

ON THE REMAKING OF THE MIDDLE VOICE IN INDO-IRANIAN

The study of the origins and prehistory of the middle voice in the overall context of the verbal system(s) of Ancient Indo-European languages was in the focus of the attention of Indoeuropeanists from the very beginnings of their discipline. Professor Erhart's activity in this area culminated in his 1989 monograph *Das indoeuropäische Verbalsystem*, where he also makes a number of observations on later developments in individual branches of IE. The following lines limited to the Indo-Iranian family, are intended to highlight some of the salient aspects of the remaking of the middle voice by means of analytic morphology.

1. Synthetic and analytic formations of Middle Indo-Iranian dialects

Early MIA dialects – most notably Ardha-Māgadhī – continued and further developed the OIA synthetic mediopassive morphology by adopting the stem of the passive (in *-ya* or *-ijja*) as a base for innovative temporal and participial forms. The present, aorist and the future tense forms are shown in (1):

(1)

Ardha-Māgadhī	Present	Aorist	Future	Participle
Active	<i>kuvv-ai</i>	<i>kuvv-it(t)hā</i>	<i>kar-iss-ai</i>	<i>kar-anta</i>
Med/Passive	<i>kijj-ai</i> (<i>< kri-ya-te</i>)	<i>kijj-it(t)hā</i> (<i>< *kri-y-išta</i>)	<i>kijj-ih-ii</i> (<i>< *kri-y-iṣya-te</i>)	<i>kar-ijj-anta</i> (<i>< *kr-iya-māna</i>)

Also the OIA imperfective mediopassive participle in *-māna* (*kriyamāna*) was remodelled by means of the active suffix *-anta*; later on, in Apabhramśa, the form *kar-ijj-anta* was reduced to *k-ijj-anta*.

It should also be observed that the singular form of the active aorist displays the suffix of its mediopassive counterpart (*< *kurv-iṣ-ta*) while the plural form of the active aorist, *kar-īm-su*, developed apparently by metathesis from the active form of the sigmatic aorist **kar-iṣ-um > kar-īm-su*. The uniform suffix *-it(t)ha* in the singular is indicative of the transition from an earlier overlapping exponence to the agglutinative exponence for voice and aspect. Matters were different in the future where OIA relied only on the mediopassive suffix. In MIA the future was also built on the passive stem and the suffix marked exclusively the person and number; contrast the OIA form *lep-sy-a-se* „you will taint yourself“ with AMg *lipp-ih-i-si*.

Pāli discontinued the mediopassive morphology of the perfect, aorist and future. A number of relic forms appear in the present (*bharate* „carries for

himself“). As in AMg the OIA passive *kri-ya-te* is now inflected actively, *kar-iy-ati* (also *kayirati*) „is done“ (cf. also Buddhist Sanskrit *drśyatu* „be it regarded“, *vadhiṣyam* „I will be slain“, *vucyāmi* „I am told“ in Edgerton 1953:182). The passive in the preterite and the future tense is now formed analytically by combining the participles, the PP *kata* and the gerundive *kātabba*, respectively, with the copula. The preterite form of the copula, *ahū* (< *abhavat*), is usually omitted, and the construction consisting of the future tense of the copula and the gerundive, *kātabba bhavissati* „it will be done“ possesses also modal meaning „it should be done“. Pertinent examples are provided in (2) and (3):

- (2) *evaṃ me sutam* [Mayrhofer 1951:195]
 thus=me hear+PP
 „Thus it was heard by me“

The passive interpretation of (2) is more likely than the ergative interpretation „Thus I heard“. In early MIA the latter would be realized by the active preterite (< aorist) *evaṃ assosim* (cf. Sanskrit *evaṃ aśrauṣam*).

- (3) *na hantabbo*
 not kill+GERVE+NOM
 „He will not be killed“ ~ „He should not be killed“

The rapid decay of mediopassive synthetic forms was precipitated by the raising of mid vowels ($\bar{e} > e > i$, $\bar{o} > o > u$, cf. Bubenik 1996: 29–33). The elimination of the crucial phonological contrast between \bar{e} and i available in OIA resulted in the elimination of the morphological contrast between the middle and the active diathesis. Furthermore, even the contrast between the active and the synthetic passive was considerably weakened; given the identity of their suffixes this contrast continued to be carried solely by the shape of the passive stem. This could be identical with its active counterpart (e.g. *chijjati* meant both „it is split“ or „he splits“; but the latter could also be realized by *chindati*); or it could be differentiated only by the geminate (e.g. *labbhati* „it is taken“ vs. *labhati* „he takes“); or, in the case of the roots in nasals by the geminate palatal in the passive vs. the dental nasal in the active (e.g. *haññati* „he is killed“ vs. „he kills“). The situation was alleviated in the 3rd Pl by the adoption of the suffix of the perfect *-(a)re* limited to the mediopassive. All these forms are surveyed in (4):

- | | | | |
|---------|---------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------|
| (4) | | | |
| Pāli | 3 rd Sg | 3 rd Pl | |
| Active | <i>han-ati</i> [hanatɪ] | <i>hah-anti</i> [hanantɪ] | „they kill“ |
| Middle | <i>han-ate</i> [hanatɪ] | <i>han-ante</i> [hanantɪ] | „they kill for themselves“ |
| Passive | <i>haññ-ati</i> [haɲ:atɪ] | <i>haññ-ante</i> [haɲ:antɪ] | „they are killed“ |
| | | – <i>haññ-are</i> [haɲ:artɪ] | |

On the Iranian side the contrast between the active and the mediopassive forms was apparently more viable in that the stem-forming element *-ya* of the latter category became *-ye* in late Avestan:

(5)	Active	Indirect reflexive	Verbum sentiendi	Passive
	<i>barai-ti/ī</i>	<i>yazai-te/ē</i>	<i>man-ye-te</i>	<i>bar-ye-te</i> (spelled <i>bairiiete</i>)
	„carries“	„worships (for himself)“	„thinks“	„is carried“

The lengthening in the 2nd and 3rd Sg active suffixes (*-ehī*, *-aitī* vs. middle *-ehe*, *aite*) may be understood as an effort to keep these two categories from their phonological merging for the same reason as in Pāli above: *xšayehī* (active) „you reign“ vs. *xšayehe* (middle). Nevertheless, phonological erosion of the contrast between */ē/* and */i/* precipitated ultimately their complete merger. As a sign of these things happening, in Iranian — as in Indic — we find mediopassive forms spelled with active suffixes. For instance, the verb *man-* „think“, a medium tantum in Gātha-Avestan, appears with the active suffix in late Zoroastrian Liturgy:

(6)	<i>maniia</i>	<i>manaṇha</i>	<i>humatəm</i>	[Aog 25]
	think+IMP	mind+INSTR	good-thought	
	„do thou think good thought with thy mind“			

Other examples, such as *hištaiti* „stands“ (~ *hištaitē*, root *stā-*), *mairiīāti* „stands“ (vs. OIA *mriyate*), *yazəṇti* „they are worshipped“, were assembled by Kellens (1984:80–81).

Late MIA (Apabhraṃśa) replaced the active preterite *akāsi* (< OIA aorist *akārṣat*) by the ergative construction *tena kiyau*. The present passive is continued with further phonological development seen in *kar-iy-ati* > *kar-ijj-ai*, later > *kīr-ai* or *k-ijj-ai*. In the preterite the copula *āsi* (< OIA *āsīt*) continued to be used in conjunction with the PP; in the perfect and the future tense, however, the copula was replaced by the verb „to go“: *tena kiyau gayau* lit. done gone „[it] was done by him“ (vs. the ergative construction *tena kiyau* „he did [it]“). Examples with the auxiliary „to go“ in the future tense of the type *tena kiyau jā-is-ai* lit. done go+FUT+3SG „it will be done by him“ are rare. One of them, from Haribhadra’s *Sanatkumāracarita* (of the 12th c.) is presented in (7):

(7)	<i>kaha</i>	<i>maim</i>	<i>diṭṭhau</i>	<i>jāisai</i>	<i>ehu</i>	[Sc 631.8]
	how	I+INSTR	see+PP	go+FUT+3SG	this	
	„How will I be able to see this [city]?“					

The system of the synthetic passive of early MIA (Ardha-Māgadhī) and that of the analytic passive of late MIA (Apabhraṃśa) are contrasted in (8):

(8)

Ardha-Māgadhī	Present	Aorist	Future	Perfect
Synthetic	<i>k-ijj-ai</i>	<i>k-ijj-ithā</i>	<i>k-ijj-ih-ii</i>	
passive				
Apabhraṃśa				
Analytic	<i>kiyau (-> erg)</i>	<i>kiyau āsi</i>	<i>kiyau jāisai</i>	<i>kiyau gayau</i>
passive				

On the Iranian side, early Middle Persian possessed synthetic forms in the present/future *kun-īhēd/kir-ēd* „it is (being)/will be made“ and the imperfect *a-kir-īh* „it was made“ (cf. Brunner 1977:213). The latter form is actually documented only once (in the inscription of Šābuhr I at Ka^fba-yi Zardušt) and represents a residual imperfect form from Old Iranian (of the type **kir-ya-ta* cf. Sanskrit *kri-yá-te*, imperfect *á-kri-ya-ta*):

(9)

<i>u=m</i>	<i>akirīh</i>	<i>nām</i>	<i>kirdēr</i>	[KKZ 8]
and=my make+IMPF+3SG		name	Kirdēr	
„I was titled Kirdēr“ (lit. my name was being made K.) vs. perfective <i>u=m kard nām Kirdēr</i> „My title was made Kirdēr“.				

In later Middle Persian the analytic passive formations (in the present, perfect and pluperfect) became more and more common. Their synopsis, following Brunner (1977:213) and Sundermann (1989:152), is given in (10):

(10)

Early MP	Present/Future	Imperfect	Perfec	Pluperfect
(synthetic passive)	<i>kun-īhēd ~ kir-ēd</i>	<i>a-kir-īh</i>		
(analytic passive)			<i>paymōxt hēm</i> „I have been dressed“	<i>paymōxt būd</i> <i>hēm</i> „I had been dressed“
Late Middle Persian	<i>kard baw-ēd</i>		<i>kard ēstēd</i>	<i>kard būd/ēstād</i>
(analytic passive)	„it is (being)/will be made“		„it has been made“	„it had been made“

Unlike in Indic, the perfect in late MP was formed by the auxiliary *ēstādan* „stand, be“; the pluperfect may be expressed in two ways: by attaching the PP of *ēstādan* or that of the copula *būdan* „be“ to the PP of the main verb.

On the Indic side, with the employment of the auxiliary „to go“ in the system of voice, the copula was freed for the employment in the system of aspect and tense. Earlier forms of the copula, *atthi* „is“ (< OIA *asti*) and *āsi* „was“ (< OIA *āsīt*), were replaced by *acchai* (< OIA *ṛcchati* „arises“) and *thiui* (< OIA *sthita* „stood“), respectively. As in the other IE languages, the two grammatical aspects of Apabhraṃśa are built on the past and the present participle. The latter may also be replaced by the gerund in *-eppi* or *-eppiṇu*. As

shown in (11), in Apabhraṃśa texts these two aspect are found only in the present and the past tense:

(11)

Apabhraṃśa	Perfect PP + Copula	Progressive (aspect) Pres Part + Copula	Gerund + Copula
Present	<i>gayau acchai</i>	<i>karantu acchai</i>	<i>kareppi(ṇu) acchai</i>
Past	<i>gayau āsi ~ ṭhiu</i>	<i>karantu acchhu ~ ṭhiu</i>	<i>kareppi(ṇu) ṭhiu</i>

The combination of the PP plus the copula is actually inherited from OIA: *āgato 'smi* (~ *jagama*) „I have come“ (Ich bin gekommen) > MIA *āgato 'mhi*. In OIA with transitive verbs the PP was enlarged by the suffix *-vant*: *aham kṛtavant* (M) ~ *kṛtavatī* (F) „I have done“ (lit. I am the one who has done).

The progressive aspect in early MIA could be expressed by combining the present participle of the main verb with verbs such as *tiṣṭhati* „stands“ and *vicarati* „walks“ (of the type *karanto tiṣṭhati* „is making“); the habitual aspect by combing the absolutive of the main verb with the verb *vattati* „becomes“. These early ‘experiments’ were paradigmatised in Apabhraṃśa as sketched above; in addition to the copula *acchai* there are also examples with the auxiliary *thakkai* „stands“ (for examples cf. Bubenik 1998:104–111).

It is of interest to observe that also in late Medieval Sanskrit the auxiliary *sthā-* „stand“ became widely used for the expression of tense. For instance, in Jambhaladatta’s *Vetālapañcaviṃśatikā* (of the 14th c.) the whole paradigmatic set of analytic expressions exploiting all the possible forms of *sthā-* is available: *kurvans tiṣṭhati* „he is doing“, *kurvans sthāsyati* „he will be doing“, *kurvans atiṣṭhat* „he was doing“ (even with the auxiliary in the aorist and perfect !).

In Middle Persian after the loss of the synthetic middle voice morphology the main exponent of the ‘experiential’ meaning (cf. Andersen 1984) became the auxiliary *ēstādan* „to stand, be“. It corresponds to Indic *sthā-* which, however, was a temporal auxiliary; a functional counterpart in late MIA was the verb *jā-* „to go“ (< OIA *y-*). The following examples are taken from *Ardā Wirāz Nāmag* (ca. 8th c.) and *Kārnāmag ī Ardašīr* (very late MP):

(12)

<i>hu-rust</i>	<i>kū</i>	<i>pad</i>	<i>frārōnīh</i>	<i>rust</i>	<i>ēstād</i>	[AWN 9.1]	
well-grown	that	in	virtue	grow+PP	stand+PP		
„well grown that is she was grown in virtue“						(stative)	
<i>sāsān</i>	<i>az</i>	<i>tōxm=ē</i>	<i>Dārāy</i>	<i>zād</i>	<i>ēstēd</i>	[KAP 1.7]	
Sāsān	from	seed GEN	Dārā y	born	stands		
„Sāsān has been born from the lineage of Dārāy“						(change of state)	
<i>kē</i>	<i>tan</i>	<i>andar</i>	<i>dēg-ē</i>	<i>rōyēn</i>	<i>kard</i>	<i>ēstēd</i>	[AWN 38.15]
whose	body	in	pot=GEN	copper	do+PP	stand+3SG	
„whose body has been put in a copper pot“						(passive)	

The verb *ēstādan* „to stand“ functions also as an aspecto-temporal auxiliary; contrast between *šud ēstēnd* (present perfect) „they have gone“ and *šud (hēnd)* (preterite) „they went“.

2. Analytic realization of the middle voice in New Indo-Iranian languages

At the end of the late MIA period we encounter earliest attempts to compensate for the eliminated category of the middle voice (*ātmanepada*) by analytic formations involving two lexical auxiliaries: *jānā* „to go“ with intransitive and transitive verbs and *lenā* „to take“ with transitive verbs. Given the identity of the middle and passive suffixes in OIA the choice of the former auxiliary for both the analytic middle and the passive is understandable. Thus the change of state, such as „he (has) died“, expressed by the middle voice aorist *amṛta* in Sanskrit, is realized by combining the PP *jāu* „gone“ (< OIA *jāta*) with the PP of the verb „to die“ in Apabhraṃśa:

(13)

<i>so</i>	<i>jāu</i>	<i>ji</i>	<i>muu</i>	[Pc 36.5.9]
he	go+PP	PRT	die+PP	

„He (has) died“

On the other hand, the PP *gau* „gone“, belonging to another OIA root (*gam*) would be used to express the passive voice as in (14):

(14)

<i>so</i>	<i>kālameha</i>	<i>vaṇe</i>	<i>diṭṭhu</i>	<i>gau</i>	[Pc 19.17.5]
that	Kālameha	forest+LOC	see+PP	go+PP	

„That Kālameha was seen in the forest“

At the end of this line of evolution, in Hindi, we witness the same verb *jānā*, whose PP is now the suppletive form *gayā*, functioning as both the auxiliary in the passive construction and a variety of constructions expressing most notably the completive events and changes of state; cf. examples in (15):

(15)

<i>vah</i>	<i>dekhā</i>	<i>gayā</i>	(passive)
he	see+PP	go+PP	

„He was seen“

<i>ham</i>	<i>stēśan</i>	<i>pahūnc</i>	<i>gae</i>	(completive event)
we	station	arrive	go+PP	

„We got to the station“

<i>vah</i>	<i>mar</i>	<i>gayā</i>	(change of state)
he	die	go+PP	

„He (has) died“

In (15), unlike in Apabhraṃśa in (13), the auxiliary *jānā* is combined with

the bare verbal root, not the PP. The same lexical auxiliary may be used to express a completive event; given its intransitive meaning, its choice precludes the use of the ergative construction:

(16)

laṛkā pūrā pannā paṛh gayā
 boy entire page read go+PP
 „The boy read through the entire page“

Another category of experiential meaning, such as the indirect reflexive, denoting an action done explicitly for one’s own purpose, is expressed by the auxiliary *lenā* „to take“; given its transitivity, the resulting construction is ergative:

(17)

laṛke=ne pūrā pannā paṛh liyā
 boy+OBL=ERG entire page read take+PP
 „The boy read the entire page (silently for himself)“

With the auxiliary *denā* „to give“ the meaning would be the reading „for someone else’s benefit“:

(18)

laṛke=ne pūrā pannā paṛh diyā
 boy+OBL=ERG entire page read give+PP
 „The boy read out the entire page (in the class)“

These two auxiliaries indicate opposite directions of the action are called appropriately ‘versive’ and ‘ablative’ by Chatterjee (1988). Another fitting minimal pair is provided by Hook (1979:64), reproduced in (19):

(19)

<i>vah</i>	<i>kar</i>	<i>lījiye</i>	cf. Czech	<i>u-dělejte=si</i>	<i>to</i>
it	do	take+IMP		PERF+do+IMP=REFL+DAT	it
„Do this (for yourself)“					
<i>vah</i>	<i>kar</i>	<i>dījiye</i>		<i>u-dělejte</i>	<i>to</i>
it	do	give+IMP		PERF+do+IMP	it
„Do this (for someone else)“					
				<i>„Do it“</i>	

The same contrast in Sanskrit would be expressed by the middle voice imperative *kuruṣva* vs. its active counterpart *kuru*; or, in Slavic languages with the morphological category of reflexive verbs, such as Czech, the same contrast would be realized by the reflexive pronoun in the dative *si* vs. its absence.

In Hindi the auxiliary *lenā* is used above all with ‘ingestive’ verbs (*khānā* „to eat“, *pīnā* „to drink“, etc.) representing physical experience par excellence;

in combination with abstract objects a number of alloemes of the basic physical experience can be distinguished. Nespital (1996:249) characterized *lenā* as indicating that the actor performs the action himself, or in his own benefit, or for his own pleasure (i.e. indirect reflexive) or that the actor is at the same the goal of the action (i.e. direct reflexive). In (1997:285) he listed seven alloemes of the compound auxiliary *khā lenā* „to take something as food“: *mār khā lenā* indicates that the actor „allows to be beaten“; in *ṃam khā lenā* the actor „swallows his grief willingly“ or „by restraining himself“; in *dhakke khā lenā* the actor „suffers indignities enduringly“. With verbs of mental experience, called traditionally *verba sentiendi* (such as *samajhnā* „to understand“, *sīkhnā* „to learn“, *pahcānnā* „to recognize“, etc.) the use equivocates between *jānā* and *lenā*. According to Hook (1979:65) the combination with *lenā* implies ‘some measure of conscious effort’ while that with *jānā* implies that ‘the mental event occurs as if of itself’. Examine the minimal pair in (20):

(20)

<i>maim=ne</i>	<i>pahcān</i>	<i>liyā</i>	<i>ki</i>	<i>vah</i>	<i>kaun</i>	<i>hai</i>	
I+ERG	recognize	take+PP	that	he	who	is	
„I figured out who he was“							
<i>maim</i>	<i>pahcān</i>		<i>gāi</i>	<i>ki</i>	<i>vah</i>	<i>kaun</i>	<i>hai</i>
I	recognize		go+PP/F	that	he	who	is
„I (Fem) realized who he was“							

In the same vein Nespital (1997:1121–2) distinguishes between *kisī kī bātem samajh jānā* „to understand someone’s words“ and *koī bāt samajh lenā* „to understand something due to one’s experience/prior knowledge“).

There is some evidence in our Apabhraṃśa texts that this analytic stage had already been reached by the end of the late MIA period. In addition to *le-* „take“ also *nī-* „take“ had a general reflexive sense heralding thus the NIA state of affairs. For instance, the Apabhraṃśa construction *ṃiu āliṅgeppīnu* in

(21)

<i>vijjulaṅgu</i>	<i>ṃiu</i>	<i>āliṅgeppīnu</i>	[Pc 25.4.9]
Vidyudāṅga	take+PP	embrace+GER	
„[The king] embraced Vidyudāṅga“			

achieves the same effect as its Sanskrit counterpart with the verb „to embrace“ in the middle voice:

(22) *rājā vidyudāṅgam āliṅgata*

In general terms, MIA by losing the mediopassive morphology of OIA did not lose the ability to express the whole range of alloemes of the basic experiential meaning associated with it. What had previously been expressed synthetically came to be realized analytically by means of lexical auxiliaries *jānā* „to go“ and *lenā* „to take“.

In Modern Persian (Farsi) an exponent of the mediopassive categories became the auxiliary *šodan* „to become“, whose original meaning was „to go“ (the Old Iranian root *šyav-* „start moving“, conjugated in the middle voice, is cognate with Sanskrit *cyáv-ate* „to move; vanish; fall, drop“ and Greek *σεύω* „to move; chase“). In Farsi the auxiliary *šodan* functions very much like Hindi *jānā* in the usual array of expressions of experiential meaning: inchoative, inactive (expressing non-controllable psychological and physiological states), reflexive and movements. Representative examples of inchoatives, psych verbs, reflexives and verbs of motion (cf. Shaki 1963: passim) are provided in (23); the first part of the compound is an adjective or a participle:

(23)

<i>motavallod šodan</i>	„to be born“	<i>xūb šodan</i>	„to heal (of wound)“
<i>esābī šodan</i>	„to become angry“	<i>moztareb šodan</i>	„to become agitated“
<i>rām šodan</i>	„to control oneself“	<i>mosallex šodan</i>	„to arm oneself“
<i>nazdīk šodan</i>	„to get near“	<i>dāxel šodan</i>	„to enter“

Mediopassive verbs may also be formed by compounding appropriate nouns with various auxiliaries: *tavallod yāftan* lit. birth+find „to be born“, *ta’ajjob kardan* lit. amazement+do „to be amazed“; cf. other examples in Lazard (1957: 287–292).

3. *Back to the synthetic middle voice in European Romani*

Lexical auxiliaries may end up as suffixes during the process of their grammaticalization which reduces their phonological material. This process may be observed on the mediopassive auxiliary *ov-el* „become“ (< OIA *bhav-ati*) which evolved into the suffix of mediopassive verbs in European Romani: *ker-d-j-ol* „he is born“ (lit. he is made) ~ „pretends“; *sikh-l-j-ol* „he studies“ (lit. he is educated). In contemporary Romani dialects the independent verb *ov-el* „become“ appears only in two dialectal areas (those spoken in South Balkan and in subdialects of Romungro, Burgenland and North Slovenia, cf. Boretzky 1995:10). In the dialect of the Romas of Wales, as described by Sampson (1926: 215), we find an intermediate state of affairs where the auxiliary *av-el* „go, become“ could appear not only after but also before participles as in (24):

(24)

<i>t’ā</i>	<i>kekār</i>	<i>na’vela</i>	<i>dik’šinō</i>	<i>papalē</i>
and	ever	not=become+3SG+FUT	seen	again

„and he will never be seen again“

Here the auxiliary is cliticized to the negative particle vs. Slovak Romani *dičh-ol-a* „will appear“, where the auxiliary was reduced to a suffix through the process of grammaticalization: **dikh-l=jov-el-a* > *dičhl’ovela* > *dičhola*.

The verb *ov-el* „become“ goes all the way back to OIA *bhav-ati* „becomes, is“. Romani is remarkable in preserving the consonant -v of the root (lost in Hindi, Gujarati, Sindhi but preserved in Panjabi, Rajasthani and Marwari). On the other hand, the IA languages preserved a reflex of the root-initial *bh-*, namely *h-*, which has been completely lost (and replaced by *j-*) in Romani:

(25)

OIA	Prakrits	Romani	Panjabi	Rajasthani
<i>bhav-āmi</i>	<i>hav-āmi</i>	<i>ov-av</i>	<i>hōv-ā</i>	<i>hv-eū</i>

Traces of the cliticization of the verb *bhav-āmi* to the PP for the purpose of forming the active preterite (paralleling the development of Nia Prakrits) are available in the area of East Hindi in both Medieval and Modern Awadhi dialects (cf. Saksena 1937/1971:248, 253, 260): *mare(h)ū* „I struck“ < *mārē=haū* < *mārē havāmi*. In Lakhimpurī dialect of Awadhi analytic constructions of the type *marā haū* possess the passive meaning „I have been struck“. The trajectory of Romani *mard'ovav* „I am (being) struck“ can be reconstructed along these lines: **māridō hovāmi* > *mardo hovam* > *mard(o)=hovav* > *mard=jovav* > *mard'=ovav* (the remaining problem is the ‘unlawful’ change *h* > *j* in Romani). Deriving mediopassives by the cliticizing of the verb *ov-el* „become“ is sans pareil in the context of Indic languages. In a sense Romani — as the only New Indo-Aryan language — went a full circle and restored the OIA dichotomy of *parasmaipada* and *ātmanepada* verbs.

On the Iranian side, Pashto also displays effects of the grammaticalization of the auxiliary *ke'dəl* „become“: *yāde'dəl* „to be remembered“ < *yād=ke'dəl*; *pohe'dəl* „to know“ < *poh=ke'dəl*. The same phonological process of the loss of the initial consonant is also observed in the formation of phrasal verbs with *ka'vəl* „to do“: *yāda'vəl* ‘remember’ < *yād=ka'vəl* (cf. Shafeev 1964:37). A typological parallel is available from Turkish where the verb *et-* „to do“ and its inchoative counterpart *ol-* „to become“ were cliticized to monosyllabic adjectives and nouns in verbal compounds such as *kayd=etmek* „to enrol“ and *kayd=ol(un)mak* „to be enrolled“; *kayb=etmek* „lose“ and *kayb=olmak* „disappear, be/get lost“ (cf. Lewis 1967:156).

ABBREVIATIONS OF PRIMARY LITERATURE

Aog	<i>Aogamadaēca</i>	(K. M. JamaspAsa, Wien: ÖAW, 1982)
AWN	<i>Ardā Wirāz Nāmag</i>	(F. Vahman, London: Curzon Press, 1986)
Bk	Dhaṇavāla's <i>Bhavisattakahā</i>	(H. Jacobi, München: BAW, 1918)
Jc	Puṣpadsanta's <i>Jasaharacariu</i>	(P. L. Vaidya, Karanja, Berar, 1931)
KAP	<i>Kārnāmag ī Ardašīr ī Pāpakān</i>	(E. K. Āntiā, Bombay, 1900)
KKZ	<i>Kirdēr Ka'fba-yi Zardušt</i> inscription	(M.-L. Chaumont, JA CCXLVIII (1960), 339–80).

Pc	Svayambhūdeva's <i>Paumacariu</i>	(H. C. Bhayani, Bombay, 1953–1960)
Sc	Haribhadra's <i>Sanatikumāracarita</i>	(L. Alsdorf, Hamburg: Friedrichsen, 1936)

REFERENCES

- Andersen, P. K., 1994: *Empirical Studies in Diathesis*. Münster.
- Boretzky, N., 1955: Die Entwicklung der Kopula im Romani. *Grazer Linguistische Studien* 43, pp. 1–50.
- Brunner, C. J., 1977: *A Syntax of Western Middle Iranian*. Demar (NY).
- Bubenik, V., 1996: *The Structure and Development of Middle Indo-Aryan Dialects*. Delhi.
- Bubenik, V., 1998: *A Historical Syntax of Late Middle Indo-Aryan (Apabhramśa)*. Philadelphia / Amsterdam.
- Chatterjee, R., 1988: *Aspect and Meaning in Slavic and Indic*. Philadelphia / Amsterdam.
- Edgerton, F., 1953: *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary*. New Haven.
- Erhart, A., 1989: *Das indoeuropäische Verbalsystem*. Brno.
- Kellens, J., 1984: *Le verbe avestique*. Wiesbaden.
- Lazard, G., 1957: *Grammatik du persan contemporaine*. Paris.
- Lewis, G. L., 1967: *Turkish Grammar*. Oxford.
- Mayrhofer, M., 1951: *Handbuch des Pāli*. Heidelberg.
- Nespital, H., 1996: Verbal aspect in Indo-Aryan and Dravidian languages. The relation of Simple verbs to verbal expressions („compound verbs“). *Berliner Indologische Studien* 9–10, pp. 247–258.
- Nespital, H., 1997: *Dictionary of Hindi Verbs*. Allahabad.
- Saksena, B., 1937/1971: *Evolution of Awadhi (A Branch of Hindi)*. Allahabad / Delhi.
- Sampson, J., 1926: *The Dialect of the Gypsies of Wales*. Oxford.
- Shafeev, D.A., 1964: *A Short Grammatical Outline of Pashto*. Bloomington.
- Shaki, M., 1963: *Moderní perská frazeologie a konverzace*. Praha.
- Sundermann, W., 1989: „Mittelpersisch“. In: R. Schmitt (ed.): *Compendium Linguarum Iranicarum*. Wiesbaden, pp. 138–164.

Vít Bubeník
 Memorial University of Newfoundland
 Elizabeth Ave.
 St John's
 Newfoundland
 Area Code 709
 CAN-737–8000