



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

On the development of pie. Final syllables in Tocharian

Kortlandt, F.H.H.

Citation

Kortlandt, F. H. H. (1988). On the development of pie. Final syllables in Tocharian. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/1893>

Version: Not Applicable (or Unknown)

License: [Leiden University Non-exclusive license](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/1893>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

F. Kortlandt

ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF PIE. FINAL SYLLABLES
IN TOCHARIAN

The fate of PIE. final syllables in Tocharian has largely been clarified by Pedersen (1941, 1944) and Lane (1976). In the following I intend to discuss a few details against the background of Jörundur Hilmarsson's dissertation (1986).

As far as I see, there is little evidence for a difference between final and non-final syllables in the development of the Proto-Tocharian vowel system. I subscribe to the view summarized by Beekes (1985: 208), which is reproduced here with the slight modification that I write \bar{e} , \bar{a} , \bar{o} for his **eh**, **aH**, **oH**.

pre-Toch.	Proto-Toch.	West Toch.	East Toch.
e, i, u	ə	a/ä	ä
a, ə	a	ā/a	ā
o	e	e	a
\bar{e}/__CC	e	e	a
\bar{e}/__CU	a	ā/a	ā
\bar{a}/__CC	a	ā/a	ā
\bar{a}/__CU	o	o	a
\bar{o}/__CC	o	o	a
\bar{o}/__CU	u	u	u
iH/__C	ya	yā/ya	yā
iH/__U	(ə)i	(i)y	y
uH/__C	wa	wā/wa	wā

uH/ __U	(ə)w	(u)w	w
ei	(ə)i	i	i
ai	ai	ai	e
oi	ei	ey > ai	e
eu	(ə)u	u	u
au	au	au	o
ou	eu	ê _u > au	o

Examples of the long vowel developments: *uēntos "wind", A *want*, B *yente*, *mē "not", AB *mā*, *pāskō "tend", A *pās-*, B *pāsk-*, *bhrātēr "brother", A *pracar*, B *procer*, *uōstu "house", A *wašt*, B *ost* (Beekes apud Hilmarsson 1986: 11), see further below. Proto-Tocharian consonants: p, p', t, t', ts, ś, s, š, k, k', m, m', n, n', l, l', r, (r'), y, w, w', e.g. *p'āñś "five", A *pāñ*, B *piś*, *p'ək'əl "year", A *ṗ_ukāl*, B *pikul*, *sək' < Skt. *sukha-* "happiness", A *suk*, B *sakw*, *w'əśəye "night", A *wše*, B *yšiye*, *sport'w'otr "turns", A *sparcwatār*, B *sporttotār*, caus. *spartwəšš, A *spārtwāš*, B *šparttaššām*.

It appears that final *-m, *-n, *-s, *-t were lost at an early stage without leaving a trace, and that a preceding vowel developed in accordance with the rules given above (cf. Lane 1976: 151 on *-om). The thesis which I would like to defend here is that this loss of final single consonants was anterior to the proposed long vowel shift in open syllables, while final *-nt, *-nts had become *-n at the time of the shift. This final *-n was lost after long vowels at a later stage. Final *-ns was preserved in Proto-Tocharian and developed into A -s, B -ṛ. Eventually, final vowels were apocopated in East Tocharian.

The hypothesis that *-ns was preserved in Proto-Tocharian and yielded A -s, B -ṛ was rejected by Pedersen and Lane for different reasons. Pedersen called the derivation of A -s from *-ns "entschieden

unrichtig In einer Sprache, wo das **-s** der Endung **-nts** geschwunden ist [], kann das **-s** in der Gruppe **-ns** nicht geblieben sein (1941 81) Lane objected to the derivation of B **-ṃ** from ***-ns** je n y crois guere pour ma part, ceux des dialectes grecs qui, diversement, alterent ***-ns** le font tous aux depens de la même consonne, la nasale (1976 153) The latter objection had already been raised by Pedersen In der Gruppe **-ns** pflegt das **-s** der stärkere Laut zu sein, der sich auf Kosten des **-n-** behauptet (1941 77) but he did not regard it as decisive Trotz allen Bedenken wird man also den Obl Pl auf den ieur Akk Pl zurückführen (1941 78) I think that the typological argument cannot be maintained Sanskrit preserves a reflex of the final ***-s** in the length of acc pl **-ān** < ***-ons** but not in nom sg **-an** < ***-onts** Armenian preserves the final spirant unchanged in acc pl **-s** < ***-ns** but not after a vowel Old High German has a reflex **-ā** < ***-ōns** which is distinct from both **-a** < ***-ōn** and **-o** < ***-ōs** Since a comparison of the Tocharian languages points to the ending ***-ns**, I think that strong evidence is required for an eventual rejection of this reconstruction The early loss of final ***-s** after an obstruent in the Tocharian branch of Indo-European partly accounts for the rise of the root subjunctive corresponding to **s**-presents and **s**-preterites (cf Kortlandt 1984 181)¹ Thus I derive A **wal** gen **lānt** B **walo**, gen **lānte** king from Proto Tocharian ***walo** ***lante**, earlier ***wəlōn** ***wlante** from ***uelonts** ***ulantos** cf Old Irish **flaith** lordship < ***ulati-** of the root ***uelH-** The nom sg ending ***-ōn** of the **nt**-stems gave rise to doublets such as B obl sg **klyomom̄**, **klyomont** of **klyomo** noble

Turning now to the development of long vowels in final syllables we find the expected reflex of ***ē** in the palatalizing **ā**-preterite, e g A **klyoṣ**, B **klyauṣa** heard < ***klēusēt** The reflex of ***-ā** and ***-ām** is found in the flexion of the original **H₂**-stems which has preserved two types of apophonic alternation The two most common types of nouns with

accentual mobility in Indo-European are proterodynamic neuters, where the accent alternates between the root and the stem formative, and hysterodynamic masculines and feminines, where the accent alternates between the suffix and the case ending, e.g. Skt **dāru** wood, gen **drós**, Gk **πατήρ** father, gen **πατρός** (cf. Beekes 1985: 167-171). Pedersen already remarked that the accusative adopted the stem form of the weak cases in Tocharian (1944: 37), as it did in the plural in Sanskrit. Thus, we may expect that the ideal reflex of a proterodynamic H_2 -stem has full grade in the root, zero grade in the nom. sg. ending, full grade of the stem formative in the other case forms, and neuter plural endings (class II), and that the ideal reflex of a hysterodynamic H_2 -stem has zero grade in the root, full grade in the nom. sg. ending, zero grade of the stem formative in the other case forms, and no neuter plural endings (class VI). This is exactly what we find. The proterodynamic type is represented by B **šana** wife < ***śəna** < ***gʷenH₂**, obl **śano** < ***-ām**, gen **snoy** < ***-ās** plus ***-eis**, pl **śnona** < ***-ās** plus ***-nH₂**, A obl pl **śnās** < ***-āns**, and B **lāntsa** queen < ***wlantya** < ***-iH₂**, obl **-o**, gen **-oy**, pl **lantsona**, A nom pl **lāntsañ** < ***-on** < ***-ās** plus ***-nes**, also B **šarya** beloved, obl **-o**. The hysterodynamic type is represented by B **kantwo** tongue ***kəntwo** < ***dnghuā**, obl **kantwa** < ***-uH₂-m**, A nom pl **kantwāñ** < ***-uH₂-nes**, B perl pl **kantwamtsa** for ***kantwāntsa** < ***-uH₂ns** plus a secondary case ending which may be derived from PIE inst. ***-H₂**, and B **kātso** stomach < ***kuhtiā** (Hilmarsson 1986: 236), obl **-a**, nom pl **katsāñ** also **tāno** grain < ***dhH₂nā**, obl **-a**, nom pl **tanāñ** and **kāswo** rash, **māskwo** hindrance, **tsāro** monastery, all obl **-a**. The pronominal adjective A **ālak**, B **alyek**, **allek** other < ***alios** plus **-k**, nom pl A **ālyek**, B **alyaik** < ***alioi** plus **-k**, shows the reflex of the proterodynamic type in the feminine. A **ālyāk**, B **alyāk**, obl A **ālyakyām** (with **-a-** for **-a-**) B **alyok**, **allok**, pl A **ālkont**, B **alloñk**, **alloñkna**, pointing to Proto-Tocharian nom.

sg ***al'l'ak**, obl sg ***al'l'ok**, nom pl ***al'l'o(na)k** < ***aliH₂**, ***aliām**, ***aliās** ²

The phonetic reflex of final ***-ō** is found in B 1st sg **-u**, for which no alternative explanation is satisfactory. The same development is found in the past participle AB **-u** < ***-wu** < ***-uōs**, where A apocoped the vowel and vocalized the preceding semivowel while B preserved the vowel and lost the semivowel, and also in the monosyllables AB **ku** dog < ***kuō**, A **wu** two < ***duō**, and in A **oktuk** eighty, which reflects the original final vowel of **okat** eight < ***ek^wtu** < ***oktō**. The corresponding B word **okt** lost its final ***-u** on the analogy of the word for seven, which conversely adopted the labiovelar of the word for eight, cf. A **špat** < ***šəpt** < ***septm**, B **šukt** < ***šək^wt**. The medial vowel of A **oktats**, B **oktate** eightfold and A **āknats**, B **aknātsa** ignorant must be derived from a vocalized laryngeal, not from a full grade vowel ³. In the decades, A **šaptuk** seventy adopted the suffix of **oktuk** while the converse development is found in B **šuktañka**, **oktañka** ⁴. The phonetic reflex of ***ō** in a closed syllable is found in the AB verbal nouns in **-or** < ***-uōr** and in the B obl sg and nom pl forms in **-oš**, **-ont**, **-oñc**, which must be derived from ***-uōsm**, ***-uōses**, ***-uōntm**, ***-uōntes**, with early loss of the final ***-ə** which arose from these endings. The **o**-grade was preserved in B **-weš** < ***-uoses** and the **e**-grade in A **-unt** < ***-uentm** cf. obl sg B **šaumom** man < ***-ōnm** but A **šomaṃ** < ***-enm**. I also assume ***ō** in B **po** all < ***pōn** < ***pōnts** < ***peH₂onts** nom pl masc **poñc** < ***pōntes** fem **ponta** ***pōnta** where the circumflex of Gk **πῶς**, **πῶν** points to a contraction in the masc and neuter nom sg forms ⁵. It follows from the position taken here that A **ytār**, B **ytārye** road cannot be derived from I E ***H₁tōr** (Hilmarsson 1986: 44) which has little to commend itself anyhow. We must rather start from a zero grade suffix ***-tr** and assume analogical introduction of the vowel from A **ysār**, B **yasar** blood <

***yasar**, where it represents a vocalized laryngeal, cf Hittite **ešhar**. The same analogy is found in A **wmār** 'jewel', cf B **wamer** < ***wamer**. The word AB **kos** 'how much' may be derived from ***k^wō-su**, certainly not from ***k^wō-suō(s)** (Hilmarsson 1986: 46), which should yield AB **-u**, as in the past participle.

The original nom. sg. ending of the **n**-stems ***-ō(n)** is preserved in the word for 'dog', AB **ku**, where it cannot be analogical. The usual ending B **-o** must ultimately be derived from ***-ōnts** (with analogical lengthened grade), which may have yielded ***-ōn** at an early stage in the development of Proto-Tocharian. It was evidently introduced into the flexion of the **n**-stems at a time when the final ***-n** was still preserved, cf. the converse substitution in Gk **φῆρων** carrying. Thus, it shows the expected reflex of ***ō** in a closed syllable. When the final ***-n** was lost, the ending merged with the reflex of ***-eh₂**. In spite of Hilmarsson's efforts to prove the contrary, I still think that obl. sg. A **koṃ**, B **kweṃ** 'dog' represent Proto-Tocharian ***kwen** < ***kwonm**, like A **por**, B **pūwar** 'fire' < ***pwar** < ***puhr** (cf. Winter 1965: 192)⁶. The preservation of **-w-** in A **štwar**, B **štwer** 'four' < ***šätwer** < ***k^wetuores** is probably due to the intervocalic position of the cluster. If A **kaṃ**, B **kene** 'melody' is correctly derived from ***ghuonos** (Hilmarsson 1986: 158) the ***-w-** must have been lost at an early stage.

A **sas**, B **še** 'one' point to Proto-Tocharian ***šens** < ***sēms**, with A **s-** for ***š-** assimilated to **-s**, and with analogical elimination of B ***-ṃ** which was preserved in the feminine A **saṃ**, B **sana** < ***səna** < ***sm** (neuter?) plus ***-h₂**. The nom. sg. ending **-e** represents ***-ēn**, where the final nasal must have been restored at a time which was anterior to the long vowel shift in open syllables, cf. the contrast between Latin **liēn** 'spleen' and

homō 'man I find no evidence for original **ē**-stems in Tocharian

Frederik Kortlandt

Cobetstraat 24

NL-2313 KC Leiden, Holland

Footnotes

1 Final ***-s** was regularly lost in ***seks**, A **šak** 'six', but analogically restored in B **škas**, evidently on the basis of the ordinal ***seksos**, A **škašt**, B **škaste**

2 Hilmansson's view that the theory outlined here makes the **o**-vocalism of A ***šom** 'continent' and ***mok** 'greatness' incomprehensible (1986: 350) must be based on a misunderstanding. Even if his derivation of these asterisked words from ***šcono** < ***stjānā** and ***moko** < ***mākā** is correct, their failure to delabialize in East Tocharian is a dialectal problem which should not affect the reconstruction of the Proto-Tocharian forms. Moreover, Hilmansson's difficulties fitting B **karyor**, A **kuryar** 'commerce' < ***k^waryor** into his system because the finals B **-or** and A **-ar** seem irreconcilable (1986: 16) are a consequence of his unwillingness to adopt the position taken here. His assumption of three different types of Proto-Tocharian ***ō** in posttonic syllables is not warranted.

3 The vocalized laryngeal is also found in Skt **asīti-** 'eighty' and probably in Gk **ἔγδο(φ)ος** 'eighth' (Kortlandt 1983: 99, 103). This obviously does not imply a direct derivational connection between A **oktats** and Skt **asīti-** (Hilmansson 1986: 349). It simply means that we have to start from zero grade before the suffix.

4 Hilmansson points out correctly that the **-u** of ***oktō** was preserved in dialectal times whereas the final nasal of ***septm** was apocoped in pre-dialectal times already (1986: 159). This does not affect the

reconstructed analogical developments in any significant way, however

5 For the possibility of deriving Gk $\pi\alpha\tilde{\alpha}\zeta$ from $*peH_2onts$ with restored $*H_2$ see Kortlandt 1980 The flexion type must evidently be compared with Skt $bh\acute{a}ran$ < $*-onts, bh\acute{a}rat-$ bearing, whereas Gk $\iota\sigma\tau\alpha\tilde{\alpha}\zeta$ setting < $*-stH_2ents$ seems to agree with Skt $du\ddot{v}i\acute{s}an$ < $*-ents, du\ddot{v}i\acute{s}at-$ hating The root of Toch B po and Gk $\pi\alpha\tilde{\alpha}\zeta$ was apparently ousted in the other Indo-European languages because of its homonymy with $*peH_2-$ protect This is no reason to question the Indo-European origin of the word, cf Gk $\lambda\alpha\tilde{\alpha}\alpha\zeta$ stone, which is doubtless Indo-European (Beekes 1985: 15-17) though it has no obvious cognates in other languages Hilmarsson's derivation of B po from $*H_2p\acute{o}nts$ (1986: 214) is impossible because there is no prothetic vowel in Greek

6 I agree with Schindler (1967: 243) that Winter's derivation of A por and B $p\acute{u}war$ from different nominatives is ein Weg, den man bei so nahe verwandten Sprachen nach M\oglichkeit vermeiden sollte We have to start from PIE $*peH_2ur$, gen $*pH_2uens$ later $*pH_2unos$ > $*puH_2nos$, then pre-Toch $*puHr$ > $*pwar$ There is no evidence for a collective in $*-\acute{o}r$ in Tocharian

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 \acute{o} -vocalism Diss Leiden
Reykjavik

Kortlandt, F

1980 $H_2\acute{o}$ and $\acute{o}H_2$ Lingua Posnaniensis 23 p 127-128

- 1983 Greek numerals and PIE glottalic consonants Munchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft 42, p 97-104
- 1984 Old Irish subjunctives and futures and their Proto-Indo-European origins Ériu 35, p 179-187
- Lane, G S
- 1976 Notes sur le sort des syllabes finales ie en tocharien Bulletin de la Societe de Linguistique de Paris 71/1, p 133-164
- Pedersen, H
- 1941 Tocharisch vom Gesichtspunkt der indoeuropaischen Sprachvergleichung København
- 1944 Zur tocharischen Sprachgeschichte København
- Schindler, J
- 1967 Tocharische Miscellen Indogermanische Forschungen 72, p 239-249
- Winter, W
- 1965 Tocharian evidence Evidence for laryngeals, p 190-211 The Hague