

COPENHAGEN STUDIES IN INDO-EUROPEAN  
Edited by Jens Elmegård Rasmussen  
ISSN 1399 5308

Previously published:

Vol. 1

Jens Elmegård Rasmussen

*Selected papers on Indo-European linguistics*

*With a section on comparative Eskimo linguistics*  
1999, 708 pages in two volumes, cloth

Vol. 2

James Clackson & Birgit Anette Olsen (eds.)

*Indo-European word formation*

*Proceedings of the Conference held at the University of Copenhagen*  
*October 20th–22nd 2000*  
2004, 424 pages, cloth

## INTERNAL RECONSTRUCTION

### IN INDO-EUROPEAN

#### *Methods, results, and problems*

Section Papers from the  
XVII International Conference on Historical Linguistics  
University of Copenhagen, 11th–15th August, 2003

Edited by

JENS ELMEGÅRD RASMUSSEN

and

THOMAS OLANDER

with the collaboration of

ANDERS RICHARDT JØRGENSEN

Museum Tusulanum Press  
University of Copenhagen  
2009

## Reconsidering the system: verbal categorization and the coding of valency in Tocharian

GERD CARLING  
Lund University  
[gerd.carling@ling.lu.se](mailto:gerd.carling@ling.lu.se)

### Abstract

This paper will deal with the coding of verbal valency in Tocharian, which is an extremely complicated chapter of the Tocharian morphology and syntax. The traditional system distinguishes two basic variants of the verbs: *non-causative* and *causative*. However, the system is more complicated than that. A number of 'causatives' are true causatives in the sense that they represent transitives derived from intransitives. Other verbs present more complicated patterns: ditransitives derived from transitives or intransitives, derived transitives with no change of meaning etc. We will try to propose a basic classification system for the different variants.

### 1 The classification of the Tocharian verbal paradigm

#### 1.1 *The 'Grundverb' – 'causative' distinction*

In the traditional handbooks of Tocharian, such as Krause (1952), Krause and Thomas (1960), or Pinault (1989), the verbs are fundamentally divided into two categories, non-causative (German *Grundverb*) and *causative*. This distinction is also used in dictionaries of Tocharian like Poucha (1955) or Adams (1999). By 'non-causative' – 'causative' is meant that many verbs are inflected in two (in some verbs three) present/subjunctive/preterit classes that influence sentence structure in different ways.

In Tocharian, the present can be inflected according to 12 classes, some of which occur in two main variants that are distinguished by the

position of the accent: IX (B -*sk-*), X (B -*nāsk-/nāsk-*, A -*nās-/nās-*), XI (B -*sask-/säsk-*, A -*sis-*), XII (AB -*nī-*). Of these classes, three are sigmatic: IX, X, XI. These two variants are referred to as 'non-causative' (IXa, Xa, XIa, XIIa) vs. 'causative' (IXb, Xb, XIb, XIIb), of which the causative is basically marked by accent on the initial syllable. Present VIII (AB -*s-* (-*s-*)), which also belongs to the sigmatic classes, is traditionally divided into VIIIa (non-causative) and VIIIb (causative). However, this distinction is not justified morphologically, as has been demonstrated by Hackstein (1995).

The subjunctive is also inflected according to 12 classes that are combined with a certain present class. The same is valid for the preterit, which is inflected in 6 classes. We also have certain causative preterit classes, i.e., preterits connected with causative presents, as preterit II (reduplicated), or preterits that are connected with non-causatives or causatives, i.e. preterit IV (-*ss-*).

Concerning the functional consequences of the non-causative – causative distinction, Krause and Thomas (1960: 174) sum up as follows:

- 1 The non-causative/causative distinction can apply to both intransitive and transitive verbs. Non-causative and causative often correspond to intransitive/passive vs. transitive/active.
- 2 Non-causative and causative generally do not differ in their lexical nucleus (*Bedeutungskern*). Some roots ending in -*k* have double causative formations; in one of these formations a lexical difference between non-causative and causative can be observed.
- 3 With some verbs, there is no semantic difference at all between non-causative and causative.

Other authors have questioned this division as being too simple. Lane (1960: 124) raises two objections: first that the basic difference intransitive/passive vs. transitive/active is not necessarily connected with causativity, and second the absence of semantic difference between non-causative and causative that is found in some verbs.<sup>1</sup>

Pinault (1989: 125) concludes that the true *causative* function of the causative becomes apparent when a transitive paradigm (in active voice) contrasts with an intransitive (in medio-passive voice). However, when the non-causative (*verbe de base*) is transitive, the causative does not carry any specific function. He concludes that (p. 125) "La valeur du paradigme causatif devait être, au moins au présent, celle d'un itératif-

intensif, mais cette valeur n'est plus sensible dans les textes, même pour les causatifs purement formels."

1.2 On the *inherent transitivity of the present, subjunctive and preterit*. Regarded individually, some present classes are inherently intransitive, whereas others are transitive.<sup>2</sup> For example present class III (thematic vowel B -*e* A -*a*, suffixal accent), normally combined with subjunctive V (cf. below) and preterit I (unsuffixal, with root accent) is inherently intransitive. The same is, with few exceptions, also valid for present IV (heavy root vowel B *o*, *ai*, *au* A *a*, *e*, *o*, thematic vowel B -*o* A -*a*), also combined with subjunctive V and preterit I. Most verbs of the present classes III and IV are so-called 'medio-actives', which show a medio-passive present beside an active preterit.<sup>3</sup>

Verbs of present class VI (B -*na* A -*nā*, suffixal accent) are inherently transitive. Like III and IV, this class is also combined with subjunctive V and preterit I.

It is a matter of dispute whether intransitivity/transitivity is marked also on the subjunctive and preterit stems. Without going into too much detail, I will briefly describe the discussion here.

Marggraf (1970) assumed that transitivity could be marked on the subjunctive V stem through the position of the accent (p. 31): "Die Konjunktive der Klasse V sind ungeachtet der Diathese des Verbs regelmässig auf der ersten Silbe betont. Unter den medialen Formen hat sich aber eine formale Kennzeichnung einer Opposition *transitiv* (unmarkiert): *intransitiv/passiv* (markiert durch Suffixbetonung) herausgebildet". Marggraf *op.cit.* tries also, but with little success, to extend this correspondence to the -*s*-preterits with ablaut (class III), while pointing out that the preterits of class I have root accent only.

Winter (1980a) thinks on the same lines as Marggraf (1970), but comes to the opposite conclusion: *initial accent* functions, together with other morphological features (cf. below), as an important marker of transitivity. Thus the presents of class III and IV are combined with a secondary subjunctive stem with suffixal accent (Winter *op.cit.* "List I") whereas presents of class VI ("List V") are combined with a secondary subjunctive stem with initial accent. In the preterit, the morphological marker of transitivity is not accentuation but word-initial palatalization.<sup>4</sup> Transitive preterits have word-initial palatalized consonant,

2 Cf. Winter (1980a).

3 See Schmidt (1974: 29ff.).

4 Presented also in Winter (1980b).

1 Cf. also Hackstein (1995: 147f.).

whereas intransitive preterits do not. Initial accentuation as a marker of transitivity recurs as a significant feature of present, subjunctive and preterit of the so-called 'causative' classes, IXb, Xb, and XIb (Winter *op.cit.*: 440), which are naturally transitive.

The theories of Marggraf (1970) and Winter (1980) has been questioned by Eypörsson (1993), especially as, in his opinion, they rely basically on synchronic data. The explanation he gives for the unstable accent patterns of subjunctive V is based on diachronic arguments. He concludes that class V subjunctives with heavy root vocalism (B  $\bar{a}$ , *ai*, *au*), as well as ablauting subjunctives with fixed *o*-grade in the non-present, both have stable root accent. Many subjunctives that reflect a Proto-Indo-European ablaut *\*o/zero* also have a stable root accent. However, a minority of subjunctives of this type have a root accent in the active singular and a suffixal accent elsewhere, reflecting a Proto-Indo-European ablauting paradigm with accented *o*-grade in the strong stem but unaccented zero-grade elsewhere.<sup>5</sup>

Verbs of the present class VIII (B  $/s(a)-/$  A  $-s(\bar{a})/sa-$ ) are also inherently transitive, as has been demonstrated by Hackstein (1995: 39ff.). This present class is only exceptionally combined with subjunctive V, dealt with before. Normally, present VIII is combined with subjunctive I (athematic) or subjunctive II (thematic). Preterit I is also only exceptionally combined with present VIII; the normal preterit is III (sigmatic).<sup>6</sup> Krause and Thomas (1960) distinguish a non-causative present VIIa from a causative present VIIIb. This distinction is, according to Hackstein (*op.cit.*: 147ff.) not substantiated morphologically or functionally. Furthermore, the division has its origin in systematic necessity (p. 153): "Die tiefere Kritik der von Krause und Krause/Thomas getroffenen Einteilung 'Prs. VIIa - VIIIb' wird daran ansetzen müssen, dass die Prämissen, derzufolge bei einer Opposition Intransitivum :: Transitivum das Intransitivum die primäre Bildung ('Grundverb'), das Transitivum die sekundäre, abgeleitete Bildung ('Kausativum') darstellt, willkürlich ist - da aus dem Material nicht begründbar."

By using this statement as a point of reference, we might have a new look at the combination of stem classes in verbs with more than one present formation, i.e. the verbs that are inflected both as non-causative and causative according to Krause and Thomas (1960).

<sup>5</sup> Cf. summary Eypörsson (1993: 68f.).

<sup>6</sup> Cf. the compilation of individual verbs of class VIII by Hackstein (1995: 44-46 (VIIIa), 108-110 (VIIIb)).

For many intransitive or passive verbs, the causative obviously has a transitivizing or activating function. These verbs will be dealt with in 4.1. However, what happens when a causative is applied to a transitive verb? In Pinault (1989: 125) it is postulated that the causative form of transitive verbs does not change the meaning or function of the verb. There are several examples which contradict this (cf. 4.2), but there are also examples that support the assumption (cf. 4.3).

## 2 Notes on the organization of the core in Tocharian

Tocharian is an accusative language, which means that the nominative is used both as S and A. The basic function of the oblique is that of the accusative in other Indo-European languages: it marks the Direct Object (O) of transitive verbs. With personal pronouns, a cliticized variant, distinguished in 1st, 2nd, 3rd singular and 1st-3rd plural (see table 1), is sometimes used instead of the independent forms. However, the clitics occur much more frequently as substitutes for Indirect Objects (IO) than Direct Objects (DO).

Table 1. *The Tocharian clitics*

	TB	TA
Sg. 1	-ñ	-ñi
2	-c	-ci
3	-ne	-ni
Pl. 1-3	-me	-mi

Besides, the oblique also has a few typically non-core functions, such as Local Extension, Local Distribution, and notion of Position in time (see Carling 2000: 5f.). The so-called oblique of direction was treated in a special study by Thomas (1983) and was incorporated into the study of local case functions by Carling (2000). This function is somewhat debated: it is obviously a residue of Indo-European, and in Tocharian it seems to be fossilized to a large extent, i.e. it is used only with certain verbs and reference objects.

### 2.1 *The Indirect Object (IO)*

The basic case for denoting Recipient with ditransitive transfer verbs, like 'give', 'provide', 'sell', or Recipient/Experiencer with ditransitive say-

ing/declaration verbs, like 'announce', 'tell', 'teach' is the *genitive*. As for personal pronouns, the clitic variant is used more frequently than the independent *genitive* in this position. With saying/declaration verbs, like 'announce', 'tell', we also find the oblique as IO in exceptional cases (see below). With ditransitive transportation verbs, like 'bring', 'place', 'put', the situation seems to be more ambivalent. As indicated above, we have local cases denoting Goal Attainment (locative), Direction (allative), Source (ablative) or Path (perlative) connected with this type of verbs, but we still have some questionable constructions for instance with the complicated verbs AB *suk-* 'deliver' (which will not be taken up here) or AB *lu-* 'send' (5.1.4), that have allative besides the *genitive*, also with animate IOs. However, these few exceptions do not affect the position of the *genitive* as the case of the Recipient.

The reason for choosing a *genitive/oblique* or a clitic form of the pronoun is not evident. Two clitics cannot occur in the same construction in *different syntactic positions*, but a repetition of clitics or repetition of an independent noun by a clitic sometimes occurs. The reasons for using a clitic or an independent form seem partly to be other than purely syntactical: topicality, metrics, narration, or the like.

Likewise, the *genitive/clitics* are also used as Indirect Subject in inverse constructions, which occur in Tocharian, but are not very common. There is no word for 'have', instead A *nas-* B *nes-* 'be' or AB *misk-* 'become' and a *genitive/clitic* is used.

### 3 Towards a re-categorization of the verbal system

3.1 *Instead of 'non-causative' - 'causative': Inflectional Paradigms (IP)*  
The classification of the verbs used in the following survey relies basically on verbal valency, as concluded from the argument structure following an individual verb in a text. In order to simplify a very complicated system, the term Inflectional Paradigm (IP), numbered in accordance with an increased valency as IP1, IP2, IP3... will be used instead of the non-causative ~ causative distinction. An 'Inflectional Paradigm' is a combination of present / subjunctive / preterit classes, applied to an individual verb that possesses a certain valency structure.

Normally the semantic lexical root of a verb corresponds to the active IP1 meaning, in the case of a medium tantum, the medio-passive IP1 meaning. Interesting examples in which we have two IPs (IP1 and IP2) without any visible semantic difference will be dealt with in 4.3.

The survey of 4.1-4.4 uses the inherent transitivity of the different IPs as a point of reference for a classification of the verbs. For verbs with more than one IP, three basic groups can be distinguished:

- 1 Verbs that alternate between intransitive and transitive (causatives)
- 2 Verbs that alternate between transitive and ditransitive (or intransitive and ditransitive)
- 3 Verbs that keep their transitivity

For the lucidity of the presentation, problems connected with individual verbs will not be taken into account in the text. What is of importance here is to try to develop a general classification for the different types. Nevertheless, there are numerous problems connected with the individual forms and verbs, the differences between Tocharian A and B, and so forth. Some verbs do not fit into any group, and some verbs might be missing in the representations.

However, it is true for most of the verbs that occur in IP pairs, that the secondary derived variant could be designated as a *causative* of the primary derived form, since the second form increases the valency by adding an A to the core and transforming the original S (or A) into an O - the general definition of a *causative*. The purpose of this presentation is therefore *not*, as it might appear, to question the use of the term *causative*, but to incorporate also exceptions of the system.

#### 3.2 *Effects of the medio-passive on the valency*

The medio-passive very often decreases the valency of a transitive verb, and makes it intransitive. There are numerous examples of this within the present classes VIII, IX, X and XI. However, this is not always the case. The medio-passive often reflexivizes a transitive verb, i.e. indicates that the Agent is also the goal of the action, or in some other way transforms the meaning without changing the valency. We have also examples of the opposite function, although this is not very usual, where the active variant is intransitive and the medio-passive is transitive. This, which Schmidt (1974: 185f.) refers to as "Objektives Aktiv neben subjektivem Medium", occurs only with Experience verbs, as AB *wär-* (A present VIII, B present IXa), active 'smell, emit a smell' (tr.) and medio-passive 'smell' (tr.) or A *pälk-* active 'look like, shine' (itr.) medio-passive 'look, behold' (tr.).

## 4 Categorization of the IP combinations according to valency

## 4.1 Verbs that alternate between intransitive and transitive (causatives)

The largest group of verbs that alternate between intransitive and transitive are inflected with an intransitive present AB III or IV (subjunctive V, preterit I) (=IP1) and a transitive present A VIII, B IXb (=IP2) (see table 2). The verbs in table 3 are referred to by Schmidt (1974: 29ff.) as 'Medio-aktiva': they have a medio-passive present beside an active preterit. The subjunctive is either active or medio-passive.<sup>7</sup> The medio-passive present is without exceptions but some deviation can occur in the preterit where we can have lack of attestation or, in exceptional cases, medio-passive forms. There is, in general, no semantic or syntactic difference between the present medio-passive and the preterit active forms.

The difference between the present AB III, IV (subjunctive V) and the present A VIII, B IXb is straightforward intransitive ~ transitive and involves the introduction of a new argument into the core and a change of S to A.

Table 2. IP1 (itr.) = present III, IV ~ IP2 (tr.)<sup>8</sup> = present TA VIII, TB IXb

	IP1	IP2:
AB <i>prānk-</i>	stay away, restrain oneself	keep away, reject, refuse (a.)
AB <i>tsār-</i>	be separated	separate (a.m.)
AB <i>tsālp-</i>	be free, pass away	free from, redeem (A m., B a.m.)
A <i>ritw-</i>	be connected with	join, put together (a.)
B <i>ritt-</i>	be attached, be suitable	join (a.); prepare (m.)
A <i>prutk-</i>	be filled	shut (a.)
B <i>prutk-</i>	be stopped, confined, shut	bring about, tame (a.)
A <i>yāt-</i>	be capable of	have power over, tame (a.m.)
B <i>yāt-</i>	be capable of	
A <i>tsārw-</i>	courage	console <sup>9</sup>

7 There are also some slight differences on this point between Tocharian A and Tocharian B.

8 Since the IP1 verbs of this group are so-called 'medio-actives' (see text), an active ~ middle change does not seem to affect the verbs semantically or syntactically.

9 Only prptc. *tsārwsant*.

B <i>tsārw-</i>	take heart, have courage	encourage, console (m.)
A <i>nut-</i>	disappear <sup>10</sup>	?
B <i>naut-</i>	disappear, be destroyed	destroy (a.)
A <i>sātk-</i>	be spread	?
B <i>sātk-</i>	be spread	spread tr. (m.)
A <i>plānt-</i>	rejoice	gladden (m.)
B <i>plānt-</i>	rejoice, be glad	gladden, make glad <sup>11</sup>
A <i>yānk-</i>	?	bewitch (a.)
B <i>yānk-</i>	be deluded	cast a spell, bewitch (a.)
A <i>sāl-</i>	jump	?

Table 3. IP1 (itr.) = present B III, IV ~ IP2 (tr.) present B IXb

	IP1	IP2
B <i>triw-</i>	be mixed, get mixed, mingle	shake (a.) mix (m.) <sup>12</sup>
B <i>māsk-</i>	be, become, find oneself	exchange (a.m.) <sup>13</sup>
B <i>spānt-</i>	trust <sup>14</sup>	trust in <sup>15</sup>
B <i>ās-</i>	dry out, dry up, parch itr.	dry tr. (a.)
B <i>kārp-</i>	descend, come down	make descend, lower (m.)

Another group of verbs has the same structure in Tocharian A as the preceding group: IP1 (itr.) = present III (IV) (subjunctive V, preterit I) ~ IP2 (tr.) present VIII. The structure in Tocharian B corresponds to Tocharian A: IP1 = present III-IV (subjunctive V, preterit I) ~ present VIII (table 4). The examples in B are more numerous. Morphologically, the verbs of table 8 (triple and quadruple formations), which occur in Tocharian B only, constitute a subdivision of this group: with the addition of another transitive IP (present IXb), we get the normal pattern for triple IP verbs: III ~ VIII ~ IXb (cf. further 4.4). Interestingly enough, most B verbs of this group have root-final *-k*, like the triple IP verbs.

10 Only prptc. *nutō*.

11 Ipv. *plāntsar-mē*.

12 This seems to be the pattern of the attested finite forms. Cf. Schmidt (1974: 459).

13 The difference active ~ middle is not clear. Cf. Schmidt (1974: 355).

14 The form is clearly intransitive, since we have only combinations with comitative or periphrastic, not oblique.

15 Infinitive forms only, constructed with an oblique as second argument (cf. Adams 1999: 717).

Table 4. IP1 (*itr*) = present (A) B III (IV) ~ IP2 (*tr*): present (A) B VIII

	IP1	IP2
A <i>ār-</i>	cease (IV)	give up, renounce (a)
B <i>ār-</i>	cease, come to an end (IV)	renounce, leave behind (a)
B <i>kāmp-</i> <sup>16</sup>	be disturbed	disturb, put a stop to (a)
B <i>pālk-</i> <sup>17</sup>	burn	torture <sup>18</sup>
B <i>rāk-</i> <sup>19</sup>	be extended <sup>20</sup>	extend, cover (a.m.) <sup>21</sup>
B <i>lāk-</i>	light up, be illuminated	light up, illuminate (a.) <sup>22</sup>
A <i>wāk-</i> <sup>23</sup>	split apart <sup>24</sup>	split, break (m.) <sup>25</sup>
B <i>wāk-</i>	burst, split apart (IV)	separate (a), burst, flower (m.) <sup>26</sup>
A <i>tsām-</i>	grow, arise	promote, fabricate
B <i>tsām-</i>	grow	cause to grow, promote (a.) <sup>27</sup>

4.2 Verbs that alternate between transitive and ditransitive  
Verbs that are inherently transitive, i.e. basically verbs that are inflected according to the present class VI can, when combined with present VIII or IXb, alternate between transitivity and ditransitivity.

AB *kārs-* 'know' is inflected with a transitive present VI ('know') and a ditransitive present A VIII, B IXb ('let know, inform') (table 5). The ditransitive construction has a double oblique [<sub>ANOM DO<sub>GEN</sub> V IO<sub>ORL</sub></sub>] instead of the normal ditransitive pattern [<sub>ANOM DO<sub>GEN</sub> V IO<sub>ORL</sub></sub>] (cf. 2).

16 No correspondence in Tocharian A.

17 Tocharian A *pālk-* is attested in (*tr*): present VIII 'burn, torture' only.

18 See Hackstein (1995: 112, n.15).

19 A *rāk-* is attested in preterit III (present VIII, *tr*): 'cover, extend' only.

20 Subjunctive V (m.) only.

21 See Hackstein (1995: 117–118).

22 Medio-passive 'be illuminated'. See Hackstein (1995: 124f.).

23 Subjunctive V and preterit I only.

24 Subjunctive V, see commentary of Hackstein (1995: 129).

25 Subjunctive (a), see Hackstein (1995: 129).

26 Hackstein (1995: 127f.). The active form is transitive and the medio-passive form intransitive. There are also traces of a third IP in the form of a preterit IV (see Adams 1999: 585).

27 AB *tsām-* see Hackstein (1996: 136ff.).

Table 5. IP1 (*tr*) = present AB VI ~ IP2 (*di*) = present A VIII, B IXb

	IP1	IP2
A <i>kārs-</i>	know (a)	let know (a)
B <i>kārs-</i>	know (a.) <sup>28</sup>	let know (a)

The verb AB *kālp-* corresponds to a transitive present VI in Tocharian A and IXa in Tocharian B, which is combined with a ditransitive AB IXb (table 6). The construction of this verb follows the normal ditransitive pattern [<sub>ANOM DO<sub>GEN</sub> V IO<sub>ORL</sub></sub>].

Table 6. IP1 (*tr*) = present A VI, B IXa ~ IP2 (*di*) = present AB IXb

	IP1	IP2
A <i>kālp-</i>	find, get, achieve (m.a.) <sup>29</sup>	bestow
B <i>kālp-</i>	find, get, achieve (a)	bestow (a)

AB *lāk-* 'see' has two different structures in Tocharian A and Tocharian B. In B we have transitive present IXa and ditransitive present IXb and in A a transitive present V and a ditransitive present VIII (table 7). In the IP1 variant, A *lāk-* distinguishes between an active 'look like' and a medio-passive 'see' (Schmidt 1974: 186). As with AB *kālp-*, the construction following the ditransitive is [<sub>ANOM DO<sub>GEN</sub> V IO<sub>ORL</sub></sub>].

Table 7. IP1 (*tr*) = present A V, B IXa ~ IP2 (*di*) = present A VIII, B IXb

	IP1	IP2
A <i>lāk-</i>	see, look at, visit (a)	demonstrate
B <i>lāk-</i>	see, look at, visit (a)	demonstrate

4.3 Verbs with double IPs that keep their transitivity  
According to Krause and Thomas (1964), many verbs are said to be without change of meaning ("ohne Bedeutungsveränderung") between 'non-causative' and 'causative'. However, many of these verbs, especially in Tocharian B, do have two different valency structures. This is evident from the dictionary of Adams (1999), where examples of individual verbs have been more carefully investigated.

28 Medio-passive 'is known'.

29 Present, subjunctive = medio-passive, preterit = active. See Schmidt (1974: 21).

However, we still have a collection of verbs that have double IPs without difference in valency or meaning. Interestingly enough, most of these verbs are restricted to Tocharian B, i.e. the corresponding Tocharian A verbs do not have double IPs. This indicates that the double formations, which have no consequences for the valency of the verb, are an 'unnecessary' innovation of Tocharian B, probably caused by analogy.

If we take a closer look at these verbs, we have AB *lik-* 'wash'. In Tocharian A, there is only a trace of one IP (present I, subjunctive V, preterit I).

In Tocharian B we have two IPs. IP1 (present VI, subjunctive V, preterit I), is attested in medio-passive only, meaning 'wash'. The object is the body or part of the body of the Agent. IP2 (present VIII) means 'wash', the object is another person, part of another person's body, or object in active (see ex. 1) and in medio-passive the body or part of the body of the Agent (cf. Schmidt 1974: 79, 235, 247).

1 *wassi* *āsīā-m* *likšan-me*  
clothes head/OBL wash/PR-3SG-A-CL.PL  
[the gives them] clothes [and] he washes [their] heads for them'  
(H.149:76 a3)

A *tsārk-* is attested in the verbal noun *tsārslune* only. In Tocharian B *tsārk-* IP1 (present VI, no subjunctive/preterit attested) and IP2 (present IXb (a), subjunctive II (Verbal Noun), preterit III (Verbal Noun)) both mean 'heat, burn, torture'.

A *ārt-* 'praise, acknowledge' is inflected in present IV (subjunctive V, preterit I) only. Tocharian B *ārt-* has two IPs: IP1 (present IV, subjunctive V, preterit I) IP2 present IXb (no subjunctive/preterit attested) both mean 'praise, love, acknowledge'. This verb is unusual, since it is transitive and inflected with present IV, which otherwise is exclusively intransitive.

AB *tāl-* 'uphold, keep' has an interesting structure. In Tocharian A, we have only one IP, a transitive present VIII (preterit II). However, in Tocharian B we have two IPs, IP1 (present VI, subjunctive V, preterit I) 'uphold, keep raised' and IP2 (present IXb, subjunctive IXb, preterit II) 'raise, lift, acquire'. This means that the difference marked by present VI and IXb in Tocharian B is not connected with valency (both 'uphold' and 'raise' are transitive), but with the degree of activity of A: 'uphold' is a state verb, whereas 'raise' is an action verb.

#### 4.4 Verbs with triple or quadruple IPs

Verbs with more than two IPs are restricted to Tocharian B and are phonetically similar: they all end in *-k* (see table 8). The list is hard to understand and shows many problematic exceptions. The verb B *trik-* does not show any semantic or syntactic difference between the three variants (cf. Carling 2003: 69f.), whereas the verb B *lānk-* 'hang' corresponds perfectly to established categories. Probably the variants in some verbs have been submitted to semantic levelling. Three valency variants of the verb 'confuse', might be confusing. The verb B *spārk-* shows an interesting correspondence: the two transitive variants VIII 'avoid' and IXb 'drive away' show a semantic difference that involves a change of the activity of the Agent. Finally we have the verb B *kātk-* (table 9). Whereas Tocharian A has only two inflectional variants, Tocharian B has four. An example of the causative construction (present IXb) 'make pass' is given in example (2).

Table 8. Verbs with triple IPs.

	prs.III	prs.VIII	prs.IXb
B <i>spārk-</i>	disappear	avoid	drive away
B <i>trik-</i>	be confused	be confused, mistake	be confused
B <i>wik-</i>	disappear	disappear, pass away	put to flight; dissolve
	prs.I		
B <i>lānk-</i>	hang (itr.)	hang (tr.)	let hang; dangle
	prs.VI	(subj.I)	
B <i>tsārk-</i>	burn (tr.)	torment	torture
	prs.IV		(pret.IV)
B <i>wāk-</i>	split (itr.)	separate (tr.)	separate (?)

Table 9. The verb B *kātk-* 'pass'

Prs. VI (act.)	pass over (itr.?)
Prs. VII (act.mid.)	pass (itr.)
Prs. IXa (med.), subj. V (med.), Pt. I (act.)	traverse (tr.)
Prs. IXb, subj. IX	make pass, allow passage
2 <i>kāssi</i> ...	<i>samāne-m</i> <i>bhavākkārsai</i>
teacher	monk/OBL.PL. of the highest existence
<i>yoñiyai</i>	<i>emške</i> <i>kātk-āssi</i>
area/obl	as far as allow passage/inf
	desirous

'The teacher was desirous of allowing the monks passage to the area of the highest existence' (B 108 b3)

In this group, the operations of the valency-changing mechanisms are highly obscured. They are far more complicated, semantically as well as syntactically, than the often very transparent verbs with only two IPs. Probably, the system was in a state of decomposition at the synchronic level, and the different structures of verbs with three or more IPs were confused with each other.

## References

- Adams, Douglas, 1999: *A Dictionary of Tocharian B* [Leiden Studies in Indo-European 10], Amsterdam / Atlanta: Rodopi.
- Carling, Gerd, 2000: *Die Funktionen der lokalen Kasus im Tocharischen*. Berlin / New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Carling, Gerd, 2003: "Middle-passive and causative: valency-change in the Tocharian B -e-presents without initial palatalization?" – *Language in Time and Space. A festschrift for Werner Winter on the occasion of his 80th birthday*, Berlin / New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 63–76.
- Eyþórsson, Þórhallur, 1993: "Proto-Indo-European origins of Tocharian accent: Class V subjunctives in Tocharian B?" – *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 6, 43–94.
- Hackstein, Olav, 1995: *Untersuchungen zu den signatischen Präsenstambildungen des Tocharischen*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Krause, Wolfgang & Werner Thomas, 1960: *Tocharisches Elementarbuch I*, Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- Krause, Wolfgang & Werner Thomas, 1964: *Tocharisches Elementarbuch II*, Heidelberg: Carl Winter.
- Lane, Georges, S., 1960: Review: W. Krause and W. Thomas, *Tocharisches Elementarbuch*. – *Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen* 213, 115–128.
- Marggraf, Wolf-Jürgen, 1970: *Untersuchungen zum Akzent in Tocharisch B*. Diss. Christian-Albrechts-Universität, Kiel.
- Pinaut, Georges-Jean, 1989: "Tocharien?" – *LALIES* 7, *Actes des sessions de linguistique et de littérature*, Paris: Presses de l'École Normale Supérieure, 6–224.
- Poucha, Pavel, 1955: *Thesaurus Linguae Tocharicae, Dialecti A* [Monografie Archivu Orientálního 15]. Prague: Státní Pedagogické Nakladatelství.
- Schmid, Klaus Todla, 1974: *Die Gebrauchswesen des Mediums im Tocharischen*. Diss., Göttingen.
- Winter, Werner, 1962: Review: Wolfgang Krause and Werner Thomas, *Tocharisches Elementarbuch I: Grammatik. – Deutsche Literaturzeitung* 83: 1066–1069.
- Winter, Werner, 1980a: "Morphological signalling of selection properties: Transitivity in Tocharian B and A verbs?" – Jacek Fisiak (ed.), *Historical morphology*, The Hague / Paris / New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 421–442.

- Winter, Werner, 1980b: "Tocharisch B yok. A yok 'körperhaar; Farbe' und Verwandtes." – Gunter Bretschneider & Christian Lehmann (eds.), *Wege zur Universalienforschung, Sprachwissenschaftliche Beiträge zum 60. Geburtstag von Hansjakob Seiler*, Tübingen: Gunter Narr, 469–472.