On the part of speech and the syntax of the Tocharian present participle

Peyrot, M.; Le Feuvre, C.; Petit, D.; Pinault, G.-J.

Citation

Peyrot, M. (2018). On the part of speech and the syntax of the Tocharian present participle. In C. Le Feuvre, D. Petit, & G. -J. Pinault (Eds.), *Verbal adjectives and participles in Indo-European languages / Adjectifs verbaux et participes dans les langues indo-européennes. Proceedings of the conference of the Society for Indo-European Studies (Indogermanische Gesellschaft), Paris, 24th to 26th September 2014* (pp. 327-341). Bremen: Hempen. Retrieved from https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3480084

ON THE PART OF SPEECH AND THE SYNTAX
OF THE TOCHARIAN PRESENT PARTICIPLE

Michaël Peyrot

Summary: The Tocharian present participle in Tocharian B *-mane*, Tocharian A *-māṃ* is normally not inflected and functions often as a converb. Accordingly, the Tocharian A present participle in *-māṃ* corresponds in the Old Uyghur *Maitrisimit*, translated from the Tocharian A *Maitreyasamitināṭaka*, mainly to the so-called "vowel converb". Rare instances of inflected *-mane* and *-māṃ* occur, but are due to calquing from Sanskrit. Although the Tocharian suffix must derive from Proto-Indo-European **-mh₁no-*, which is traditionally seen as the present participle middle suffix, as in Gk. -μενο-, the Tocharian present participle is not middle. While the fact that the Tocharian present participle is uninflected must be an innovation, its voice indifference is probably old: the specialisation of the suffix **-mh₁no-* for middle voice seems to be an innovation of the central Indo-European languages.

1. INTRODUCTION

In recent years the Tocharian participles and agent nouns have repeatedly been in the focus of scholarship.[1] Almost all relevant categories have been treated from a number of different viewpoints. These categories range from the preterite participle, the topic of the book by Saito (2006; see also Peyrot 2010), the present participle, treated in an article by Pinault (2012b), and the agent nouns, discussed by Pinault and Hackstein in recent articles (Pinault 2012a, Hackstein 2012), as well as by Hannes Fellner in his dissertation (2013) and an article (2014). All these topics recur in Melanie Malzahn's *The Tocharian verbal system* (2010), as well as in my own book *The Tocharian subjunctive* (2013a).

There have been several points of discussion, and in many of these no consensus has so far been reached. Some of these topics are of diachronic nature and concern the phonological and morphological explanation of the Tocharian forms. For example, the formation and the historical explanation of the preterite participle have been discussed repeatedly, as well as that of many or several agent nouns. There are also more synchronic points at stake, which concern for instance the meaning and the syntactic status of the agent nouns.

The main topic of this paper is a formation that corresponds to the present participle middle as attested in for instance Gk. -μενος and Skt. *-āna*, *-māna*: the present

---

participle in Tocharian B *-mane*, Tocharian A *-māṃ*. With this formation, there are two major problems, neither of which are a secret to the scholarly community, but nonetheless they are not always stated so clearly, without any doubt because the *Elementarbuch* (Krause and Thomas 1960: 157, 184) and the most important grammar, the *Tocharische Grammatik* (Sieg, Siegling and Schulze 1931: 337), are not sufficiently clear and in part incorrect on this point.[2] These two major difficulties are:

    1) this formation is not middle;
    2) it is not inflected.

    In these two points Tocharian clearly deviates from what can be reconstructed on the basis of Greek and Indo-Iranian.

2. THE PRESENT PARTICIPLE AND THE AGENT NOUNS

The fact that the present participle is not middle has long been recognised, but not always valued sufficiently. Dietz, for instance, claims it on a general disappearance of the contrast between the active and middle inflexion (1981: 144), which is clearly wrong and biased, because it starts from the idea that the present participle was in origin middle, also in Tocharian.[3]

    In her book, Malzahn acknowledges that there is no relation between the so-called "active" present participle and finite active inflexion on the one hand, nor between the so-called middle present participle and finite middle inflexion on the other hand (2010: 480-481). Thus, she neutrally terms the so-called active present participle the "*nt*-participle" and the so-called middle present participle the "*m*-participle".

    Although I agree in essence with Malzahn's observations, and fully understand her choice to use the neutral terms *nt*-participle and *m*-participle, I think that the *nt*-participles are rather to be analysed as agent nouns (2013b: 236-238). They behave morphologically exactly like other formations that *are* commonly accepted to be agent nouns, like TB *-nta*, *-ntsa* (~ TA *-ṃts*), *-uca* and have 1) a nominal genitive in *-ntse*; 2) no feminine; 3) a nominal vocative in *-ai*. Further, 4) they hardly ever modify nouns; 5)

---

2   To be precise, the lack of clarity is first of all caused by the use of the terms "Partizipium Präsentis Medii" (in the former) and "mediales Präsenspartizip" (in the latter). According to the *Tocharische Grammatik*, the Tocharian A present participle is "in attributiver und prädikativer Funktion stets unflektiert" (l.c.). The *Elementarbuch* states, "Während im Wtoch. das PPs. Med. auf *-mane* stets unflektiert ist, zeigt die entsprechende Bildung im Otoch. verschiedentlich flektierte Formen beim Maskulinum" (p. 157) and "Besonders in der Präsensklasse I steht ein mediales Partizip neben finiten aktivischen Formen".

3   This idea was revived by Hannes Fellner (Vienna) in a paper at the Arbeitstagung of the Indogermanische Gesellschaft in Marburg, 22 September 2015. His main arguments are that 1) present participles in B *-mane*, A *-māṃ* correlate with finite middle inflexion, and 2) passive use of the present participle coincides with passive middles. In my view, the first argument cannot be substantiated, while the second is based on such a small number of forms that I strongly doubt its value (I leave the question open whether it would have any in case of more forms; active and passive use is also found in infinitives and preterite participles, see also next note). In any case, in their syntactic behaviour the agent nouns in TA *-nt*, TB *-ñca* are NOT the active counterpart of the participle in *-mane*, *-māṃ*: the former are closest to nouns and the latter are closest to adverbs.

they denote permanent characteristics; and 6) they are often used to translate Skt. agent nouns in *-in-* (Fellner 2013: 113; 142-145; 2017: 85-86). Feminine plural forms occur, but are exceedingly rare and result from calquing.

In the light of the observation that the so-called *nt*-participle (which has indeed a formant *-nt-* in Tocharian A, but actually *-ñc-* in Tocharian B) is a noun, there is no longer any reason to analyse it as a participle. We can simply add these formations to the list of different agent noun formations that are already recorded. This makes the designation of the remaining present participle as *m*-participle completely redundant. The only true present participle is the formation in Tocharian B *-mane*, Tocharian A *-māṃ*, so that we should call it simply the present participle (Pinault 2012: 229).[4]

It must be admitted, however, that the analysis of the "active present participle" or "*nt*-participle" as an agent noun does not meet all possible classification criterita. As argued by Fellner (2017: 73-84), the "verbal" case inflexion of agent noun objects rather points to appurtenance to the verbal system, and so to participle status. I accept Fellner's arguments and agree that these do suggest that the *nt*-agent nouns are to be analysed as participles. However, in my view the evidence from morphology outweighs that from case syntax. Although the evidence is in part conflicting, I think that the morphological and syntactic arguments put forward above are decisive. If case syntax were the main criterion, most of the other agent nouns would also have to be analysed as participles, which would leave us with a large set of different participle formations of unclear semantic differentiation. In addition, further support for my analysis is the heterogeneity of the agent nouns (including the "*nt*-participles"), and their relative infrequency as compared to the present participles (i.e. the "*m*-participles"), which places the agent noun formations in the domain of derivation. The present participle formation, on the other hand, belongs to the domain of inflexion, which points to participle status as well.

3. MARGINAL INFLECTED FORMS OF THE PRESENT PARTICIPLE

The strange fact that the present participle is indeclinable has not gone unnoticed. In texts that are translated mechanically, this phenomenon is perhaps the clearest. This applies in particular to the Sanskrit present participle, which through its inflection allows many more different syntactic constructions than the Tocharian present participle. A good example is the following passage from the Vinayavibhaṅga. This text contains stories explaining the background of living rules for monks in fairly acceptable Tocharian, but these are then followed by the literal text of the rule itself as found in the Prātimokṣasūtra. The Tocharian of this rule is highly peculiar: it is a completely literal translation of the Sanskrit original text and very difficult to understand without recourse to that original.

---

4   I may add that the phenomenon that there is no voice contrast in the present participle does not stand on its own. As I indicated (Peyrot 2007: 799), this problem is found in the whole non-finite verb, including the preterite participle, the infinitive, and the gerund.

Tocharian B, IOL Toch 248 a6-b1[5]

mäksu no ṣamāne mā alāṣmo eneṅka osne piṃtwātäśc ynemane · aletsai aśiyaimeṃ · ṣañ ṣarsa trās(k)alye · tsāltalye eñcīträ ·

'Which monk, not [being] ill, inside a house, going for alms, from an unrelated nun, would take hard [or] soft food with his own hand, ...'

The word order of this sentence is rather difficult, because, for instance, *mā alāṣmo* is simply in apposition to *ṣamāne* without any overt marking, which is unusual in Tocharian. However, *alāṣmo* 'ill' is a normal verbal adjective, which is fully unambiguously marked as nom.sg.m., so that one can be certain that *mā alāṣmo* refers to *ṣamāne*. The real problems arise with *ynemane*, the present participle of *y-* 'go': Who is going? *ynemane* has no marking whatsoever and in principle one would be inclined to take it together with *ṣamāne* 'monk', because usually the subject of the present participle precedes. This would mean that a monk who is not ill is going for alms inside a house. However, the Sanskrit original shows that this is completely wrong. *mā alāṣmo* 'not ill' does belong together with the monk, but the following words all refer to the nun. In the original this is clear from the morphological marking of *carant-*, fully absent in Tocharian.

mäksu	no	ṣamāne	mā alāṣmo	eneṅka osne	piṃtwātäśc
yaḥ	*punar*	*bhikṣur*	*aglāno*	*'ntargṛhaṃ*	*piṇḍāya*

ynemane ·	aletsai	aśiyaimeṃ ·	ṣañ ṣarsa
carantyā	*ajñātyā*	*bhikṣuṇyāḥ santikāt*	*svahastam*

trās(k)alye · tsāltalye	eñcīträ ·
khādanīyabhojanīyaṃ	*pratigṛhṇīyāt*

The correct translation of the line thus is: 'Wenn ein Mönch, ohne krank zu sein, von einer mit ihm nicht verwandten Nonne, die in den Häusern auf Bettelgang geht, eigenhändig feste oder weiche Nahrung annimmt, ...' (Simson 2000: 236, 302).

Another text corpus that does not give us any beautiful Tocharian literature, but indeed provides precious insights into the morphology of the present participle, is formed by the Udānavarga (Udv.) bilinguals. In these bilinguals, all Sanskrit words, often including particles and preverbs, are translated separately. The goal is not to have a nicely readable Tocharian text, but to have an exact translation of its parts so that the Sanskrit text can be read in the original. For syntactic purposes these bilinguals are completely useless, but they show how the translator tried to find a compromise between keeping in accordance with Tocharian grammar on the one hand and making an exact rendering of the Sanskrit text on the other.

As expected, the present participle is used in its invariant form to render both active and middle present participles of Sanskrit, without any marking in the case of the

---

5   In Tocharian and Sanskrit text samples, parentheses "( )" denote restorations; in Old Uyghur text samples (to follow further below), rectangular brackets "[ ]" denote restorations, while parentheses are used for vowels that must have been there but are not effectively written.

accusative or the plural (the Sanskrit present participles of the Udānavarga are followed by their rendering into Tocharian B):⁶

nom.sg.m.	act.	*akurvann* 'not doing'	Udv.25.9a
	indecl.	*mā yamaskemane*	B 308 b7
nom.sg.m.	act.	*anusaraṃ* 'going after'	Udv.2.13a
	indecl.	*postāṃ ynemane*	IOL Toch 152 a2, PK AS 1B b1
nom.sg.m.	act.	*apaśyan* 'not seeing'	Udv.16.24b
	indecl.	*mā lkā(ske)mane*	B 299 b4
nom.sg.m.	act.	*parikartann* 'cutting round'	Udv.2.11b
	indecl.	*kärsnāmane*	PK AS 1B a1
nom.sg.m.	act.	*saṃgaṇayaṃ* 'counting'	Udv.4.22c
	indecl.	*ṣāṃsemane*	B 305 b8
nom.sg.m.	mid.	*pacyamānaḥ* 'being roasted'	Udv.31.31d
	indecl.	*(pä)ksemane*	IOL Toch 206 b6
acc.sg.m.	mid.	*kurvāṇam* 'doing'	Udv.25.9b
	indecl.	*yamaske(mane)*	IOL Toch 225 a3, B 308 b8
nom.pl.m.	act.	°*avijānantaḥ* 'not knowing'	Udv.22.2a
	indecl.	*(mā ai)k(e)mane*	IOL Toch 70 a1
nom.pl.m.	act.	*harantaḥ* 'taking'	Udv.10.11d
	indecl.	*premane*	THT 2376 g.a4, i.a4

However, for the genitive and the locative, we find in this genre genitives and locatives.

gen.sg.m.	act.	*avijānataḥ* 'not knowing'	Udv.1.19d
	gen.sg.	*mā aikemanetse*	IOL Toch 114 a2
gen.sg.m.	act.	*caratas* 'moving'	Udv.1.32b
	gen.sg.	*ynemanentse*	SI B 75 b5
gen.sg.m.	act.	*tiṣṭhatas* 'standing'	Udv.1.32b
	gen.sg.	*klyemanentse*	SI B 75 b5
loc.sg.n.	act.	*sati* 'being'	Udv.1.4b
	loc.sg.	*(nesa)manene*	IOL Toch 38b5

For the locative, this is the only example I know of;⁷ the genitive is attested a little more often: apart from the three examples here, Dietz lists a few more (1981: 140-141; see

---

6   Not included below are two deviating and isolated correspondences: the adjective *pṛthivīsadṛśo* 'resembling the earth' Udv.17.12a ~ *kenāmpa tasemane* PK NS 107 b3; and the absolutive *samudānīya* 'having accumulated' Udv.1.21c ~ *(krau)wpemane* B 304 a4.

7   B 21 b2 /// *manene* has been interpreted as a locative *(prutkemane)* 'being prevented' by Sieg and Siegling (1949, II: 35); Hackstein, Habata and Bross (2015: 75–76) rather suggest a du. *(kule)manene* 'being exhausted'. If the latter interpretation is correct, it would be the first instance of a dual present participle. This would be all the more remarkable since no plural forms have as yet been found.

also Peyrot 2013b: 237). In total, I have now collected 13 examples of the genitive.[8] There is further one instance of the perlative (Dietz 1981: 77) and one of a feminine. The number of inflected forms is extremely low compared to the overall frequency of the present participle. Most importantly, however, most of these forms can be shown to occur in contexts with a fair amount of other calques, as in the case of the examples just cited, so that the whole phenomenon can with confidence be attributed to calquing.

In Tocharian A, even less inflected forms are found. One present participle is fully inflected, the word *knānmāṃ* 'knowing'; this word is clearly lexicalised and cannot be used to argue for inflexion of the present participle in general (Peyrot 2013b: 237-238; pace Krause and Thomas 1960: 157). Similarly, the word *śāmāṃ* 'living, alive' occurs two times with an oblique *śāmānäṃ*, which also points to a shift of word class. Apart from these lexicalised examples, there are in Tocharian A hardly any inflected forms. There is one example of a genitive, A 152 b3 *läntsamāntāp* 'going out'. There are further three instances of a present participle in the perlative plural, found in the same sentence of a text that is fully calqued on its Sanskrit original, A 353: *plaṃtmāṃñcsā* 'rejoicing', calquing Skt. *saṃmodamānair*; *mā kᵤñaś ypamāñ(cs)ā* 'not fighting', calquing Skt. *avivada(mānai)r*; *pañitswātsäṃ lutkäsmāñ(csā)* 'brilliantly illuminating', calquing Skt. *dīpayamānaiḥ* (restored on the basis of a literal parallel, see Waldschmidt 1968: 9). It may be noted that in all instances, the inflexion of the present participle is based on that of the preterite participle (Peyrot 2013b: 237-238).

Tocharian A, A 353 a3-6

ṣyak-ṣoma-ārtlune	pältskumäñcsā	plaṃtmāṃñcsā	mā kᵤñaś ypamāñ(cs)ā
sahitaiḥ	*samagraiḥ*	*saṃmodamānair*	*avivada(mānai)r*
(ṣoma-pä)ltskumäñcsā ·	ṣoma-ṣä(r)p(ā)ṣluneyumäñcsā ·		sas-wär-mal(k)e nāṃtsuñcsā
ekāgr(ai)r	*ekoddeśair*		*ekakṣīrodakībhūtaiḥ*
kāṣṣiyāp	enāṣlune	pañitswātsäṃ lutkäsmāñ(csā)	
(śāstuḥ	*śāsanaṃ*	*dīpayamānaiḥ)*	

'... einig, einmütig, freudig, ohne Streit, einträchtig, einer [einzigen] Anweisung folgend, eins geworden wie [eine Mischung von] Milch [und] Wasser [und] die Lehre des Meisters erleuchtend.' (Schmidt 1989: 73, 74, 77).

Above, mostly inflected forms have been cited, in order to show that these do occur but can in all cases be explained as calques on Sanskrit models. In most cases, the precise original Sanskrit text has even been identified, so that no doubt remains about these forms being calques. In regular Tocharian, the present participle is not inflected: uninflected occurrences outnumber by far the few inflected forms just discussed. In this sense, the inflected forms must be seen as exceptions confirming the rule that the present participle is indeclinable.

---

8   Apart from those already cited, the following examples can be listed: IOL Toch 114 a2 *aikemanetse*, PK NS 22 b6 *āykemanentse* 'knowing'; THT 1579 a 2 *kätkanamanetse* 'crossing, trespassing' (Ogihara 2012: 164); B 194 a6 *nesamanentse* 'being'; PK AS 6E a5 *mäskemanentse* 'being'; B 527 a3 *yamaskemanentse*, IOL Toch 13 b5 *(ya)maskemaneṃtse* 'doing'; B 527 a4, B 601 a4 *lkāskemanentse* 'seeing'; B 16 a5 *(weske)manentse* 'saying'; B 33 a5 *ṣmemanentse* 'sitting' (in *ostä-ṣmemanentse* 'householder').

4. CONVERBIAL USE OF THE PRESENT PARTICIPLE

The fact that the present participle is not inflected leads to the question to which part of speech it actually belongs. Unfortunately, the absence of inflexion is not by itself enough to decide the matter, since there are in Tocharian many uninflected words. Most importantly, a large number of adjectives is not or only partly inflected and in many cases the transition between adjectives and adverbs is fluent. Therefore the question can only be answered with reference to syntax.

It has been noted by Hackstein (2012: 160) that the present participle is often used converbially. He gives two examples that I repeat here because these show indeed the typical use of this formation:

> Tocharian B, B 284 a3-4
> *kektseñ premane toṃ⁹ läklenta wärpnātra*
> 'Carrying a body, one feels these pains.'

> Tocharian B, B 336 a7
> *(mā wai)ke (weskau) weskemane aiśträ waike we(skau)*
> '[While] saying "I am not telling a lie" he knows, "I am telling a lie".'

That this is the typical use is confirmed by the investigation of Dietz (1981), who discusses this type in half of his dissertation (p. 74–136). In a much smaller section he has collected deviating examples (p. 136–143): these do exist, but are definitely marginal in terms of statistics. Whether this use can be termed "converbial" is of course a matter of definition, but it does actually fit most definitions of the term found in the literature. More precisely, if "broader" and "narrower" definitions are distinguished (cf. the practical review of several definitions and the terminology by Rapold 2010), it accords also quite well with the narrower ones like that of Haspelmath (1995: 3): "a nonfinite verb form whose main function is to mark adverbial subordination".[10]

The term converb was invented for the description of Khalkha-Mongolian (Ramstedt 1902: 3, 55-58), and also today, Altaic languages figure very prominently in typological accounts of converbs. Interestingly, Tocharian is well known to have been in contact with Turkic languages and probably also with other languages that were typologically similar. Since the most important Tocharian A text, the Maitreyasamiti-Nāṭaka, has even been translated into Old Uyghur, a direct comparison of the use of the present participle and Old Uyghur converbs is possible. Ideally, all possible participles and converbs should be compared, and ideally this should be done not only from the viewpoint of Tocharian, but also from that of Old Uyghur. Such a comprehensive study is not possible here, but I may refer to Pinault (2015: 95-97[11]), who points out the parallelism between the Tocharian absolutive and the Old Uyghur converb in *-p*, e.g.:

---

9   So to be corrected for *tau* in the manuscript.

10   For an investigation of converbal use of participles in Young Avestan, see Sommer (2014).

11   Cf. further also Wilkens (2008: 419) and Pinault (2003: 47).

Sanskrit *tac chrutvā* 'Having heard that, ...'
Tocharian A *täm kaklyuṣuräṣ* 'id.'
Tocharian B *tu keklyauṣormeṃ* 'id.'
Old Uyghur *anı ešidip* 'id.'

Apart from the absolute construction, usually found at the beginning of the sentence, the Old Uyghur *p*-converb is mostly used to translate finite verb forms in the middle of the sentence, while the last Tocharian A finite verb form is then rendered with a finite verb also in Old Uyghur.

Although I had to restrict my own investigation to the rendering in Old Uyghur of Tocharian A present participles in the first four acts of the Maitreyasamiti-Nāṭaka, the results are relatively clear. In many instances the corresponding passage in Old Uyghur was damaged or missing completely, or the text deviated to such an extent that a grammatical comparison was not possible. However, in the instances where the texts were close enough, the present participle corresponded often to the Old Uyghur "vowel converb", so called because the suffix consists only of a vowel.[12] (Unless indicated otherwise, the passages are cited after Ji 1998 and Geng and Klimkeit 1988.)

• Tocharian A, YQ III.5 a5
*wsā-yokäṃ kanak tsaraṃ **pärmāṃ** mahāprajāpati gautami śākkeṣi lāṃ(ts)*
'... **carrying** the gold-coloured cotton-cloth in her hands, the Śākya queen Mahāprajāpatī Gautamī ...'

~ Old Uyghur, MaitrHami 3.5b7-9
*ol altun öŋlüg böz eligintä **tuta** mahapr(a)čapati gautami hatun yašodaraka inčä tep tedi*
'... **holding** the gold-coloured cloth in her hand, queen Mahāprajāpatī Gautamī said to Yaśodharā.'

• Tocharian A, YQ I.10 a5
***tärmmāṃ** kapśiñño klopasuṃtsāṃ waśenyo **śertmāṃ** trä(ṅkäṣ)*
'... with **trembling** body, with sorrowful voice, he says **weeping**.'

~ Old Uyghur, MaitrHami 1.16a26-27
***titräyü kamšayu** ät'özin ämgäklig ünin **ıglayu** inčä tep tedi*
'... with **trembling** body, with sorrowful voice, he said **weeping**.'

• Tocharian A, YQ II.14 a8
*kāckeyo **kātkmāṃ** nāṃtsu ñañmusāṃ kapśiño śl⸗ āñcālyi*
'... **joyful** with (...) joy, with [his] body bowed, with [his] hands placed together ...'

~ Old Uyghur, MaitrHami 2.16a20-23
*anta ötrü ayagka tägimlig maitri bodisv(a)t ulug ögrünč[ün] **ögirü säwinü** äŋitä [ä]t'özin [ayaların kav]šurup*
'Then the honourable Bodhisattva Maitreya, rejoicing with great joy, placed with bowing body his hands together ...'

---

12 The suffix has the variants *-a/-ä*, *-ı/-i*, *-u/-ü*, *-yu/-yü*. These variants can only in part be explained with vowel harmony and correspond to the variants of the aorist (Erdal 2004: 311, 312).

• Tocharian A, YQ I.4 a7
kātkmāṃ nāṃtsu bādhari brāmaṃ kurosāṃ kapśiñño ksäṅk ksäṅk **karemāṃ**
'Joyful Bādhari the brahmin, with his aged body, **laughing** "ha ha" ...'

~ Old Uyghur, MaitrHami 1.10b5-10[13]
bu [savag ešidip aṇsız ögrünčülüg sävinčlig bolup badari braman ulug karı bükülmiš ät'özin kirt kirt **külčirä** *inčä tep tedi]*
'Having heard these words, Bādhari the brahmin suddenly became joyful, and, with his very old [and] bent body, **laughing** "ha ha", he said: ...'

• Tocharian A, YQ II.9 b1
māgatṣinās ypeyäntwaṃ yme **ymāṃ** *pāṣānak ṣulaṃ*
'... **going** [his] way through the lands of Magadha, on Mount Pāṣānaka ...'

~ Old Uyghur, MaitrHami 2.10b14-16
magat elkä sanlag uluš balıklar .. sayu **yorıyu** *pašanak tagka tägdilär*
'... **going** through all countries and cities belonging to the realm of Magadha, they reached Mount Pāṣānaka.'

The present participle *kātkmāṃ* 'rejoicing' has clearly been lexicalised in Tocharian, requiring a form of *nas-* 'be' to follow. Unlike the correspondence YQ II.14 a8 ~ MaitrHami 2.16a20-23 cited above, these constructions are mostly rendered into Old Uyghur by an adjective (in fact mostly a double adjective), and a form of 'be' as well, e.g.:[14]

• Tocharian A, YQ II.15 a5
(kā)tkmāṃ *nātsu*
'having become **joyful**'

~ Old Uyghur, MaitrHami 2.17a18-19
ögrünčülüg sävinčlig *bolup*
'having become **joyful**'

Likewise, *puk knānmāṃ* 'all-knowing' is translated with *tükäl bilgä* 'fully wise':[15]

• Tocharian A, YQ II.5 a8
puk **knānmānänt** *ptāñkät pkärsās*
'recognise him as the all-**knowing**'

~ Old Uyghur, MaitrHami 2.6a10-12
ötrü sizlär inčä ukuŋlar (..) seziksiz tükäl **bilgä** *t(ä)ŋri t(ä)ŋrisi burhan ärmiš*
'Then you have to understand it so: without doubt he is the fully **wise** Buddha, god of gods.'

Relatively frequent in my sample was attributive use as in *tärmmāṃ kapśiñño* 'with trembling body', a type of use that runs counter to the typical use as described by Dietz

---

13 This portion has been restored after the parallel manuscript from Turfan.

14 The same and similar expressions are found for example in YQ I.1a2 ~ MaitrHami 1.6b23; YQ I.1 b1 ~ MaitrHami 1.7a28-29; YQ I.4 a6 ~ MaitrHami 1.10b3; YQ II.2 a4 ~ MaitrHami 2.2a20; YQ II.15 a5 ~ MaitrHami 2.17a18-19; YQ III.3 b4 ~ MaitrHami 3.3b27.

15 Cf. in addition with a less exact correspondence YQ I.9 b4 ~ MaitrHami 1.15b29-30.

(1981). Notably, these constructions are rendered in exactly the same way in Old Uyghur. This use of the vowel converb is remarkable also for Old Uyghur and noted explicitly by Erdal (2004: 312), who says that "the head of this construction is in all cases an inalienable part of the subject of the verb." Indeed, most examples concern body parts in the instrumental case, and we also find the word for 'voice'. The result is an adverbial construction just like the present participle or the converb would have been by itself. In fact, these constructions are semantically very close to 'trembling with one's body', and this might perhaps be the origin of the construction, or the explanation of its being allowed in the first place. It must be noted, however, that this deviating interpretation requires a marked word order that is quite unusual in Tocharian, and, at least synchronically, excluded in Old Uyghur. Examples are:[16]

Tocharian A, YQ I.10 a5	~	Old Uyghur, MaitrHami 1.16a26
tärmmāṃ *kapśiñño*		***titräyü*** *kamšayu ät'özin*
'with **trembling** body'		'with **trembling** body'
Tocharian A, A 215 a5[17]	~	Old Uyghur, MaitrHami 1.12b11
tärmmāṃ *waśenyo*		***titrä[yü]*** *ü[nin]*
'with **trembling** voice'		'with **trembling** voice'
Tocharian A, YQ II.1 a7	~	Old Uyghur, MaitrHami 2.1a29-30
smimāṃ *akmalyo*		***külčirä*** *yüzin*
'with **smiling** face'		'with **smiling** face'
Tocharian A, YQ II.14 a8[18]	~	Old Uyghur, MaitrHami 2.16a22-3
ñañmusāṃ *kapśiño*		***äŋitä*** *[ä]t'özin*
'with **bowing** body'		'with **bowing** body'
Tocharian A, A 213 b7	~	Old Uyghur, MaitrHami 2.6a1
sākät ***kälymāṃ*** *pältsäkyokk ats*		***yašru*** *köŋlin*
'with **silent** mind only'		'with **secret** mind'[19]

---

16 Erdal (2004: 312) further lists *tikä kulgakïn* 'with cocked ears', for which I could so far find no exact match in Tocharian A.

17 Cf. also YQ I.6 b4 ~ MaitrHami 1.12b11.

18 *ñañmusāṃ* is a preterite participle, i.e. literally 'with [his] body bowed'. For the same phrase with a present participle, cf. YQ II.12 b2 *nmäsmāṃ kapśiññä* 'with bowing body' (in the perlative instead of the more usual instrumental) without Old Uyghur parallel.

19 This correspondence is a little difficult because the Old Uyghur passage may alternatively correspond to YQ II.5 a6 (belonging in the lacuna between A 213 a1 and a2; see Peyrot 2013a: 645-646), which reads *sne ṣotre pältsäkyokk ats* 'without a sign, only with [your] mind'. The two Tocharian A passages are very close in meaning and obviously refer to the same thing, but the second has no direct counterpart in the Old Uyghur text. It seems therefore justified to compare the Old Uyghur phrase with the first instead of the second Tocharian A passage. This could explain the enigmatic *äd(i)zü turup* 'standing upright (?)' that precedes *yašru köŋlin* and has no exact equivalent in the Tocharian A text: *turup* 'standing' could be an addition of the Old Uyghur translator who misunderstood the idiomatic expression *sākät kälymāṃ pältsäkyo* 'with silent mind', but literally 'with [his] mind standing still'.

In a number of cases, I found Old Uyghur aorists corresponding to Tocharian A present participles. The Old Uyghur aorist is mostly used predicatively and "usually expresses continuous aspect", while it is also used as a participle (Erdal 2004: 240, 284-285); normally, it renders the Tocharian A finite present.

> • Tocharian A, YQ I.6 a1
> *(bādhari brā)hma(ṃ) ṣñi waṣtwaṃ kakmuräṣ* **plumā(nn oki)**
> '(Bādhari) the brahmin, having come back to his quarters, **floating** (as it were), ...'

> ~ Old Uyghur, MaitrHami 1.12a2-5
> *anta ötrü b[adar]i b[raman] käntü ävintä oluru kök t(ä)ŋrikä* **kalır** *täg artok ögrünčülüg sävinčlig bolup inčä tep tedi*
> 'Then Bādhari the brahmin, sitting in his own house, as if **floating** in the sky, having become very joyful, said.'

In the following case, we may surmise that the Tocharian phrase *kātkmāṃ akmalyo* 'with joyful face; with rejoicing face' was considered too difficult to render one-to-one into Old Uyghur, because a face cannot rejoice in the literal sense. To solve this problem, the translator inserted *külär* 'laughs; laughing'.

> • Tocharian A, YQ II.1 a3
> **kātkmāṃ** *akmalyo bādhari träṅkäṣ*
> 'with **joyful** face Bādhari says'

> ~ Old Uyghur, MaitrHami 2.1a13-14
> *ögirä sävinü* **külär** *yüzin badari braman inčä tep tedi*
> 'Joyful Bādhari the brahmin said with **smiling** face.'

Similarly, the addition of the conjunction *ärkän* 'while' makes the grammatical function of the Tocharian A clause with *ymāṃ* 'going' more explicit in the Old Uyghur translation in the example below.

> • Tocharian A, YQ II.7 b8
> */// – ytār* **ymāṃ** *penu kucne tu pältsäṅkātār ·*
> 'Even while **going** a ... way, what you think ...'

> ~ Old Uyghur, MaitrHami 2.8b21-23
> *uzun yol* **yorıyur** *ärkän ymä täriŋ täriŋ dyan sakınčlarag sakınur siz*
> 'Even while you are **going** a long way you think very deep meditation thoughts.'

In the following example the construction has likewise been adapted, evidently because it was difficult to render in Old Uyghur literally.

> • Tocharian A, YQ I.4 a6
> *puk lo ārar el* **esmāṃ**
> 'all had gone away, **being given** as alms'

> ~ Old Uyghur, MaitrHami 1.10b2
> *buši* **berdiŋiz**
> 'you **have given** as alms'

An isolated type of correspondence is that between a Tocharian A present participle and an Old Uyghur perfect participle in *-mIš*. The explanation in this case is probably that the phrase in *-mıška* makes the causal value explicit that has to be inferred from the context in the Tocharian A version (Erdal 2004: 485–486).

> • Tocharian A, YQ II.8 b2
> *(tseṃ śā)k(w)aṣiṃ jar mrācaṃ natäkyo* **ymāṃ** *tsru ṣkārā ywatr-äṃ oki*
> 'The topknot of blue hair on his head is leaning a little backwards as it were [because of his] **going** in haste.'

> ~ Old Uyghur, MaitrHami 2.9b6-9
> *baštınkı köküš öŋlüg tokırı evä tävä* **yor(ı)mıška** *azkıa ketärü kamıtmıš*
> 'The blue-coloured hair knot on his head is a little loosened as he is **going** in haste.'

The Old Uyghur translation of the Tocharian A *Maitreyasamitināṭaka* is a good translation. Although the Old Uyghur *Maitrisimit* does show remarkable syntax that is due to the Tocharian A original, the relationship between the two texts cannot in any way be compared to the slavish calquing from Sanskrit originals into Tocharian B or A that has been discussed above. It cannot come as a surprise, therefore, that the Tocharian A present participle does not have a one-to-one correspondent in the Old Uyghur translation. However, not counting the instances that were too fragmentary to evaluate, or where the texts deviated to such an extent that a grammatical comparison was not possible, the correspondence between the Tocharian A present participle and the Old Uyghur vowel converb stands out among these heterogeneous correspondences in being by far the most frequent. There is no other grammatical category with which the vowel converb is in competition.

5. RECONSTRUCTING PROTO-TOCHARIAN

What can we say about a Proto-Tocharian *-mane* on the basis of the above observations? On the one hand, both languages show marginally inflected forms, Tocharian B a little more than Tocharian A. On the other hand, both languages show marginally attributive use, Tocharian A a little more than Tocharian B. One strategy could be to add up the evidence from both languages to conclude that Proto-Tocharian had a regularly inflected adjective that effectively lost its attributive use and its inflexion in both languages, with the former surviving better in Tocharian A and the latter in Tocharian B.

Such a strategy is certainly oversimplified and therefore necessarily wrong. The Tocharian B inflexion is definitely secondary, because it occurs in texts that are full of calques and because many individual instances can be shown to be calques. In addition, the Tocharian B genitive, the most prominent instance of inflexion, is nominal and not adjectival. If anything, it would prove that the present participles were nouns, not adjectives. Likewise, the very marginal inflexion in Tocharian A can easily be shown to be secondary, because it is fully modeled on the preterite participle, whose completely irregular paradigm (a mixture of vestiges of *s*- and *nt*-stem inflexion) cannot possibly have replaced a regularly inflecting adjective.

It is more difficult to decide what the evidence for attributive use is worth. In the case of Tocharian A, influence from Old Uyghur is not possible chronologically, despite the parallelism pointed out above, because contact with Old Uyghur is to be dated towards the end of the first millennium, and so towards the end of the Tocharian A language itself. If the parallels noted are due to contact, it is rather the Old Uyghur literary language that is influenced by Tocharian A. However, it must be noted that other Old Turkic varieties cannot be excluded as a source of influence; and likewise influence from typologically similar languages – Turkic or not Turkic – remains possible. The Maitreyasamiti-Nāṭaka is definitely a Tocharian A composition and must be taken very seriously as a source for original, genuine Tocharian A syntax. Nevertheless, also the phenomena found there cannot be simply projected back to Proto-Tocharian: it is a literary, highly developed text that makes use of a rich literary inventory taken from other literatures, in part Sanskrit, in part Middle Indian, and perhaps in part from yet other traditions. Also in the Maitreyasamiti-Nāṭaka, calque patterns can occur. In essence, the same is true of the examples of attributive use in Tocharian B, which have not been the topic of this paper.

In sum, I consider it very likely that Proto-Tocharian had an indeclinable present participle. Less certain, but still probable is it that this participle was only or predominantly used adverbially. In view of the current definitions of the term converb in typology, this term is justifiable for the Tocharian present participle. However, it does not have the terminological elegance as for instance for Turkic, since it would be the only one of its kind in the language. The essential point is that the present participle was not middle, that it was indeclinable, and that is was used adverbially.

6. CONSEQUENCES FOR PROTO-INDO-EUROPEAN

As far as I can see, the consequences for Proto-Indo-European, for which commonly a suffix *-mh_1no- is reconstructed (after Klingenschmitt 1975: 159-163), are mixed. The fact that the Tocharian present participle is uninflected is remarkable, but may easily have come about secondarily, possibly through contact with other languages with converbs, such as Turkic, or other typologically similar languages. There is no parallel for such an uninflected formation in Proto-Indo-European.

By contrast, the voice-indifference of the Tocharian present participle seems in fact significant. In view of the firm entrenchment of voice in the finite verb and the preservation of the *nt*-participle in the form of an agent formation, it is difficult to imagine how a clear-cut voice contrast could have been given up. If there had been such a neat voice contrast between the two participles, as it is found in Indo-Iranian and Greek, why would this contrast have been abolished only in the participles, but not in the finite verb? The same objection is valid for Latin. The traditional view that *alumnus* and *femina* are remnants of an earlier middle present participle, while the active present participle otherwise ousted its middle counterpart although the voice contrast was preserved in the finite verb derives its logic only from the presupposition that there was originally a voice contrast in the present participle in the first place. In this point, I

agree with Pinault (2012b: 229), who states that "the specialization for medio-passive meaning as seen in some languages (Indo-Iranian, Greek) correlates with the specialization of the participle in *-(e/o)nt- for the active voice".

As Melchert points out (1983: 24), the suffix *-mh₁no- must in origin have been one of several verbal adjectives, not a participle in the strict sense. If no voice contrast between the "active" participle in *-nt- and the "middle" participle in *-mh₁no- can actually be reconstructed, it does not make sense to reconstruct *-mh₁no- as a participle at all.

REFERENCES

ADAMS, D.Q., 2015. *Tocharian B: A grammar of syntax and word-formation.* Innsbruck, Institut für Sprachen und Literaturen der Universität Innsbruck.

DIETZ, R., 1981. *Der Gebrauch der Partizipia Präsentis im Tocharischen.* Diss. Frankfurt/Main.

ERDAL, M., 2004. *A grammar of Old Turkic.* Leiden – Boston, Brill.

FELLNER, H.A., 2013. *Studies in Tocharian adjective formation.* Diss. Harvard.

—, 2014. 'Tocharian special agents: 'The *nt*-participles''. *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 15, 53-67.

GENG SHIMIN, KLIMKEIT, H.J., 1988. *Das Zusammentreffen mit Maitreya. Die ersten fünf Kapitel der Hami-Version der Maitrisimit.* Teil I: Text, Übersetzung und Kommentar. In Zusammenarbeit mit Helmut Eimer und Jens Peter Laut. Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz.

HACKSTEIN, O., 2012. 'Collective and feminine in Tocharian'. O. Hackstein, R.I. Kim (eds.), 2012. *Linguistic developments along the Silkroad: Archaism and innovation in Tocharian.* Wien, Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 143-177.

HACKSTEIN, O., HABATA, H., BROSS, C., 2015. ,Tocharische Texte zur Buddhalegende II: Die Geschichte von Devadatta und Ajātaśatru (B21-22)'. *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 69, 51-121.

HASPELMATH, M., 1995. 'The converb as a cross-linguistically valid category'. M. Haspelmath & E. König (eds.), 1995. *Converbs in cross-linguistic perspective. Structure and meaning of adverbial verb forms. – Adverbial participles, gerunds –.* Berlin/New York, Mouton de Gruyter, 1-55.

JI XIANLIN, 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. Berlin – New York, Mouton-de Gruyter.

KLINGENSCHMITT, G., 1975. ,Tocharisch und Indogermanisch'. H. Rix (Hrsg.), 1975. *Flexion und Wortbildung. Akten der V. Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Regensburg, 9. - 14. September 1973.* Wiesbaden, 148-163.

KRAUSE, W., Thomas, W., 1960. *Tocharisches Elementarbuch, I. Grammatik.* Heidelberg, Winter.

MALZAHN, M., 2010. *The Tocharian verbal system.* Leiden – Boston, Brill.

MELCHERT, H.C., 1983. 'A 'new' PIE *men suffix'. *Die Sprache* 29, 1-26.

OGIHARA, H., 2012. 'A fragment of the Bhikṣu-prātimokṣasūtra in Tocharian B'. *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 13, 163-179.

PEYROT, M., 2007. 'Review of Saito (2006)'. *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 64, 797-801.

—, 2010. 'On the formation of the Tocharian preterite participle'. *Historische Sprachforschung* 121 (2008), 69-83.

—, 2013a. *The Tocharian subjunctive. A study in syntax and verbal stem formation.* Leiden/Boston, Brill.

—, 2013b. 'Review of Malzahn (2010)'. *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 14, 213-259.

PINAULT, G.-J., 2003. « Contacts linguistiques en Asie Centrale à la lumière des textes tokhariens ». S. Bretfeld, J. Wilkens (eds.), 2003. *Indien und Zentralasien, Sprach- und Kulturkontakt. Vorträge des Göttinger Symposions vom 7. bis 10. Mai 2001.* Wiesbaden, Harassowitz, 45-83.

—, 2012a. 'Tocharian *-nt-* participles and agent nouns'. O. Hackstein, R.I. Kim (eds.), 2012. *Linguistic developments along the Silkroad: Archaism and innovation in Tocharian.* Wien, Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 179-204.

—, 2012b. 'Sound laws and the suffix of the PIE 'middle' participle'. R. Sukač, O. Šefčík (eds.), 2012. *The sound of Indo-European 2. Papers on Indo-European phonetics, phonemics and morphophonemics.* München, LINCOM, 227-251.

—, 2015. 'Buddhist stylistics in Central Asia'. *Linguarum Varietas* 4, 89-107.

RAMSTEDT, G.J., 1902. *Über die Konjugation des Khalkha-Mongolischen.* Helsingfors, Druckerei der finnischen Litteraturgesellschaft.

RAPOLD, C.J., 2010. 'Defining converbs ten years on – a hitchhiker's guide'. *Frankfurter Afrikanistische Blätter* 19 (2007), 7–30.

SAITO, H., 2006. *Das Partizipium Präteriti im Tocharischen.* Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz.

SCHMIDT, K.T., 1989. *Der Schlußteil des Prātimokṣasūtra der Sarvāstivādins. Text in Sanskrit und Tocharisch A verglichen mit den Parallelversionen anderer Schulen.* Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

SIEG, E., SIEGLING, W., 1949. *Tocharische Sprachreste, Sprache B. Heft 1. Die Udānālaṅkāra-Fragmente, Texte, Übersetzung und Glossar.* Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

SIEG, E., SIEGLING, W., SCHULZE, W., 1931. *Tocharische Grammatik.* Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

SIMSON, G. von, 2000. *Prātimokṣasūtra der Sarvāstivādins. Teil II. Kritische Textausgabe, Übersetzung, Wortindex sowie Nachträge zu Teil I, nach Vorarbeiten von Else Lüders† u. Herbert Härtel herausgegeben.* Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

SOMMER, F., 2014. ‚Satztopographie und Skopuseffekte bei konverbalen Strukturen im Jungavestischen'. *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 67, 177-196.

WALDSCHMIDT, E., 1968. *Drei Fragmente buddhistischer Sūtras aus den Turfanhandschriften.* Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

WILKENS, J., 2008. ‚Maitrisimit und Maitreyasamitināṭaka'. P. Zieme (ed.). *Aspects of research into Central Asian Buddhism, In memoriam Kōgi Kudara.* Turnhout, Brepols, 407-433.

Michaël Peyrot
Leiden University

Verbal Adjectives and Participles in Indo-European Languages

Adjectifs verbaux et participes dans les langues indo-européennes

Proceedings of the conference
of the Society for Indo-European Studies
(Indogermanische Gesellschaft),
Paris, 24th to 26th September 2014

edited by
Claire Le Feuvre, Daniel Petit
and Georges-Jean Pinault

Claire Le Feuvre, Daniel Petit & Georges-Jean Pinault (eds.)
Verbal Adjectives and Participles in Indo-European Languages

CONTENTS

Verbal Adjectives and Participles in Indo-European Languages