

[Intended for the workshop "The Typology of Contact-Induced Changes in Morphosyntax"]

## Non-finite verb forms in Tocharian and Uralic

Tocharian shows a number of anomalous features when compared to the other Indo-European languages, both in terms of phonology and morphology. It has repeatedly been proposed that such features may be due to influence from other languages with which the ancestor of Tocharian was in contact. In particular, influence from early Uralic has often been suggested (e.g. Krause 1951, Schmidt 1990, Bednarczuk 2015, Peyrot 2019).

In this presentation, I will discuss the syntactic behaviour of Tocharian system of non-finite verb forms (participles, gerunds, an infinitive, and a privative), and compare these to the non-finites found in the Uralic languages. The system of non-finites in Tocharian is different from what is reconstructed for its ancestor, Proto-Indo-European, and from what is found in the Indo-European languages of Europe. Rather than having a distinction between active and passive participle formations for transitive verbs, Tocharian exhibits both meanings in the same formation (e.g. both Tocharian A and B *yāmu* 'having done' (act.) or 'having been done' (pass.); Krause & Thomas 1960: 185). An active or passive interpretation depends on the context. This type of participle is known from many other languages, and can be described with the term "contextually oriented" (Haspelmath 1994).

Building on the hypothesis that the ancestor of Tocharian was in contact with, and influenced by an early Uralic language, I explore a connection with the participles found in the Samoyed branch of Uralic. Contextually oriented participles are known from Uralic languages, especially those found in the eastern side of the language family, like Samoyed (Shagal 2018). Furthermore, from among the Uralic languages, Samoyed is geographically closest to Tocharian, and contact with this branch in particular has been proposed by Peyrot (2019). I will compare the systems of non-finite formations in Tocharian and Samoyed in order to figure out whether the Tocharian system may have come about due to influence from early Samoyed. Since Shagal (2018) pointed out that the types of participial systems found in Uralic languages are influenced by language contact, the comparison between Tocharian and Samoyed may shed further light on such areal effects on an Indo-European language.

Bednarczuk, Leszek. 2015. 'Non-Indo-European features of the Tocharian dialects'. In: Elżbieta Mańczak-Wohlfeld & Barbara Podolak (eds.), *Words and Dictionaries. A Festschrift for Professor Stanisław Stachowski on the occasion of his 85th birthday*. Kraków: Jagiellonian University Press, 55-67.

Haspelmath, Martin. 1994. 'Passive Participles across Languages'. In: Paul J. Hopper & Barbara A. Fox (eds.), *Voice: From and Function*, 151-177.

Krause, Wolfgang. 1951. 'Zur Frage nach dem nichtindogermanischen Substrat des Tocharischen'. *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 69, 185–203.

Krause, Wolfgang & Werner Thomas. 1960. *Tocharisches Elementarbuch. Band I: Grammatik*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter-Universitätsverlag.

- Peyrot, Michaël. 2019. 'The deviant typological profile of the Tocharian branch of Indo-European may be due to Uralic substrate influence'. *Indo-European Linguistics* 2019, 72-121.
- Schmidt, Karl Horst. 1990. . 'The Postulated Pre-Indo-European Substrates in Insular Celtic and Tocharian'. In: T.L. Markey & A.C. Greppin (eds.), *When Worlds Collide: the Indo-Europeans and the Pre-Indo-Europeans*. Ann Arbor: Karoma, 179–202.
- Shagal, Ksenia. 2018. 'Participial systems in Uralic languages: An overview'. *Journal of Estonian and Finno-Ugric Linguistics* 9 (1), 55-84.