

# Tocharian periphrastic *yām-* constructions revisited

## A Tocharian *cvi*-construction?

Laura Grestenberger  
Austrian Academy of Sciences  
laura.grestenberger@oeaw.ac.at

Iris Kamil  
University of Edinburgh  
iris.kamil@ed.ac.uk

34. Deutscher Orientalistentag (DOT), Sept. 12–17, 2022, Freie Universität Berlin  
Workshop “Tocharian language and Buddhist literature of the Tarim basin”

## 1 Introduction

- Tocharian periphrastic *yām*-constructions consist of a light verb AB *yām-* ‘do’ + a verbal noun, adjective or adverb
- They can be transitive (+ obl. or other case obj.) or intransitive
- They are sometimes used to translate Sanskrit *aya*-verbs, but are not restricted to this use and are notably never used to translate *causatives* in *-aya-* (“What does not seem to be attested is the rendering of a true Skt. *aya*-causative by a collocation of a noun with AB *yām-* ‘do’, even though such collocations of AB *yām-* and the obliquus of an abstract noun are especially often used in order to render noncausative Skt. *aya*-forms”, Malzahn 2010:63).
- Their synchronic distribution (/function) and origin is unclear

The goal of this contribution is to discuss the place of this construction in the Tocharian verbal system. We argue that

- The *yām*-construction is used to form periphrastic unergatives (verbs with agent/actor subjects) and factitives, specifically
  1. Periphrastic factitives to (adverbialized) adjectives, e.g., B *ārkwī yām-* ‘make white’, *pākri yām-* ‘make clear’, *māka yām-* ‘multiply, augment’, etc., some of which alternate with periphrastic inchoative constructions with *māsk-* ‘become’ and *nes-* ‘be’
  2. Periphrastic unergatives (mostly to roots without a synchronic verbal paradigm), e.g., B *āklyi yām-* (A *āklye yām-*) ‘practice, study’, A *tuñk yām-* ‘love’, B *keś yām-* ‘count’, etc.
  3. Periphrastic constructions in which the verbal noun is a Sanskrit loanword, e.g., *anumodit yām-* ‘give approbation to’, *cotit yām-* ‘accuse’, etc., which functionally overlap with class 2).
- It thus fills the functional “gap” created by the lack of synchronically productive *synthetic* denominal/deadjectival verb formation (Adams 2013:530)
  - Specifically the lack of productivity of the inherited *\*<sub>i</sub>e/o*-verbalizer in this function.
  - ... though a few of the constructions in classes 1) and 2) compete with synthetic denominal verbs of class XII (or with other types of periphrastic constructions).
- Function 1 is moreover functionally equivalent to periphrastic constructions with predicatively used nominal case forms or adverbs in other IE languages, such as the notorious “*cvi*-construction” in Sanskrit or the Latin *arefaciō/facit are*-type.
  - ... but is it also *formally* equivalent...? Stay tuned!

## 2 Background

### 2.1 Meunier’s classification

Meunier (2013) distinguishes between predicative *yām*-constructions with a morphologically invariable substantive, adjective, or adverb and non-predicative constructions in which the substantive or adjective is in the oblique and thus the expected direct object of *yām*-; (1).

- (1) Meunier (2013): Predicative vs. non-predicate *yām*-constructions
  - a. Predicative (“locution prédicative”):  
[*yām*- + predicate] + DO<sub>OBL</sub>.
  - b. Non-predicative (“locution non prédicative”):  
[*yām*- + DO<sub>OBL</sub>.]
- (1-b) includes constructions in which a non-oblique noun is dependent on the DO (as in its use outside of the periphrastic construction) - this is Meunier’s main criterion for classifying a construction as non-predicative.
- (1-a) consists of constructions in which the predicate is an *invariant* substantive, adjective, or adverb — its form doesn’t change under passivization, whereas it alternates between nominative and oblique in the non-predicative construction.
  - The usefulness of this criterion is undercut by the fact that *all* of the nouns used in the “non-predicative” constructions have identical nominative and oblique forms.
- We mostly follow Meunier’s distinction w.r.t. the status of the DO, but focus on the synchronic function of these constructions within the Tocharian verbal system that has not yet received much discussion.

Unambiguous examples of (1-a)<sup>1</sup>:

- (2) a. TB, THT 308 a2:  
mā l(āre) **yamītār** yolaiṃ waṣamoṃ  
not love.OBL do.3SG.OPT.MID bad.OBL friend.OBL  
“one should not love a bad friend” (= Uv. XXV.3a *na bhajet pāpakaṃ mitraṃ*, Meunier 2013:140)
- b. TA, A 153 (THT 786) b3:  
wram pättāñkāt kāṣṣi **eše** **yāmtsāt**  
thing.OBL buddha-lord.NOM teacher.NOM knowledge do.3SG.PRET.MID  
“le Buddha-seigneur, le maître, prit connaissance de l’affaire.” (Meunier 2013:148)

Unambiguous example of (1-b):

- (3) TB, IOL Toch 2 b2:  
**yolo** **yamaṣān** no añmatse śle=lyeñkāt  
evil.OBL do.3SG.PRES.ACT but self.GEN with=other.GEN.PL  
“he commits evil for himself and for others” (Peyrot 2007)

Problems:

- The distinction between the two constructions isn’t always so clear-cut — an alternative way of analyzing the distinction is as transitive vs. intransitive periphrastic constructions (as in Adams 1999:491; Adams 2013:530)
- It’s unclear whether these are two related constructions (in which one is older than the other) or arose independently. Meunier hints at the latter possibility and speculates that the predicative type could be inherited, but without giving arguments.

---

<sup>1</sup>All Tocharian examples & translations are from CEToM unless otherwise indicated.

## 2.2 Denominal/deadjectival verb formation in IE and Tocharian

- *\*-ie/o*-verbalizer: productive denominal verb-forming suffix in (Anatolian?), IIr. & Greek; extensions (such as *\*-āie/o*- etc.) in Italic, Celtic ... but not in Tocharian (but see (5))
- (4)
- a. Ved. *vasnayāti* ‘haggle, negotiate’ (*vasná-* ‘price’), *mantráyate* ‘say mantras’ (*mantra-*), *mṛgáyate* ‘hunt’ (*mṛgá-* ‘wild animal; deer’), etc.
  - b. Greek οἰκέω ‘dwell, inhabit’ (οἶκος ‘house, home’), νικάω ‘be victorious’ (νίκη, -η ‘victory’), στεφανόω ‘crown’ (στεφάνος ‘crown’), etc.
  - c. Lat. (mostly *\*-āie/o*): *frumentor* ‘fetch corn’ (*frumentum* ‘corn’), *arbitror* ‘observe, witness’ (*arbitr* ‘witness’), *cūrō* ‘take care of’ (*cūra* ‘care’), etc.
- No reflexes of the “*newahhi*-type” (Jasanoff 2003, Rau 2009) in Tocharian
  - The only 1) synthetic, 2) synchronic way of forming denominal verbs in Tocharian is via the class XII suffix *-ññā-* < *\*-n(h₂)-ie/o-*, with limited productivity, (5).
- (5) Denominal *-ññā*-verbs in Tocharian (Malzahn 2010:477–9)<sup>2</sup>:
- a. *āñm-ññ-* ‘wish’ (*āñme* ‘wish’)
  - b. <sup>A</sup>*arṣas-ññ-* ‘fit (of clothes)’ (*\*arās* ‘shape?’)
  - c. *kāwā-ññ-* ‘desire’ (*kāwo* ‘desire’)
  - d. <sup>A</sup>*kāṣ-ññ-* ‘scold’ (*\*kās-* ‘black(ness)’? Cf. B *kāswō* ‘skin inflammation’, Hackstein 2003:84)
  - e. <sup>A</sup>*klop-ññ-* ‘express sorrow’ (*klop* ‘sorrow’)
  - f. *kwipe-ññ-* ‘be ashamed’ (*kwipe* ‘shame’)
  - g. *tāñkw-ññ-* / <sup>A</sup>*tuñk-ññ-* ‘love’ (B *tāñkwe*, A *tuñk* ‘love’)
  - h. *ykāmṣ-ññ-* ‘feel disgust’ (*\*ykāmṣe* ‘repulsion, aversion’)
  - i. *lāre-ññ-* ‘love’ (*lāre* ‘dear’; ‘love’)
  - j. *wīnā-ññ-* / <sup>A</sup>*wīn-ññ-* ‘enjoy’ (*wīna* ‘pleasure’)
  - k. <sup>A</sup>*śew-ññ-* ‘yawn’ (*\*śewān-*?)
  - l. *skw-ññ-* ‘be happy’ (*sakw* ‘pleasure, happiness’)
  - m. <sup>A</sup>*sukas-ññ-* ‘be happy’ (? base unattested, but similar to l.)
  - n. *sklok-ññ-* ‘despair’ (*sklok* ‘doubt’)
  - o. *tsere-ññ-* ‘deceive’ (*\*tserek(w)* ‘deception’, pl. *tserekwa*)

- Note that the synthetic verbs in (5) are mostly psychological state/“experiencer” verbs

→ Periphrastic *yām*-constructions are used instead as a type of “DO-support” to form prototypically unergative verbs (mostly activity and accomplishment verbs) from substantives.

- Periphrastic unergatives are a typologically common strategy, (6).

- (6) Periphrastic unergatives in Basque, Tanoan & Persian (Hale and Keyser 1998, 2002; Folli et al. 2005)

a. Basque			b. Tanoan		c. Persian		
<i>lo</i>	<i>egin</i>	‘sleep’	<i>se-’a</i>	‘speak’	<i>raghs</i>	<i>kardan</i>	‘dance’
sleep	do		speech-do		dance	doing	
<i>barre</i>	<i>egin</i>	‘laugh’	<i>sae-’a</i>	‘work’	<i>gerye</i>	<i>kardan</i>	‘cry’
laugh	do		work-do		cry	doing	

As for the classes of synthetic deadjectival verbs, it has long been noted that Tocharian class III & IV verbs mostly denote “state[s], or more commonly the process of entering a state” (Jasanoff 1975:102; also Jasanoff 2003, 2004). While the connection to change-of-state-verbs in general is well-established, it is less easy to find class III/IV presents (or any kind of synthetic present, for that matter) to primary, **Caland-associated** property-concept adjectives.

<sup>2</sup>And maybe also *ārc(-āññ-)* ‘should, ought to’, *cele-ññ-* ‘appear’, <sup>A</sup>*krās-* ‘vex’, <sup>A</sup>*slañk-ññ-* ‘?’.

- (7) Inherited Caland-adjectives with associated primary verb stems in Tocharian (Fellner 2016, Pinault 2021:124)

Adjective		verb		class	root
B <i>swāre</i> , A <i>swār</i>	‘sweet’	A <i>swārāštār</i>	‘enjoy’	VIII	* <i>ṣueh<sub>1</sub>d</i>
B <i>asāre</i> , A <i>āsar</i>	‘dry’	B <i>osotār</i> , A <i>asatār</i>	‘be dry’	IV	* <i>h<sub>2</sub>eh<sub>1</sub>s</i>
B <i>pārkare</i> , A <i>pārkār</i>	‘long’	A <i>pārkatār</i>	‘arise’	III	* <i>b<sup>h</sup>erġ<sup>h</sup></i>
B <i>lāre</i>	‘dear, lovable’	B <i>lare-ññ-</i> (hapax)	‘love’	XII	* <i>leh<sub>2</sub>d</i> (?)

- ... but the direction of derivation is extremely murky: A *swārāštār* is a deadjectival verb morphologically (semantically?), while B *asāre*, A *āsar* look like \*-*ro*-adjectives to the verbal root AB *ās<sup>(ā)</sup>*- (see Pinault loc.cit. for more examples of verbal root-derived \*-*ro*-adjective).
- Clearly none of the verbal strategies in (7) were productive in forming deadjectival factitive/inchoative alternation verbs — so how were such verbs formed *synchronically* in Tocharian? → **periphrastic *yām*-/*māsk*-/*nes*-constructions!**

### 3 Types of *yām*-constructions

#### 3.1 Periphrastic unergatives

Total of *yām*-constructions in TB: 47, in TA: 26

- Periphrastic unergatives are the largest group of attested *yām*-constructions, consisting of a noun with nom/obl-syncretism + voice-invariant form of *yām*- (= finite forms are either only active or nonactive/middle).
- I.e., DO<sub>aux</sub> + direct object — formally similar to Skt. type *saphalaṃ kṛ* ‘fulfill a promise’, *kathāṃ kṛ* ‘tell a story’, *mithunāṃ kṛ* ‘pair, mate’, etc. (Balles 2006:50ff.)
- Most of these nouns are also attested outside of the periphrastic construction

- (8) Tocharian B periphrastic unergatives

Form	Meaning	Base		Noun case	Case on obj	Voice of aux.
<i>āke yām-</i>	‘end, put an end to’	<i>āke</i>	‘end’	nom=obl	gen	act
<i>ākli yām-</i>	‘study, train’	<i>akalye</i>	‘study, learning’	obl	loc, com	mid
<i>ekita yām-</i>	‘help’	<i>ekita</i>	‘help’	obl	all, loc	act
<i>kartse yām-</i>	‘do good’	<i>kartse</i>	‘good, welfare’	nom=obl	gen	act
<i>karyor pito yām-</i>	‘do commerce, trade’	<i>karyor</i> ; <i>pito</i>	‘buying’; ‘price, cost’	nom=obl	/	mid
<i>keś yām-</i>	‘count’	<i>keś</i>	‘count, number’	nom=obl	obl	mid
<i>lāre yām-</i>	‘love’	<i>lāre</i>	‘dearness, love’	nom=obl	obl	mid
<i>pāke yām-</i>	‘take part in’	<i>pāke</i>	‘part’	nom=obl	obl; gen	act/mid
<i>paucčiṃ yām-</i>	‘renounce, separate from’	<i>paucčiṃ</i>	‘separation’	nom=obl	abl	mid
<i>pkante yām-</i>	‘obstruct’	<i>pkante</i>	‘obstacle’	nom=obl	gen, all	act
<i>pruccamñe yām-</i>	‘procure an advantage’	<i>pruccamñe</i>	‘advantage’	nom=obl	gen-dat	
<i>putkalñe yām-</i>	‘renounce, separate from’	<i>putkalñe</i>	‘separation’	nom=obl	abl	
<i>saim yām-</i>	‘take refuge in’	<i>saim</i>	‘refuge’	nom=obl	obl	mid
<i>spaktāṃ yām-</i>	‘perform a service (for)’	<i>spaktāṃ</i>	‘service’	nom=obl	gen-dat	act

<i>telki yām-</i>	‘sacrifice’	<i>telki</i>	‘sacrifice’	nom=obl	/	act
<i>waste yām-</i>	‘take refuge in’	<i>waste</i>	‘refuge’	nom=obl	obl	
<i>yarke yām-</i>	‘honor’	<i>yarke</i>	‘honor’	nom=obl	gen	act
<i>yarpo yām-</i>	‘do a good deed’	<i>yarpo</i>	‘good deed’	nom=obl	/	mid
<i>yolo yām-</i>	‘do/commit evil’	<i>yolo</i>	‘bad, evil’	nom=obl	gen	act (?mid)

(9) Tocharian A periphrastic unergatives

Form	Meaning	Base		Noun case	Case on obj	Voice of aux.
<i>āke yām-</i>	‘end, put an end to’	<i>āk</i>	‘end’	nom=obl	gen	
<i>āklye yām-</i>	‘study, train’	<i>āklye</i>	‘study, learning’	nom=obl	loc, com	mid
<i>kāsu yām-</i>	‘do good’	<i>kāsu</i>	‘good (deed)’	nom=obl	gen	act
<i>omāskeṃ yām-</i>	‘do/commit evil’	<i>omāskeṃ</i>	‘evil’	nom=obl	gen	act
<i>pñi yām-</i>	‘do a good deed’	<i>pñi</i>	‘good deed’	?	/	mid
<i>pruccamñe yām-</i>	‘procure an advantage’	<i>pruccamñe</i>	‘advantage’	nom=obl	gen-dat	mid
<i>sem yām-</i>	‘take refuge in’	<i>sem</i>	‘refuge’	nom=obl	obl	mid
<i>spaktām yām-</i>	‘perform a service (for)’	<i>spaktām</i>	‘service’	nom=obl	gen-dat	act
<i>tuñk yām-</i>	‘love’	<i>tuñk</i>	‘love’	nom=obl	loc	mid
<i>umpar yām-</i>	‘do/commit evil’	<i>umpar</i>	‘evil’	nom=obl	/	act
<i>yärk yām-</i>	‘honor’	<i>yärk</i>	‘honor’	nom=obl;	gen	act
				perl (1x)		

(10) ... and a few that are probably better analyzed as psychological state/experiencer verbs:

Form	Meaning	Base		Noun case	Case on obj	Voice of aux.
AB <i>onmiṃ yām-</i>	‘repent, feel remorse’	<i>onmiṃ</i>	‘remorse’	nom=obl	/	mid
B <i>wīna yām-</i>	‘find pleasure in’	<i>wīna</i>	‘pleasure’	nom=obl	loc	mid
B <i>yirṣalñe yām-</i>	‘show deference’	<i>yirṣalñe</i>	‘deference’	nom=obl	all	mid
B <i>swāralñe yām-</i>	‘enjoy, take pleasure in’	<i>swāralñe</i>	‘pleasure’	nom=obl	/	mid

- Voice alternations such as active—passive are expressed by changing the auxiliary rather than the inflection (act–mid) of *yām-*: *māsk-* ‘be(come)’; B *nes-*, A *nas-* ‘be’ (and less frequently also *kālp-* ‘obtain’, A *yap-* ‘do’ and a couple of others)
- The inflection of the *yām-* auxiliary varies (act. vs. mid.). Meunier remains agnostic as to any sort of functional differentiation; Schmidt (1974:419ff.) argues that the middle forms fall under “subject-affected”/“subject-oriented” uses (“Das Subjekt vollzieht die Verbalhandlung für sich”).
- There’s a slight tendency for constructions with an oblique DO to take middle endings, while those with a genitive (or all, loc...) object take active endings — but needs to be confirmed by further work.

(11) Examples:

- a. TA, YQ II.7 a5, act; gen:

klyomānt metrākyāp **yärk** **ypēñc**  
noble.OBL Maitreya.GEN honor.OBL do.3PL.PRES.ACT

“They honor/pay homage to the noble Maitreya”

- b. TA, A 18 (THT 651) a1, mid; itr:

ptāñkāt **kāṣṣi** **tri** **asaṃkhes kānt** **kalpsaṃ** **āklye** **yāmṣāt**  
buddha.NOM master.NOM three.OBL A.OBL hundred kalpa.OBL practice do.3SG.PRET.MID

“the Buddha, the master, has practised over three Asaṃkhyeyas and a hundred kalpas”

### 3.2 Calques/“tocharianizations”

- Mostly translate Buddhist technical terms into Tocharian — synthetic verbs like the abovementioned *-aya*-verbs, but not exclusively.
- While there is a functional/typological parallel to Sanskrit periphrastic constructions (with *kṛ-* ‘do’), the Tocharian *yām*-construction as such cannot be reduced to a calque
- Among other arguments, this is shown by B *saim* A *sem yām-* (*not i-*!) ‘take refuge’, which translates Skt. *śaraṇan gam-*.

(12) Periphrastic *yām-* as Tocharianizations of Skt. terms

Toch. AB	Meaning	Sanskrit		case on obj	voice of aux
B <i>adhiṣṭhīt yām-</i> A <i>anumodīt yām-</i>	‘hold, possess’ ‘approve’	<i>adhiṣṭhīta-</i> <i>anumodayati;</i> <i>anumodita-</i>	‘possession, control’ ‘approved, permit- ted’	obl obl	mid act
B <i>appamāt/ A</i> <i>appārmāt yām-</i>	‘neglect, mock’	<i>avajananti;</i> Skt. <i>alpa-</i> <i>matra-</i> , Pkt. <i>appamāta-</i>	‘little/unimportant thing’	obl	mid
B <i>cotit yām-</i>	‘accuse’	<i>codayati;</i> <i>codita-</i>	‘accusation’	obl(?)	act
B <i>deśit yām-</i>	‘confess’	<i>deśita-</i>	‘confession’	/	mid
B <i>kṣānti yām-</i>	‘pardon’	<i>kṣānti-</i>	‘pardon’	obl	act
B <i>nermit yām-</i>	‘create, form (by magic)’	<i>nirminoti;</i> <i>nirmita-</i>	‘created (by magic)’	obl	(ptcp)
B <i>sarit/ A</i> <i>sārit</i> <i>yām-</i>	‘memorize’	<i>smarayati;</i> * <i>sarita-</i> (Skt. <i>smarita-</i> , Pkt. <i>sārita-</i> )	‘learned, memorized’	obl	act
B <i>samanit yām-</i>	‘assemble, summon’	<i>samānīta-</i>	‘assembly’	/	(PP)
B <i>śrīgupti yām-</i>	‘take refuge in’	<i>śrīgupti-</i>	‘refuge’	loc	(PP)
B <i>wasampāt/ A</i> <i>wasāmpāt yām-</i>	‘ordain (a monk)’	<i>upasaṃpadā-</i>	‘ordination’	gen	act

### 3.3 Periphrastic factitives

- Factitive-inchoative alternation verbs to adjectives or adjective-derived adverbs

(13) Toch. B (*yām-/*)*māsk-/nes*-constructions with predicative adjectives

Form	Meaning	Base		Case
<i>astāre yām-</i>	‘be made pure’ <sup>3</sup>	<i>astāre</i>	‘pure’	nom
<i>col(yi) nes-</i>	‘become wild’	<i>col</i>	‘wild, savage’	nom(.pl.)
<i>lakutse nes-</i>	‘be(come) bright, shining’	<i>lakutse</i>	‘shining, bright’	nom
<i>orotstse nes-</i>	‘become big, grow up’	<i>orotstse</i>	‘big, great’	nom
<i>swāre nes-</i>	‘be sweet’	<i>swāre</i>	‘sweet’	nom
<i>tapre nes-</i>	‘be(come) high’	<i>tapre</i>	‘high’	nom
<i>ārkwī yām-/māsk-</i>	‘make/become white’	<i>ārkwī</i>	‘white’	nom=obl?
<i>krošce nes-</i>	‘be(come) cold’	<i>krošce</i>	‘cold’	nom

- For the factitive version, these adjectives apparently needed to either

1. be substantivized, so that the predicate could be used as a substantive in the oblique (cf. *kartse*, *lāre*, *yolo* in section 3.1)
2. be turned into an adverb, cf. (15).

<sup>3</sup>THT 549 b5 *maim palsko astare yamašülle* “thought [and] mind [are] to be made pure”.

But there is one odd exception: *ārkwī yām-* in (14), which seems to use the nominative (?oblique) of the adjective *ārkwī*. We’ll get back to this.

(14) W 11 a5 (also W 8 b2?):

se laiko ārkwi yamaṣāṃ  
this unguent white make.3SG.PRES.ACT

“cet onguent rend blanc” (Filliozat 1948); “this as a rinse makes white” (Broomhead 1962)

- A second group consists of an indeclinable “adverbial” form + *yām-*
- Some of these are morphologically related to adjectives and/or classified as indeclinable adjectives on CEToM & by Meunier.

(15) Toch. B, predicative *yām-*constructions with adverbials/indeclinable adjectives

Form	Meaning	Base		Voice of aux.
<i>apākārtse yām-</i>	‘make visible, manifest’	<i>apākārtse</i>	‘visible, manifest’	(PP)
<i>erkatte yām-/mäsk-</i>	‘mistreat/be mistreated’	<i>erkatte</i>	‘hostile’	mid
<i>pākri yām-/mäsk-/nes-</i>	‘make/be(come) clear, obvious’	<i>pākri</i>	‘clear’	act
<i>aīśai yām-/mäsk-</i>	‘notice, pay attention to/appear’	<i>aīśai</i>	‘aware’	mid
<i>ārwer yām-/nes-</i>	‘get ready, prepare/be ready’	<i>ārwer</i>	‘ready’	mid
<i>ate yām-</i>	‘distance, get rid of’	<i>ate</i>	‘away, far’	act
<i>epīyac yām-</i>	‘make remember, remind’	<i>epīyac</i>	‘in mind’	mid
<i>māka yām-</i>	‘multiply, augment’	<i>māka</i>	‘many, much’	act/mid
<i>yneś yām-/mäsk-/nes-</i>	‘make/be(come) true, real’	<i>yneś</i>	‘real, true’	mid

(16) Toch. A, predicative *yām-*constructions with adverbials/indeclinable adjectives

Form	Meaning	Base		Voice of aux.
<i>pākār yām-/mäsk-</i>	‘make/become clear, obvious; show’	<i>pākār</i>	‘clear’	act
<i>pākraśi yām-</i>	‘make visible, manifest’	<i>pākraśi</i>	‘visible, manifest’	mid
<i>ārwar yām-/nas-</i>	‘get ready, prepare/be(come) ready’	<i>ārwar</i>	‘ready’	PP
<i>eśe yām-</i>	‘notice, pay attention to’	<i>eśe</i>	‘aware’	mid
<i>opyāc nas-</i>	‘remember’	<i>opyāc</i>	‘in mind’	
<i>paṃ yām-/yap-/mäsk-</i>	‘take care of/be occupied with’	<i>paṃ</i>	‘with effort (?)’	mid
<i>yneś yām-</i>	‘make true, real’	<i>yneś</i>	‘real, true’	mid

- All except B *apākārtse yām-* and A *pākraśi yām-*, *ārwar yām-* are transitive with obl. objects (*ārwar yām-* takes an infinitival complement).
- Functionally, these are similar to the Sanskrit *cvi*-construction, which makes (among other uses) factitives and inchoatives from adjectives in (post-Vedic) Sanskrit (Balles 2006, 2009): deadjectival predicate in  $-\bar{i} + kṛ-$  ‘make, do’/  $bhū-$  ‘become’ (univerbated in Classical Skt.), (17).

(17) a. *krūrī kṛ-* ‘wound’ (< \*‘make bloody’): *krūrā-* ‘bloody’  
 b. *tivrī kṛ-* ‘make sharp; bitter, intense’: *tivrā-* ‘sharp, bitter, intense’  
 c. *śitīkṛ-* ‘cool, make cold’, *śitībhū-* ‘become cold’: *śīta-* ‘cold’

While the (de)adjectival predicates in (15)–(16) are not as morphologically uniform as the *cvi*-construction, they do share in common the adverbial/predicative use of an erstwhile case form (cf. Balles 2006, 2009 on predicatively used instrumentals):

- **B *pākri*, A *pākār***: adverbial/fossilized case forms of B *pākri*, A *pākār* ‘visible, evident’ < *\*paġ-ró-* (Ved. *pajrá-* ‘firm, fixed’) or < *\*(s)pōk-ró-* ‘visible’ (vel sim.; *\*spek-* ‘see, notice’, AB *pāk-* ‘intend’; Adams 2013:390). The first is semantically unconvincing, the second requires a R(*ō*) grade that is difficult to motivate. Either way, if this is an old *\*-ro-*adj., B *pākri* and A *pākār* could reflect adverbially used accusatives, while B *pākri* could be an old dat. in *\*-ōi* or loc. in *\*-oi* according to Adams (2013:389).
- ... but **B *pākri*** could conceivably also be a fossilized instrumental form in *\*-ih<sub>1</sub>*, with “*i*-substitution” (originally substantivization) of *\*-o-* by *\*-i-* (Schindler 1980; Nussbaum 1999, 2014; Balles 2006; Grestenberger 2017) + instr.sg. *\*-h<sub>1</sub>* — on “predicative instrumentals” cf. Balles 2006 and recently Fortson 2020.
- **Phonology**: Either *\*-r-ih<sub>1</sub>#* > PT *\*-ryə* > B *\*-r’ə* > B *-ri*; > A *\*-r’ə* > *-r* OR *\*-r-ih<sub>1</sub>#* > PT *\*-r-əy#* > B *-ri*, A *-ri*, Jasanoff, p.c. — cf. 3sg.aor.opt. TB *parśi* (*pārk-* ‘ask’) < *\*prék-ih<sub>1</sub>-t*; B *keni* (A *kanweṃ*) < *\*ġonu-ih<sub>1</sub>* ‘knees’; B *pwāri* < *\*p(u)wōr-ih<sub>1</sub>* ‘fires’.
  - In the latter case, the attested TA form (*pākār*) would presumably continue the oblique stem.
  - B *apākārtse* < *\*e(n)-pākār-* + *-tstse* (Adams 2013:17) — if the adverbial use reflects the old accusative/oblique, it has escaped the analogical palatalization in *-cce* that is usual for this type (Fellner 2013:93f.).
  - A *pākraśi*: cf. Pinault 2008:501 on the origin of the adverbial marker A *-śi* (B *-śe*) from (genitival/appurtenance) *\*-k(i)yo-*.
- **B *aiśai*, A *eśe***: only attested in the *yām-/māsk-* constructions. Adams (2013:112) posits an old action noun PToch. *\*āiśai* to *aik-* ‘know’, but without specifying the stem formation — *\*Heik-ōi-*?
  - If this was a verbal abstract of the type B *yoko*, obl. *yokai* ‘thirst’, an oblique in B *-ai*, A *-e* would be synchronically expected (so also Pinault 2008:343; on the prehistory of obl. *-ai* cf. also Pinault 2008:482ff.; Peyrot 2012; Jasanoff 2018).
  - That this was an oblique is also suggested by one passage in which we find a predicatively used perlativative B *aiśaisa* construed with *māsk-*, (18).
- **B *ārwer*, A *ārwar***: Adams (2013:57) suggests an old pret.ptcp. from *\*h<sub>2</sub>er-* ‘fit together’ from with a nominal *\*(o)r-* stem was derived; presumably something like PT *\*aru-ær-*. An adjective derived from this stem is attested in B *arwāre* (< *\*arwōro-*, Adams loc.cit.). The adverb could be based on the oblique or an endingless locative (note *\*-or*, not *\*-ōr*; cf. also Pinault 2011:164).
- **B *ate*** < PT *\*āté* (*\*āté*) < PIE *\*h<sub>2</sub>etō* or *\*h<sub>2</sub>etos* according to Adams (2013:10), cf. Lith. *ato-* ‘back, away’, Ved. *átaḥ* ‘from there’.
- **B *epiyac*, A *opyāc***: Loaned from Middle Iranian *\*abiyāta-* or *\*abiyāti-* ‘memory’ (cp. Pahlavi *aβyāt*; Adams 2013:95), originally the oblique of a noun - so probably belongs to the periphrastic unergatives in section 3.1.
- **B *māka*** (A *māk*) < *\*mākā* < *\*mækā* < *\*mēgh<sub>2</sub>* (with *a*-umlaut, Pinault 2008:430; less likely *\*moġh<sub>2</sub>*, Adams 2013:479f.).
- **A *paṃ***: unclear adverbial form that may be related to Gk. *πόνοσ* ‘work, toil’ (Barnes apud Meunier 2013:137 fn. 18)
- **AB *ynes***: < *\*yān-æśü* ‘in the eyes’ < *\*(h<sub>1</sub>)en-* + *æśü* du. ‘eyes’ < *\*h<sub>3</sub>ok<sup>h</sup>-ih<sub>1</sub>* (Pinault 2008:142, Adams 2013:560), NB requires *\*-ih<sub>1</sub>* > *\*-yü*.

(18) B, PK AS 12 J b2–3:

tāne amāc	aiśai	māskētār	lāc	kañcuki	• tāne lāntsa
then minister.NOM	aware	become.3SG.PRES.MID	go.3SG.PRET	chamberlain	then queen
<b>aiśai-sa</b>	<b>māske(tār)</b>				
aware-PERL	become.3SG.PRES.MID				

“alors le ministre apparaît. Le chambellan sortit; alors la reine apparaît” (Meunier 2013:148)

A final note on B *ārkwī* ‘white’: This is usually analyzed as nom/obl and related to *\*h<sub>2</sub>arǵ-* ‘white; swift’ (Ved. *rjrá-* ‘swift’; Gk. ἀργυ-), cf. recently Pinault 2021 (*\*-u-i-(o)n-*), Malzahn (2022) (*\*-u-ēn*).

- ... but the use as adverbial-like *predicative* use in W 11 (and with *māsk-*, but this is less significant) could suggest that this, too, was originally an old (de-)instrumental adverbial in *-ih<sub>1</sub>*.
- Once the form had become opaque, it was reanalyzed as nom/obl (in analogy to other such forms in *yām-/māsk-* constructions) and eventually remodeled with a morphologically transparent *n*-stem extension.

## 4 Conclusion

- The Tocharian *yām-* construction productively builds denominal unergatives and deadjectival factitives to (borrowed or inherited) substantives/verbal nouns and adjectives/adverbs.
- It is the formal (in a broad sense, without cognacy) equivalent of periphrastic constructions with predicative nouns/adverbs in other IE languages such as Latin and Sanskrit (*cvi-* construction)
- It is the functional equivalent of synthetic denominal and deadjectival unergatives and factitives formed with the *\*ie/o-* verbalizer in IIr., Greek, Latin, etc.
- There are some forms that suggest that the formal equivalence with the Sanskrit *cvi-* construction also extends to cognacy, with the *-i* of certain adverbial forms reflecting an instrumental in *\*-ih<sub>1</sub>* (B *pākri*, maybe B *ārkwī*), but this needs to be confirmed by future work.

## References

- Adams, Douglas Q. 1999. *A Dictionary of Tocharian B*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Adams, Douglas Q. 2013. *A Dictionary of Tocharian B, Revised and Greatly Enlarged*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2 edition.
- Balles, Irene. 2006. *Die altindische Cvi-Konstruktion. Form, Funktion, Ursprung*. Bremen: Hempen.
- Balles, Irene. 2009. The Old Indic *cvi* construction, the Caland system, and the PIE adjective. In *Internal Reconstruction in Indo-European. Methods, Results and Problems*, ed. J.E. Rasmussen and Th. Olander. Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum.
- Broomhead, J.W. 1962. A textual edition of the British Hoernle, Stein and Weber Kuchean manuscripts. With transliteration, translation, grammatical commentary and vocabulary. Doctoral Dissertation, Trinity College, Cambridge.
- CEToM = Malzahn, Melanie, and Hannes A. Fellner et al. 2011–. A comprehensive edition of Tocharian manuscripts. <http://www.univie.ac.at/tocharian/>.
- Fellner, Hannes A. 2013. Studies in Tocharian adjective formation. Doctoral Dissertation, Harvard University.
- Fellner, Hannes A. 2016. Caland in sight in Tocharian. Paper presented at the 42. annual meeting of the Austrian Linguistics Society (ÖLT), Graz, Nov. 18–20, 2016, Workshop “Caland in Sicht”.
- Filliozat, Jean. 1948. *Fragments de textes koutchéens de médecine et de magie. Texte, parallèles sanskrits et tibétains, traduction et glossaire*. Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve.
- Folli, Raffaella, Heidi Harley, and Simin Karimi. 2005. Determinants of event type in Persian complex predicates. *Lingua* 115:1365–1401.
- Fortson, Benjamin W. IV. 2020. Towards an assessment of decasulative derivation in Indo-European. *Indo-European Linguistics* 8:46–109.
- Grestenberger, Laura. 2017. On “*i*-substantivizations” in Vedic compounds. In *Usque ad radices: Indo-European studies in honour of Birgit Anette Olsen*, ed. B. S. S. Hansen, A. Hyllested, A. R. Jørgensen, G. Kroonen J. H. Larsson, B. Nielsen Whitehead, Th. Olander, and T. M. Søborg, 193–206. Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum.
- Hackstein, Olav. 2003. Reflexivpronomina, Präverbien und lokalpartikel in indogermanischen Sprachen. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 10:69–95.
- Hale, Ken, and Samuel Jay Keyser. 2002. *Prolegomenon to a theory of argument structure*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Hale, Kenneth L., and Samuel J. Keyser. 1998. The basic elements of argument structure. *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 32:73–118.
- Jasanoff, Jay H. 1975. Class III presents in Tocharian. *Indo-European Studies* .

- Jasanoff, Jay H. 2003. *Hittite and the Indo-European verb*. Oxford University Press.
- Jasanoff, Jay H. 2004. “Stative” \*-ē- revisited. *Die Sprache* 43 (2002–03 [2004]):127–170.
- Jasanoff, Jay H. 2018. The phonology of Tocharian B *okso* ‘ox’. In *Farnah: Indo-Iranian and Indo-European studies in honor of Sasha Lubotsky*, ed. Lucien van Beek, Michiel de Vaan, Alwin Kloekhorst, Guus Kroonen, Michaël Peyrot, and Tijmen Pronk, 72–78. Ann Arbor: Beech Stave.
- Malzahn, Melanie. 2010. *The Tocharian verbal system*. Leiden: Brill.
- Malzahn, Melanie. 2022. Troublesome Tocharian color terms. Paper presented at the 41<sup>th</sup> East Coast Indo-European Conference, Harvard University, June 23–26, 2022.
- Meunier, Fanny. 2013. Typologie des locutions en *yām-* du tokharien. *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 14:123–185.
- Nussbaum, Alan J. 1999. \**Jocidus*: An account of the Latin adjectives in *-idus*. In *Compositiones Indogermanicae: In Memoriam Jochem Schindler*, ed. Heiner Eichner and Hans Christian Luschützky. Prague: Enigma.
- Nussbaum, Alan J. 2014. Feminine, abstract, collective, neuter plural: some remarks on each (expanded handout). In *Studies on the Collective and Feminine in Indo-European from a Diachronic and Typological Perspective*, ed. S. Neri and R. Schuhmann, 273–306.
- Peyrot, Michaël. 2007. An edition of the Tocharian fragments IOL Toch 1 – IOL Toch 822 in the India Office Library. URL [idp.bl.uk/database/oo\\_cat.a4d?shortref=Peyrot\\_2007](http://idp.bl.uk/database/oo_cat.a4d?shortref=Peyrot_2007).
- Peyrot, Michaël. 2012. The Tocharian A match of the Tocharian B obl.sg. *-ai*. *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 13:181–220.
- Pinault, Georges-Jean. 2008. *Chrétomathie tokharienne: Textes et grammaire*. 2 vols. Leuven/Paris: Peeters.
- Pinault, Georges-Jean. 2011. Let us now praise famous gems. *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 12:155–220.
- Pinault, Georges-Jean. 2021. Regard comparatif sur la dérivation nominale en tokharien. In *Dérivation nominale et innovations dans les langues indo-européennes anciennes. Actes du colloque international de l’université de Rouen (ÉRIAC), 11-12 octobre 2018*, ed. Alain Blanc and Isabelle Boehm, 113–132. Lyon: Maison de l’Orient et de la Méditerranée.
- Rau, Jeremy. 2009. Myc. *te-re-ja* and the athematic inflection of the Greek contract verbs. In *East and West. Papers in Indo-European Studies*, ed. K. Yoshida and B. Vine, 181–188. Bremen: Hempen.
- Schindler, Jochem. 1980. Zur Herkunft der altindischen *cvi*-Bildungen. In *Lautgeschichte und Etymologie. Akten der V. Fachtagung der indogermanischen Gesellschaft*, ed. M. Mayrhofer, M. Peters, and O. E. Pfeiffer, 386–393. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Schmidt, Klaus T. 1974. *Die Gebrauchsweisen des Mediums im Tocharischen*. Univ. Göttingen.