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Middle-passive and causative: valency-change in the Tocharian B -e-presents without initial palatalization

Gerd Carling

1. Introduction

The systematic generalization of a morphological category causative in Tocharian A and B is by most Tocharologists considered to be an inner-Tocharian innovation. Though having its roots in Common Tocharian, its details probably developed later than the split of Tocharian A and B. The suffix used in all causative presents, CT *sk- (B *s-(*-s)-)*s-, [A *s-(*-s)] occurs also in the non-causative present classes IX-XI. As demonstrated by Hackstein (1995), through careful analysis of the non-causative *sk-presents, no inherent causative function can be postulated for this suffix in Common Tocharian. Furthermore, the causativity should be looked for in the initial accent.

Concerning the functions of the causative, Krause and Thomas (1960: 174, § 297) list the following features: 1. The causative can apply to both transitive and intransitive verbs, 2. Primarily, the difference between “Grundverb” and “Kausativ” corresponds to intransitive/passive vs. transitive/active, 3. “Grundverb” and “Kausativ” are generally not different in their lexical nucleus (“Bedeutungskern”), 4. Some roots ending in -k have double causative formations; in one of them a lexical difference between “Grundverb” and “Kausativ” sometimes occurs, 5. With some verbs, there is no difference at all.

The first question is, if all causatives are true causatives in the sense that they introduce a new argument into the core, the causative, which takes the A (Agent) position, whereas original S (Subject) or A (Agent) becomes O (Object) and an original O (in case of a transitive verb) becomes E (Extension of core) or IO (Indirect Object), which is the normal definition of a causative. The second question is if the middle, which has basically a valency-decreasing function, can change the syntactic effects caused by the causative.

In this article, I will look closer upon a distinct group of verbs in Tocharian B that are, with one exception, inherently intransitive: verbs that have a present stem in B -e-[A -a-] (with initial accentuation), no initial...
palatalization and subjunctives with non-initial accentuation (Winter 1980, “list I”). These verbs belong to the group that by K.T. Schmidt (1974: 29–55) is referred to as “Medio-aktiva”: they have a middle-passive present beside an active preterite. The subjunctive is either active or middle. The middle-passive present is without exceptions, some deviation can occur in the preterite, where we can have lack of attestation or, in exceptional cases, middle-passive forms. In general there is no semantic or syntactic difference between the present middle-passive and the preterite active forms.

2. Valency of the “Grundverb” (present III)

Some verbs are fully intransitive and have no second argument (Table 1). Other verbs could be characterized as “extended intransitives”: they are inherently intransitive, but are normally constructed with a more or less obligatory second argument, which, however, is not an oblique (O). These extensions are either secondary cases, as ablative, locative, allative, locative or comitative, or (only in inverse constructions, see below) the genitive/uninflected enclitic pronoun. Examples of verbs of this type are given in Table 2.

B märs- ‘forget’ is mentioned by Winter (1980: 434) as an exception from the intransitive tendency of this class. A causative of B märs- is found in the passage Br.Mus. 1 a3(b3) (example 1). Though the exact meaning of this passage is obscure, it is relatively clear that we have a causative of a transitive ‘forget’, i.e. ‘make forget'; a third argument is however lacking.

### Table 1. Examples of intransitive verbs with -e-present ("Grundverb")

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Extension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>B krämp</strong>-</td>
<td>‘be disturbed’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B kwal</strong>-</td>
<td>‘fail’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B lip</strong>-</td>
<td>‘remain’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B mask</strong>-</td>
<td>‘disappear, perish’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B plänt</strong>-</td>
<td>‘be sold’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B pruuk</strong>-</td>
<td>‘be stopped, shut, filled’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B spärk</strong>-</td>
<td>‘disappear’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B struc</strong>-</td>
<td>‘die’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2. Examples of extended intransitive verbs with -e-present ("Grundverb")

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Extension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>B lit</strong>-' ‘pass away, fall down’</td>
<td>ablative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B ritt</strong>- ‘go, set out’</td>
<td>ablative, locative, permissive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B prük</strong>- ‘stay away, restrain oneself’</td>
<td>ablative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B spänt</strong>- ‘trust’</td>
<td>comitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B triv</strong>- ‘be mixed, get mixed, mingle’</td>
<td>comitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B tsäpp</strong>- ‘be free, pass away’</td>
<td>ablative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B tsär</strong>- ‘be separated, be apart’</td>
<td>ablative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B tus</strong>- ‘adhere, cling, attach to’</td>
<td>ablative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With the past participle we have several occurrences with the comitative (3a), and exceptionally also the locative (3b). In an example with causative past participle which exhibits no semantic difference when compared to its corresponding past participle of the "Grundverb" we have the allative (3c).
3. Valency-increasing present formations: VIII and IXb

It has been clearly demonstrated by Hackstein (1995: 147–158) that a formal and functional difference between the presents VIIIa and VIIIb cannot be established. The characteristic for the whole class of presents VIII, demonstrated in the exposition of the individual verbs, can be summarised as follows (Hackstein 1995: 154):

1. A Tocharian -selo-present to an Indo-European transitive root remains transitive.
2. A Tocharian -selo-present to an Indo-European intransitive root becomes transitivised.

Following the conclusion by Hackstein (1995), the verbs of this group that have other present formations than class III should be divided in three groups:

1. Verbs with present III (+ subj. V) and present IXb (+ subj. IX) stems (table 4).
2. Verbs with present III (+ subj. V) and present VIII (+ subj. I, II) stems (table 5).
3. Verbs with present III (+ subj. V), present VIII (+ subj. I, II) and present IXb (+ subj. IX) stems (table 6).

Table 3. Intransitive vs. transitive constructions of -sel presents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present III</th>
<th>Present VIII, IXb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[{mon, V_{intr}, E_{abl/all/loc/com/pers}}]</td>
<td>[{mon, V_{tr}, O_{obl, E_{abl/all/loc/com/pers}}}]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The general syntactic pattern of the present VIII and present IXb constructions are very similar, compared to their present III counterparts. As demonstrated by Hackstein (1995), present VIII generally has a transitivising effect on an inherently intransitive stem. On these verbs, the transitivising effects come very close to the causative effects, if now “causative” is a proper term for the present IXb formations of this class.

Considering the verb B plümk- ‘be sold, come up for sale’, the present VIII form appears as a transitive ‘sell’ (6).
In cases in which we find active as well as middle passive forms in present VIII or IXb, they do not, as a rule, differ in meaning and construction. As an example we might use B tsäm- ‘grow’ (intransitive), present VIII ‘cause to grow, promote’ (transitive) (7a–b).

(7a) PK.AS.7B (K2 Lévi) b6 kätken plontontrā spēkkā maliya tsamsne
‘they rejoice and make glad and promote (act.caus.) their strength’

(7b) PK.NS.54 (previously PK.1086) a1 kos kot tsämtrā yämortā bodhisattve wakcēn tāryā-yākē
‘as often as a Bodhisattva promotes (mid.caus.) the three-fold, distinguished deeds ...’

An exception is here B ritt- ‘be attached, be suitable’. The present III constructions have been dealt with earlier. The present IXb active means ‘join’ (8a), and the action is done for someone else’s benefit. The middle, however, ‘prepare; bind’ is done for the benefit of the Agent (8b–c).

(8a) PK.AS.12F a2 amac wēsam pēniyace soysse okompa pūtrā ritkasē
‘the minister says: to the splendid fruit of a son (com.) I join (prsa IXb.act.) the father (obl.) [i.e. I bring father and son together]’

(8b) H.149.add. 37 a4 illraitante pyāpyaiṁ pāsaka[nia]
‘they tied (prt.II.mid.) the flowers (obl.) [into] garlands (obl.)’

(8c) B 339 a5 ill/sāl wēsamai rittate
‘he prepared (prt.II.mid.) [himsel] a bed (obl.)’

Considering the semantic structure of the presents VIII and IXb above, no general difference can be established: instead of achievements and lack of control by S, as expressed by the present III forms, both present VIII and IXb denote accomplishments and control of action by A. This indicates that we should assume a basically valency-increasing function of both present VIII and present IXb, which also implies control of action, as indicated above (cf. Table 3).

4. Verbs with triple present stems

Three verbs of this list have triple present stems.14 III (+subj. V, +pret. I), VIII (+subj. II + pret. III) and IXb (+subj. IX): trik- ‘be confused’, wik- ‘disappear’, and spärk- ‘disappear’.

B wik- ‘disappear’ is the verb whose structure is most obvious. In all examples of present III (+subj.V), the S is inanimate. In several cases it
is constructed with a genitive or uninflected enclitic pronoun (or both) as second argument (see example 9a–b).

(9a)  B 3 a4 f. te keklautormom brāhmaṇ(i) saṅhe (s)kwa(n)/[n]/(e)
wicka-ne
‘Having heard that, the good fortune of the brahmin in life disappeared for him’

(9b)  PK.AS.17D a5 tria wroastse amarže wikštār-m(e) snai lýpār
‘The great error of vexation will disappear for you and leave no rest’

Present VIII (+subj.II) is, as compared to pres.III (+subj.V + pret.I) clearly transitive, though not “causative”: the meaning is ‘avoid, stay away from’ (example 10a–b).

(10a)  B 117 a7 (ai)samye sa samo wāi anaisai tom wā/n/[n]/(rwa)///
‘A wise man should carefully avoid these things’

(10b)  B 600 b5 (okt bodhisatvent[ts]) somotkāmnie wikṣallona wāntara skente
‘For a Bodhisattva there are eight things that are likewise to be avoided’

Table 5. Constructions with different present stems of B wik- ‘disappear’

| Present III (+subj.V ’disappear’ | Syntactic structure: [Snom. Vint. (Vgen/encl.)] |
| Present VIII (+subj.II) ’avoid’ | Syntactic structure: [Anom. Vint. Oobj.] |
| Causative present IXb (+pret.II) ’drive away’ | Syntactic structure: [Anom. Vint. Oobj.] |

The causative IXb (+pret.II, no subjunctive attested) is semantically based upon the present III meaning, ‘disappear’ → ‘drive away, make disappear’ (11a–b, past participle 11c). The construction has the same syntactic structure as present VIII (+subj.II) (see table 5).

(11a)  B 523 a7 ///(krama)/[rtsana pāj]škonta [ʃe]/k wāj̆kasʃşim
‘He always drives away heavy thoughts’

(11b)  PK.AS.5C (S 6 Lēvi) b3 po yolāniie wikššim po cemane
‘May I drive away evil in all births.’

(11c)  B 7 b7 kiešanma yaiku(wa) nī
‘the afflictions have been expelled by me’

How should we define the semantic difference between ‘avoid’ and ‘drive away’? Again, the degree of control by the A should be considered.

B spārk- ‘disappear’ has, as compared to B wik-, a somewhat different structure. Present III (+pret. I, no subjunctive attested) is fully intransitive and the S is, as with wik-, inanimate (12a–c). We also find inverse constructions (12d). The past participle means ‘disappeared, gone’ (12e).

With present VIII we have only one single example (subj. II) (13). The verb is fully intransitive and there seems to be no difference in meaning: ‘disappear’. Interestingly, the S is animated, which means that we have a similar, though not corresponding, shift as with B wik- above.

(12a)  PK.AS.8B (M2 Filliozat) a2 f. svājine mot (kete) ku[rape]le tākam
madanaphali se ciwrene [ʃ]sapanal(e) mot spārketrā
‘In Svāti, a sliver of the thorn-apple is to be crushed in(to) the doorway of anyone who is concerned with alcohol (i.e. is a drunkard). The alcohol disappears’

(12b)  H.149.add.8 a11 (a)māk[nu]şempa [taisai hvāsampa] pastai[ne]
[kr]/[a]nk[a]/mpa [pa]ra [t]āw proyainne spā(r)k[t]ā[n(e)]
‘If a monk has sexual intercourse with (non-)humans, even with animals, even as much as a chicken, it is pārājika. At this occasion it disappeared (i.e. was not pārājika): with an imaginary non-human being’

(12c)  B 99 a11 /// (subhāsitagevāg)īs:i) walo olyapotse läklessu ere pāst
spārk-ne
‘King S. was suffering greatly; his color disappeared completely’

(12d)  S 7 a1 (po) f[ʃ]m(e)/[ʃ][a]s:en se[r]k[e]me palsko õstre manta
spārkoytā nī
‘May in all chains of birth the pure thought never disappear for me!’

(12e)  B 9 b7 (10 a3) kektseṇān stāstaukaanwa āmpauwa spārkauw=ere
‘bodies distended, rotten, color gone’

The causative IXb (+pret.II, no subjunctive attested) is semantically based upon the present III meaning, ‘disappear’ → ‘drive away, make disappear’ (11a–b, past participle 11c). The construction has the same syntactic structure as present VIII (+subj.II) (see table 5).

(13a)  B 523 a7 ///(krama)/[rtsana pāj]škonta [ʃe]/k wāj̆kasʃşim
‘He always drives away heavy thoughts’

(13b)  PK.AS.5C (S 6 Lēvi) b3 po yolāniie wikššim po cemane
‘May I drive away evil in all births.’

(13c)  B 7 b7 kiešanma yaiku(wa) nī
‘the afflictions have been expelled by me’

In causative we find only two finite forms, one active present (14a) and one middle-passive preterite (14b). Though the context of H.149.add.8 is somewhat unclear, it seems likely that the meaning in both passages is ‘drive away, put to flight’. Gerund is attested in medical texts, meaning ‘dissolve’ (14c).
B 241 b1 po šaulās[e]m klautken[n]e šaulīsa larem trīšīm-c mā 'In all behaviors of life may I not mistake you, [being] dearer than life'

(17a) B 282 b1 lī[l/s]n(y)ai parwa lextaimen tsākam su kl(ā)y(ā)m n(o) k(ā)m'īlsa wīhcåhinē ša(r)wa[r]/r(ā)n(e)sa tr(i)ksā(m) 'If he rises without feathers from his nest, he will fall to the earth; he err because of wīhcåhinē arrogance'

(17b) PK.AS.7H (K8 Lēvī) a1 (e=lā)kn(d)sa(i)n(e) m(ai)ntsa trikṣe mūsīlāne yamaskem 'Some beings err by ignorance in their thought and show bad character'

(18) PK.AS.5C (S6 Lēvī) b6 (bhav)ākarṇāi pōy(i)nīm kauñāktentsō pārक्षळे trīṣīm manta 'Puisse je absolument ne pas manquer le lever du soleil de l’Omniscience en fin de lustre'19

(19) S 8 Supp. 4 pōyśiṇāṣai ekṣalyeṃ mā trīśīmār kāl-lock=spā oatneṃ (lantist) 'May I not wander away from the parousia of the Buddha! May I achieve the leaving of [my] house!'

Examples with causative present IXb (pret.II.mid. only) (20) show no semantic difference as compared to present III.20 The same is true for the class IXb past participles, 'confused, bewildered' (21a-c).

(20) H.149.290 b3 III/pajlsko trikate ot talānte; 'Thereupon the spirit of the unfortunate one became confused'

(21a) B 212 a4 s[am]śarāste karāste ce tetrīkoṣā klesa(mmasa) 'In the Sāṃśāra forest, him lead astray by the Klesa’s'

(21b) B 148 a4 yatra mūdham idam jagat+ente tetrīku se šāsihe 'where this world is confused'

(21c) B 17 a2 (kā)lym(ī)mne (nāś) tetrikē 'I am lost in the directions'

(21d) H.149.69 a3 (tu)sa īme tetrīku si naśi orkāntai 'Thereby with confused spirit he swam hither and thither'

This “exception” might be caused by the semantics of this verb, which inherently implies lack of control. A non-causative present III ‘be confused’ (present VIII ‘mistake’), causative ‘confuse, lead astray’, in (reflexive middle) ‘confuse oneself’ will come full circle.
Notes

1. I thank Prof. Folke Josephson for valuable remarks and Prof. Georges-Jean Pinault for valuable remarks and transcriptions of unpublished Paris manuscripts. I also thank Dr. Judith Josephson for correcting my English.
6. There are also some slight differences on this point between Tocharian A and Tocharian B.
7. This is most probably an innovation, since A märs- has a *-na- present stem: märnes. See Winter (1980).
8. B storwe is a noun or adjective of unknown meaning.
9. Plural of *rākṣasa, feminine of rākṣatse (male) rākṣasā.
10. The comitative here cannot be dependent of eṣe ‘together’ that is attested with comitative as a preposition only.
11. Also “impersonal constructions”.
14. They are “double causatives” according to Krause and Thomas (1960: 207, § 376).
16. B wegerke, hapax in this text, is of unknown meaning. It might be formed from the root B spārk-, and is thus a “figura etymologica”.
17. Pārājika-dharma 2, adattādānam ‘theft’, cf. Rosen (1959: 52); no exact correspondence in the Sanskrit text.
18. For -entze
20. The translation in die Irre führen, verwirren by Krause and Thomas (1964: 200) seems to be a ghost.
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Some thoughts on ‘Universals’

N. E. Collinge

It is an honour to be allowed to offer a contribution to the marking of Werner Winter’s eightieth year. His insights into language behaviour – and his control of linguists’ behaviour – are legendary. If the remarks below concern a sector slightly foreign to his own interests, at least they are offered in the firm belief that he would never be party to the possibly confused thinking noted therein.

The Sapir-Whorf hypothesis (on which now see Lee 1996) really rests on two pronouncements. The second – the one which has caused most stir – declares that the categories of a given language (Lx), lexical or grammatical, constrain the patterns of thought as a whole of the speakers of Lx. The first supposition, however, is crucial: that all languages differ at arbitrary points, which are numerous, unpredictable and may be located anywhere. This ruling in effect proclaims that linguistic universals, if not totally absent, are going to be very difficult to identify, especially if it has to be over 6,000 languages. Of course, any previous search for universals received a setback in 1836 with the appearance of von Humboldt’s study *Über die verschiedenheit des menschlichen sprachbaues und ihren einfluss auf die geistige entwicklung des menschengeschlechts*, which directed the limelight to the sheer diversity of human speech and the influence of that diversity on man’s mental evolution. Yet from the early 1960s, and with increased acceleration over the last two decades of the twentieth century, the search for universals has been enthusiastically renewed. Fashionable now is the view trenchantly expressed by Hawkins (1989: 119): “the major challenge facing any general linguistic theory is to extract the universals from the enormous range of variation exhibited by the 5,000 or so currently spoken languages”. Hawkins is courageous in seeing the Humboldtian attitude exactly as a challenge: is he (and those he speaks for) also sensible?

Despite the many learned essays listed in the references below, and despite the greater care in formulation which has lately developed after an over-optimistic period, doubts – deliberately of a simple sort – remain. These doubts have to do with the highly variable nature of the proposed universals themselves – as to status, importance, diagnostic reliability, expression, not to mention lasting validity – and the especially