

The original paradigm of the Tocharian word for 'king'

ALEXANDER LUBOTSKY

§1. It was suggested long ago that the Tocharian terms for the Indian god Indra, viz. B *ylaiñäkte*, A *wlā(m)ñkät*, represent a compound 'king + god' (see, e.g., Sieg – Siegling – Schulze 1931: 230, Krause – Thomas 1960: 116, Thomas 1964: 144, van Windekens 1976: 554). This suggestion was based on the place of Indra in the Indian pantheon, on Tocharian expressions like A *ñäkcī wäl wlāñkät* 'the divine king Indra', *wlāññäktäṣṣ aci ñäk[c]i(ñi) lās* 'the divine kings with Indra at the top' (Sieg – Siegling – Schulze 1931: 230), and Indra's epitheta like B *ñäktemts saswe* 'the lord of the gods', *ñäktemts walo* 'the king of the gods' (Thomas 1969: 236, fn. 5).

On the other hand, it remained unclear whether the first member of this compound (B *ylai-*, A *wlām-*) reflects one Proto-Tocharian form and, if so, how this form fits in with the paradigm of the word for 'king' (nom.sg. B *walo*, A *wäl*, gen.sg. AB *lānt*).

§2. Let us first take a quick look at the other compounds in B *ñäkte*, A *ñkät*. They are fairly common in Tocharian, denoting both "indigenous" deities, cf. B *kau(m)ñäkte*, A *komñkät* 'Sun, Sun-god'; B *me(ñ)ñäkte*, A *ma(ñ)ñkät* 'Moon, Moon-god'; B *kemñäkte*, A *tkamñkät* 'Earth, Earth-goddess', and gods borrowed from India, cf. B *bramñäkte*, A *bram ñkät*, *pram ñkät*, gen. *pramñäktes* 'God Brahma'; B *kāmñäkte* 'God Kāma', B *mārñäkte*, A *mārñkät*, gen. *mārñäktes* 'God Māra'; B *pūdñäkte* (metrical form), *pañäkte*, A *ptāñkät* 'God Buddha', etc. In general, the complement *ñäkte* / *ñkät* is not obligatory, and the names of these deities can also appear without it. Only the first members of B *pūdñäkte* / *pañäkte*, A *ptāñkät* and B *ylaiñäkte*, A *wlā(m)ñkät* are not attested uncompounded (Thomas 1969: 235ff.).

It is essential that the compounding of sequences of a noun with B *ñäkte*, A *ñkät* is a relatively recent phenomenon. "It seems likely that for this configuration the status of a conjoined, not fused, sequence of lexemes was retained until a fairly late date" (Winter 1987: 309). This is indicated by the absence of a connecting vowel in these compounds and, less important, by disjunct spelling with a *virāma* (Winter *ibid.*). It is even not always certain that this sequence is a compound at all. As there is no connecting vowel and the first member normally coincides with the form of the nom.sg.,¹ only two criteria remain: (1) the first member is not

67

¹ The form of the first member, if attested independently, generally coincides with the form of the nominative singular. Only in B *me(ñ)ñäkte* 'Moon, Moon-god' the first member is not identical with the nom.sg. *meñē*. This may be due to haplology (**meñēñäkte* > *me(ñ)ñäkte*), but it is equally possible that *meñ* reflects the original

inflected, and (2) the accent falls on the first member, which results in the form B $\overset{\circ}{n}\tilde{ä}kte$. These criteria, however, are often still insufficient to decide (cf. Thomas 1969: 235, fn. 1).

As far as semantics is concerned, Tocharian compounds with $\overset{\circ}{n}\tilde{ä}kte$ / $\overset{\circ}{n}\tilde{kät}$ do not mean ‘the god of X’, but rather ‘the divine X, deified X’, cf. B *yäl $\tilde{n}\tilde{ä}kte$* ‘oh divine gazelle!’. This again points to the original apposition ‘X, the god’. The type remained productive in both languages, which can be illustrated by the independent formations for the Indian god Karman, viz. B *yāmor $\tilde{n}\tilde{ä}kte$* , A *lyalpyu $\tilde{n}\tilde{kät}$* ‘deed, karman + god’.

§3. An important step towards elucidation of the prehistory of B *ylai-*, A *wlām-* was made by Winter in his recent paper on Tocharian B *näkte*, A *nkät* (Winter 1987: 304ff). He pointed to some examples of correspondence B *-ai* ~ A *-ān* and convincingly argued for a phonetic rule PT $*-an\# > B -ai\#$. This rule allows to reconstruct the first member of our compound B *ylai-*, A *wlām-* as PT $*w'\partial lan$ (with palatalized w' - yielding B *y-* and A *w-*) $<$ PIE $*u\epsilon lH_2-n(t-s)$. This explanation, which presupposes a final position for PT $*w'\partial lan\#$, fits well with the recent date of compounds in B $\overset{\circ}{n}\tilde{ä}kte$, A $\overset{\circ}{n}\tilde{kät}$. We shall return to this reconstruction below.

68

Winter, however, is reluctant to reconstruct *e*-grade in this form. He believes that the first member represents an old vocative, reconstructs PT $*wlan(t)$ and, in order to explain the aberrant onset in both languages, assumes “that A *wl-* was retained under the influence of the nominative singular A *wäl* ‘king’” (Winter o.c.: 306) and that *y-* of B *ylai-* was due to assimilation to interior *-y-*. This solution seems unsatisfactory for a variety of reasons.

Firstly, the assimilation B $*wlai- > ylai-$ is certainly an *ad hoc* rule, as was admitted by Winter himself. The analogical retention of *wl-* in East Tocharian also seems improbable. If the speakers of Tocharian A wanted to adjust the alleged voc.sg. $*lān$ to the nom.sg. *wäl* (which I doubt, as all the other cases have the stem *lānt-* / *lānc-*), they would rather have created the form $*wälān$.

Secondly, it is by no means certain that the first member of the compound was a vocative. In East Tocharian the vocative is lost, and one must have strong evidence to assume that the original vocative survived as the first member of a compound. Except for the compound A *wlām $\tilde{n}\tilde{kät}$* , Winter assumes an original vocative in the Tocharian A compound nom.sg. *ptā $\tilde{n}\tilde{kät}$* , gen.sg. *ptā $\tilde{n}\tilde{ä}kte$* , *ptā $\tilde{n}\tilde{kte}$* , *pättā $\tilde{n}\tilde{ä}kte$* ‘Buddha’. He writes: “*-ā $\tilde{n}\tilde{n}$ -* in A *pättā $\tilde{n}\tilde{n}\tilde{kät}$* , etc., might well be due to the influence of A *wlām $\tilde{n}\tilde{kät}$* , etc. Forms with a single *- \tilde{n} -* before a vowel, can, however, hardly be so explained. Instead, one may want to suggest that A *-ā* in such forms should be taken to be a precise match of B *-a* found in vocatives... If so, the loanword

nom.sg., which is also the case with B *ylai $\tilde{n}\tilde{ä}kte$* , A *wlā(m) $\tilde{n}\tilde{kät}$* , as we shall see below. As a matter of fact, the attested Tocharian paradigm of the word for ‘moon, month’ (nom.sg. B *me $\tilde{n}\tilde{e}$* , A *ma \tilde{n}* , obl.sg. B *me \tilde{n}* , A *ma \tilde{n}*) is a result of an inner-Tocharian restructuring (Pedersen 1941: 250) of the PIE paradigm nom.sg. $*meH_1n-öt$, acc. $*meH_1n-es-m$, gen. $*meH_1n-s-os$ (cf. Beekes 1982: 55). The root vocalism of B *me $\tilde{n}\tilde{e}$* probably comes from the oblique cases $*meH_1ns-$ (cf. Kortlandt 1988: 80), while the palatalization comes from the accusative.

ultimately derived from *buddha-* would have been aligned with words going back to PIE **-o-* stems; in B, there is no evidence for such a development" (o.c.: 307). It is clear that assuming an old vocative as the first member of *ptāñkät* gets one involved in serious difficulties. It seems simpler to assume influence by A *wlāmñkät* and to ascribe the single *-ñ-* to forms where the *-ñ-* stood before a consonant (gen. *pättāñäkte* vs. *ptāñkte*, comitative *ptāñäktassäl* vs. *ptāñktassäl*, all. *ptāñäktac* vs. *ptāñktac*, etc.).

Finally, I doubt that compounds with the vocative as a first member ever existed in Indo-European languages. I must admit that I am unaware of any parallels. 69

§4. Therefore, in view of the problems with the reconstruction of a vocative in B *ylaiñäkte*, A *wlāmñkät*, it seems better to look for a different solution. Considering the facts outlined in the preceding sections, it seems probable that the first member of B *ylaiñäkte*, A *wlāmñkät* reflects PT **w’əlan*, which was the original nominative of the word for ‘king’. Whereas this nominative was replaced within the paradigm, it was preserved in a standing phrase (cf. the archaic gen.sg. in Lat. *pater familiās*).² The phonetic and semantic sides of this solution are impeccable, and in the following we shall only be concerned with the morphology, i.e. we must indicate why and how this nominative was replaced in Tocharian and show that this type of nominative was possible in Indo-European.

The attested paradigms of the word for ‘king’ are as follows (the reconstructions are based on Pedersen 1941 and Kortlandt 1988: 82):

	B	A	PT		
nom.sg.	<i>walo</i>	<i>wäl</i>	<i>*wəlo</i> <	<i>*wəlōn</i> <	<i>*ṷlH-ōn(t-s)</i>
obl.sg.	<i>lānt</i>	<i>lānt</i>	<i>*lant</i> <	<i>*wlant</i> <	<i>*ṷlH-nt-m</i>
gen.sg.	<i>lānte</i>	<i>lānt</i>	<i>*lante</i> <	<i>*wlante</i> <	<i>*ṷlH-nt-os</i>
nom.pl.	<i>lāñc</i>	<i>lāñc/lāmś</i>	<i>*lañc</i> <	<i>*wlan’t</i> <	<i>*ṷlH-nt-es</i>
obl.pl.	<i>lāntām</i>	<i>lāñcäs</i>	<i>*lantəns</i> <	<i>*wlantəns</i> <	<i>*ṷlH-nt-ns</i>
gen.pl.	<i>lantamts</i>	<i>lāñcässi</i>	?	³	

All derivatives of this word are based on the root form AB *lānt-*, cf. B *lāntsa*, A *lānts* f. ‘queen’ < **ṷlH-nt-ṷH₂*, B *lantuññe*, A *lāñci* adj. ‘royal’, B *lantuññe*, A *lāntunc* a. ‘king’s dignity, sovereignty’, etc. 70

The preserved initial *w-* in B *walo*, A *wäl* indicates that **l* was vocalic in the nom.sg., but consonantal elsewhere. This points to a laryngeal after **l*, which became vocalized in a precon-

² Incidentally, this scenario presupposes that the Tocharians had a ‘king of the gods’ in their own pantheon, before the Indian influence. This may also account for the fact that Indra was not ‘translated’ into Tocharian as ‘Indra + god’.

³ The reconstruction of a Proto-Tocharian genitive plural seems impossible, as the attested endings reflect two different endings. Toch. A has introduced palatalization into all forms of the plural from the nom.pl.

sonantal position and disappeared before a vowel (for the laryngeal cf. also OIr. *flaith* f. (later m.) ‘sovereignty, rule; lord, prince’, MW. *gwlad* f. ‘land’ < **u*lati- < **ulH*ti-⁴).

§5. It is further important that the final long PT *-ō of the nom.sg. must reflect the lengthened grade of the suffix, which does not belong in the nominative singular of the -nt- participles and must therefore be of a secondary origin. The precise source of the lengthened grade can hardly be traced,⁵ however, as the original -nt- participles have been subject to thorough restructuring in Tocharian. In addition to *walo*, we find only three original participles or adjectives in -nt- which have kept the athematic inflection:

B obl.sg.m. *erkent*, gen. *erkeñcepi*, nom.pl.f. *erkenta* ‘black’ ~ A nom.pl.m. *arka(m)ś*, obl.pl. *arkančäs*;

B nom.sg.m. *kartse*, f. *kartsa*, obl.m. *krent*, f. *kartsai* ‘good’ ~ A nom.sg.m. *kāsu*, obl.m. *krant*, f. *kräntsām*;

B nom.sg.m.f. *po*, obl. *po*, nom.pl.m. *poñc* f. *ponta* ‘all’ ~ A nom.sg.m.f. *puk*, obl.m. *poñcām* f. *pontsām*, nom.pl.m. *poñś* f. *pont*.

It is noteworthy that there are problems with the nom.sg. of all these adjectives. The nom.sg. to the oblique stem B *erkent*-, A **arkant*- (< **H*₁*rg*^w-ont-, for the vocalization of the initial **r*- cf. Hilmarsson 1984) is not attested and it seems possible that B *orkamo*, A *orkām* ‘dark, black’, derived from the same root (< **H*₁*rg*^w-mōn(t-s)), was used in this function. The paradigm of the word for ‘good’ has a suppletive nom.sg. As to the nom.sg. of AB *pont*-, A *puk* is suppletive, too, whereas the original vocalism of B *po* is difficult to determine (Kortlandt 1988: 84 reconstructs **peH*₂-onts).

71

It seems plausible to assume that the original nominatives of all these adjectives became aberrant and were replaced. We cannot know for sure what was aberrant in these forms, but one of the reasonable guesses is that the nominatives had a different ablaut grade of the root. In the case of our word, this means that the PT nom.sg. **wəlōn* is secondary, replacing a different nominative, and I suggest that this original nominative was PT **w’əlan*.

§6. The final question is whether the nominative singular PT **w’əlan* is plausible from an Indo-European standpoint. I believe that this is indeed the case. PT **w’əlan* reflects PIE **uelH*-nt(-s), with e-grade in the root and zero grade in the suffix, and this is exactly the type which Beekes in his monograph on the Indo-European nominal inflection (1985: 64ff) considered original in PIE on the basis of the Latin and Avestan evidence (cf. also Schindler 1982: 199).

⁴ This peculiar vocalization is probably due to the initial cluster **ul*-, where the initial *u*- remained (or became) vocalic at the time of vocalization of the laryngeals, cf. also MW *gwlan* m. ‘wool’ < **u*lano- < **ulano*- < **H*₂*ulH*₁*no*- (?). A comparable phenomenon is attested in Sanskrit, where *u*- of the initial sequence **ul*- remained vocalic, cf. Skt. *ulkā*- f. ‘meteor’, *ulva*- n. ‘caul’ (vs. *vṛka*- < **ul*k^wo-).

⁵ The same lengthened grade is attested in the nominative of words with the suffix *-ment-, cf. B *klyomo*, A *klyom* adj. ‘noble’, B *śaumo*, A *śom* m. ‘man’.

REFERENCES

- Beekes, R.S.P. 1982: GAv. *mā*, the PIE word for 'moon, month', and the perfect participle. *JIES* 10, 53-64.
- Beekes, R.S.P. 1985: *The origins of the Indo-European nominal inflection*. Innsbruck.
- Hilmarsson, J. 1984: East Tocharian *ort* "friend (?)" etc., and the question of *u*-umlaut of Tocharian *ā*. *MSS* 43, 107-121.
- Kortlandt, F.H.H. 1988: On the development of PIE final syllables in Tocharian. *Tocharian and Indo-European Studies* 2, 80-88. 72
- Krause, W. – W. Thomas 1960: *Tocharisches Elementarbuch. Band I. Grammatik*. Heidelberg.
- Pedersen, H. 1941: *Tocharisch vom Gesichtspunkt der indoeuropäischen Sprachvergleichung*. Copenhagen.
- Sieg, E. – W. Siegling – W. Schulze 1931: *Tocharische Grammatik*. Göttingen.
- Schindler, J. 1982: Zum Nom.Sing.m. der *nt*-Partizipien im Jungavestischen. *Investigationes philologicae et comparativae* (Gs. H. Kronasser), ed. E. Neu, Wiesbaden, 186-209.
- Thomas, W. 1964: *Tocharisches Elementarbuch. Band II. Texte und Glossar*. Unter Mitwirkung von W. Krause. Heidelberg.
- Thomas, W. 1969: Bemerkungen zum Gebrauch von *toch.* A *ptāñkāt* [B *pañäkte*, *pudñäkte*], A *kom* [B *kaum*] : A *komññkāt* [B *kaumññäkte*] usw., *Orbis* XVIII/1, 235-268.
- Van Windekens, A.J. 1976: *Le tokharien confronté avec les autres langues indo-européennes. Volume I. La phonétique et le vocabulaire*. Louvain.
- Winter, W. 1987: Tocharian B *ñakte*, A *ñkāt* 'god': two nouns, their derivatives, their etymology. *JIES* 15, 297-325.