The Tocharian B Accent

Jay Jasanoff Harvard University

The so-called "basic rule" of Tocharian B accentuation, which placed the word accent on the first syllable of disyllables and on the second syllable of polysyllables, is uncontroversial. This paper deals with exceptions to the basic rule — cases where polysyllables are irregularly accented on their first syllable.

These exceptions, as succinctly stated by Malzahn (2010: 6), fall into three groups:

- 1) class I and V subjunctives;
- 2) causative presents, subjunctives, and preterites; and
- 3) other forms in which a "full" (= non-high) vowel in the first syllable is or was followed by a Fremdvokal (= schwa) in the second.

Malzahn calls the accentuation principle in group 3 the " $p\bar{a}t\ddot{a}r$ (accentuation) rule," but offers no formulation of the rule in historical terms. According to the position taken here, the historical accentuation system of Tocharian B was preceded by a stage in which all words had initial accent. This was followed by a sound change that moved the accent one syllable to the right in words of more than two syllables, *except* in sequences of the form *- AC_0 -(A = "full" vowel). The result was the accentual difference seen in the declension of the past participles $y\bar{a}mu$ 'done' and ltu 'gone out':

```
masc. (< nt.) sg. y 	ilde{a} mu < *y 	ilde{a} m 	ilde{w} a vs. lt 	ilde{u} < *lat 	ilde{a} wa (< *-uwus) masc. nom. pl. u 	ilde{a} mos < *u 	ilde{u} masc vs. u 	ilde{u} wa < *u 	ilde{u} musc (< *-u 	ilde{u} mosc) fem. (< nt.) pl. u 	ilde{a} muwa < *u 	ilde{u} muwa vs. u 	ilde{u} musc < *u 	ilde{
```

The non-advancement of the accent in *- AC_0 - sequences will be called the " $y\bar{a}mu$ rule." I will try to show that the $y\bar{a}mu$ rule and its analogical aftereffects were responsible for the irregular initial accent of the subjunctive and causative.

Reference:

Malzahn, Melanie. 2010. The Tocharian Verbal System. Leiden/Boston: Brill.