Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

The Tocharian subjunctive

Peyrot, M.

Citation
Peyrot, M. (2010, September 28). *The Tocharian subjunctive*. Retrieved from https://hdl.handle.net/1887/15996

Version:	Not Applicable (or Unknown)
License:	Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden
Downloaded from:	https://hdl.handle.net/1887/15996

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

The Tocharian subjunctive

PROEFSCHRIFT

ter verkrijging van

de graad van Doctor aan de Universiteit Leiden,

op gezag van Rector Magnificus prof.mr. P.F. van der Heijden,

volgens besluit van het College voor Promoties

te verdedigen op dinsdag 28 september 2010

klokke 15.00 uur

door

Michaël Peyrot

geboren te Amsterdam

in 1978

promotiecommissie

promotor: Prof. dr. A.M. Lubotsky

overige leden: Prof. dr. H. Gzella
Prof. dr. O. Hackstein (Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München)
Prof. dr. F.H.H. Kortlandt
Prof. dr. G.-J. Pinault (École Pratique des Hautes Études, Parijs)
Prof. dr. A. Verhagen

front cover: view on Subeši east site north of Kuča (photo by Kristin Meier)
back cover: fragment of a mural from Simsim grotto №48 (ZXBQ 5: plate 76)

copyright © 2010: Michaël Peyrot. All rights reserved.

CONTENTS

preface 9

abbreviations and symbols 11

1 introduction 13
- 1.1 Tocharian 13
- 1.2 the Tocharian subjunctive 15
- 1.3 Indo-European sources 16
- 1.4 aim 18
- 1.5 structure 19

2 morphology 21
- 2.1 introduction 21
  - 2.1.1 traditional analysis 21
  - 2.1.2 problem 23
  - 2.1.3 method 24
  - 2.1.4 structure 25
- 2.2 categories of the verb 26
  - 2.2.1 person and number of the subject 26
  - 2.2.2 tense 31
  - 2.2.3 aspect 32
  - 2.2.4 mood 33
  - 2.2.5 voice 36
  - 2.2.6 valency 37
  - 2.2.7 pronoun suffix 38
- 2.3 the stem pattern 39
  - 2.3.1 basic stems 39
  - 2.3.2 derived stems 40
  - 2.3.3 derived forms 41
  - 2.3.4 overview 42
- 2.4 the root 44
  - 2.4.1 *x*|Ø-roots 45
  - 2.4.2 *x*|*a*-roots 45
  - 2.4.3 *ə*|*x*-roots 46
  - 2.4.4 *a*|*x*-roots 46
  - 2.4.5 *VC*-roots and *CV*-roots 46
  - 2.4.6 weak consonant roots in Tocharian A 47

2.5 morphological distinctions 47
2.5.1 affixation 47
2.5.2 gradation 56
2.5.3 affection 64
2.5.4 palatalisation 64
2.5.5 suppletion 78
2.5.6 reduplication 81
2.5.7 accent 85
2.5.8 gemination 90
2.6 stem derivation in Tocharian A 94
2.6.1 overview 95
2.6.2 primary preterites 96
2.6.3 derived preterites 96
2.6.4 zero preterites 98
2.6.5 primary subjunctives 99
2.6.6 derived subjunctives 99
2.6.7 zero subjunctives 103
2.6.8 primary presents 107
2.6.9 derived presents 110
2.6.10 zero presents or internally derived presents 115
2.7 stem derivation in Tocharian B 117
2.7.1 overview 118
2.7.2 primary preterites 120
2.7.3 derived preterites 121
2.7.4 zero preterites 122
2.7.5 primary subjunctives 124
2.7.6 derived subjunctives 126
2.7.7 zero subjunctives 128
2.7.8 primary presents 130
2.7.9 derived presents 130
2.8 the imperative 137
2.8.1 Tocharian A 137
2.8.2 Tocharian B 141
2.9 the preterite participle 146
2.9.1 Tocharian A 146
2.9.2 Tocharian B 148
2.10 summary 152

3 syntax and meaning 155
3.1 introduction 155
3.1.1 former descriptions 155
3.1.2 aim 158
3.1.3 method 158

3.1.4 presentation of examples 164
3.1.5 structure 166
3.2 the Tocharian A subjunctive in main clauses 166
3.2.1 bilinguals 166
3.2.2 subject 167
3.2.3 first person 168
3.2.4 speaker 171
3.2.5 hearer 174
3.2.6 neutral prediction 175
3.2.7 questions 177
3.2.8 compared to the present 180
3.2.9 compared to the optative 185
3.2.10 compared to the imperative 189
3.3 the Tocharian A subjunctive in subclauses 191
3.3.1 conditionals with subjunctive apodosis 191
3.3.2 conditionals with present apodosis 195
3.3.3 conditionals with imperative apodosis 198
3.3.4 eventual 201
3.3.5 iterative 202
3.3.6 indefinite 203
3.3.7 *kosne* 'as' 204
3.3.8 concessive 206
3.3.9 comparison 208
3.3.10 final 209
3.3.11 compared to the present 211
3.3.12 compared to nominal clauses 213
3.3.13 compared to the optative 213
3.4 other uses of the Tocharian A subjunctive 216
3.4.1 subjunctive gerund with imperfect copula 216
3.4.2 subjunctive gerund with present copula 218
3.4.3 subjunctive gerund with subjunctive copula 219
3.4.4 preterite participle with subjunctive copula 221
3.4.5 adverbials and particles 222
3.4.6 the present-subjunctive 230
3.5 the Tocharian B subjunctive in main clauses 231
3.5.1 bilinguals 231
3.5.2 notion of future 233
3.5.3 subject 236
3.5.4 first person 236
3.5.5 speaker 238
3.5.6 hearer 239
3.5.7 neutral predictive 242
3.5.8 questions 243

3.5.9 1pl address 245
3.5.10 compared to the present 245
3.5.11 compared to the optative 247
3.5.12 compared to the imperative 249
3.6 the Tocharian B subjunctive in subclauses 250
3.6.1 conditionals with subjunctive apodosis 251
3.6.2 conditionals with present apodosis 253
3.6.3 conditional with imperative apodosis 259
3.6.4 other conditionals 260
3.6.5 eventual 261
3.6.6 iterative 261
3.6.7 indefinite 262
3.6.8 concessive 263
3.6.9 final 264
3.6.10 compared to the present 265
3.6.11 compared to nominal clauses 266
3.6.12 compared to the optative 268
3.6.13 conditionals in prātimokṣa texts 272
3.7 other uses of the Tocharian B subjunctive 276
3.7.1 subjunctive gerund with imperfect copula 276
3.7.2 subjunctive gerund with present copula 279
3.7.3 subjunctive gerund with subjunctive copula 282
3.7.4 preterite participle with subjunctive copula 283
3.7.5 with adverbials and particles 287
3.7.6 present-subjunctive 317
3.8 meaning 321
3.8.1 the Tocharian subjunctive in main clauses 322
3.8.2 the Tocharian subjunctive in subclauses 323
3.8.3 towards a unified meaning 324
3.8.4 the Tocharian subjunctive and aspect 325

4 origin 329
4.1 introduction 329
4.1.1 subjunctive 330
4.1.2 optative 332
4.1.3 present 332
4.1.4 “present-subjunctive” 333
4.1.5 perfect 334
4.1.6 *molō*-type 337
4.1.7 perfective present 338
4.1.8 aorist injunctive 339
4.1.9 method 340
4.1.10 structure 340

4.2 endings 341
4.2.1 present active 341
4.2.2 preterite active 347
4.2.3 present middle 349
4.2.4 preterite middle 349
4.2.5 conclusion 350
4.3 some irregular verbs 351
4.3.1 'come' 351
4.3.2 'put' 357
4.3.3 'know' 365
4.3.4 'go' 366
4.3.5 'go out' 368
4.3.6 'drink' 371
4.3.7 'get' and 'do' 372
4.3.8 conclusion 376
4.4 present-subjunctive 377
4.4.1 *ə*/*e*-suffix 378
4.4.2 *x*|Ø-roots 389
4.4.3 with root-final *a* 393
4.4.4 **ńə*/*e*-denominatives 394
4.4.5 *lyāka*-type 395
4.4.6 *sk*-causatives 398
4.4.7 conclusion 402
4.5 *ə*|Ø-root subjunctive 403
4.5.1 introduction 403
4.5.2 the preterite-subjunctive 407
4.5.3 gradation and palatalisation 408
4.5.4 *-s-* and *-sa-* 411
4.5.5 accent 413
4.5.6 the *s*-present 419
4.5.7 *nəsk*'*ə*/*e*-presents 425
4.5.8 Hittite 3sg. *ḫi*-prt. *-š* 426
4.5.9 1sg. preterite 427
4.5.10 *o*-grade 429
4.6 *ə*|*a*-root subjunctive 430
4.6.1 grading subjunctive 430
4.6.2 stem pattern 431
4.6.3 comparative evidence 432
4.6.4 *ńk*-presents 435
4.6.5 root aorist 442
4.6.6 transfer 443
4.6.7 preterite plural 446
4.6.8 *e*-presents 447

4.6.9 *nask*$^{\text{ə}}/_{e}$-presents 448
4.6.10 other presents 450
4.7 *e*-grade presents 453
4.7.1 *klep*-type 454
4.7.2 *kĺews*-type 457
4.7.3 *tək*-type 458
4.7.4 *sparcwṣ*-type 462
4.7.5 diachronic notes 464
4.8 minor types 469
4.8.1 *ə*$^{\text{y}}/_{e}$-subjunctive 469
4.8.2 *ñ*$^{\text{ä}}/_{a}$-subjunctive 472
4.8.3 *e*-subjunctive 476
4.8.4 $^{\text{ə}}/_{e}$-subjunctive 478
4.9 meaning 480
4.9.1 subjunctive 481
4.9.2 present 483
4.9.3 perfect 486
4.9.4 injunctive 488
4.9.5 semantic sources of the Tocharian subjunctive 490
4.10 conclusions 491
4.10.1 origin 491
4.10.2 formation 492
4.10.3 tools and methods 493

5 summary 495
5.1 morphology 495
5.2 syntax and meaning 495
5.3 origin 496
5.4 outlook 497

references 499

indices 519
Tocharian A 519
Tocharian B 520
Old Uygur 522
Sanskrit 522

samenvatting in het Nederlands 523

curriculum vitae 525

PREFACE

The value of the Tocharian evidence for the reconstruction of the Indo-European proto-language is disputed. Still, it is generally agreed that its verb is relatively archaic, and if Tocharian has preserved something old that can change the picture of reconstruction based on the other Indo-European languages, it must be looked for in this domain. Yet the Tocharian verb is poorly understood, principally because the central category of the subjunctive poses problems. Its formation and syntax remain difficult, but especially its historical explanation has guaranteed decades of hot debate with little convergence between differing opinions. Whereas the verb has generally received a good deal of the scholars' attention, most of the research was aimed at other categories, such as the present and the preterite. With the subjunctive taking an intermediate position, as it is a kind of present of the preterite, these studies have created a dangerous vacuum: how is it possible to address matters of the verb if such a central category is unclear?

Therefore, it is high time the subjunctive were studied, in its morphology, its syntax and its origins. This is what the present work aims at. Much weight is attached to its synchronic analysis, both formally and semantically, in order to solve many remaining problems of detail, but most of all to understand the principles and patterns of the verbal system. Only on the basis of a thorough understanding of the synchronic facts can we proceed to the diachronic level: insight in the various morphological patterns and markers is a necessary prerequisite for the uncovering of the many analogical restructurings and repairments.

The research presented here was carried out within the framework of an *assistent-in-opleiding* (AiO) position at the Faculty of Arts, now Humanities, of Leiden University in the years 2004-2009. Without this position, nothing similar could have been possible. I am therefore grateful to the staff of the Centre of Non-Western Studies, who have granted me this opportunity, and to Jos Schaeken, Maarten Mous, Jeroen van de Weijer and Gea Hakker who have always supported me when I had become a member of the Leiden University Centre for Linguistics in my second year.

My sincere thanks go to Georges-Jean Pinault, Paris, who has taught me Tocharian, from the very basics in 2003 up till endless matters of minute detail in 2009. During in total three long stays in Paris he has invested an incredible amount of time and effort, which I hope are not wasted. He has shown me how to work in a field that seems so hostile to beginners, how to translate Tocharian passages and how to proceed if you can't translate them.

Almost from the start of my project I have been in frequent contact with Melanie Malzahn, Vienna, which has led to a fruitful exchange of all kinds of materials relevant to Tocharian studies. She has also sent me the commented appendix of her

forthcoming book *The Tocharian verbal system* (forth.b), which I have been using since 2008 with much profit, and to which is occasionally referred. Unfortunately, I have not been able to consider and incorporate the main text of her book, which she kindly sent me in September 2009.

In the last two years, I have been most kindly welcomed on several occasions by Werner Winter, Preetz, the father of Tocharian historical linguistics. Long discussion sessions have directed me to many important problems; even if I do not agree on all topics, these discussions have influenced my approach in essential points. I thank him for his interest and his hospitality.

To Sasha Lubotsky, the supervisor of my thesis, I am grateful for his confidence and his quick and minute corrections. Further, I thank Rob Beekes and Frits Kortlandt, who have formed my way of thinking about language and language change as much as Sasha. Frits has also read parts of a draft version at an amazing speed and his comments have all led to important improvements.

Apart from many discussions about Proto-Indo-European, reconstruction and philology, my friends and colleagues Alwin Kloekhorst, Guus Kroonen, Lucien van Beek and Tijmen Pronk have shaped the past five years with many drinking sessions and incredible fun at conferences, summer schools, etc. Uwe Bläsing has always been there for matters of Turkish or scanning, and small pessimist sessions on nearly everything. I am further grateful to Hanno Lecher, who has been able to get hold of a copy of the Uygur Maitrisimit edition.

After all this linguistics, I mustn't forget my ski mates Arnoud, David, Joris and Marijn, and Anita, Fief, Frank, Jesse, Julie, Martijn, and all other coffee and beer companions. Last but not least I thank my family, my parents Coobke and Piet, my brothers Wouter and David, and Kristin.

Michaël Peyrot – Leiden, May 2010

ABBREVIATIONS AND SYMBOLS

grammatical abbreviations

For Old Uygur linguistic terms that have no clear parallel in Tocharian or Indo-European linguistics, references to the grammer of Erdal (2004) are given.

abl.	ablative
abs.	absolutive
acc.	accusative
act.	active
adj.	adjective, adjectiviser
ag.n.	agent noun
all.	allative
aor.	aorist (cf also Erdal 2004: 240)
arch.	archaic (cf Peyrot 2008a)
ben.	benefactive auxiliary (cf Erdal 2004: 260)
class.	classical (cf Peyrot 2008a)
coll.	colloquial (cf Peyrot 2008a)
com.	comitative
cond.	conditional (cf Erdal 2004: 320)
cvb.	converb (cf Erdal 2004: 308)
dat.	dative
dem.	demonstrative
du.	dual
emph.	emphatic (particle)
equ.	equative (cf Erdal 2004: 376)
f.	feminine
fut.	future
gen.	genitive
ger.	gerund
humil.	humilitive auxiliary (Erdal 2004: 529)
indf.	indefinite, indefinitive
inf.	infinitive
inst.	instrumental
int.	interjection
ipf.	imperfect
ipv.	imperative
loc.	locative
m.	masculine
mid.	middle
neg.	negation
nom.	nominative
obl.	oblique
opt.	optative
perl.	perlative
pf.	perfect
pl.	plural
poss.	possessive
priv.	privative
proh.	prohibitive
pron.	pronoun
prs.	present
prs.-sbj., prs/sbj	present-subjunctive
prt.	preterite
ptc.	participle
q.	question particle
purp.	purposive
refl.	reflexive
resp.	respective auxiliary (cf Erdal 2004: 528)
sbj.	subjunctive
sg.	singular
suff.	pronoun suffix
vn	verbal noun
vol.	volitional (cf Erdal 2004: 234)

language abbreviations

Alb.	Albanian	Latv.	Latvian	Pruss.	Prussian
Arm.	Armenian	Lesb.	Lesbian Greek	PT	Proto-Tocharian
Chin.	Chinese	Lith.	Lithuanian	PTA	Pre-Tocharian A
Du.	Dutch	M	Middle	PTB	Pre-Tocharian B
Fr.	French	MHG	Middle High German	Russ.	Russian
Gk.	Greek	Mo	Modern	SCr.	Serbo-Croation
Gm.	German	O	Old	Skt.	Sanskrit
Goth.	Gothic	OAv.	Old Avestan	TA	Tocharian A
IIr.	Indo-Iranian	OCS	Old Church Slavonic	TB	Tocharian B
Ir.	Irish	OHG	Old High German	Uy.	Uygur
It.	Italian	Osc.	Oscan	Ved.	Vedic
Lat.	Latin	PIE	Proto-Indo-European	YAv.	Young Avestan

symbols

/x/	phonological form	>	developed phonologically in
[x]	• phonetic form;	<	developed phonologically from
	• uncertain reading in a Tocharian text;	<x>	orthographic form
		>>	developed by analogy in
	• restoration in other (Old Uygur and Sanskrit) texts;	<<	developed by analogy from
		⇒	yields through zero-derivation
	• addition in translation to match English grammar	⇐	zero-derived from
		→	yields through derivation
(x)	• restoration in a Tocharian text;	←	derived from
	• added defective vowel in Old Uygur texts	√	root
		¦	caesura, added to the original text
{x}	morphological form	*x*|*x*	root type
‹x›	infix in a morphological form	C	cover symbol for consonants
*x	reconstructed (diachronic) form	V	cover symbol for vowels
x*	deduced (synchronic) form	⫽	sandhi

Tocharian spelling

Strictly speaking, the pronunciation of Tocharian is unknown because the language is dead. Therefore, the characters of the International Phonetic Alphabet given below are no more than an approximation.

spelling	IPA	spelling	IPA	spelling	IPA
a	[ɐ]	*ṃ*	[n]	*ly*	[ʎ]
ā	[a], possibly [aː]	*ṅ*	[ŋ]	*w*	[w] or [v]
ä	[ə]	*c*	[c] or [tɕ]	*ś*	[ɕ]
i, *ī*	[i]	*ñ*	[ɲ]	*ṣ*	[ʂ]
u, *ū*	[u]	*y*	[j]	*ts*	[ʦ]