

Tocharian B *laka-* ~ *palka-*, A *lakā-* ~ *palkā-* ‘to see, look’¹

Stefan Norbruis

The article points out a number of problems with the traditional scenario in which the Tocharian verbal pair meaning ‘to see, look’, B *laka-*, A *lakā-* < PT **laka-* and B *palka-*, A *palkā-* < PT **palka-*, started out as two separate lexemes that became associated with each other. It is proposed that **palka-* rather developed from **laka-* by a reanalysis of its imperative. This can better account not only for several morphological details, but also for the large semantic and formal overlap, as well as for the specific way in which the semantics are here argued to differ: an analysis of both verbs in Tocharian B suggests that in those categories in which both verbs are found, *laka-* refers to perception with the eyes (‘to see’), *palka-* to fixing one’s gaze (‘to look (at)’).

1 Introduction²

Tocharian A and B both feature a verbal pair meaning ‘to see, look’: B *laka-* ~ *palka-*, A *lakā-* ~ *palkā-* < PT **laka-* ~ **palka-* (see in general

-
- 1 This research was financed by the European Research Council (ERC-2017-STG 758855). Thanks to Michaël Peyrot for helpful comments on an earlier draft.
 - 2 Throughout this article, the notations of roots and stems, recognizable as such from the final hyphen, is phonological. In the case of Tocharian B roots and stems, *ə* and *a* rather than *ä* and *ā* are used for /ə/ and /a/, as well as *l̄* rather than *ly* for /l̄/, e.g. *palka-*, *palkā-* rather than *palkā-*, *palykā-* for /palka-/, /palkā-/. These spellings are also used for Proto-Tocharian. Full Tocharian B words, however, follow the Tocharian spelling, meaning that *a* represents either /ə/ or unaccented /a/, *ā* stands for /ā/, and *ä* for unaccented /ə/, e.g. *palka* /palka/, *palyka* /palka/, *palykāre* /palkāre/ (except in the occasional attestation with archaic spelling, of which one prominent feature

offprint from:

Tocharian and Indo-European Studies, volume 20
© Museum Tusulanum Press and the author(s) 2020

Malzahn 2010: 716–717, 836–839, Peyrot 2013: 776, 807–808). In Tocharian B, *laka*-³ is inflected for all verbal categories except the imperative; *palka*- is found in all categories except those built on the present stem (the present and the imperfect).⁴ In Tocharian A, *läkā*- and *pälkā*- constitute one suppletive verb, of which *läkā*- supplies the present and the imperfect, and *pälkā*- all other categories.⁵ These distributions are tabulated in the following overview.

	Tocharian B		Tocharian A	
	<i>laka</i> -	<i>palka</i> -	<i>läkā</i> -	<i>pälkā</i> -
pres.	<i>laká^{ssə}/skē-</i> med. also <i>laká</i> -		<i>läkā</i> -	
impf.	<i>lakássi-</i> med. also <i>lakóy</i> -		<i>lyāka</i> -	
sbj.	<i>laká</i> -	<i>palka</i> - / <i>pálka</i> -		<i>pälkā</i> -
opt.	<i>lakóy</i> -			<i>pälki</i> -
ipv.		<i>palka</i> - / <i>pálka</i> -		<i>pälkā</i> -
pret.	<i>laká</i> -	<i>pálkā</i> - / <i>palká</i> -		<i>pälkā</i> -

is that *ä* may also be /*é*/). Since Tocharian A uses a more transparent system, with <*ā*>, <*a*>, <*ä*> simply representing three distinct phonemes, its spelling (including *ly* for /*l*/) is also used in the notation of its roots and stems.

- 3 The B verb *laka*- (and its Proto-Tocharian predecessor) can be cited in various ways. Here I use *laka*- because this is the root shape found in all finite forms, as can be seen in the overview. The only form that warrants a citation as *lak*- or *lak(a)*- is the pret.ptc. *lyelyaku*, -*oʃ*. It may be pointed out that the isolated *ə*|*∅*-root structure of this pret.ptc. is probably an archaism vis-à-vis its finite counterpart, given the verb's probable origin in PIE **leǵ-* 'to collect, gather' (cf. Adams 2013: s.v.). *palka*- has the *ə*|*a*-root structure throughout (pret.ptc. *pälkau*, -*oʃ*).
- 4 The lack of the optative in our current corpus is certainly due to chance.
- 5 The imperative in fact holds an intermediate position between the two roots; see below.

2 Proto-Tocharian reconstruction

B *laka-* is found as such as the subjunctive stem, and occasionally, in the middle voice, as the present stem. The latter fact suggests that the usual present stem, *laká^{ss0}/ske-*, was an innovation to create a distinct present stem in what had been a present-subjunctive *laká-* (cf. Peyrot 2012: 88). This analysis is confirmed by Tocharian A (cf. Hackstein 1995: 250), in which *lakā-* is the only present stem; here the expression of the subjunctive was innovated instead. The Tocharian A imperfect *lyāka-* < **lyākā-* is historically identical to the Tocharian B preterite *laká-*. The morphology of this formation suggests that the B preterite preserves the original function, and that the imperfect function in A came about when the incorporation of *palkā-* into the paradigm confined the usage of *lakā-* to the present (cf. Couvreur 1947: 66, Peyrot 2012: 96–99). For Proto-Tocharian, we can therefore reconstruct a present-subjunctive **laka-* next to a preterite **lakā-*.

The corresponding imperative is special in both A and B. In B, the imperative is furnished by *palka-* (sg. *palka*, pl. *palkas*; cf. Malzahn 2010: 837, Peyrot 2013: 807 fn. 734).⁶ This is matched by the Tocharian A imperative *palkā-* (sg. *palkār*, pl. *palkāc*), which is, however, synchronically aberrant because from *palkā-* we would have expected the imperative stem to be ***ppalkā-* (cf. e.g. *ppālskār* ‘think!’ to *pālskā-*). Although the imperative *palkā-* cannot be separated from the root *palkā-* as found in its closest functional neighbors, as is further underlined by its middle voice — *palkā-* is middle only — its shape reveals an alternative analysis

6 An imperative built to *laka-* can in fact be found in B, namely the hapax *pāl[yā]ka* (PK NS 31 b4); cf. Pinault *apud* Malzahn (2010: 837), Adams (2013: s.v. *lak-*), who, however, read *pālyaka-me*. Michaël Peyrot (p.c.) points out to me that the reading should rather be *pāl[yā]ka-me*: the second akṣara of this word is damaged, but there is a clear trace of an *ā*. This hapax is not only very clearly a secondary creation, but it also has causative value (‘let us see, show us’, cf. Adams 2013: s.v. *lak-*); the imperative of the base verb meaning ‘to see, look’ is always supplied by *palka-*.

as *pä-lkā-*, i.e. as belonging to *läkā-*, at least at some point in the prehistory of Tocharian A (cf. Schmidt 1974: 22 fn. 4).

Since we can reconstruct all principal stems (pres., sbj., pret.) for PT **laka-*, **palka-* must have been a separate verb (cf. Peyrot 2013: 776), albeit one that did not occur in the present. Morphologically, we would expect the preterite stem of a verb **palka-* to have been **palka-* / **palka-*. In Tocharian B, the actual active stem is *palká-* (3sg. *palyka*, 3pl. *pälykäre*).⁷ Despite Malzahn's (2010: 13–18) efforts, a development **palka-* > **palká-* is not straightforward (cf. Peyrot 2013: 776 fn. 467) — rather, the position of the palatalization suggests that *palká-* underwent liquid metathesis in pre-Proto-Tocharian (see § 3 and § 6.1 below). This implies that Proto-Tocharian had **palka-*, from older **plaka-*.

Thus, for Proto-Tocharian we end up with the following picture (cf. Peyrot 2013: 776, 807):

	<i>*laka-</i>	<i>*palka-</i>
pres. (→ impf.)		—
sbj. (→ opt.)	<i>*laka-</i>	<i>*pelka-</i> / <i>*palka-</i>
ipv.		<i>*pelka-</i> / <i>*palka-</i>
pret.	<i>*laka-</i>	<i>*palka-</i> / <i>*palka-</i>

3 Pre-Proto-Tocharian: current analysis

The usual analysis envisages the diachronic path leading to the Proto-Tocharian situation as follows. According to Adams (2013: s.vv.), **laka-* (~ **lak-*, see fn. 3) goes back to PIE **leg-* (cf. Lat. *legō* ‘to collect, gather’), and **palka-* is closely related to B *palk-*, A *palk-* ‘to shine’ and B *palk-* ‘to burn (intr.)’ < PIE **b^hleg-* (cf. Gr. *φλέγω* ‘to burn (tr. & intr.)’). In accordance with the latter etymology, the palatalization of the preterite **palka-* suggests that the ablaut slot of this verb used to be after the **l*, which was then

7 Since Tocharian A *palkā-* is middle only, it cannot be used for determining the Proto-Tocharian place of the palatalization in the preterite active.

relocated through liquid metathesis: **pālka-* < **plāka-* < **b^hleg-* (cf. Kim 2003: 209 fn. 39, Kim 2007: 93 fn. 52, Peyrot 2013: 776 fn. 462).⁸ Forms presupposing an analysis **palka-* (B subj.sg., e.g. *palkam*, ipv.sg. *pālka*, and *pilko* ‘glance’) must then have been realigned, or built altogether, after the vowel slot had been relocated.

At some point, the two verbs became associated with each other. This is usually seen as the result of a semantic development on the part of **palk-*, with ‘to shine’ developing to ‘to see’ (e.g. Schmidt 1974: 187 fn. 7, Adams 2013: s.v.).⁹

The Tocharian A analysis of the imperative as belonging to *lakā-* as evidenced by the single *p-* is explained as resulting from a reanalysis of the imperative of *palkā-* as *pā-lkā-* (Schmidt 1974: 22–23 fn. 4, Malzahn 2010: 717). According to Peyrot (2013: 807 fn. 737), the original imperative of **laka-* must in fact have had this shape at one point ($|p-laka-| > |palka-|$), and the identity of this imperative with that of **palka-* ($|p-palka-| > |palka-|$) may have contributed to their entanglement.

4 Problems

The prevailing analysis is not without issues. In the following I will point out three main points that make the envisaged scenario less than satisfactory: the morphology, the semantics, and the formal overlap between the two verbs.

8 For the well-established phenomenon of liquid metathesis, i.e. **CLəCV > *CəLCV*, see Ringe (1996: 158–159). One of many other examples is B (*ñem-*) *kālywe* ‘fame’ < **kīlwe* < **kīleuos* (Gr. κλέος).

9 Hackstein (1995: 112–113 fn. 15) conversely tries to explain the development from ‘to shine’ to ‘to see’ for **palka-* as the result of a semantic adaptation from **palka-* to **laka-* once a suppletive relation was established. This option is precluded by the semantic difference between the two, as established in 6.3.1 below.

4.1 Morphology

The morphological issue has already been expounded by Malzahn (2010: 106–107). In an objection to Schmidt’s (1974: 186–187 fn. 7) claim that there is in Tocharian A a single lexeme *pālk-* meaning ‘to look (like), shine’ in the active and ‘to see’ in the middle, Malzahn points out that the roots involved are not identical: in both A and B these verbs have different root structures (B *pālk-*, A *pālk-* ‘to shine’, but B *pālka-*, A *pālkā-* ‘to see, look’). They also have different preterite types in Tocharian B: the preterite of *pālk-* is *palka*, whereas that of *pālka-* is *palyka*, with palatalization. It is therefore hardly possible to arrive at the attested state of affairs merely through a semantic change of **pālk-*.

4.2 Semantics

It is not impossible for ‘to shine’ to develop to ‘to see, look’. The effects of such a development can be found, for example, in Eng. *to glare*, which means both ‘to shine with a harsh, dazzling light’ and ‘to stare with a fierce look’.¹⁰ Nevertheless, the semantic connection is not so obvious as to render an etymological connection between *pālk-* ‘to shine’ and *pālka-* ‘to see, look (at)’ undeniable, and the supposed ties between the two may be sacrificed without harm if a better etymology presents itself — all the

10 Another example is OCS *zvrěti* ‘to see, look at’ ~ Lith. *žerėti* ‘to shine, glow, glisten, sparkle, shimmer’, with apparent relic meanings in nominal derivations such as SCr. *zrāk* ‘ray of light, beam, glimpse’. A few continuations of the PIE root **leuk-* ‘light; to light up, shine’ (continued, for example, in Toch. B *lāwk-*, A *lāwk-* ‘to light up; to bring light to, illuminate’) have similar meanings: Gr. *λέωσω* ‘to look, gaze upon, see’ < **leuk-ie/o-*, Skt. *lókate* ‘to see, perceive’ (through *loká-* ‘light, free space’, see EWAia s.v.). It may be mentioned here that Tocharian **lāka-* has also been thought to continue **leuk-*. This is not very likely (cf. Adams 2013: s.v.): **leuk-* is already continued in **lāwk-*, and the PT preterite **lāka-* cannot go back to a preform with **u*, but rather points to **lēk-* (cf. Lat. *lēgī*, perfect of *legō* ‘to collect, gather’ < **lēg-*).

more so since the morphological differences suggest that they are two separate lexemes rather than one polysemous lexeme.

The semantic development has also been envisaged to have gone from ‘to shine’ first to ‘to appear, look’ (cf. G. *scheinen*), which then became the basis for the meaning ‘to look, see’ (cf. Eng. *to look*, G. *aussehen*). However, the development from ‘to shine’ to ‘to appear, look’ is only found in Tocharian A, and is therefore most probably post-Proto-Tocharian. Moreover, the parallels for the second part of the development, Eng. *to look*, G. *aussehen*, do not actually offer typological support for such a development, since the semantic change proceeded in the opposite direction in these verbs. And this is typical: if ‘to see, look’ and ‘to appear, look’ are expressed with cognate lexical elements, the historical starting point is usually ‘to see, look’, which then through metonymy or derivation gives rise to the meaning ‘to appear, look’, rather than the other way around. Often we also find explicit passivizing morphology, e.g. Gr. *ιδεῖν* ‘to see’ → *εἶδεσθαι* ‘to appear’, Lat. *videō* ‘to see’ → *videor* ‘to appear’. The path from ‘to appear, look’ to ‘to see, look’ is less easy: there is little that, for example, voice differences can do to make the one seen into the seer. One could think of a middle causative that would mean ‘to make appear to oneself’ > ‘to see’, but not only is this quite farfetched — the actual morphology of **palka-* is also not consistent with this analysis. Another possibility could be a nominal intermediary (e.g. ‘to appear’ → ‘appearance, visual impression’ → ‘to have a visual impression of’; cf. Skt. *lókate* in fn. 10), but again this is quite complicated, and there is no evidence suggesting that this is what happened in Tocharian.

4.3 Formal overlap

Perhaps the most disturbing element of the prevailing analysis is that the two roots **laka-* and **palka-* < **plaka-* are formally very much alike, and this would have to be a coincidence. The imperatives, in particular, would have happened to overlap completely, just like most of the semantics of these verbs. While this is perhaps not impossible, it is another uneasy fact, and one that, in my view, rather points in a different direction.

5 Sieg, Siegling & Schulze

We can move one step forward by going back to Sieg, Siegling & Schulze (1931: 346). In an attempt to explain the appearance of the A imperative *pālkā-* for expected ***ppālkā-*, they point out the formal similarity between *pālkā-* and *lākā-* and propose that *pālkā-* is a preverbed version of *lākā-*, i.e. *pā-lkā-*, which rendered the addition of the formally identical imperative prefix *pā-*, which normally accompanied the derivation of the imperative from the preterite, superfluous. Although the scenario can hardly be upheld as such — the non-existence of a derivational preverb *pā-* precludes the required Tocharian A analysis of *pālkā-*, and it is more straightforward to assume that the imperative was simply analyzed as belonging to *lākā-*¹¹ — it does have the merit of offering an analysis of **pālka-* as based on **lāka-*, which would solve both the morphological and the semantic difficulties specified in the previous section. The analysis of **pālka-* as based on **lāka-*, and as containing a prefix that is identical to the one found in the imperative, will also feature in the scenario proposed in the following.

6 A new scenario

The imperative **pālka-* can be analyzed in two ways: as the imperative of **pālka-* and as the imperative of **lāka-*. It is normally assumed that the former analysis is original. As we have seen, however, the failure of the Tocharian A imperative to obtain ***pp-* for *p-* reveals that the alterna-

11 In view of the existence of Tocharian B *pālka-*, the supposed derivation of this lexeme from **lāka-* by means of a prefix **pā-* would in any case have to be pushed back to pre-Proto-Tocharian. The same objection applies: there is no evidence for the existence of such a derivational prefix at this level either. It is of course not excluded that the PT imperative prefix **pā-* does in fact ultimately go back to a more fully-fledged prefix, but this is far from secure, and indeed the restriction of the prefix to the imperative in both Tocharian A and Tocharian B rather suggests that the prefix was the result of a development that was specific to the imperative.

tive analysis of the imperative as belonging to **laka-* can also be found in Tocharian itself. I would suggest that if we take this analysis as our starting point, and assume that **palka-* is also originally the imperative of **laka-* (for this possibility cf. Peyrot 2013: 45), it provides us with a much more straightforward scenario. Let us look at the Proto-Tocharian state of affairs again:

	<i>*laka-</i>	<i>*palka-</i>
pres. (→ impf.)		—
sbj. (→ opt.)	<i>*laka-</i>	<i>*pelka-</i> / <i>*palka-</i>
ipv.		<i>*pelka-</i> / <i>*palka-</i>
pret.	<i>*laka-</i>	<i>*palka-</i> / <i>*palka-</i>

If the ambiguous imperative **palka-*¹² is in origin the imperative of **laka-*, rather than of **palka-*, it may be exactly its ambiguity — also allowing for an analysis as belonging to a verb **palka-* — that led to the *creation* of other forms based on a root **palka-*. In other words, the reanalysis of the imperative **palka-* may have proceeded in exactly the opposite direction from what is usually assumed. The scheme above may, then, reflect the expansion of the imperative out of its original home, **laka-*, to become the basis of a parallel verb, **palka-*.

This scenario does not have to cope with the shortcomings of the standard view: the morphologically and semantically awkward connection with **palk-* ‘to shine’ can be given up, and the large overlap between the two verbs in both form and semantics is neatly explained if one grew out of the other. Several details immediately fall into place.

6.1 Root structure and place of the ablaut slot

The scenario dovetails nicely with the specific morphological characteristics of **palka-*. The *ə|a*-character of **palka-* is identical to the *ə|a*-character

12 Recall from § 3 that the pret. **palka-* < **plaka-* indicates that the ipv. stem variant **pelka-*, with the ablaut slot before the **l*, is a late form postdating liquid metathesis.

of **laka-*.¹³ The original location of the ablaut slot of **palka-* after the **l*, as suggested by the palatalization of the preterite **pálka-* < **pláka-* (see § 3), is, of course, also fully in accordance with a scenario that derives **palka-* from **laka-*. The preterite thus offers the refinement that **palka-* must have been built on the imperative of **laka-* when liquid metathesis had not yet relocated the ablaut slot.

6.2 Categories

The scenario further accords well with the fact that **palka-* was restricted to the subjunctive, preterite and imperative. It is a well-established pattern in Tocharian grammar that the subjunctive, preterite and imperative form a tight part of the verbal web, typically making use of the same stem, that contrasted with the present stem (cf. e.g. Peyrot 2013: 38–39). A spread of the stem **palka-* from the imperative would make its restriction to the subjunctive, preterite and imperative understandable: the imperative stem then spread only to its closest neighbors. A more precise, semantic reason for not spreading further to the present will become apparent in the following section.

6.3 Semantics: a motivation for having two verbs

Finally, an origin of **palka-* in the imperative can also explain two related facts that have so far received little to no scholarly attention: the very fact that there are two lexemes meaning ‘to see, look’ in the first place, and the existence of a semantic difference between the two.

6.3.1 A semantic difference

Formulating a more widely held view, Adams (2013: s.v. *¹pálk-*) states that B *palka-* “provides the only imperative and alternate subjunctive, preterite, and preterite participles to *lák-* ‘see, look at’”. In my opinion, it is

13 For the pret.ptc. *lyelyaku*, the only category that shows a deviating stem *lak-*, see fn. 3.

a priori not very likely that *palka-* was merely an alternative to *laka-*; the side-by-side occurrence of both lexemes from Proto-Tocharian to attested Tocharian B — in which they may even occur together in the same line (cf. below) — rather suggests that there was a semantic difference between the two. We only have reduced chances to recover this difference: the merger into a single lexeme will have erased it in A, and in B *palka-* is not all that frequently attested as a finite verb. Moreover, since such a difference has not so far been identified on the basis of the B forms that we do have, and the lexemes were able to collapse into a single verb in A, the distinction between **laka-* and **palka-* will have been only slight. In spite of this, a semantic difference may in fact be detectable in B after all.

Most informative is the category in which most forms of both verbs can be contrasted: the absolutive. The distributions of *lyelyakormem* and *pälkormem* are clearly different. *lyelyakormem* occurs almost exclusively in contexts in which someone witnesses an event, or a new element appears in someone’s sight, which then prompts him or her to (re)act in a certain way. A typical example is the following.

THT 81 b2–5

tume(m) c(ai) brähmaṇi tot ike-postäm ynemane araṇemiñ länte yapoyne kameṃ (tä) rrine yaipormem älyauces weskeṃ bho bho • k_use (pi) ksa wesän kekamor orocce lant sä(r)sässi || tane plaktu(kä)ñña brähmaṇem lyelyakormem kerciyenn(e) yopsa sle-yärke läntas weššäm ñakta alyek-ypoysi brähmaṇi parna klyenträ säswem lkätsi ñäskenträ
 ‘Thereupon these Brahmins, going step by step, came to the country of king Araṇemi. Having entered this city, they say to each other: “Well now, who ever would make our arrival known to the great king?” Then the doorkeeper, **having seen** the Brahmins, went into the palace and with respect she says to the king: “Your Majesty, Brahmins from another country are standing outside! They desire to see the lord.”’

pälkormem is never found in such contexts. Rather, it occurs a few times in contexts such as the following. Note that this passage immediately follows the one above.

THT 81 b5–6 + PK NS 35 a1–3¹⁴

walo weṣṣām ramer ecce pwāyar-me kārtse-yamiñ cai ñi || tane brāhmaṇi kerciyemne yaipormem poñc šar koš ceccalorsa ka lānte yarke yamaskem || tane araṇemi walo brāhmaṇem wratsai tsāñkormem kāṣṣīññe yāknesa asānne lyāmate-me || tumem (tse)ññai uppālām || ñcane kreñc eśanesa brāhmaṇem pālkormem we(ṣṣām) ||

‘The king says: “Quick, lead them here! They are benefactors to me.” Then the Brahmins, having entered the palace, all pay respect to the king by raising the hand high. Then king Araṇemi, having risen towards them, in the way of a teacher made them sit on the throne. Thereupon, ... blue, lotus-(like?) ..., and with ..., pleasant eyes **having looked at** the Brahmins, he says: ...’

Unlike in the preceding case of *lyelyakormem*, *pālkormem* clearly does not refer to the moment in which the Brahmins first appear in sight, i.e. when the subject first *sees* them — the actants have already interacted. Rather, the sentence describes the expression in Araṇemi’s eyes as he fixes his gaze upon the Brahmins, i.e. how he *looks at* them.

Unlike *lyelyakormem*, *pālkormem* also occurs in non-narrative contexts. The usual translation in such cases is ‘with regard to’ (‘im Hinblick auf’). An example is the following.

THT 23 a2–3

*palkas oko oktacepi samvarntse cwi tot orotse tusa paṣṣalle 15
tu pālkormem ce weña pudñākte ślok krent ce :
takarškñe taisāk kwipassorñe taisāk r/ āyor :
pelaiknenta cai krentaṃts sāmnaṃts papāla(šo) :*

‘Behold, the fruit of such five-fold self-discipline is so big; therefore it should be practiced. **Regarding** this matter the Buddha has spoken

14 *walo ... uppālām* is given as attested in THT 81 b5–6. The last part is PK NS 35 a3. What is left of PK NS 35 a1–2 is fully parallel to THT 81: a1 || *ñ(ā)skentrā* || (*walo we*)ṣṣām ramer e(cce) ||, a2 || *(ya)m(a)sk(em)* || *tane araṇ(e)mi walo brāhmaṇem wr(antsai) ||*. The first readable akṣara of a3 is *ñca* rather than *kā*, so that the restoration (*lalaṃṣ*)*kāne* ‘tender’ is impossible (Michaël Peyrot p.c.).

the following good verse: “Belief, as well as modesty, and also giving — these are the *dharmas* praised by good people.”

The quotation of the Buddha (*takaṣṣkñe ... papāla(ṣo)*) — translated from the Udānavarga¹⁵ (cf. Pinault 2008: 51–53) — is not part of a story in which any actual kind of seeing or looking takes place; rather, *tu pälkormem* means ‘regarding this’, ‘on this topic’, connecting the current doctrinal topic with the quote. For this usage an original meaning ‘having seen this’ is not an obvious starting point; this would more naturally develop meanings comparable to ‘in view of this’, again with the matter that is seen prompting a reaction. However, as already hinted at by the etymologies of the usual translations, the meaning ‘regarding this’ can be straightforwardly understood as developed from a meaning ‘focusing on this’, ‘with attention to this’, ‘concerning oneself with this’, i.e. ‘looking at this’, or even more accurately, given that it is an absolutive, ‘having directed one’s attention towards this’, ‘having fixed one’s gaze at this’.

At least the absolutive, then, suggests a clear semantic difference between the two verbs: *laka-* referred to perception with the eyes, *palka-* to directing one’s gaze. In other words, *laka-* meant ‘to see’ and *palka-* ‘to look (at)’. Incidentally, this is exactly what we could have expected a semantic difference between two close verbs meaning ‘to see, look’ to have been, not only because it makes sense to distinguish these two meanings (cf. e.g. Schmidt’s 1974: 187–192 treatment of A *pälkâ-*), but also on typological grounds, since such a distinction is found in many languages. At the same time, the close semantic relation between the two is underlined by the fact that many other languages use a single lexeme to express both notions.

The semantic contrast is also apparent in other categories. Even though the preterite participles *lyelyaku* and *pälkau* are both not very frequently attested, let alone in clear contexts, they do point to the same distinction,

15 *śraddhātha hrīṣīlam athāpi dānaṃ, dharmā ime satpuruṣapraśastāḥ* ‘Belief, modesty, moral conduct and also giving, these are the *dharmas* praised by good people’ (Uv 10.1 a–b). For the translation of the dvandva *hrīṣīlam* (*hrī-* ‘shame, modesty’, *śīla-* ‘moral conduct’) with the single word *kwipassorñe*, cf. Sieg & Siegling (1949: 2.38 fn. 1), Pinault (2008: 52).

as the two following examples may illustrate. Again *lyelyaku* refers to a moment of spotting someone who was not in sight before:

PK AS 6A a4–5

śem akartte jetamvaṃ pūḍṇākte lau keṃ lyakā-ne :

*wñā-neśā laukar waśir(ṣe su)k wñā-n(eś)«†ā» laukar **lyelyaku** :*

‘(Someone) came near the Jetavana-grove and the Buddha saw him far away on the earth. To him from afar spoke Vajraka. He (Buddha) said to him: “(I) have **seen** (you) from afar.”’

Instead, *pālkau* is found referring to examination with due attention (note the accompanying adverb *ānaiśai* ‘carefully’):

PK AS 6C a4–6

mākte ost poṣiyantsa wawārpau papaikau āstre :

śim mā prākre aiṇu no iścemtsa oṃṣmeṃ mā yāmu :

*wraṃtse stmānma (tr)onkanma **pālkowwa** m^o ānaiśai tākaṃ 84*

śanmāṃ swese kālyiminmeṃ śtwāra toṃ swāsaṃ śimtsa ce_u (:)

(mākte) ostne tsroriṃtsa mā wal(k)e kauśān olypotse :

mant ...

‘Like (when) a house is surrounded by walls and painted pristinely, but the roof is not firmly covered, not made with clay on top, and the water pipes and holes have not been carefully **looked at** — if there comes rain from the four directions and it rains on this roof, before long it does severe damage through the holes in the house — so also ...’

The verbal nouns *lkālñe* and *palkalñe* are contrasted in the same way. They further illustrate the more general difference that directional elements (‘up’, ‘towards’, ‘at’, etc.) combine with *palka-* rather than with *laka-* — a clear function of the difference between ‘to see’, in which the direction of the action proceeds from the seen to the seer (the subject is an Experiencer), and ‘to look’, in which the subject (here an Agent) literally *directs* his or her gaze to a certain point. Accordingly, *lkālñe* is attested with meanings such as ‘seeing’ (e.g. ‘if there has arisen doubt about something, seeing it with one’s own eyes is best’, THT 100 a2), ‘sight, view’ (e.g. ‘who

could be such as to somehow get enough of this sight?’ (PK AS 17I b1), and ‘insight’ (e.g. ‘the noble one, who is equipped with insight, he alone obtains prosperity here in the world’, THT 14 a7), but in none of its attestations is it accompanied by a directional element. By contrast, *palkalñe*, attested twice in one text (THT 41 a7, b7), is in both cases found in combination with *etswai* ‘towards’, *etswai-palkalñe* being the name of one of the six parts of mindful breathing (Skt. *ānāpāna-smṛti-*) whose counterpart in Sanskrit is *upa-lakṣaṇā-* ‘observing’ (containing *upa-* ‘towards’), on which the Tocharian name is clearly calqued.

Further support for the semantic difference comes from the indicative. By now unsurprisingly, we find *laka-* referring to spotting something upon arrival at a new scene:

THT 107 a2

ājivike upage tane tammeṃ ynemane śem cauk *÷ke«†ṃ»ne*¹⁶ :
pāksemane oñkorñai lyāka tāka āktike lau mā ṣ masa :

‘The Ājivika Upaga, going here and there, came to this place, and **saw** the cooking porridge. He was amazed and did not go away.’

And again, only *palka-* is combined with a directional element (*ke_{uc}* ‘up’) and a description of body language (*tāñwsa* ‘with love’):

THT 365 a4–5

šāñ m(a)ts(i) reksa pūdñāktentse tāṣṣatsisa katkemāne suma(ti go
pä)lyka tāñwsa no ke_{uc}«†ä» katkemane pū(d)ñ(ä)ktemeṃ ṣamāññe ot
ritāte āśc (mä)rtkā(t)e

‘Joyfully, Sumati extended his hair for the Buddha to tread on. He **looked** up with love, and then joyfully desired monkhood from the Buddha, and shaved his head.’

It is further suggestive of a semantic difference that the 3pl.pret. forms *pälykāre* and *lyakāre* occur side by side in the same line. This line occurs

16 For the interpretation of the sequence *caukkeṃne* as being composed of *cau-k* ‘this very’ and *yke-ne* ‘to (the) place’ (loc. of *ike*), see Pinault (2008: 121–122).

in the context of the news of Supriya's good deed (of making it rain desirable objects by means of a wishing jewel) spreading to the gods.

PK AS 17G b1

/// - ..k· (ñā)kt(i) **pālyk(ā)r(e)** ś(ā)mñe ś(ai)ṣṣ(ene) **lyakār(e)**
 su(p)r(i)y(entse sa)s(ā)ll(a)ṣ ///

'... the gods **looked** and in the human world they **saw** ... brought about by Supriya'

Not only does this suggest a semantic difference, the order of these predicates further confirms the interpretation of *pālka-* as 'to look' and *laka-* as 'to see': since 'to look' may be paraphrased as 'to fix one's gaze in order to see', 'to make an effort to see' (cf. 'to listen' = 'to prick up one's ears in order to hear', 'to make an effort to hear'), 'looking' generally precedes 'seeing' if both occur together in a sequence. This appears to be exactly what we have here.

The derived meaning 'to give attention to, concern oneself with', encountered earlier in *pālkormem*, also appears in *palyka*:

IOL Toch 5 b4–5

walo māga(tṣe) yolaiṃ wāṣmots ṣeṣartu kausa pātār krent
 tañ paiynene spalkāte nāki **palyka** yolomeṃ kalp/ āstarñe :

'King Magadha, incited by bad friends, killed his good father. At your feet he made an effort, **took heed of** the reproach, and (keeping) away from evil obtained purity.'

The relevant phrase is normally interpreted as meaning 'recognized his fault' (e.g. Broomhead 1962: 1.187: 'recognised his crime', Schmidt 1974: 176: 'sah den Fehler ein', Pinault 2008: 326, 328: 'constata [sa] faute'), which would speak more in favor of an original meaning 'to see'. However, since *nāki* is derived from *nak-* 'to blame, reproach', its principal meaning is 'reproach, criticism' rather than 'fault', and the sense of the phrase should therefore roughly be 'took the reproach to heart', i.e. *concerned himself with, took heed of* the reproach, as opposed to *disregarding* or *looking away* from it. This speaks more in favor of a development from 'to look at', and fits neatly with the meaning 'to direct one's attention to,

concern oneself with’ as found in *pälkormem* ‘with regard to, regarding, concerning’.

In this context we may further mention *empalkaitte* ‘unworried, without concern’ (= A *apälkât*), a privative adjective derived from *palka-* whose semantic relation to the verb has not been fully clear. Adams (2013: s.v.) rightfully provides the proposed original meaning ‘(deliberately) not seeing’ with a question mark. Malzahn’s (2010: 717) derivation ‘without sight’ → ‘without consideration’ is better, but can be improved in view of the analysis of *palka-* above. The meaning ‘without concern’ is immediately understandable if *palka-* meant ‘to direct one’s gaze to’, and metonymically also ‘to direct one’s attention to, concern oneself with’.

Finally, the meaning ‘to look’ rather than ‘to see’ for *palka-* is also supported by the nominal derivation *pilko*. Rather than ‘sight’ (vel sim.), its principal meaning is ‘glance, gaze’ (for an example see PK NS 32 b6 below), from there also ‘way of looking at something, view’ (e.g. *yolo-pilkotstse* ‘with a wrong view’).¹⁷

One distinction between *palka-* and Eng. *to look* has to be specified: the Tocharian verb appears to refer only to the initial event of directing or fixing one’s gaze, not to the potentially resulting state of extended gaze-fixation. At most, this following stage is implied. The verb apparently did not go on to develop a present that could have expressed this related, but durative meaning. Instead, as there is no instantiation of *palka-* to contrast with *laka-* in the present, *laka-* can express all senses in this cat-

17 Unfortunately, the infinitive *palkatsi* is attested only in inconclusive contexts. Even so, the frequent infinitive *lkätsi* is only attested with the meaning ‘to see’, including many shades of meaning similar to those of English *to see*, such as ‘to understand’ and ‘to experience, undergo, endure, suffer’ — but not ‘to look’. In the two least unclear attestations of *palkatsi*, the object refers to a person (*bodhisatvem palkatsi*, THT 115 b3; *rähulem palkasi*, THT 109 a6), and the most obvious meaning is ‘to visit, meet with’. Since *lkätsi* can have a similar meaning (see THT 81 b1–5 above for an example), these cases cannot be used to argue for an original meaning ‘to look (at)’. Conversely, however, in light of the previous analysis, it is likely that the meaning ‘to visit, meet with’ developed in *palkatsi* through ‘to turn one’s attention to, concern oneself with’.

egory, including that of continued fixed gaze — even though this is otherwise very similar to ‘to fix one’s gaze’; indeed, when *laka-* expresses this meaning, most typically in the present participle *lkāskemane*, it may, like *palka-*, have a ‘non-new’ object, be combined with directional elements, and occur together with such elements as *pilkosa* ‘with a ... glance, gaze’. An example is the following passage, which occurs in a conversation between the king and a Brahmin; the latter has just spoken.

PK NS 32 b6

tumeṇ walo wawākaṣ eresa śle smīlñe pilkosa brāhmaṇeṇ rupne lkāskemane

‘Thereupon the king, with a blooming appearance, with a smiling gaze **looking** the Brahmin in the face ...’

Regarding the semantics we can conclude the following. In those categories in which both forms of *laka-* and forms of *palka-* are found, i.e. all categories except the present, there is clear evidence for a semantic difference between the two. The basic meaning of *laka-* is ‘to see’, in the sense of ‘to perceive with the eyes’; the subject is an Experiencer. *palka-* rather means ‘to look (at)’, in the sense of ‘to direct one’s gaze (towards)’, and from there also ‘to direct one’s attention to’, ‘to concern oneself with’; the subject is an Agent.

6.3.2 *Semantics as a motivation for the creation of a second verb based on the imperative*

The semantic difference between *laka-* ‘to see’ and *palka-* ‘to look’ as established in the previous section finds an immediate explanation in the scenario in which *palka-* is historically based on the imperative of *laka-*. With an Experiencer as its subject, ‘to see’ is typically an uncontrolled, non-volitional action. It is something that happens to the subject, rather than an action the subject can carry out at will or does intentionally. One can, of course, make a conscious effort to see something, which generally entails directing one’s gaze in the direction of that which one wishes to see — which is an accurate description of ‘to look’. In other words,

the addition of an element of control or volition to ‘to see’ will generally lead to an interpretation ‘to look’ — and it is exactly such an element of control or volition that is always part of the imperative. If the subject of the imperative did not have any control over the action, it would not make sense to command him or her to do it. Therefore, the imperative is generally used only with verbs in which this condition is met — or else it adds a layer of control to the semantics of the verb, *imposing* a controlled interpretation (*make an effort to...*). This is to say that a verb meaning ‘to see, look’ generally assumes the meaning ‘to look’ in the imperative. Similarly, in languages with two distinct verbs for ‘to see’ and ‘to look’, the verb expressing the latter is normally found in the imperative without any restriction, while the verb expressing the former is either rarely found in the imperative or even completely incompatible with it. This semantic characteristic of the imperative provides a natural explanation for the creation of a separate verb on its basis: if **laka-* originally meant both ‘to see’ and ‘to look’, but its imperative generally meant only ‘to look’, this offered an opportunity to create a separate verb meaning ‘to look’, contrasting with ‘to see’ — an opportunity which the Tocharians evidently seized.

7 Conclusion

The preceding analysis suggests the following scenario. Pre-PT **laka-* meant both ‘to see’ and ‘to look’. Its imperative, regularly derived from **laka-* with the imperative prefix **pə-*, generally meant ‘to look’ rather than ‘to see’, due to the element of control or volition that this category requires the action to have, which is present in ‘to look’ but not in ‘to see’. The imperative thus offered a form that primarily meant ‘to look’. The potential of such a separate expression of the meaning ‘to look’ was exploited through an expansion of the imperative form into an independent verb meaning ‘to look’, which left **laka-* meaning only ‘to see’. The meaning of the new verb, PT **palka-*, was properly ‘to direct one’s gaze (to)’ (secondarily also ‘to direct one’s attention (to), concern oneself with, take heed of’, whence e.g. B *palkormem* ‘regarding, concerning’, *empalkaitte*

‘without concern’). This meaning did not lend itself well to expression in the present, for which a corresponding form was never created (the related but durative event of *continued* gaze-fixation was still expressed with **laka-*). The resulting state of affairs was inherited as such by Tocharian B. In Tocharian A, the two verbs merged to form a single verb again, *lākā-* + *pälkā-*, with *lākā-* appearing in the present and the imperfect (and at least partially also still in the imperative, whose form was never recharacterized as ***ppälkā-*), and *pälkā-* in all other categories.

[RECEIVED: AUGUST 2020]

Leiden University Centre for Linguistics
Leiden University
Postbus 9515
2300 RA Leiden
The Netherlands
s.norbruis@hum.leidenuniv.nl

References

- Adams, Douglas Q. 2013. *A dictionary of Tocharian B*. Second edition, revised and greatly enlarged. Amsterdam / New York: Rodopi.
- Broomhead, J.W. 1962. *A Textual Edition of the British Hoernle, Stein and Weber Kuchean Manuscripts: With Transliteration, Translation, Grammatical Commentary and Vocabulary*. PhD Thesis Trinity College, Cambridge. [2 vols.]
- Couvreur, Walter. 1947. *Hoofdzaken van de Tochaarse Klank- en Vormleer*. Leuven: Beheer van Philologische Studiën.
- EWAia = Manfred Mayrhofer. 1992–2001. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen*. Heidelberg: Winter. [3 vols.]
- Hackstein, Olav. 1995. *Untersuchungen zu den sigmatischen Präsensstambildungen des Tocharischen*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Kim, Ronald I. 2003. “Uncovering the Prehistory of the Tocharian Class II Preterite”. *Historische Sprachforschung* 116: 190–233.
- Kim, Ronald I. 2007. “The Duke of York Comes to Xinjiang: Ablaut, Analogy, and Epenthesis in Tocharian Nasal Presents”. *Historische Sprachforschung* 120: 66–104.
- Malzahn, Melanie. 2010. *The Tocharian Verbal System*. Leiden / Boston: Brill.

- Peyrot, Michaël. 2012. “Tocharian ‘eat’ and the strong imperfect in Tocharian A”. In Olav Hackstein & Ronald I. Kim (eds.), *Linguistic developments along the Silk Road: Archaism and Innovation in Tocharian*, Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 85–119.
- Peyrot, Michaël. 2013. *The Tocharian Subjunctive: A Study in Syntax and Verbal Stem Formation*. Leiden / Boston: Brill.
- Pinault, Georges-Jean. 2008. *Chrestomathie Tokharienne: Textes et Grammaire*. Leuven / Paris: Peeters.
- Ringe, Don, Jr. 1996. *On the Chronology of Sound Changes in Tocharian, Volume 1: From Proto-Indo-European to Proto-Tocharian*. New Haven, Connecticut: American Oriental Society.
- Schmidt, Klaus T. 1974. *Die Gebrauchsweisen des Mediums im Tocharischen*. PhD Thesis Göttingen.
- Sieg, Emil & Wilhelm Siegling. 1949. *Tocharische Sprachreste: Sprache B. Die Udānālāṅkāra-Fragmente: Text, Übersetzung und Glossar*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. [2 vols.]
- Sieg, Emil, Wilhelm Siegling & Wilhelm Schulze. 1931. *Tocharische Grammatik*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Tocharian and Indo-European Studies

Founded by Jörundur Hilmarsson

Edited by

Birgit Anette Olsen (executive editor)

Hannes Fellner · Michaël Peyrot

Georges-Jean Pinault

VOLUME 20 · 2020

Museum Tusulanum Press

2020

Tocharian and Indo-European Studies, Vol. 20
© Museum Tusculanum Press and the authors, 2020

ISSN 1012 9286
ISBN 978 87 635 4682 9

Published with support from the Department of Nordic Studies and
Linguistics, University of Copenhagen

EDITORIAL ADVISORY BOARD

Douglas Q. Adams (Moscow, Idaho)
Gerd Carling (Lund)
Olav Hackstein (Munich)
Jay Jasanoff (Harvard)
Ronald Kim (Poznań)
Frederik Kortlandt (Leiden)
Jens Peter Laut (Göttingen)
Melanie Malzahn (Vienna)
H. Craig Melchert (Los Angeles)
Donald Ringe (Pennsylvania)
Guðrún Þórhallsdóttir (Reykjavík)

Museum Tusculanum Press
Rådhusvej 19
DK 2920 Charlottenlund
www.mtp.dk

Contents

ATHANARIC HUARD

- The end of Mahākāśyapa and the encounter with Maitreya —
Two Leaves of a Maitreya-Cycle in Archaic TB 1

ILYA B. ITKIN & ANNA V. KURITSYNA

- Again on nomina agentis in Tocharian B: some new observations 83

ILYA B. ITKIN, SERGEY V. MALYSHEV & MICHAËL PEYROT

- Tocharian A *si* ‘tail’ 107

FREDERIK KORTLANDT

- The origin of grammatical gender in Tocharian and Indo-European 113

LAURA MASETTI

- Chatter and Laugh: Latin *garrīō* ‘chatter’, TA *kary-*, TB *kery-* ‘laugh’,
Old Irish *gáire* ‘laugher’ and PIE **ǵar-* ‘utter a loud sound’ 125

STEFAN NORBRUIS

- Tocharian B *lōka-* ~ *pōlka-*, A *lākā-* ~ *pālkā-* ‘to see, look’ 141

OGIHARA HIROTOSHI WITH A CONTRIBUTION BY L. RUSSELL-SMITH

- A magical practice to protect children from the demons in Kuchean
Buddhism: Research on THT 3998 kept in the Museum für Asiatische
Kunst in Berlin 163

MICHAËL PEYROT

- The simplification of the Archaic Tocharian B clusters *ltk* and *rtk* —
with a note on the vowel assimilation in Late Tocharian B *oñkorñō* 191

GEORGES-JEAN PINAULT

- Tocharian nouns of the Latin *ferōx*-type 201

TOCHARIAN AND INDO-EUROPEAN STUDIES (abbreviated TIES) was founded in 1987 by Jörundur Hilmarsson and appeared under his editorship in Reykjavík, Iceland, until his death in 1992. Vol. 6 appeared posthumously in 1993 under the editorial finish of Guðrún Þórhallsdóttir who also supervised the continuation of the Supplementary Series up to vol. 5 in 1997. Vols. 7 to 10 were published by C. A. Reitzel Publishers Ltd., Copenhagen. Subsequent volumes are published by Museum Tusculanum Press in Copenhagen.

Editors:

Birgit Anette Olsen (executive editor, Copenhagen)
Hannes Fellner (Vienna)
Michaël Peyrot (Leiden)
Georges-Jean Pinault (Paris)

Orders and correspondence concerning distribution should be directed to:

Museum Tusculanum Press
Rådhusvej 19
DK 2920 Charlottenlund
Denmark
info@mtp.dk

Manuscripts for publication and other correspondence on editorial matters should be directed to:

Mail: Georges-Jean Pinault
École Pratique des Hautes Études, PSL
4-14, rue Ferrus
75014 Paris
France

Email: ties@hum.ku.dk