

Development of form and function in a case system with layers: Tocharian and Romani compared¹

Gerd Carling

o Introduction

In this article, I will look at the formal and functional organization of the case systems in Tocharian A and B and Romani, two languages that are in a similar state-of-change when it comes to the restructuring of a former inflectional system into a so-called system with *layers*. By layers is meant that cases are constructed by using different principles, primarily inflectional (layer I) and secondarily agglutinative (layer II, by using layer I as a basis). Tocharian and Romani are, though both Indo-European, not closely related. Their respective case systems have nothing in common except the above-mentioned structural similarities, which have arisen independently, through decay and a following re-

1 I thank Georges-Jean Pinault, Folke Josephson and Michaël Peyrot for valuable comments. I am also grateful to Dimitri Florin, Micke Demetri, Angelina Dimiter-Taikon, Gregory Kwiek and students at Agnesberg Roma Folk High School, Gothenburg, and Linköping University for information on the Romani language. This research has been funded by the Bank of Sweden Tercentenary foundation, the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation and the Swedish Research Council. I started writing this article while I was a Humboldt Fellow with Professor Dr. Werner Winter in Kiel, 2001–2002. It was never finished, partly because details of Romani had to be clarified, partly because good studies on the Tocharian core cases were lacking at the time. I dedicate this work to the memory of my friend and mentor Professor Dr. Werner Winter.

structuralization of a former richer, inflectional system. Tocharian was spoken in Chinese Central Asia 500–1000 AD, and the decay and restructuralization of the system lies somewhat 500–800 years earlier than the earliest attestation. The Indo-Aryan languages have had a similar development, even if they, like Romani, became separated from the Indian linguistic area. In the case of Indo-Aryan, the restructuralization of the system was operative at the time when Tocharian, most likely, had ceased to restructure its system. Therefore, the risk of areal influence is minimal, and we would be able to look for similarities that possibly might have their origin in the corresponding restructuralization of the respective systems.

In this paper, I will examine first the restructuralization of the systems independently in the two language groups (Tocharian/Indo-Aryan). Thereupon, I will look more closely at the organization of the core in both groups: first the *central core*, i.e., the marking of S, A, and P and the logical Subject in inverted case constructions, and second the *extended core*, i.e., trivalent constructions and the marking of the Indirect Object (for terminology cf. Carling 2005: 36f.).

1 Tocharian

1.1 *The case system of Tocharian*

The Tocharian case system has, unlike some of the Indo-Aryan languages (excluding Romani), only two layers, one inflectional, ‘primary cases’, and one agglutinative, ‘secondary cases’. The inflectional cases are most probably the remnants of a richer, inflectional system, like the one reconstructed for Indo-European. The primary cases are nominative, oblique and genitive, and the secondary cases are instrumental (A), perative, comitative, allative, ablative, locative and causal (B) (see table 1).

Table 1. The Tocharian case system (Pinault 2008: 468)

	Tocharian A		Tocharian B	
	Sg.	Pl.	Sg.	Pl.
Nom.	<i>yuk</i>	<i>yukañ</i>	<i>yakwe</i>	<i>yakwi</i>
Obl.	<i>yuk</i>	<i>yukas</i>	<i>yakwe</i>	<i>yakweṃ</i>
Gen.	<i>yukes</i>	<i>yukaśsi</i>	<i>yäkwentse</i>	<i>yäkweṃts</i>
Instr.	<i>yuk-yo</i>	<i>yukas-yo</i>	---	---
Perl.	<i>yuk-ā</i>	<i>yukas-ā</i>	<i>yakwe-sa</i>	<i>yakwen-tsa</i>
Comit.	<i>yuk-aśśäl</i>	<i>yukas-aśśäl</i>	<i>yakwe-mpa</i>	<i>yakweṃ-mpa</i>
All.	<i>yuk-ac</i>	<i>yukas-ac</i>	<i>yakwe-ś(c)</i>	<i>yakweṃ-ś(c)</i>
Abl.	<i>yuk-äṣ</i>	<i>yukas-äṣ</i>	<i>yäkwe-mem</i>	<i>yakwen-mem</i>
Loc.	<i>yuk-am</i>	<i>yukas-am</i>	<i>yakwe-ne</i>	<i>yakweṃ-ne</i>

There are a few things to be noticed concerning the morphological organization of this system. First, the nominative, oblique and genitive present a large number of variants, depending on the stems (for a comprehensive overview cf. Pinault 2008: 474ff.).

Tocharian has two genders: masculine and feminine. A third gender, which historically reflects the Indo-European neuter, is called ‘genus alternans’: it shows masculine syntactic agreement in the singular and feminine in the plural. Most inanimate words have stem variants marked by zero endings in the nominative as well as in the oblique singular; some variants have an alternation of the stem vowel in the oblique. For animates, there is a special oblique case ending in *-ṃ*. This ending is obviously an innovation, since it is not found in archaic paradigms, as A *pācar* B *pācer* ‘father’, oblique A *pācar* B *pātär*. Tocharian B shows a greater diversity than Tocharian A. We have, in Tocharian B, a group of nouns ending in vowel, with a few exceptions feminine in gender, which have different nominative and oblique singular forms: *-a* : *-o*, *-ya* : *-yai*, *-a* : *-ai*, *-o* : *-ai*, *-yo* : *-yai*, *-o* : *-a*.

One Tocharian B class of inanimates has a reverse marking as compared to the animates: Nom. *-(i)ye* : Obl. *-(i)* (Tocharian A *-(i)* : *-(i)*) (B *meñe*, oblique *meñ*), i.e., the nominative is marked, whereas the oblique has a bare stem.

It is a complicated issue to reconstruct the pre-history of the complete system of the inflectional Layer I endings, since we obviously have far-gone innovations as compared to Indo-European. In Proto-Tocharian, phonological erosion has affected the final syllables to a great extent, which has given rise to thorough reorganization, also in the system of Layer I endings (cf. Pinault 2008: 474ff.).

A reconstruction of the restructuring, using relative chronology, indicates that at periods only an inflectional nucleus of the nominative and oblique/accusative was kept: the genitive is partly agglutinative in A (A *-is*, cf. Pinault 2008: 501f.), and in B *-mts* the Common Tocharian final **-ns* of the accusative plural has become part of the ending, as with the other secondary cases (for this morpheme boundary change in Tocharian B, cf. Carling 2008b: 8).

The autonomy of the secondary case affixes is of importance here. Apparently, these affixes have a relatively independent status, being affixes rather than endings, as indicated by the stress in Tocharian B: nom.sg. *lákke* ‘suffering’, gen.sg. *lákkléntse*, loc.sg. *lákke-ne* (Pinault 2008: 465). Occasionally, Tocharian B also allows a separation of the noun and the affix, as in example 1.

(1) Tocharian B

škas meñatse -ne
 six month-GEN LOC
 ‘on the sixth [day] of the month’

1.2 Organization of the core in Tocharian

1.2.1 The marking of verbal valency in Tocharian

Before we get closer into the organization of the core in Tocharian, a few words should be said about the marking of verbal valency. The present can be inflected according to 12 different inflectional stem variants (classes), of which some occur in two variants that are basically distinguished by the position of the accent. The subjunctive occurs in 12 classes, and the preterit in 6 (for an overview cf. Pinault 2008: 569ff.).

Certain present-, subjunctive and preterit classes are normally combined with each other, forming inflectional ‘paradigms’ (averbo) of an individual root. It has been noticed that most present classes are either transitive or intransitive (cf. Winter 1980), whereas others still represent a mix of transitive and intransitive individual verbs (for details see Carling 2003, 2005, 2009, Malzahn 2010: 50ff.). On the corresponding subjunctive and preterit stems, the transitivity is less transparent, since we can find the same subjunctive- and preterit stems connected with both intransitive and transitive presents.

Some roots present only *one* inflectional paradigm (present – subjunctive – preterit), whereas others have two. As an exception, we find verbs with three, or even four, inflectional paradigms. When we find more than one inflectional paradigm variants on an individual root, this normally indicates that we have different transitivity variants of the same basic lexical root. Most normally we have two inflectional paradigm variants that represent the intransitive vs. the transitive of a lexical root, i.e. ‘hang’ (itr.) ‘hang’ (tr.).

Competing with this system we have the middle-passive, marked by a certain set of endings, distinguished in present (A *-mār, -tār, -tār, -mtār, -cār, -ntār*, B *-mar, -tar, -tār, -mt(t)ār, -tār, -ntār*), preterit (A *-e, -te, -t, -mät, -c, -nt*, B *-mai, -tai, -te, -mt(t)e, -t, -nte*) and imperative (A *-r, -c*, B *-r, -t*). The middle-passive has many functions: reflexivization, subjectivization etc. (see Schmidt 1974, Carling to appear:a). One of the most important functions is to detransitivize a transitive verb, and in this function the middle-passive often overlaps the valency marked by the Grundverb-causative distinction. With the verb AB *ākl-*, for example, Tocharian A marks the two variants ‘teach’ (transitive) vs ‘learn’ (ditransitive) by using middle vs. active forms, whereas Tocharian B uses different Grundverb - causative.

1.2.2 Subject and Direct Object

Tocharian is, as opposed to many of the Middle Indo-Aryan languages, an accusative language, which means that the nominative is used as Subject to intransitive as well as transitive verbs. The basic function of the

oblique is that of the accusative in other Indo-European languages: it marks the Direct Object of transitive verbs. With personal pronouns, a cliticized variant, distinguished in 1st, 2nd, 3rd singular and 1st–3rd plural (cf. Carling 2006) is sometimes used instead of the independent forms. However, the clitics occur much more frequently as substitutes for Indirect Objects (see below).

Besides, the oblique also has a few typically non-core functions, as Local Extension and Local Distribution, and notion of Position in time (see Carling 2000: 7–8). The so-called Oblique of direction was devoted a special study by Thomas (1983) and is incorporated in the study of local case functions by Carling (2000). This function is somewhat debated: it is obviously a residue from Indo-European, and in Tocharian it seems to be fossilized to a large part, i.e. it is used only with certain verbs and reference objects.

However, Winter (p.c., cf. also 1980) suggests that the Oblique of direction should be moved to the core, since it is used with verbs that are morphologically marked as transitives. This might be true for some of the of the verbs occurring with the Oblique of direction, i.e. AB *rām-* ‘bend down (towards)’, AB *läm-* ‘sit (down)’, A *näm-*, A *kārp-* ‘step down’ (for details on transitive marking see Winter 1980). The verbs AB *kām-* ‘come’, and AB *i-* ‘to go’ do not belong to particularly transitivity-marked classes, but they also occur, to a limited extent, with the Oblique of direction. On the whole, the Oblique of direction occurs most frequently in frozen expressions, as A *ālu ype i-* ‘go into another country’, A *kälyme i-* B *kälymi i-* ‘go in a certain direction’.

1.2.3 Indirect Object

The basic case for denoting Recipient with Transfer verbs, as ‘give’, ‘sell’, ‘buy’ is the genitive. With personal pronouns, the clitic variant is used more frequently than the independent genitive in this position. With Declarative verbs, as ‘announce’, ‘tell’, we also in exceptional cases find the oblique as third argument.

The Genitive is used with the verb A *e-* B *ai-* ‘give’: [S_{NOM} DO_{OBL} IO_{GEN} V] (see example 2), that has only one inflectional stem, unlike other ditransitive verbs, that are ‘transitivized’ transitives.

(2) A 8 a2

kyal mā nāṣ penu cami ṣñi amok lkātsi
 why not I-NOM also he-GEN own art-OBL look-INF

āyim

give-OPT.1SG.

‘Why shouldn’t I give him to see my own skill?’

The verb AB *āks-* ‘announce, declare’ has also only one inflectional stem, and has normally the valency [S_{NOM} DO_{OBL} IO_{GEN/ECL} V] (example 3).

(3) A 66 b6

videhak riyāṣ lcār cam wram ṣñi ṣñi
 Videhaka city-ABL go-PRT.3PL this thing-OBL own own

ypeyac kälkorāṣ lāñcāśsi ākṣiññār
 country-ALL gone-ABS king-GEN.PL announce-PRT.3PL

‘Thereupon they [scil. the messengers] went out from the city Videhaka and, having arrived in their respective countries, announced this matter to the kings.’

The verb AB *ākl-* has been mentioned before. The two transitivity variants ‘teach’ vs. ‘learn’ are marked differently in Tocharian A and Tocharian B (active/middle respective Grundverb/causative). However, in both languages we have the genitive (or, by personal pronouns, clitics) as third argument. Other verbs in causative that are constructed with genitive as third argument are A *kālp-* ‘bestow’ (Grundverb ‘find, get, obtain, achieve’), B *wātk-* ‘order’ (Grundverb A ‘decide’ B ‘separate, distinguish, decide’).

In lexicalized constructions with the verb AB *yām-* ‘do’, as A *kṣānti yām-* ‘do pardon; cause forgiveness’, A *spaktām yām-* ‘do a favour, serve’, B *yarke yām-* ‘do honour, worship’, we find the genitive (see example 4).

(4) A 8 a6

ñi yantarši śomiṃ cami spaktām ypā
 my-GEN mechanical girl-NOM he-GEN service do-IPF.3 SG
 ‘My mechanical doll served him’

For the Transfer verb AB *lu-* ‘send’, we find competing constructions. Basically, if the construction has a Recipient, we have genitive or enclitic as third argument, but we also have example of the allative (Tocharian A) that normally marks Direction (see example 5).

(5) A 21 b1

seyacc oki nāṣ cwac lyu ptāñkāt kāṣṣi
 son-ALL like I-OBL you-ALL send-PRT.3 SG Buddha-NOM
 ‘The Buddha-lord, the teacher, sent me to you like to a son.’

With the verb B *kārs-* Grundverb ‘know’, causative ‘make known’ we find an oblique as third argument (Double Object Construction) (see example 6)

(6) B 81 b3

k_nse (pi) ksa wesāñ kekamor orocce lānt
 who-NOM well any our-GEN coming-OBL great king-OBL
śarsāṣṣi
 announce-OPT.3 SG
 ‘[Is there] anyone who would indeed announce our arrival to the great king?’

1.2.4 Inverse constructions

Tocharian has, like many other languages, no special verb for ‘have’. A construction with the verb ‘to be’ and a genitive or clitic is used instead. Inverse constructions, where the logical Subject is marked by an oblique case and the verb formally agrees with the logical Object, which has

nominative marking, are not very common in Tocharian, but when they occur, genitive or clitic is used as Agent.

In general, forms with an inflected verb are found most frequently with clitics (see Carling 2006), whereas a genitive (also for personal pronouns, where a choice is possible) occurs more frequently with an adjectival construction (with or without copula), as in example 7a and b.

(7a) A 369 a2

rake cami mā perāk
 word he-GEN not reliable
 'he does not believe in the word'

(7b) B 588 b7

(mā ta)ñ yolyai imai-mem prosko nesām
 not you-GEN bad road-ABL fear-NOM be-PRS.3SG
 'you don't fear the evil road'

2 Indo-Aryan

2.1 *The case layer system of Indo-Aryan – a general outline*

In New Indo-Aryan (NIA), case is a vital category. Like in Pre-Tocharian (Pre-A/Pre-B), the systems are in a process of expanding, but the situation is far more complicated and diverse, especially because of the vast number of different languages or dialects. In contrast to Tocharian, the decay and restructuralization of the case systems can be observed historically, from Sanskrit via Middle Indo-Aryan (MIA) to the different New Indo-Aryan languages. Sanskrit had a rich, inflectional system with a large number of different stem variants, very much similar to the system reconstructed for Indo-European. In late MIA, this system is considerably restricted (see Masica 1991: 231ff.). Most NIA dialects have then developed case systems with layers: at least two, at most four levels. How are these levels constructed and how do you distinguish them from each other?

Layer I corresponds to the remnants of the inflectional system from OIA and MIA, though not without shift of function and rearrangement of the forms (see Masica 1991: 232). They are, as a rule, characterized by declensional differences in singular/plural, masculine/feminine and normally also stem class. They are attached to the stem directly, without any intermediate element. Layer I consists normally of the two cases nominative/direct and oblique (some languages also reflect traces of other older cases, i.e. ablative, locative, which are normally restricted in number or in use). In a few languages (see below), the oblique/direct has no independent function, it is used exclusively as a base for Layer II elements. Adjectives only take Layer I elements; they do not come along with the Layer II or III affixes. A handful of languages (Assamese, other Eastern languages) lack Layer I, but it is nevertheless preferred to count their affixes, because of functional parallelism and for typological reasons, to Layer II (see below).

Layer II elements are normally a) attached to a Layer I element, normally the oblique, b) invariant for all nouns and the same for both numbers, namely sg. and pl., thus, by definition ‘agglutinative’ (exceptions are the Marathi dative and instrumental affixes *lā/nā* and *nē~/nī~*, which vary in number but are attached via a Layer I element). Morphophonemic variation is not completely absent at Layer II, but it is of much more simple nature than in Layer I. It involves, for instance, a supporting vowel with consonant stems or other Sandhi rules. A Layer II element can be classified either as an agglutinative affix or an analytic particle; here the opinion on individual languages, i.e. Hindi, varies from author to author. The Layer II affixes/particles are normally monosyllabic and represent mostly grammaticalized, reduced earlier independent lexical items (postpositions or alike), or primary inflectional elements that functionally have ‘switched’ group. In some specific situations, Layer II affixes can appear as attached to strings of words instead of individual words, i.e. Hindi *rām*, *śyām*, *aur mohan-ko* ‘to Ram, Shyam, and Mohan’ (Masica 1991: 234).

Layer III is by definition formed by elements that are mediated by a Layer II element, normally a genitive (in some languages dative, ablative, agentive, or locative). However, in a number of NIA languages, the

Layer II element in such constructions is optional, e.g. (Masica 1991: 234):

Hindi	<i>laṛke</i>	<i>ke</i>	<i>sāthe</i>
Gujarati	<i>chokrā</i>	<i>nī</i>	<i>sāthe</i>
	or <i>chokrā</i>		<i>sāthe</i>
	boy	-GEN	with
	‘with the boy’		

Thus the mediating genitive (or dative, ablative, agentive, locative) is not an absolute criterion for the definition of a Layer III element, and, under certain conditions, a Layer II element may also be mediated by a genitive. Other criteria might also agree with the Layer III elements: a) They lack morphophonemic variants, may be longer than one syllable and often have a relatively transparent connection with an independent lexeme, b) They are semantically more specific, as compared to a more general meaning of Layer II (and Layer I) elements. Here, we typically find meanings as ‘on top of’, ‘under’, ‘behind’, ‘inside of’, ‘near’. There are, however, Layer III elements in individual languages that are more grammaticalized, as Punjabi instrumental-sociative °-*nāl*, Marathi allative °-*kaḍe*.

In general, the border between Layer II and III can be very vague in individual instances, which of course is caused by the fact that Layer II and III represent different stages of a grammaticalization of once independent lexical items, which could be seen as gradual. Many items may be on the move from one group to the other, and thus hard to be classified as belonging to one group or the other.

2.1 *The case system of Romani*

Romani belongs typologically to the NIA languages, and has, like other NIA languages, a case system with layers. Romani disappeared from Central India at some point during the middle or later half of the first millennium AD (cf. Matras 1994: 5f., 2002: 14ff.). One of the most serious obstacles for the study of Indo-Aryan historical linguistics is the paucity of data from the period between Late MIA and Early NIA,

which makes the positioning of a language like Romani in space and time problematic. For many of the NIA languages, we simply lack early data, or early data are very scanty, which complicates the picture of Indo-Aryan as the ‘perfect’ language group for the study of historical linguistics.

As for the case system, Romani obviously reflects a primitive version of the Layer system, having only two Layers, one inflectional, and one agglutinative, that is mediated by the oblique case. Therefore, it comes out as very similar to the Tocharian system.

In this outline, I will use basically fully inflectional varieties (focus on Kelderaš (spoken originally in Rumania, today in most countries of the world), Kale (Finland), and Sinte (Germany)), in which the inflectional/agglutinative case system has not been reduced (as is often the case in mixed varieties, cf. Lindell, Djerf and Carling 2008). In most inflectional varieties, the case system is kept intact morphologically, with very little variation. Data are from previous studies (when indicated) or own fieldwork (cf. acknowledgement, footnote 1).

Layer I consists, like many other NIA languages of nominative, accusative and vocative. The nominative is not, as in most agglutinative languages, marked by zero, but by a stem vowel, mostly inherited from OIA. The accusative stem (singular/plural) is used as a basis for attaching agglutinative case affixes for dative, ablative, instrumental, locative (also directional/prepositional) and genitive. In Kelderaš, we have masculine stems in (nom./acc.) *-o/-és*, *-C/-és*, *-i/-és*, *-o/-ós* (loan words), *-a/-ás* (loan words) and feminine stems in *-i/já*, *-C/-já*, *-a/-á* (loan words); these categories are also basically found in Sinte. Full paradigms are given in table 2.

Table 2. Paradigm for masculine *-o*-stems in Kelderaš and Sinte (Holzinger 1993, Boretzky and Iglá 1994, spelling of sources kept in this paradigm)

	Kelderaš		Sinte	
	Sg.	Pl.	Sg.	Pl.
Nom.	<i>rakl-ó</i> ‘boy’	<i>rakl-é</i>	<i>tšav-o</i> ‘boy’	<i>tšav-e</i>
Voc.	<i>rakl-éja</i>	<i>rakl-ále</i>	<i>tšav-a</i>	<i>tšav-ane</i>
Acc.	<i>rakl-és</i>	<i>rakl-én</i>	<i>tšav-es</i>	<i>tšav-en</i>

	Kelderaš		Sinte	
	Sg.	Pl.	Sg.	Pl.
Dat.	<i>rakl-és-kə</i>	<i>rakl-én-gə</i>	<i>tšav-es-ke</i>	<i>tšav-en-ge</i>
Prep.	<i>rakl-és-te</i>	<i>rakl-én-de</i>	<i>tšav-es-te</i>	<i>tšav-en-de</i>
Instr.	<i>rakl-é(s)-sa</i>	<i>rakl-én-ca</i>	<i>tšav-eha</i>	<i>tšav-en-tsa</i>
Abl.	<i>rakl-és-tar</i>	<i>rakl-én-dar</i>	<i>tšav-es-ter</i>	<i>tšav-en-der</i>
Gen.	<i>rakl-és-ko/ -ki/-kə</i>	<i>rakl-én-go/ -gi/-gə</i>		

2.2 The affixes

Some of the case affixes used in Romani are quite transparent, whereas others are more complicated historically. In the first instance, we can notice a couple of Sandhi rules operative at the morpheme boundaries:

- Dat. *-ke* and Prep. *-te* become voiced: *-ge* and *-de* after a nasal in the accusative plural;
- Instr. *-sa* after an accusative *-s* in the singular is retained in Kelderaš, but turns into *-ha* (with loss of the preceding *-s*) in Sinte;
- In the plural, Instr. *-sa* → *-tsa* after a nasal in accusative plural in Sinte. In Kelderaš, the result is also palatal, but not so pronounced: *-ca* (see Boretzky and Iglā 1994: 373–374). This indicates a relative independency of the case affixes. However, the stress doesn't follow: it is kept on the oblique marker.

The genitive in Kelderaš is *-ko/-ki/-kə*, other Romani dialects have forms in *-ko(ro)/-ki(ri)-ke(re)* (see Boretzky and Iglā 1994: 372). It can be inflected as an adjective, which is the reason for many Romani philologists not to list the genitive among the cases. The inflected genitive is a feature that Romani shares with most NIA languages (see Masica 1991: 239). Genitives containing *k* and *r* occur in many NIA languages, for example the Layer II suffix Hindi °*kā*, *kī/ke*, Nuristani °*ko*, (*kī*), Awari *-ker*. Most NIA languages have reduced the original form, which is well preserved in Romani *-ko(ro)/-ki(ri)-ke(re)*. All variants probably reflect different nominal forms of the OIA root *kṛ-* 'to do', *kārya*, *kṛta*, *kṛtvā* (Masica 1991: 243).

The dative *-ke* is related to the most common Dative (Layer II) affix in NIA, which occurs in many different variants, *ko*, *khē*, *ke*, *kai*, *ka*, *ku*,

-*kh*, i.e. Hindi -*ko*, Bengali -*ke*. Strangely enough, theories concerning the origin of this affix is the same as for the genitive: different nominal forms of the OIA root *kṛ-* 'to do', *kārya*, *kṛta* (Masica 1991: 243).

The instrumental -*sa* recurs in many other NIA languages as a (Layer II) affix for instrumental/sociative/ablative, *se*, *sa*, *sa~*, *sau*, *sō*, *sō~*, *sū~* is probably related to Sanskrit *sam* 'with, together with, along with' or *sama* 'equal'.

The origin of the prepositional affix -*te* is uncertain; the NIA Layer II endings do not provide any reliable solution, perhaps the Bengali instrumental in -*te* could be related. Romani *te* also has, in the different dialects, a wide range of functions (co-ordinating 'and', subordinating 'that; if', as well as subjunctive marker). Several etymological explanations have been proposed for these different functions of *te* and it is altogether uncertain they are etymologically related (cf. Boretzky and Iglá 1994).

The origin of the ablative affix -*tar* is also uncertain.

2.3 Organisation of the core

The usage of this system in the various dialects is interesting. It is typical for Romani that there is a considerable degree of variation as to the usage of the case forms: the morphological system is almost intact in all inflected varieties, but the morpho-syntactics allows for a number of variants. First of all, prepositions are used instead of postpositions thus complicating a further extension of the system of the type found in other New Indo-Aryan languages. The word order shift of Romani is an important innovation as compared to Indo-Aryan: Romani has SVO and prepositions, as most of the other European languages (cf. Matras 2002: 45f.). In prepositional phrases we normally find the case prepositional/locative, but often also nominative: Kelderaš has the nominative when the preposition is followed by a noun and prepositional/locative when followed by a pronoun.

Unlike several NIA languages, Romani is an accusative language, which marks intransitive and transitive subject alike. Animacy is a marked criterion: accusative/oblique is used only with animate objects (cf. example 8).

(8) Sinte (Holzinger 1993)

o Bakr-o da-j-as peskr-o tšav-es
 the Bakro-NOM.SG.M beat-PF.3SG his-NOM.M son-ACC.SG.M
 'Bakro beat his son.'

If we look at typically ditransitive verbs, as 'give', 'show', we normally find an accusative for the DO and dative for the IO: [_{NOM} V IO_{DAT} DO_{ACC}] (see example 9). This construction is found all over Romani. The word order of DO and IO can be reversed. Kelderaš allows, with personal pronouns, constructions with two accusatives (Gjerdman-Ljungberg 1963: 222), otherwise this construction seems to be unusual.

(9) Kale

me dav e čaves-ke o
 I-NOM give-PRS.1SG the-ACC boy-DAT the-NOM=ACC

lil
 book-NOM=ACC
 'I give the book to the boy'

When it comes to a verb like 'teach, show', there is a greater ambiguity. In Kelderaš, the verb *sikavav* has different meanings depending on the construction: 'teach' with DO=Acc and IO=Acc and 'show' with DO Acc and IO=Dat (see examples 10 a-b)

(10a) Kelderaš

me sikavav le čaves romani čib
 I-NOM teach-PRS.1SG the-ACC boy-ACC Romani language-ACC
 'I teach the boy Romani'

(10b) Kelderaš

me sikavav čaves-ke o kher
 I-NOM show-PRS.1SG boy-DAT the-NOM=ACC house
 'I show the boy the house'

The usage of Inverse constructions is limited. The verb ‘to have’ is normally expressed by a copula and accusative for the possessor (example 11).

(11) Sepeči (Matras 2002: 174, data from Cech and Heischink 1999)

voj si la ek čhavo
 she-ACC is-PRS.3SG her one son
 ‘she has one son’

Other typical Inverse constructions, as with Experiencer verbs, are constructed by means of a verbal noun (with or without copula), an accusative/dative and sometimes a prepositional (in case of diseases/pain) for the Experiencer (cf. Crevels and Bakker 2000, Matras 2002:174) and accusative (example 12a) or sometimes genitive (Kelderaš) for the Patient (example 13).

(12) Kelderaš

man si dukhal šeroske
 I-ACC be-3SG pain-VBLN head-GEN-ACC
 ‘I have a headache’

(13) Kelderaš

grijacol man kabeske
 abhore-VBLN I-ACC food-GEN-ACC
 ‘I hate this food’

However, it seems as if these constructions are more common in the Central and Vlach dialects, as Kelderaš and Lovari. In Northern dialects of the first migration, as Finnish Kale, where the typology is more influenced by majority languages (in the case of Kale: Swedish/ Finnish), these constructions are more limited.

In general, a tendency that seems to hold for most dialects is that prepositional constructions are increasing at the expense of the uses of bare cases. For the locative (also called prepositional) the use of a bare case is almost extinct, even though it can occur in older forms (“my grandmothers dialect”), cf. example 14 from Kelderaš.

(14) Kelderaš (old)

me tradav aver foros-de
 I-NOM GO-PRS.1SG. other-OBL square-LOC
 'I go to another square'

Conclusion

The two systems investigated here, Tocharian and Romani, show great similarities in the way in which they build up their case systems after a breakdown of a former, rich, inflectional system. This holds very well for the morphology, e.g., the processes of grammaticalization, the independence of the case affixes, and the distinction between case layers. Tocharian is different from Romani in that the genitive/dative is included among to the layer I cases (even though we know that it was historically partly a layer II case).

However, the question that remains is if this formal organization of the system has any implication for the functional setup. This question is really difficult to answer and it also raises the question of how valid reconstructions of pre-historic morpho-syntax generally are. Apparently, the central core functions, i.e., the Agent and Patient functions as well as logical Subject in Inverse constructions (Romani: accusative, Tocharian: clitic/ genitive) are kept within the system of primary cases in both languages. When it comes to the extended core, i.e., The Indirect Object, it is more ambiguous: In Tocharian it is represented by the genitive, in Romani by the dative, a non-primary case. Double-accusative constructions occur in both languages, but they seem to be more common in Tocharian than in Romani. With these exceptions, everything that is outside the core, e.g., local or temporal constructions, instrumental, are marked by Layer II cases (holds for both Tocharian and Romani) or adpositional constructions (more common in Romani). In contrast to Tocharian, Romani has changed its basic word order, which means that the further expansion of the system by means of grammaticalization of postpositions has become blocked. Therefore, the expansion lies rather in prepositional constructions than new cases.

It is highly likely that the rebuilding of both systems has functional implications. The remains after a breakdown is a minimal system, where central core case functions, as well as animacy, gender, and stem class are marked by means of inflection. At some point these systems also represent, both in Tocharian and Romani, an innovation as compared to earlier stages, e.g., with loss of the neuter case and introduction of an animacy/ inanimacy distinction. Everything outside the core (the extender core being somewhat problematic here) is marked by postpositional constructions. After a while, a new inflectional-agglutinative system emerges from this “primitive” system, using both postpositional and affixal material of the language, re-establishing a system that in many respects looks similar to the system that was there before the breakdown.

[RECEIVED: NOVEMBER 2011]

Centre for Languages and Literature
Lund University
Box 201, 221 00 Lund
Sweden
gerd.carling@ling.lu.se

Abbreviations

A	Agent
S	Subject
O	Object
DO	Direct Object in ditransitive constructions
IO	Indirect Object in ditransitive constructions
OIA	Old Indo-Aryan
MIA	Middle Indo-Aryan
NIA	New Indo-Aryan

References

- Boretzky, Norbert & Birgit Igl (1994) *Wörterbuch Romani – Deutsch – Englisch für den südosteuropäischen Raum*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

- 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". Georges-Jean Pinault & Brigitte Bauer (eds.), *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.
- Carling, Gerd (2005) "The coding of ditransitivity in Tocharian". *Lund University, Department of Linguistics: Working Papers* 51. Lund: Dept. of Linguistics, 31–46.
- Carling, Gerd (2006) "Notes on the syntactic functions of the Tocharian clitic pronouns". Gerd Carling (ed.), ^{GIS.HUR}*gul-za-at-ta-ra*. A festschrift for Folke Josephson on the occasion of his 70th birthday. Göteborg: Meijerbergs Arkiv för Svensk Ordforskning 32, 39–49.
- Carling, Gerd (2008a) "Reconsidering the system: verbal categorization and the coding of valency in Tocharian". Jens Elmegård Rasmussen & Thomas Olander (eds.), *Internal reconstruction in Indo-European. Methods, results and problems*. Section papers from the XVIth International Conference for Historical Linguistics, University of Copenhagen 11th–15th August, 2003. Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum Press, 49–63.
- Carling, Gerd (2008b) "Phonological erosion and semantic generalization: Notes on the grammaticalization of the Tocharian case paradigm". *Working Papers* 53. Lund: Dept. of Linguistics, 5–14.
- Carling, Gerd (to appear:a) "Interplay between lexical transitivity, morphology, and argument structure: The Tocharian system". *Proceedings of Arbeitstagung "Struktur und Semantik der Verbalphrase", Jena 2006*.
- Carling, Gerd (to appear:b) "Tocharian syntax". Matthias Fritz & Jared Klein (eds.), *Comparative Indo-European linguistics*. An international handbook of language comparison and the reconstruction of Indo-European. Berlin / New York: De Gruyter.
- Crevels, Mily & Peter Bakker (2000) "External possession in Romani". Viktor Elšik & Yaron Matras (eds.), *Grammatical relations in Romani: The noun phrase*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 151–185.
- Gjerdman, Olof & Erik Ljungberg (1963) *The language of the Swedish Copper-smith Gipsy Johan Dimitri Taikon*. Uppsala: Gustav Adolfs Akademien.
- Holzinger, Daniel (1993) *Das Rómanes. Grammatik und Diskursanalyse der Sprache der Sinte*. (Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Kulturwissenschaft 85.) Innsbruck: PUBLISHER.

- Lenny Lindell, Kenth Thorbjörnsson-Djerfþ & Gerd Carling (2008) *Ordbok över svensk romani. Resandefolkets språk och sånger*. Bearbetad och med inledning / grammatik av Gerd Carling. [Dictionary of Swedish Romani. Edited by Gerd Carling with an introduction and grammar.] Stockholm: Podium.
- Malzahn, Melanie (2010) *The Tocharian verbal system*. Leiden / Boston: Brill.
- Masica, Colin P. (1991) *The Indo-Aryan languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Matras, Yaron (1994) *Untersuchungen zu Grammatik und Diskurs des Romanes. Dialekt der Kelderaša/Lovara*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Matras, Yaron (2002) *Romani: A linguistic introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Monier-Williams, Monier (1995=1899) *A Sanskrit-English dictionary*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Pinault, Georges-Jean (2008) *Chrestomathie tocharienne. Textes et grammaire*. Leuven / Paris: Peeters.
- Thomas, Werner (1983) *Der tocharische Obliquus im Sinne eines Akkusativs der Richtung*. Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur. Nr. 6. (Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Mainz. Abhandlungen der Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse). Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag.
- Turner, R. L. (1999=1966) *A comparative dictionary of the Indo-Aryan languages*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.
- Winter, Werner (1980) "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.