

Pre-Toch. **b₁lud^b-néu-ti* ‘goes out’

JAY H. JASANOFF



I **-n(é)u-* presents in Tocharian

Thanks in no small part to the contributions of our honorand, the formal background of the Tocharian verbal system is much clearer today than it was a generation ago. Much of what has been learned, however, has yet to be fully digested. The research culture of Tocharian is still mostly focused on finding the IE origins of particular forms, i.e., on asking questions of the type, “Where does X come from?” Only rarely are serious efforts made to write history in the proper sense, i.e., to give an orderly account of the transformations undergone by individual formatives and categories in the transition from reconstructed PIE to attested Tocharian.

An example of a PIE formation whose scattered Tocharian reflexes have been studied with some success, but whose history has never been organized into a clear and coherent narrative, is the athematic present type in **-n(é)u-*, corresponding to the Sanskrit fifth present class (*asṅóti* ‘obtains’). The PIE inflection of this type is uncontroversial, with full-grade accented **-néu-* in the active singular and zero-grade **-nu-* with accented endings in the active dual and plural and throughout the middle. The **-n(é)u-* suffix, extracted from nasal-infix presents like **k₁l₁-né-u-ti* ‘hears’ (cf. Ved. *śṅmóti* ‘hears’), was fairly robust in late PIE; *LIV* lists 35 “certain” examples, most built to *amīṭ* roots that also made root aorists.

In Tocharian, the reflexes of **-n(é)u-* presents are seen in three descriptive categories:¹

- 1) *Class I* (“athematic”) *subjunctives*. The Tocharian roots traditionally lemmatized as B *au-n-/A o-n-* ‘hit; begin’, BA *kli-n-* ‘be obliged to, have to’, BA *ri-n-* ‘leave, give up’, BA *si-n-* ‘sate oneself, be depressed’, and B *sai-n-/A se-* ‘lean on, rely on’ owe their unstable final *-n-* to earlier presents in **-n(é)u-*. In Toch. B and, exceptionally, Toch. A, these roots mostly make class I subjunctives (< presents), the middle forms of which directly preserve the weak stem in **-nu-* > Toch.

¹Data are cited from Malzahn 2010, henceforth simply “Malzahn.”

Jay H. Jasanoff

-*n(ä)*-: cf. B 3 sg. *auntär*, pl. *aunantär*; A 3 sg. *kl(y)intär*; B 3 sg. *rintär*; B 3 pl. *sainantär*; all < **-nutor*, pl. **-nuntor*. The root *kli-n-*, it will be noted, corresponds etymologically to a **-n(é)u-* present in Avestan (YAv. *-sirinaoiti* ‘supports’). *si-n-*, on the evidence of the isolated Vedic nominal forms *asinvá-* and *ásinvat-* ‘insatiable’, was once paired with such a present as well.²

- 2) *Class X* (“-näsk-”) *presents*. When etymological presents serve as subjunctives in Tocharian, a common reason for this is that their primary presential functions were taken over by a formally renewed version of the older present stem. A standard example is B subj. VI *kärnä-* ‘buy’ (3 sg. mid. *kärnätär*, etc.; root *käry-*), formally matching Ved. pres. *krīṇāti* and OIr. *crenaid* ‘buys’, but replaced as a present by pres. X *kärnä-sk-*, with added **-ske/o-* (cf. 3 sg. mid. *kärnätär*, ptcp. *kärnäskemane*). Like *kärnäsk-* beside *kärnä-*, the presents corresponding to the class I subjunctives *aun-*, *kl(y)in-*, etc. have an added *-sk-*: cf. *aunäsk-* (B 3 sg. *aunassäm/A* 3 pl. mid. *omsantär*), *kl(y)inäsk-* (B 3 sg. *kl(y)inassäm/A* 2 sg. *klinäšt*), *rinäsk-* (B 3 sg. mid. *rinastär/A* *rinastär*), *sinäsk-* (B 2 sg. mid. *sinastär/A* *sinäštär*), and *sainäsk-* (B 3 sg. mid. *sainastär*), all virtually < **-nu-ske/o-*. In purely formal terms, the relationship of, e.g., subj. I B *rintär* to pres. X B *rinastär* is the same as that of a Greek present in *-νυμι* (e.g., *ζώννυμι* ‘gird’, *ρήννυμι* ‘break’) to the corresponding “iterative” imperfect in *-νυσκε/o-* (3 sg. *ζώννυσκε* ‘would gird’, *ρήννυσκε*, etc.).³
- 3) *Class VII* (“-ñ-”) *subjunctives*. Subjunctives in *-ñ-* (cf. Malzahn 337ff., with literature) are concentrated in Toch. A, where they are formed to just over twenty verbs. There is no consensus regarding the origin of the palatal nasal. A thematic suffix **-n(H)-e/o-*, with palatalization generalized from the forms where the thematic vowel was **-e-*, would work algebraically, but Tocharian is otherwise extremely consistent in keeping the *-e-* and *-o-* forms distinct in thematic stems.⁴ **-ñe/o-*, proposed by Hilmarsson (1991:108f.), is not a viable alternative, since **-ñ-* did not cause palatalization after coronals.⁵ Significantly, most of the roots that have or once had class I middle subjunctives, mainly in Toch. B (*au-n-*, *kl(y)i-n-*, *ri-n-*, *si-n-*, *sai-n-*), have class VII subjunctives in Toch. A: cf. 3 sg. mid. *oñtar* [sic]; 2 sg. mid. *riñtär*, ger. *riñäl*; 3 pl. mid. *siñantär*, ger. *siñäl*; 1 sg. mid. *señmār*. As seen by Peyrot (2013:585–89), the best explanation for the relationship between the *-n-* (cl. I) of Toch. B and the *-ñ-* (cl. VII) of Toch. A is that the palatal nasal was proper to the active, from which it spread to the

²On the other hand, Ved. 3 pl. *arīṇyan* (MS) ‘stirred up’, a potential comparand for Toch. *ri-n-*, is an error for *arīnan* (cf. LIV 306).

³But the Greek and Tocharian forms are not true cognates; the sequence **-nu-ske/o-* was separately created in the two branches.

⁴Thus, there is no spread of palatalization from the *e-* forms to the *o-* forms in the presents of class II (cf. 3 sg. mid. AB *āštär* ‘leads’, 3 pl. act. A *ākeñc*, B *ākem*), class VIII (3 sg. A *aräs*, B *eršäm* ‘causes’, pl. A *aršeñc*, B *eršem*), or class IX (3 sg. B *kälpässäm* ‘obtains’, 3 pl. *kälpäskem*).

⁵As shown by Fellner 2013:46–50.

Pre-Toch. *h₁lud^h-néu-ti ‘goes out’

middle in Toch. A but not in Toch. B. The only root with unambiguous *-ñ-* in both languages, AB *we-ñ-* ‘say’, is confined to the active (cf. A 1 sg. *weñam*, 3 sg. *weñäs*, 3 pl. *weñeñc*; B sg. 1 *weñau*, 2 *went* (< **-ñt*),⁶ 3 *wem* (< **-ñäm*; see below), pl. 1 *weñem*, 2 *weñcer*, 3 *weñem*). The suffix-form *-ñ(ä)-* is a blend of **-ñaw-* < **-neu-*, proper to the active singular, and **-nə-* < **-nu-*, proper to the active plural.⁷ The etymological link between the class VII subjunctive and the PIE present type in **-n(é)u-* is confirmed by the word equations A subj. *wāk-ñ-* ‘break (tr.) = Gk. (ε)ἄρνυμι ‘id.’, and A subj. *ar-ñ-* ‘bring forth’ = Gk. ὀρνυμι ‘stir up’.

The broad history of **-n(é)u-* presents, then, can be summarized as follows. Tocharian inherited a basic inventory of presents in **-n(é)u-*, including probably **kli-n(é)u-* ‘lean’, **sh₂i-n(é)u-* ‘satisfy, satiate’, **u₂h₂ǵ-n(é)u-* ‘break’, and **h₁or-n(é)u-* (vel *sim.*) ‘raise’. Within Tocharian proper, these acquired iteratives in **-nu-ske/o-*, which were later revalued as unmarked presents, leaving the original present stems to serve as subjunctives. In the middle, the former **-n(é)u-* presents, now subjunctives, emerged with a 3 sg. in (Proto-Tocharian) **-n(a)-tər* < **-nu-tor* and a 3 pl. in **-nə-ntər* < **-nu-ntor*. These survive as class I middle subjunctives in Toch. B (*aun(an)tär*, *sainan-tär*, etc.) and, in one probable case, Toch. A (*kl(y)intär*). In the active, alternating **-neu-* (singular) and **-nu-* (plural) combined morphologically to give PToch. **-ñ(a)-*. Palatalized *-ñ(a)-* remained confined to the active in Toch. B, where, apart from the forms of *we-ñ-* (cf. above), it is also underlyingly present in the forms 3 sg. subj. *aum* and **kl(y)im*⁸ < **-ñäm*, with the same phonology as in 3 sg. *wem*. In Toch. A, putting aside *we-ñ-*, *-ñ-* is found both in the active (e.g., 1 sg. *wākñam*, *kärkñam* ‘I will bind’; 2 sg. *lipñät* ‘you will leave behind’; 3 sg. *wākñäs*, *kärkñäs*) and in the middle (e.g., 1 sg. *riñmār*, *señmār*; 2 sg. *riñtār*; 3 sg. *oñtar*; 3 pl. *siñantär*). The middle forms with *-ñ-* represent a clear innovation vis-à-vis the Toch. B class I forms with *-n-*.

2 **lä-n-t-*: The Proto-Tocharian situation

The present and subjunctive of the root listed in the handbooks as *lä-n-t-* ‘go out’ are generally taken to be related to the subjunctive forms just discussed (cf. Malzahn 344f.), but the details are murky. The underlying root was PIE **h₁leud^h-* ‘go out’, which should be separated, in my view, from the possibly homophonous **Hleud^h-* that underlies Ved. *ró(d)hati* ‘grows, climbs’ and Go. *liudan* ‘grow’.⁹ **h₁leud^h-* ‘go

⁶With the regular Toch. B depalatalization of *-ñ-* to *-n-* before *-t-*. I follow Malzahn in citing the root as *we-ñ-*, with palatal *-ñ-*.

⁷So Peyrot *loc. cit.* The one “weak” active form where the **-n-* was not analogically palatalized was the 2 sg. imperative A *pem* ‘tell!’, pointing to a preform of the type Ved. 2 sg. impv. *śṛṇu* ‘hear!’. The palatalization in B *poñ* ‘id.’ is secondary.

⁸Inferable from 3 sg. *kl(y)in-ne*, with suffixed *-ne*.

⁹The two are combined into a single entry in *LIV*, though not with complete confidence; see the entry for **h₁leud^h-*, n. 2.

Jay H. Jasanoff

out’ was unusual in giving rise to two lexical verbs in Tocharian: 1) *lut-* ‘expel’, built around the transitive *s*-preterite seen in Toch. B pret. 1 sg. *lyautwa*, 3 sg. *lyautsa*, etc. (< PIE presigmatic aorist $*b_1loud^b-$ / $*b_1l(e)ud^b-$ / $*b_1lēud^b-s-$);¹⁰ and 2) *lä-n-t-* ‘go out’, built around the irregular intransitive preterite seen in Toch. B 3 sg. *lac*, pl. *latem*, Toch. A *läc*, *läär* (< PIE thematic aorist $*b_1lud^bē/ó-$; cf. Gk. 3 sg. $\acute{\eta}\lambda\upsilon\theta\epsilon$ ‘came’, OIr. *luid* ‘went’). Our focus here will be on the second, intransitive line of development. The forms of particular interest are the present and subjunctive:

Toch. A subj: *läñc-* (e.g., sg. 1 *läñcam*, 3 *läñcäs*, pl. 3 *läñceñc*; opt. 1 sg. *läñcim*)

pres.: *länt(ä)s-* (e.g., sg. 1 *läntsam*, 3 *läntäs*, pl. 3 *läntseñc*)

Toch. B subj: *länn-* (sg. 1 *lanmu*, 2 *lant*, 3 *lam*, pl. 3 *lam*; opt. 3 sg. *lanñi*, pl. *lanñem*)

pres. *lännäsk-* (e.g., sg. 1 *lnaskau*, 3 *lnassäm*; impf. 3 pl. *lännasyem*)

As in the case of *ri-n-*, *kli-n-*, etc., the forms that serve synchronically as presents are *-sk-*-extended versions (with *-sk-* regularly replaced by *-s-* in Toch. A) of the original presents, which serve synchronically as subjunctives. The challenge posed by the forms of *lä-n-t-* is to explain the relationship of the subjunctive stems *länn-* (B) and *läñc-* (A) to each other and to PIE $*b_1leud^b-$.

Most sources are agreed in taking the *-n-/-ñ-* of the Toch. A forms from an infix (see Malzahn *loc. cit.*, with references to Hilmarsson 1991, Hackstein 1995, Peters 2006, and Pinault 1994). This view will be contested here. Nasal-infix presents have a peculiar profile in Tocharian. The only such stem with an exact cognate in another IE branch is B 3 sg. *pinkäm* ‘paints, draws’ (: Toch. root *pik-*; cf. Lat. *pingo* ‘paint’); two other conceivably old forms, neither compelling, are B 3 sg. mid. *slänktär* ‘draws, pulls’ < virtual $*s_l-n-k-$ (: Toch. root *sälk-*; cf. Gk. $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\kappa\omega$ ‘pull’) and B 3 sg. *prantsäm*, impf. *prantsitär* < $*pr-n-s-$ (: Toch. root *pärs-* ‘sprinkle’; cf. Hitt. *pappars-* ‘id.’).¹¹ Otherwise, so-called nasal-infix presents in Tocharian are secondary creations to synchronic “roots” in *-sk-* or *-tk-* < $*-T-sk-$ (e.g., B 3 sg. *kättänkäm* (: *kätk-* ‘arise’), mid. *puttänkätär* (: *putk-* ‘distinguish’), A 3 sg. *pältsänkäs* (: *päl(t)sk-* ‘think’), mid. *wäsänkätär* (: *wäsk-* ‘move’). Whether these are phonologically regular for older $*-(T)sk-n-$, rather than sporadic metatheses or analogical creations on the basis of the inherited infix type (*pink-*, etc.), is unclear (cf. Malzahn 418–23). What is clear is that the creation of a nasal-infix present $*b_1lu-n(\acute{e})-d^b-$ / $*l\alpha-n-t-$ would not have had any credible motivation within Tocharian. Even if a present of this shape once existed, it would be a non-trivial task to explain how the stem-final consonant of Toch. A *läñcam*, *-äs*, etc. came to be consistently palatalized (contrast *kättänkäm*, *pältsänkäs*,

¹⁰For my views on the prehistory of the sigmatic aorist, which will play no role in the following discussion, cf. Jasanoff 2003:ch.7.

¹¹In the latter case, the competing nasal-suffix (cl. VII) present *pärsnä-* has at least as strong a claim to antiquity as the infix form. Michaël Peyrot (p.c.) points out that *lik-* ‘wash’, with an innovated class VI present in Toch. B (3 sg. mid. *laikanatär*) but otherwise generally parallel to *pik-* ‘paint’, may have inherited a present **link-*.

Pre-Toch. *h₁lud^h-néu-ti ‘goes out’

etc.),¹² and how PToch. *l^hant- could have given rise to the stem-form *l^hann-* presupposed by the Toch. B forms.¹³

The position I will take here is that the root *h₁leud^h- (vel sim.) was fitted out with a present *h₁lud^h-n(é)u- in pre-Tocharian. Like *kli-n(é)u-, *sh₂i-n(é)u-, and the other stems of this type discussed above, the new present was in due course paired with an iterative in *-nu-ské/o-, thus setting the stage for the reflex of *h₁lud^h-nu-ské/o- to become an unmarked present and leaving the unextended stem to serve as the corresponding subjunctive. At a stage just prior to the Proto-Tocharian cluster simplification rules, *h₁lud^h-nu-ské/o- and *h₁lud^h-n(é)u- would have been realized as pre-Toch. *l^hatnask- and *l^hat’n’ə-, respectively.¹⁴ With what I will maintain was the phonologically regular assimilation of pre-Toch. *-tn- and *-t’n’- to *-nn- and *-ññ-, these sequences gave the forms reconstructible for Proto-Tocharian:

PToch. pres. *l^hannask-¹⁵ < *l^hatnask- < *h₁lud^h-nu-ské/o-

PToch. subj. *l^haññə- < *l^hat’n’ə- < *h₁lud^h-n(é)u-

For the change of *-tn- > *-nn-, compare Toch. A pres. *knā-* (: *kāt-* ‘scatter’), *wnā-* (: *wāt-* ‘place’), and *rinā-* (: *rit-* ‘seek’), regularly degeminated from PToch. *kanna-, *wanna-, *ranna- < *katna-, *watna-, *raytna-. The cluster *-tn- was morphologically restored in the corresponding Toch. B forms (*katna-*, *ritana-*).¹⁶

3 From Proto-Tocharian to Toch. A and B

Let us now follow the fortunes of the PToch. forms in the two daughter languages. In Toch. B the present (1 sg. *lnaskau*, 3 sg. *lnassäm*, 3 pl. *lnaskem*, impf. 3 pl. *lännasjem*, etc.) is entirely straightforward; all the forms go back to *lännásk-, mostly with syncope of the unaccented Fremdvokal. The forms of the finite subjunctive (sg. 1 *lan^hnu*, 2 *lant*, 3 *lam*, pl. 3 *lam*; opt. sg. 1 *laññam* [for correct *laññim; cf. Peyrot 2013:445], 2 *lyñit*, 3 *laññi*, 3 pl. *laññem*) are less transparent. The underlying geminate is most clearly seen in the optative *laññi-. In the subjunctive proper, 3 sg. *lam*, as recognized by Pinault (1994:129f.), is regular for *laññäm by the same rule that gave 3

¹²To explain the palatalization, Hackstein (1995:309ff.), followed by LIV, starts from a PIE subjunctive *h₁lu-n-e-á^h-e/o-, where the *-n- would have been palatalized throughout the paradigm. But apart from the fact that subjunctives of this type are unattested outside Indo-Iranian, the Toch. A reflex of a sequence *(h₁)luned^h- before the *o*-variant of the thematic vowel would have been *l^hānt-, not *lāñc-*.

¹³There is no basis other than desperation for the idea, widely repeated since Krause 1952:140ff., that *l^hann- goes back to *l^hant-n-, a nasal-suffixed form of the nasal-infixed root.

¹⁴It may have been at this stage that the transitive readings of these forms, corresponding to the separately lexicalized *lut-* ‘expel’, were renewed as *l^hatnask- and *l^hat’n’ə-, respectively. *l^hat’n’ə- would then have gone on to give, with various analogical repairs, the Toch. A class VII subjunctive *lyut-ñ-*. But this could also have been created later.

¹⁵I adopt this notation for the more strictly accurate *l^hannaska-/sə-.

¹⁶Otherwise Peyrot (2008:151, 2013:446–7), for whom B *katna-*, *ritana-* were restored from phonologically regular *k^hanta-, *rinta-, and *-tn- > *-n- was a sound change confined to Toch. A.

Jay H. Jasanoff

sg. *wem*, **kl(y)im*, and *aum*; for the specific case of geminate *-*ññäm* giving -*m* compare pres. XII 3 sg. *māntam* < *-*āññäm* ‘stirs’. Since the 3 pl. athematic subjunctive ending was homophonous with the 3 sg. in Toch. B, *lam* is the historically correct 3 pl. form as well. 2 sg. *lant* (*sic recte*; cf. Malzahn 842) is regular for **lāñ(ñä)t*, with normal depalatalization of -*ñ*- before -*t*-. The most difficult form, likewise discussed by our honorand (Pinault 1994:127–35), is 1 sg. *lanmu*, with an unexpected unpalatalized -*nm*- that contrasts starkly with the regular -*ñ*- of 1 sg. B *weñau*, A *weñam*. But the comparison with *we-ñ*- is illuminating. Under the account of the class VII subjunctive given in §I, the historical *-*ñaw*- < *-*neu*- of the active singular and the historical *-*na*- < *-*nu*- of the active plural blended to produce invariant *-*ñä*-. A stem in *-*ñä*- would have been expected to form a PToch. 1 sg. in *-*ñä-m* (< *-*mi*) and 3 pl. in *-*ñä-n(c)* (*vel sim.*) (< *-*nti*),¹⁷ which would have given Toch. B 1 sg. *-*ñu* < *-*ñaw*,¹⁸ 3 pl. *-*ñam* and Toch. A 1 sg. *-*ñäm*, 3 pl. *-*ñinc*, respectively. These are not, for the most part, the endings we find; “normal” class VII subjunctives thematized the 1 sg. to *-*ñe-m* (> B -*ñau*, A -*ñam*), the 1 pl. to *-*ñe-mä* (> B -*ñem*),¹⁹ and the 3 pl. to *-*ñe-n(c)* (> B -*ñem*, A -*ñeñc*) in the PToch. period. This thematization was an innovation—an innovation in which, as shown by the 3 pl. form *lam* < **lāññäm* < **lāññän(c)*, the subjunctive of “*lä-n-t*” did not participate. The etymologically correct 1 sg. **lāññu* would thus presumably not have been thematized either, and the full subjunctive paradigm would have been

1 sg. 1 * <i>lāññu</i> < PToch. * <i>lāññäm</i> 2 <i>lant</i> < PToch. * <i>lāññ(ä)tä</i> 3 <i>lam</i> < * <i>lāññän</i> ← PToch. * <i>lāññäṣ</i> ²⁰	pl. * <i>lāññäm</i> < PToch. * <i>lāññ(ä)mä</i> * <i>lāñcer</i> < PToch. * <i>lāññ(ä)cer</i> (?) <i>lam</i> < * <i>lāññän</i> < PToch. * <i>lāññän(c)</i>
---	---

The position of the 1 sg. *lāññu* in this array would have been precarious. The ending -*u* was otherwise confined to the regular class I subjunctive, where the preceding consonant was never palatalized (e.g., *neku* ‘I will destroy’, *preku* ‘I will ask’, etc.; cf. Malzahn 276). A learner of Toch. B would thus have tended to produce the incorrect form **lanmu*; under normal circumstances this error would have been “unlearned” by hearing the correct form and encountering other disambiguating evidence for the underlying palatal -*ññ*-. But apart from 1 pl. **lāññäm*, such other evidence would have been in short supply. Neither the second person forms, where the palatality of the -*n(n)*- was determined by the following ending, nor the third person forms, where the distinction between underlying -*ññ*- and -*nm*- was lost in the portmanteau ending -*m*-, nor the non-finite forms, where there was often no nasal at all (ger. II *lalyai*,

¹⁷On the variants of the 3 pl. ending see Malzahn 34–6.

¹⁸With the same Toch. B lenition of postvocalic -*m*- as in the demonstrative *su* (= A *säm*) and in *men*-stems (cf. *wāki* [= A *wākäm*] ‘difference’ < **wak-ä-w’* < PToch. **wak-ä-m’* < *-*men* [< *-*mēn*?]; cf. Jasanoff 2018:73–4). The proper formulation of the rule is still unclear.

¹⁹No 1 pl. forms of the class VII subjunctive occur in Toch. A.

²⁰The etymologically obscure Toch. B 3 sg. in -(*ä*)*m* was the replacement of PToch. *-(*ä*)*ṣ* < *-*ti*, which survives in Toch. A.

Pre-Toch. * h_1 lud^h-néu-ti ‘goes out’

abstr. II *lalñe*),²¹ would have supplied any corrective to the wrongly acquired **lanmu*. The result, I suggest, was the actual establishment of *lanmu* in place of **laññu*, and the consequent synchronic reinterpretation of the paradigm *lanmu*, *lant*, *lam*, etc. as an aberrant class I subjunctive.

A notable Toch. B form is the hapax causative *lantäsk-* (3 pl. *läntäskem-me*), which has been seen as providing evidence for an underlying root form *länt-* in Toch. B.²² This conclusion is unwarranted. Since no causative of this root is attested in Toch. A, we cannot know how far back the history of B *lantäsk-* extends. The causative of the parallel **-n(é)u-* present B *si-n-* ‘sate oneself’ (< **sh₂i-n(é)u-*) is *sinäsk-* (< **sh₂i-nu-ske/o-*; Hackstein apud Mahlzahl 946), secondarily distinguished by accent (cf. 3 sg. *sinäṣṣäm*) from the non-causative present *sinäsk-*. It would be reasonable to suppose, therefore, that the causative corresponding to pre-Toch. **lat-na-* (< **h₁lud^h-n(é)u-*), if a causative existed at this stage, would have been pre-Toch. **lat-na-sk-* (< **h₁lud^h-nu-ske/o-*), likewise segmentally identical with the normal present. The phonological treatment of this sequence, with initial accent, would have been B **lanmäsk-* (= **lännmäsk-*)—which is not, of course, correct. The actual form *lantäsk-* presupposes a “morphological” development, possibly in two steps: 1) restoration of phonologically regular pre-Toch. B **lännäsk-* to **lätnäsk-* to differentiate the causative segmentally from the non-causative present,²³ and 2) sporadic metathesis of **lätnäsk-* to **läntäsk-* (i.e., *lantäsk-*), as arguably also seen in B *känta-* beside *kätna-* ‘strew’. Alternatively, the steps could have been combined into one: pre-Toch. B speakers could simply have remade **lännäsk-* to **läntäsk-* by adding what was felt to be a needed *-t-* in the position where it was phonotactically most felicitous, i.e., after the *-n(n)-*. Other variations are possible on the same theme.²⁴

The Toch. B causative provides a natural transition to the Toch. A forms. Some version of the extended “restoration + metathesis” scenario that explains *lantäsk-* in Toch. B evidently operated more widely in Toch. A. Here PToch. **lämm-* and **läññ-* were replaced by *länt-* (cf. pres. *läntsam*, etc.) and *läñc-* (cf. subj. *läñcam*, etc.) everywhere, probably again via restored sequences **lätnäsk-* and **läcñ-* (**lat’n’-*). No special assumptions—e.g., leveling from positions in the paradigm where the thematic vowel was **-e-*—are needed to explain the stable root-final palatalization of the subjunctive *läñc-*, which follows directly from the fact that the starting point was a class VII subjunctive, with palatalized **-ñ(a)-* throughout the active. The descriptive

²¹The only subjunctive-based non-finite form where the nasal appeared was the infinitive (*lantsi*), where the palatality distinction was likewise neutralized.

²²So, e.g., by Peyrot (2013:446), who rightly avoids positing a nasal-infixed root form **(h₁)lu-n-d^h-*, but (wrongly, in my opinion; cf. n. 16) assumes metathesized *länt-*, rather than *lämm-*, as the phonologically regular Toch. B output of underlying **lat-n-*.

²³For the restoration, compare B *katna-*, *ritana-* (§2, end) and A subj. VII *yāt-ñ-* ‘enable’ and *lyut-ñ-* ‘remove’, all with the dental stop reinserted.

²⁴Yet another option would be to start from an archaic deradical causative **latask-* (i.e., **h₁lud^h- + *-ske/o-*) and assume that this was analogically “nunated,” i.e., provided with an *-n-* in the position where, like the *-t-* in the scenario just detailed, it was most felicitous.

Jay H. Jasanoff

fact that the dental and the nasal are historically in the wrong order in Toch. A is clearer than the exact mechanism by which they assumed this order. In principle, the development of restored **-tn-* and **-cñ-* to Toch. A *-nt-* and *-ñc-* could have been a Neogrammarian sound change; forms like 3 sg. *kotnaṣ* ‘cleaves’ or *mām̃tne* ‘as’, with their strong morpheme boundary, can hardly be taken as serious counterexamples.²⁵ On the other hand, morphological metathesis of **-C-n-* to **-n-C-* in nasal presents, as in Lat. *pandō* ‘spread’ < **padnō* < **patnō* beside Osc. *patensíns* ‘panderent’, or OS *gífrang* ‘asked’ beside *gífragn*, pres. *-fregnan*, is also a well-attested process; such a development would have been possible here as well.²⁶

4 Epilogue

If the above account is correct, the nasal forms of the root “*lä-n-t-*,” which have been variously thought to contain a nasal infix, a nasal suffix, or both at the same time, fall into place as more or less normal continuants of the PIE present type in **-n(é)u-*. The case of this verb nicely illustrates the special challenges and rewards of treating Tocharian with the seriousness it deserves. For most of the twentieth century, Tocharian was too inaccessible, too poorly understood phonologically, and too much in the shadow of Hittite to pull its weight as an archaic branch of Indo-European in its own right. It was only in the sixties that a trickle of discoveries began to change the picture, and only in the seventies and eighties, with the generation of Adams, Hilmarsson, K. T. Schmidt, and, importantly, Georges-Jean Pinault, that the trickle became a stream. So rapid has progress been in recent years that—as hopefully illustrated by the present study—there is hardly a nominal or verbal category of Tocharian, however straightforward it may have seemed ten or twenty years ago, that cannot benefit from re-examination today.

Abbreviations

LIV = Kümmel, Martin, and Helmut Rix. 2001. *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben: Die Wurzeln und ihre Primärstambildungen*. 2nd ed. Wiesbaden: Reichert.

References

Fellner, Hannes A. 2013. “Studies in Tocharian adjective formation.” Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University.

²⁵Not to mention the reconstituted subjunctives with *-t-ñ-* (cf. n. 23).

²⁶And there is yet one further possibility. If we wanted to avoid having to assume two completely independent metathesis operations, one in Toch. B (*lantäsk-*) and the other in Toch. A (*länt-/läñc-*), we could project the creation of the causative **lantäsk-* back into Proto-Tocharian and then invoke this causative as an analogical model for the refashioning of pres. **lan(n)as(k)-* to *läntäs-* (and, with it, subj. **läññ-* to *läñc-*) in Toch. A. I repeat, however, that there is no attested causative of this root in Toch. A.

Pre-Toch. *h₁lud^h-néu-ti ‘goes out’

- Hackstein, Olav. 1995. *Untersuchungen zu den sigmatischen Präsensstambildungen des Tocharischen*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Hilmansson, Jörundur. 1991. “The elements -*n̄*- and -*n̄n̄*- in Tocharian present and subjunctive classes.” *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 5:61–122.
- Jasanoff, Jay H. 2003. *Hittite and the Indo-European Verb*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . 2018. “The phonology of Tocharian B *okso* ‘ox’.” In *Farnab: Indo-Iranian and Indo-European Studies in Honor of Sasha Lubotsky*, 72–8. Ann Arbor: Beech Stave.
- Krause, Wolfgang. 1952. *Westtocharische Grammatik. I. Das Verbum*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Malzahn, Melanie. 2010. *The Tocharian Verbal System*. Leiden: Brill.
- Peters, Martin. 2006. “Zur morphologischen Einordnung von messapisch *klaohi*.” In Maria Teresa Laporta (ed.), *Studi di antichità linguistiche in memoria di Ciro Santoro*, 329–53. Bari: Cacucci.
- Peyrot, Michaël. 2008. *Variation and Change in Tocharian B*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- . 2013. *The Tocharian Subjunctive: A Study in Syntax and Verbal Stem Formation*. Leiden: Brill.
- Pinault, Georges-Jean. 1994. “Formes verbales nouvelles dans les manuscrits inédits du fonds Pelliot Koutchéen.” In Bernfried Schlerath (ed.), *Tocharisch: Akten der Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Berlin, September 1990*, 105–205. Reykjavík: Málvísindastofnun Háskóla Íslands.