagung Tocharisch*, TIES Supplementary Series, Volume 4, Reykjavík [forthcoming].

Isebaert, L.

- 1980 *De Indo-Iraanse bestanddelen in de Tocharische woordenschat. Vraagstukken van fonische productinterferentie, met bijzondere aandacht voor de Indo-Iraanse diafonen a, ā*. Leuven.

Jasanoff, J. H.

- 1988 "PIE \**ǵnē-* 'recognize, know', in: A. Bammesberger (Hrsg.), *Die Laryngaltheorie und die Rekonstruktion des indo-*

*germanischen Laut- und Formensystems*. Heidelberg, pp. 267–239.

Klingenschmitt, G.

1982 *Das altarmenische Verbum*. Wiesbaden.

Krause, W.

1952 *Westtocharische Grammatik*. Band I: *Das Verbum*. Heidelberg.

Krause, W. & W. Thomas

1960 *Tocharisches Elementarbuch*. Band I. *Grammatik*. Heidelberg.

Lane, G. S.

1953 "Imperfect and Preterite in Tocharian", *Language* 29, pp. 278–287.

1959 "The formation of the Tocharian Subjunctive", *Language* 35, pp. 157–179.

Lindeman, F. O.

1987 "Tocharian and the Laryngeal Theory", *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 100, pp. 297–303.

Melchert, H. C.

1984 *Studies in Hittite Historical Phonology*. Göttingen.

Pedersen, H.

1941 *Tocharische vom Gesichtspunkt der indoeuropäischen Sprachvergleichung*. Det Kgl. Danske Videnskabernes Selskab. Historisk-filologiske Meddelelser XXVII,1. København.

Pinault, G.-J.

1982 "A neglected phonetic law: The reduction of the Indo-European laryngeals in internal syllables before yod", in: *Papers from the 5. International Conference on Historical Linguistics (= Current Issues in Linguistic Theory*, vol. 21), pp. 265–272.

1988 "Le Praṭītyasamutpāda en koutchéen", *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 2, pp. 96–165.

1989 "Introduction au tokharien", *LALIES* 7. Actes des sessions de linguistique et de littérature (Aussois, 27 août – 1<sup>er</sup> septembre 1985). Paris, pp. 3–224.

- 1990 "Notes sur les manuscrits de *Maitreyasamiti*", *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 4, pp. 119–202.

Pokorny, J.

- 1959 *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Bern & München.

Poucha, P.

- 1955 *Institutiones linguae tocharicae*. Pars I. *Thesaurus linguae tocharicae dialecti A*. Monografie Archivu Orientálního, vol. 15. Praha.

Rasmussen, J. E.

- 1989 *Studien zur Morphophonemik der indogermanischen Grundsprache*. Innsbruck.

Schmidt, K. T.

- 1969 *Die Gebrauchsweisen des Mediums im Tocharischen*. Dissertation zur Erlangung des Doktorgrades der Philosophischen Fakultät der Georg-August-Universität zu Göttingen. Göttingen.
- 1982 "Spuren tiefstufigen *sef*-Wurzeln im tocharischen Verbsystem", in: J. Tischler (Hrsg.), *Serta Indogermanica*. Festschrift für Günter Neumann zum 60. Geburtstag. Innsbruck, pp. 363–372.
- 1986 *Fragmente eines buddhistischen Ordinationsrituals in westtocharischer Sprache. Aus der Schule der Sarvāstivādins. Text, Übersetzung, Anmerkungen und Indizes*. Habilitationsschrift in Manuskript.

Sieg, E.

- 1944 *Übersetzungen aus dem Tocharischen I*. Abhandlungen der Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Jahrgang 1943. Philosophisch-historische Klasse. Nr. 16. Berlin.
- 1952 *Übersetzungen aus dem Tocharischen II*. Aus dem Nachlaß herausgegeben von Werner Thomas. Abhandlungen der Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin. Berlin.

Sieg, E. & W. Siegling

- 1921 *Tocharische Sprachreste*. I. Band. *Die Texte. A. Transcription*. Berlin und Leipzig.

- 1949 *Tocharische Sprachreste. Sprache B. Heft 1. Die Udānālaṅkāra-Fragmente. Text, Übersetzung und Glossar.* Göttingen.
- Sieg, E. & W. Siegling & W. Schulze
- 1931 *Tocharische Grammatik.* Göttingen.
- Thomas, W.
- 1957 *Der Gebrauch der Vergangenheitstempora im Tocharischen.* Wiesbaden.
- 1974 "Zu einigen weiteren sanskrit-tocharischen Udānavarga-Fragmenten", *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 88, pp. 77–105.
- 1983 *Tocharische Sprachreste. Sprache B. Teil I: Die Texte. Band 1. Fragmente Nr. 1–116 der Berliner Sammlung.* Herausgegeben von Emil Sieg<sup>†</sup> und Wilhelm Siegling<sup>†</sup>, neuarbeitet und mit einem Kommentar nebst Register versehen von Werner Thomas. Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen. Philologisch-historische Klasse. Dritte Folge. Nr. 133. Göttingen.
- 1987 "Ein neues Pātayantika-Fragment in Toch. B", *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 1, pp. 169–191.
- Thomas, W. & W. Krause
- 1964 *Tocharisches Elementarbuch. Band II. Texte und Glossar.*
- Van Windekens, A. J.
- 1941 *Lexique étymologique des dialectes tokhariens.* Université de Louvain. Institute Orientaliste. Bibliothèque de Muséon. Volume 11. Louvain.
- 1944 *Morphologie comparée du tokharien.* Louvain
- 1976 *Le tokharien confronté avec les autres langues indo-européennes. Volume I: La phonétique et le vocabulaire.* Louvain.
- 1982 *Le tokharien confronté avec les autres langues indo-européennes. Volume II,2: La morphologie verbale.* Louvain.
- Winter, W.
- 1977 "Internal structure and external relationship of two verbal

paradigms: Tocharian B *weñ-*, A *weñ-* 'say', *The Journal of Indo-European Studies* 5, pp. 133–159.

1980[81] [Review of] A. J. Van Windekens' *Le tokharien confronté avec les autres langues indo-européennes I: La phonétique et le vocabulaire*. Louvain 1976. The same, II,1: *La morphologie nominale*. Louvain 1979. In: *Kratylos* 25, pp. 125–132.

1984 *Studia Tocharica*. Selected Writings. Poznań.

1990 "B *-ññ-* : *-wññ-* and related problems", *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 4, pp. 5–31.