

## Proto-Indo-European \*-y<sup>e</sup>/o- presents in Tocharian: consensus and contentions

Ronald I. Kim  
Swarthmore College  
rkim2@swarthmore.edu



### 1. Introduction

A non-specialist consulting the standard references may easily obtain the impression that PIE \*-y<sup>e</sup>/o- presents have nearly disappeared in the Tocharian languages.

- Van Windekens (1982:86ff.) notes only the Class XII presents with suffix PT \*-ññ<sup>ə</sup>/ë- < \*-ny<sup>e</sup>/o-, which he thinks were all denominative in origin (see §2).
- Adams (1988:72-6) posits deverbative vs. denominative \*-y<sup>e</sup>/o- presents, but no \*-ey<sup>e</sup>/o- presents.
- Pinault (1989) recognizes only the Class XII denominatives (see below), but believes that Tocharian inherited PIE o-grade presents in \*-éy<sup>e</sup>/o- and replaced them with \*-sk<sup>e</sup>/o- presents (§3).

It is true that fewer secure examples of such presents seem to exist in Tocharian than in most other IE branches, but recent advances in our understanding of Tocharian historical phonology allow us to identify a number of previously unsuspected reflexes. The time seems ripe for a review of the entire problem.

### 2. Tocharian Class XII presents

Pedersen (1941:170) first proposed that Class XII denominative presents, e.g. TB /tənk<sup>w</sup>əññ<sup>ə</sup>/e-/, TA *tuñkiñ-* to TB *tañkw*, TA *tuñk* 'love', originate in PIE \*-y<sup>e</sup>/o- denominatives to n-stem nouns; he compared Ved.

*iṣanyāti* 'excite', to which Van Windekens (1944:244) added the type of Gr. ὀνομαίνω 'name'. This interpretation is now generally accepted; cf. Couvreur 1947:62, Van Windekens 1982:86, Adams 1988:72, 75, Pinault 1989:141, pace TE I:216 (\*-ññ- < \*-sñ-).

- The inflection of these verbs is fully thematic, like that of Class II (\*-e/o-) or Class VIII (\*-s<sup>e</sup>/o-) or IX and X (\*-sk<sup>e</sup>/o-), pace Van Windekens 1982:87-9.
- We thus have \*-n- + \*-y<sup>e</sup>/o- > \*-ny<sup>e</sup>/o- > PT \*-ññ<sup>ə</sup>/ë-, with pre-PT \*Cy giving a palatalized geminate \*C<sup>y</sup>C<sup>y</sup> (Hilmarsson 1986:316ff.; Adams 1988:35, 44fn.4; Ringe 1996:116-7).

Cf. TB /lareññ-/ , 3pl. *lareññentär* 'love' <— *lāre* 'dear', /sklokəññ-/ , 3pl. *sklokäntär* 'doubt' <— *sklok* 'doubt'.

However, other members of this class are clearly non-denominative in origin, pace Van Windekens 1982:89ff., Adams 1988:75 (suffix \*-ññ<sup>ə</sup>/ë- extended to "primary" verbs). At least the following are formed to verb roots ending in /-a-/; they take Class V subjunctives and Class I preterites and/or occur beside Class VI nasal presents in /-(ə)na-/.

TB /məntəññ<sup>ə</sup>/e-/, 3sg. *mäntam* to /mənta-/ 'eliminate, destroy'

TB /kläntsəññ<sup>ə</sup>/e-/, 3sg. *kläntsam* 'sleeps', beside TA Cl. VI pres. *klisn-ā-š* to *klisā-*

TB /käskəññ<sup>ə</sup>/e-/, mid. 3sg. *käskantär*, Cl. V subj. *käskātär*, Cl. I pret. *käskāte\** to /käska-/ 'destroy' (<— PIE \*g<sup>wh</sup>ṛ-sk<sup>é</sup>/ó-)

Following Schmidt (1989:311-3, 1995:279-80; cf. Pinault 1989:141), I would derive these presents from PIE \*-nH-y<sup>e</sup>/o-, i.e. nasal-infixed formations to set roots with additional suffix \*-y<sup>e</sup>/o-.

- He compares the type of Ved. *grbhāyāti* beside *grbhñāti* 'grasps', if -āya- < \*-nh<sub>2</sub>-y<sup>é</sup>/ó- (de Saussure, Insler, Peters) rather than \*-eh<sub>2</sub>-y<sup>e</sup>/o- (Kurylowicz, Narten, Hoffmann).
- Note especially the attractive equation of Ved. *mathāyāti* 'robs, tears from' (beside *mathnāti\**, impf. *ámathnāt*) and TB /məntəññ<sup>ə</sup>/e-/: *mathāyanti* = *mäntaññem* < \*mñt-ñh<sub>2</sub>-y<sup>ó</sup>-nt-i.

Other than these two subtypes, Tocharian appears to have no secure (direct) reflexes of PIE \*-y<sup>e</sup>/o- presents. (On TB Class IV subj. *kälypīsi* <— PIE \*klep-y<sup>e</sup>/o-, see §4.)

- Note that if the normal treatment of a \*Cy cluster was PT \*C<sup>y</sup>C<sup>y</sup>, one should look for thematic presents ending in a uniformly palatalized consonant, including before PIE \*-o- > PT \*-ë- (> TB -e-, TA -a-, 3pl. -eñc), and geminatead in TB.
- The only likely candidate is the mysterious TA Class VII subj. in -ñ(ä)- ~ -ña-, e.g. *ar-äñ-tär* ‘will come forth’, *nākāñtär*, pl. *nākñantär* ‘will blame’. These usually correspond to ablauting Class I subjs. in TB (cf. TB *ertär*, pl. *eräntär*) and so must be a post-PT innovation of some kind.

### 3. PIE \*-ey<sup>e</sup>/o- presents in Tocharian

The question of PIE \*-ey<sup>e</sup>/o- presents in Tocharian obviously depends on the fate of intervocalic \*y.

- Van Windekens (1976:62-5) and Adams (1988:35) state that PIE \*y was retained in Tocharian, but does not discuss the consequences for \*-ey<sup>e</sup>/o- presents.
- Pinault (1989:126) states that PIE \*-ey<sup>e</sup>/o- > pre-PT \*-äyë- ~ \*-äyä- contracted and so “perdait toute identité formelle”, thus presumably clearing the way for the rise of the causative in \*-skë- ~ \*-ššä- < \*-sk<sup>e</sup>/o- (see below).
- The most thorough review of the problem is in Ringe 1996:51-6; he comes to no definite conclusion, but cites Cowgill’s idea that PIE \*treys > \*tre:s > PT \*trey (\*-s > \*-y in monosyllables, cf. Katz 1997) > TB *trey* ~ *trai*, TA *tre*. (The linking vowel /-ə-/ in TB compounds such as *treyá-meskem* /treyá-/ ‘threefold power’ could be a later innovation.)

Nevertheless, at least one Tocharian thematic present must reflect an inherited formation in \*-ey<sup>e</sup>/o-, namely TB *mely-*, TA *malyw-* ‘grind, crush’ < PT \*mēlyw<sup>y</sup>-äy<sup>ə</sup>/ë- < PIE \*molh<sub>2</sub>wéy<sup>e</sup>/o-.

- This was compared with the Goth. Class I weak verb *ga-malwjan\**

‘bruise’ (pret. ptcp. masc. acc. pl. *gamalwidans*), ON *mølva* already by Lane (1938:31). Most scholars have derived the verb from a \*-y<sup>e</sup>/o- present: cf. Van Windekens 1976:95 (\*ūj), 278-9, 1982:11, Adams 1988:73-4, 75 (“\*Co(C)C-ye/o-”). Ringe (2000:124-5) sets up PT \*mēlyw<sup>y</sup>/ë- or \*m<sup>y</sup>el<sup>y</sup>w<sup>y</sup>/ë-, but does not specify the origin of the palatalized \*w<sup>y</sup>.

The Tocharian development was rather

PIE \*molh<sub>2</sub>wéy<sup>e</sup>/o- > \*molwéy<sup>e</sup>/o- (Saussure’s Law; Hackstein 1995:26 with refs.) > PT \*mēlyw<sup>y</sup>-äy<sup>ə</sup>/ë-; then

PT \*mēlyw<sup>y</sup>-äy<sup>ə</sup>/ë- > \*melyw<sup>y</sup>/e- (syncope of \*ä after glides, or rather rightward stress shift; Hilmarsson 1989:14, Ringe 1989:37) > \*mely- > TB /mely-/ , pres. 3sg. *melyim*, *melyán-*, 3pl. *melyem*; and

PT \*mēlyw<sup>y</sup>-äy<sup>ə</sup>/ë- > \*malw<sup>y</sup>äy<sup>ä</sup>/a- > \*malw<sup>y</sup>ä/a- (syncope of \*ä) > \*malw<sup>y</sup>- > TA *malyw-*, pres. 2sg. *malywät*, act. ptcp. obl. *malywäntām*, mp. ptcp. *malywmām*, impf. 3sg. *malywā*.

See R. Kim 2003:222-3fn.70, but no “secondary palatalization” of \*w+y > \*w<sup>y</sup> is needed.

The Tocharian and Germanic forms, along with CLuv. *mālhu-* ~ *malw-* ‘break’ < \*malh<sup>w</sup>-, e.g. pret. 3sg. *mālhu*, pres. 3sg. *malwai*., point to a (probably already PIE) *u*-extension of the *h<sub>2</sub>e*-conjugation present \*mólh<sub>2</sub>- ~ \*mélh<sub>2</sub>- ‘grind’ (LIV:433 s.v. ?\*melh<sub>2</sub>- ‘zerreiben, malmen’, Jasanoff 2003:64ff.). This was thematized by means of the suffix \*-ey<sup>e</sup>/o- in both Tocharian and Germanic, like many *h<sub>2</sub>e*-conjugation presents in non-Anatolian IE languages.

Another \*-ey<sup>e</sup>/o- present underlies TA Cl. II pres. *pañwäš* ‘stretches (forth)’, pl. (*pa*)ñweñc-ām, mid. 1pl. *pañwamträ*, ptcp. *pañwmām*, inf. *pañwīsi*. This verb is to be connected with PIE \*(s)penh<sub>1</sub>- ‘pull, stretch’ and its reflexes, e.g. OHG *spannan* ‘stretch’, Gr. πονέομαι ‘work hard, toil’ (LIV:578-9). I have argued elsewhere (R. Kim 2006:fn.15, pace Ringe

2000:125fn.13) that the TA present may be equated with TB mp. *peññátrā* (B558 b3/4):

post-PIE *\*ponh<sub>1</sub>w-ey<sup>e</sup>/o-* > *\*ponw-ey<sup>e</sup>/o-* (laryngeal loss) > PT  
*\*pēñw<sup>y</sup>-əy<sup>ə</sup>/ə-* > *\*peñyáyətar* > *\*peññəyətər* > pre-TB *\*peññótər*  
 > *peññátrā*; > *\*pañw<sup>y</sup>-äy<sup>ä</sup>/a-* > *\*pañw<sup>y</sup>y<sup>ä</sup>/a-* > *\*pañw<sup>y</sup>ä/a-* > TA  
*pañw-*.

Cf. Klingenschmitt 1982:234-5, Hackstein 1995:26-7; for the *u*-present, cf. Arm. *henowm* 'weave, sew together'. (I cannot account for the other TB pres. *pāññān-m(e)* (B253 b2), with different root ablaut.)

We thus have two good examples of *\*-ey<sup>e</sup>/o-* presents to roots extended with a formant *-u-*.

- In contrast to *\*-i-*, a suffix *\*-u-* is not so well attested among *h<sub>2</sub>e*-conjugation presents ("a somewhat shadowy category"; Jasanoff 2003:141-3). Cf. e.g. Hitt. *tarḫu-* 'overcome, be capable' (3sg. *tarḫuzzi*, *taruḫzi*) and Ved. *tūrva-* 'conquers', *tarute* 'crosses over' < *\*térh<sub>2</sub>-u-* ~ *\*trh<sub>2</sub>-u-*.
- As far as I am aware, *\*melh<sub>2</sub>-* 'grind' is the only *h<sub>2</sub>e*-conjugation verb which forms both a root present and a *u*-present: semantic distinction?
- In any case, at least some of the numerous Tocharian verb roots ending in *\*-w-* (see e.g. Van Windekens 1982:11-15) may go back to *u*-suffixed presents of this type.

Another possible example of an *o*-grade present in *\*-ey<sup>e</sup>/o-* is TB pres. mp. ptcp. *cepyemane*, ger. I *ceppille* 'tread'.

- If pre-PT *\*py* yielded PT *\*p<sup>y</sup>p<sup>y</sup>* > TB *pp*, the stem-final cluster *py* of the participle must be from underlying /cepəy-/ , with syncope of /ə/.
- But it cannot be ruled out that *py* and *pp* are alternative spellings for /p<sup>y</sup>p<sup>y</sup>/. Also, the palatalization of stem-initial *c* points to PT *\*e* < *\*ē* rather than *\*ē* < *\*o* as the stem vowel.

Interestingly, the iterative-causative function assumed for PIE *o*-grade *\*-ey<sup>e</sup>/o-* presents finds no support in Tocharian.

- Several scholars have suggested that Tocharian inherited *o*-grade

transitive(-causative)s in *\*-éy<sup>e</sup>/o-* from PIE, but later replaced this suffix with the reflex of *\*-sk<sup>e</sup>/o-* (Pinault 1989:126, Kobayashi 1997).

- But there is no evidence that *\*-ey<sup>e</sup>/o-* ever acquired causative value in pre-Tocharian. Furthermore, the suffix *\*-sk<sup>e</sup>/o-* is not itself transitive-causative in value, but is rather simply a present-forming suffix which became generalized in marked transitives; cf. the numerous non-causative Class IX and X (*sk-*)presents, e.g. 1sg. TB *aiskau*, TA *esam* to TB /ai-/ , TA *e-* 'give', TB *yamaššām* 'does, makes' to /yam-/ 'do, make', TB *känmaššām*, TA *kumnäs* to TB /kəm-/ , TA *kum-* 'come'. As pointed out by Hackstein (1995:2-4), the distinctive marker of the marked transitive ("causative") in TB is initial stress, which probably reflects PT initial reduplication.

#### 4. PIE denominative presents in *\*-e-y<sup>e</sup>/o-*

Class IV subjunctives are characterized by a suffix *-i-*, e.g. TB *kälypītsi* 'to steal', *aklyitār* 'will teach', *lalyitār* 'will strive, exert oneself'. They were attested only in TB until recently, but TA v.n. *āklyuney-ā* 'by being taught' in the newly published *Maitreyasamini-Nāṭaka* (YQ 1.10 a4; MSN:124) presupposes a subj. stem *ākly-*, which can go back to PT *\*akl<sup>y</sup>-əy-* (cf. TB *aklyilñe*).

A connection between Class IV subjunctives and PIE *\*-ey<sup>e</sup>/o-* presents has long been alleged, but never investigated in detail.

- The older view (Lane 1959:166; cf. Van Windekens 1982:224, Pinault 1989:144), that these are simply optatives transferred to non-past (= subjunctive) usage, is unattractive: why only in these verbs, which share no obvious formal or semantic properties?
- The clear relationship between TB subj. *śeritār* 'will hunt' and TB *śeruwe\** (*śerwe*, obl. *śeruwem*), TA *śaru* 'hunter' < PT *\*śerawē* < (post-)PIE *\*k<sup>ér</sup>uwo-* (*vṛddhi*-derivative to PIE *\*k<sup>ér</sup>wo-* 'deer') suggests that these stems actually reflect denominatives in *\*-e-y<sup>e</sup>/o-* to thematic nouns, and so may be compared with the Greek ποιέω-type or Vedic denominatives in *-a-yā-*.
- In this case, (post-)PIE *\*k<sup>ér</sup>uwe-y<sup>e</sup>/o-* > PT *\*śeraw<sup>y</sup>-əy<sup>ə</sup>/ə-* > *\*śerəy-əy<sup>ə</sup>/ə-*, whence by haplology TB /śerəy<sup>ə</sup>/ə-/ . Cf. Ringe 1996:53;

similarly Adams 1988:74-5, but probably not from \* $\acute{g}^h w\acute{e}rwe\text{-}y^e/_O\text{-}$  (to \* $\acute{g}^h w\acute{e}r\text{-}$  ‘wild animal’).

This suffix was then extended to other denominatives, e.g. TB *aklyitār* ‘will teach’ < PT \* $akl\acute{y}\text{-}\acute{a}y\acute{a}/\acute{e}\text{-}$  to *akalye*, obl. *ākli* ‘teaching, Lehre’, TB *lalyitār* ‘will strive, exert oneself’ < PT \* $lal\acute{y}\text{-}\acute{a}y\acute{a}/\acute{e}\text{-}$  to *lalyiye*, obl. *lālyi* ‘exertion, effort’ (pace Adams 1988:74-5). Ringe (1996:54-5) suggests that *akalye*, *lalyiye* were conversely derived from the verbs, citing the pret. ptcps. *āklu*, *lalālu* without stem-final palatalization; but the latter may have other explanations.

In the case of TB *kālypītsi* ‘steal’, PT \* $k\acute{a}l\acute{y}p\acute{y}\text{-}\acute{a}y\acute{a}/\acute{e}\text{-}$  may have replaced \* $k\acute{a}l\acute{y}p\acute{y}\text{-}\acute{a}/\acute{e}\text{-}$  < \* $klep\text{-}y^e/_O\text{-}$  (cf. Gr. κλέπτω; Ringe 1996:54), or perhaps < \* $klep\text{-}y^e/_O\text{-}$  by sound change (epenthesis of \* $\acute{a}$ ?). Pace Ringe (loc. cit.), *kālypītsi* cannot continue PT \* $k\acute{a}l\acute{y}p\acute{y}\text{-}\acute{a}\text{-}$  ~ \* $k\acute{a}l\acute{y}p\text{-}\acute{e}\text{-}$  < PIE \* $klep\text{-}^e/_O\text{-}$  (Goth. *hlifan*, OLat. *clepere*); in that case the infinitive should have been “*kalyptsi*” / $k\acute{a}l\acute{y}p\acute{a}\text{-}t\acute{s}y\acute{a}/$ .

##### 5. A PIE present in \*-o-y<sup>e</sup>/<sub>O</sub>-?

Finally, I tentatively propose that Tocharian preserves an example of a suffix \*-o-y<sup>e</sup>/<sub>O</sub>- in TA pres. 3pl. *karyēñc*, mp. ptcp. *karemām* and subj. 3sg. *kareş*, *karyaş*, 3pl. *kareñc(-m)* ‘laugh’, alongside TB pres. 3pl. *keriyem*, *keryem*, mp. ptcp. *keriyemane*.

- This verb surely reflects PIE \* $\acute{g}^h er\text{-}$  (LIV:176-7 [but no mention of Tocharian verb!], Adams 1999:197); cf. Ved. *hāryati* ‘finds pleasure in, likes’, Gr. χαίρω ‘rejoice’, OLat. *horitur* ‘encourages, incites’, Umbr. fut. *heriest* ‘volet’, OHG *gerōn* ‘desire, long for’.
- Lane (1953:285-6) and Adams (1988:73, 1999:197) interpret this verb as a \*-y<sup>e</sup>/<sub>O</sub>- present comparable, except for the root vocalism, with Gr. χαίρω. Lane suggested that the TA imperfect in -ā- (with preceding palatalization) continues the PIE stative suffix \*-eh<sub>1</sub>-, that that the latter was generalized from stative aorists to verbs with presents in -y<sup>e</sup>/<sub>O</sub>-, including ‘laugh’. But quite apart from the antiquity of such

stative aorists (see now Jasanoff 2002-3), the TA impf. is a post-PT innovation: \*-ā- from the pret. was added to PT \*-āy-, preserved in TB (R. Kim forthcoming).

- In any case, stem-final -ry- cannot continue \*-r-y<sup>e</sup>/<sub>O</sub>-. Although I am not aware of any secure examples of PIE \*ry in Tocharian, the parallel of \*ny > PT \*ññ (see §2) implies \*ry > PT \*r<sup>y</sup>r<sup>y</sup>, which should have given TB -rr-, TA -r-. All examples of TA and TB ry with known histories result from the relatively late pre-PT change of liquid metathesis (Schindler 1967, Ringe 1996:158-60 with refs.): cf.

PIE neut. \*trih<sub>2</sub> > \*triya > \*tr<sup>y</sup>āya > PT \*tər<sup>y</sup>ya > TB fem./neut. *tarya* ‘three’ (pre-TA \*täry > \*täräy > *tri*) and

PIE \*k<sup>w</sup>rih<sub>2</sub>- > \*k<sup>w</sup>riya- > \*k<sup>w</sup>r<sup>y</sup>āya- > PT \*k<sup>w</sup>ər<sup>y</sup>ya- > TB /kərya-/ ‘buy’ in pret. act. 1pl. *käryām*, mp. *käryānte*.

The spelling of TB *keriyem*, *keriyemane* makes it clear that the underlying form of the verb in TB is /kerāy-/ , presumably from PT \* $k\acute{e}r(y)\acute{a}y\text{-}\acute{a}/\acute{e}\text{-}$  (so Hilmarsson 1996:135-6). Van Windekens’s supposed “dédoublement” of \*y > \*iy in this and some other TB forms (1976:65) is utterly unfounded. Such a preform would also be consistent with TA pres. 3pl. *karyēñc* (<\*karañc ~ *kare*\* < PT \* $k\acute{e}r\acute{e}ñc\acute{a}\text{-}$  ~ \* $k\acute{e}r\acute{e}ñ\text{-}$ ).

- PT \* $k\acute{e}r(y)\acute{a}y\text{-}\acute{a}/\acute{e}\text{-}$  could in turn continue \* $\acute{g}^h or\text{-}\acute{e}y^e/_O\text{-}$ , but I remarked that the intransitive meaning of ‘laugh’ conflicts with the transitivity of such formations elsewhere in IE (R. Kim 2003:223fn.70); cf. Hilmarsson 1996:136 (“iterative \* $\acute{g}^h or\text{-}e\acute{a}^e/_O\text{-}$ ”). I thus cautiously suggested “a denominative to an old o-grade thematic deverbal noun, hence \* $\acute{g}^h oros$  ‘pleasure, rejoicing’ → \* $\acute{g}^h ore\text{-}y^e/_O\text{-}$ ?”

But how to account for the bizarre and synchronically isolated TA stem alternation -e- ~ -ya- (-ye-)?

- Van Windekens (1944:245-6, 1976:188) posits a present with ablaut suffix \*-i- ~ \*-ēi- and “contamination entre \* $\acute{g}^h or\text{-}i\text{-}$  et \* $\acute{g}^h(e)r\acute{e}i\text{-}$ ”; improbable to say the least.
- Hilmarsson (1996:136) takes *karyaş* to be a Class V subj. (< \**karyāş*).

by weakening of  $*\bar{a} > *a$ ; TE I:45-6), but his proposed sound change of  $*r^y a- > *r^{\bar{a}} i- > TA -re-$  would be unparalleled. Even if it is accepted, I do not understand what he means by “[i]n *karyeñc* epenthesis was already there for a different reason so that the sequence *-rya-* was preserved”.

- Ringe (2000:123-4) tentatively postulates a subj. suffix PT  $*-ëy-$ , ablaut variant of pres.  $*-äy-$ , but this would be the only such ablauting suffix in the Tocharian verbal system, and without any obvious PIE source. Also unlikely is that TA  $-e-$  < PT Cl. IV subj.  $*-e-$ ; see §4 on the origins of this type.

I suggest instead that this present is to be reconstructed for PT as  $*kër-ëy\bar{a}- \sim *kër-ëy\bar{e}-$ .

- This would regularly give pre-TA  $*kar-ay\bar{a}- \sim *kar-aya- > *kar-ay\bar{a}- \sim *kar-äya-$  (weakening of  $*a > *\bar{a}$  in second syllable between preceding and following “full vowels”; TE I:46-7) > TA *kar-e-* ~ *kar-ya-*.
- We should thus have 3sg. *kareş*, 3pl. *karyeñc*, mid. ptcp.  $*karya\ m\bar{a}m\bar{.}$ . The 3pl. *kareñc* took over the stem alternant of the 3sg. (and 2sg., 2pl., i.e. the “*e*-forms”), as did the ptcp. *karemām̃*. Conversely, 3sg. *karyaş* has adopted *-ya-* from the “*o*-forms”, e.g. 1sg. *karyam\**, 1pl. *karyamäs\**.
- Cf. the analogical reshaping of Cl. II presents such as PT  $*käl^y(y)-\bar{a}/\bar{e}-$  ‘be standing’ > pre-TA  $*käl^y-\bar{ä}/\bar{a}-$ : 3sg.  $*käl^y-\bar{ä}-tär > käl^y\bar{t}är$ , 3pl.  $*käl^y-a-ntär > klyantär$ , but 1sg.  $*käl^y-a-mār$ , ptcp.  $*käl^y-a-mān > *klyamār$ ,  $*klyamām̃ \rightarrow käl^y\bar{m}ār$ ,  $käl^y\bar{m}ām̃$  after verbs with syncope, e.g.  $\bar{a}kmār*$ ,  $\bar{a}kmām̃ < *\bar{a}k-a-mār$ ,  $*\bar{a}k-a-mān$  to  $\bar{a}k-$  ‘lead’ (Winter 1991:52-3). A (virtually) unique alternation  $-e- \sim -ya-$  would have been exceptionally prone to remodeling.

TB pres.  $/këräy-\bar{a}/\bar{e}-/$  must then have assimilated this verb to the type of  $/mäl^y-\bar{a}/\bar{e}-/$  ‘crush’, seen above.

Such a PT formation would in turn go back to a denominative present  $*g^h\bar{o}r-o-y^e/\bar{o}-$ , to  $*g^h\bar{o}ros$  ‘pleasure, rejoicing (or sim.)’.

- This verb may then be added to the Anatolian evidence for a PIE date of  $*-o-y^e/\bar{o}-$  presents: as Melchert (1997:136-7) remarks, Lycian

leniting verbs in  $-e-$  such as *tubedē* are difficult to explain otherwise, and it is possible that “the massive Hittite class in  $-\bar{a}i/-\bar{a}i-$  (and likewise Luvian  $-\bar{a}i/-\bar{a}i-$ ) represents a conflation of BOTH  $*-éh_2-y^e/\bar{o}-$  AND secondary thematic  $*-ó-y^e/\bar{o}-$ .”

- Cf. also the Gr. present type in  $-\omega\omega$ , considered by some scholars to be an innovation, but possibly inherited.

## 6. Conclusions

- The suffix of Class XII denominative presents continue  $*-n-$  +  $*-y^e/\bar{o}-$ , but at least some non-denominal presents probably continue  $*-nh_2-y^e/\bar{o}-$ , as per K. T. Schmidt. Otherwise, no traces of  $*-y^e/\bar{o}-$  may be clearly discerned.
- Tocharian preserves at least a couple of *o*-grade presents in  $*-éy^e/\bar{o}-$ , but offers no trace of the iterative-causative function familiar from the classical IE languages.
- Denominative presents in  $*-e-y^e/\bar{o}-$  are represented by Class IV subjunctives; the suffix has spread from thematic to other nouns.
- TA *kary-* may reflect an old present in  $*-o-y^e/\bar{o}-$ , comparable to the Anatolian presents cited by Melchert.

## References

- Adams, Douglas Q. 1988. *Tocharian Historical Phonology and Morphology*. (American Oriental Series, Vol. 71.) New Haven: American Oriental Society.
- Couvreux, Walter. 1938. Les dérivés verbaux en *-ske/o* du hittite et du tocharien. *Revue des Études Indo-Européennes* 1, 89-101.
- . 1947. *Hoofdzaken van de tochaarse klank- en vormleer*. (Katholieke Universiteit te Leuven Philologische Studiën, Teksten en Verhandelingen, II<sup>e</sup> Reeks, Deel 4.) Leuven: Philologische Studiën.
- Hilmarsson, Jörundur. 1986. *Studies in Tocharian Phonology, Morphology, and Etymology with Special Emphasis on the o-Vocalism*. (Ph.D. Diss., Rijksuniversiteit te Leiden.) Reykjavík.
- . 1989. *The Dual Forms of Nouns and Pronouns in Tocharian*. (TIES Supplementary Series, Volume 1.) Reykjavík.
- . 1996. *Materials for a Tocharian Historical and Etymological Dictionary*. Ed. by Alexander Lubotsky and Guðrún Þórhallsdóttir with the assistance of Sigurður H. Pálsson. (TIES Supplementary Series, Vol. 5.) Reykjavík: Málvísindastofnun Háskóla Íslands.
- Jasanoff, Jay H. 2002-3 [2004]. "Stative" *\*-ē-* revisited. *Die Sprache* 43:2, 127-70.
- . 2003. *Hittite and the Indo-European Verb*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Katz, Joshua T. 1997. Ein tocharisches Lautgesetz für Monosyllaba. *TIES* 7, 61-87.
- Kim, Ronald I. 2003. Uncovering the prehistory of the Tocharian Class II preterite. *HS* 116:2, 190-233.
- . 2006. Root and derived preterites in Tocharian. To appear in *MSS* 63.
- . Forthcoming. Stem-final palatalization in Tocharian imperfects and preterites, and the prehistory of the Tocharian and Indo-European verb.
- Klingenschmitt, Gert. 1982. *Das altarmenische Verbum*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Kobayashi, Masato. 1997. The Tocharian causative. MS, University of Pennsylvania.
- Lane, George Sherman. 1959. The formation of the Tocharian subjunctive. *Language* 35:2, 157-79.
- LIV: *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben: Die Wurzeln und ihre Primärstammbildungen*. Unter Leitung von Helmut Rix und der Mitarbeit vieler anderer, bearbeitet von Martin Kümmel, Thomas Zehnder, Reiner Lipp, Brigitte Schirmer. Zweite, erweiterte und verbesserte Auflage bearbeitet von Martin Kümmel und Helmut Rix. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 2001.
- Melchert, H. Craig. 1997. Denominative verbs in Anatolian. *Studies in Honor of Jaan Puhvel, Part One: Ancient Languages and Philology*, ed. by Dorothy Disterheft, Martin Huld, and John Greppin, 131-8. (Journal of Indo-European Studies Monograph No. 20.) Washington, DC: Institute for the Study of Man.
- MSN: Ji Xianlin, Werner Winter, and Georges-Jean Pinault. 1998. *Fragments of the Tocharian A Maitreyasamiti-Nāṭaka of the Xinjiang Museum, China*, transliterated, translated and annotated by Ji Xianlin in collaboration with Werner Winter and Georges-Jean Pinault. (Trends in Linguistics, Studies and Monographs 113.) Berlin/New York: de Gruyter.
- Pedersen, Holger. 1941. *Tocharisch vom Gesichtspunkt der indoeuropäischen Sprachvergleichung*. (Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskab, Historisk-filologiske Meddelelser 28, 1.) Copenhagen.
- Pinault, Georges-Jean. 1989. Introduction au tokharien. *LALIES* 7, 3-224.
- Ringe, Don. 1989. Tocharian B *ausu, auṣu, aultsu*. *TIES* 3, 35-50.
- . 1996. *On the Chronology of Sound Changes in Tocharian. Vol. 1: From Proto-Indo-European to Proto-Tocharian*. (American Oriental Series, Vol. 80.) New Haven: American Oriental Society.
- . 2000. Tocharian class II presents and subjunctives and the reconstruction of the Proto-Indo-European verb. *TIES* 9, 121-42.
- Schindler, Jochem. 1967. Tocharische Miszellen. *IF* 72, 239-49.
- Schmidt, Klaus T. 1989. Zur Vorgeschichte der tocharischen Nasalpräsentien. *XXIII. Deutscher Orientalistentag vom 16. bis 20. September 1985 in Würzburg: Ausgewählte Vorträge*, hrsg. von Einar von Schuler, 303-13. (Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft, Supplement VII.) Stuttgart: Steiner.
- . 1995. Ex oriente lux: Anhaltspunkte für ursprünglich wurzelabstufende Nasalpräsentien im Tocharischen. *Verba et Structurae: Festschrift für Klaus Strunk zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. by Heinrich Hettrich, Wolfgang Hock, Peter-Arnold Mumm, and Norbert Oettinger, 273-83. (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft, Band 83.) Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft.
- TE I: Krause, Wolfgang and Werner Thomas. 1960. *Tocharisches Elementarbuch. Band I: Grammatik*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Van Windekens, Albert Joris. 1944. *Morphologie comparée du tokharien*. Louvain: Muséon.
- . 1976. *Le tokharien confronté avec les autres langues indo-européennes. Volume 1: La phonétique et le vocabulaire*. Louvain: Centre International de Dialectologie Générale.
- . 1982. —. *Volume II, Tome 2: La morphologie verbale*. —.
- Winter, Werner. 1991. The mediopassive present participles in Tocharian A. *TIES* 5, 45-56.