

F Kortlandt

THE TOCHARIAN WORD FOR WOMAN

Consider the following paradigms

	A	B		A	B	
sg nom	śam	śana	wife	κ ₂ li	klyiye, klīye	woman
obl	śam	śano		κ ₂ le	klaiñ, klaim, klai	
pl nom	śnu	śnona		κ ₂ lewāñ	klaina	
obl	śnās	śnona		κ ₂ lewās	klaina	

I agree with K T Schmidt that the word for woman must be derived from the word for wife with dissimilation of the radical nasal to **-l-** before a suffixal nasal (1980: 410). For a similar dissimilation cf. Lith **glinda** ntr < ***gninda**. I disagree with Schmidt's view that the two words represent different stem forms of the same paradigm, to be compared with Arm **kin** < ***g^wena**, pl **kanay-** < ***g^wnai-**, Gr **γυνή**, gen **γυναικός**. These forms must probably be derived from an original proterodynamic neuter paradigm, PIE nom/acc ***g^wenH₂**, gen/abl ***g^wneH₂s**, dat/loc ***g^wneH₂i** (cf. Beekes 1985: 167). The Toch word for woman is rather a derivative of this root. For the derivation cf. Slovene **žéna** 'wife', **žénski** 'female (adj)', **žénska** 'woman', and the English noun **female**. Thus, we may look for an adjectival suffix which yields the proper output when added to the root ***g^wnH₂-**

It is clear that the suffix must have contained an ***n** for the dissimilation of the radical ***n** to take place. This is not the only requirement, however. Hilmarsson observes that B **klyiye** shows the main characteristics of Class VI.2: nom sg **-iye** and nom pl with **-ai-**. This fact might prompt one to assume that this word belonged to Class

VI,2 at an earlier stage and was later transferred to Class II,1 because of its meaning" (1986: 218, also 333). I think that this is quite correct, but one may wonder if it is compatible with his conclusion that **-iye-** is "an intruder in Class VI,2, it seems to be more at home in Class VI,1" because "**-iye** in its natural element (Class VI,1) had a palatalizing effect, but when transferred to a foreign flexional category (Class VI,2) **-iye** had no such effect" (1986: 229). Thus, we have to account for the palatalizing effect of **-iye** in the word for "woman".

Hilmarsson has convincingly argued that the ending **-(i)yē** must be derived from ***-(i)yēn** (1986: 231-236). The problem with the word for "woman" is that there is no obvious reason for the loss of the root-final laryngeal of ***g^wnH₂-** before this ending. On the one hand, ***H₂** is not lost before ***i**, cf. especially A **sne**, B **snai** "without" < PIE. ***snH₂i**, Latin **sine**. On the other hand, ***H₂** colors a following ***e** to ***a**, so that palatalization cannot take place. Thus, we must look for a suffix before which ***H₂** is lost. The only possibility I can think of is ***-H₂en-**, ***-H₂n-** (cf. Beekes 1985: 53), which fits perfectly. Assuming that ***H₂** was lost before ***H₁**, I arrive at the following reconstruction:

stage I	stage II	stage III	stage IV
*g^wnH₂-H₁ēn	*k^wH₁ēn	*k^wlye	klyiye
*g^wnH₂-H₁n-	*k^wH₁n-	*k^wlan-	klain-

For the substitution of **-iye**, **-ain-** for ***-e**, ***-an-** I refer to Hilmarsson (l.c.) and for the vocalization of ***H₁** as **-a-** to Klingenschmitt (1975: 161-162).

Frederik Kortlandt

Cobetstraat 24

NL-2313 KC Leiden, Holland

References

Beekes, R. S. P.

- 1985 The origins of the Indo-European nominal inflection.
Innsbruck.

Hilmarsson, J.

- 1986 Studies in Tocharian phonology, morphology and etymology,
with special emphasis on the **o**-vocalism. Diss. Leiden.
Reykjavik.

Klingenschmitt, G.

- 1975 Tocharisch und Urindogermanisch. Flexion und Wortbildung, p.
148-163. Wiesbaden.

Schmidt, K. T.

- 1980 Zu Stand und Aufgaben der etymologischen Forschung auf dem
Gebiete des Tocharischen. Lautgeschichte und Etymologie, p.
394-411. Wiesbaden.